Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA

The Holy Library, complete in eight books

English translation — mindofthechurch.com

CONTENTS

Book I — On the Divine Volumes (with the front matter) p. 2

Book II — The Books and Writers Mentioned in Scripture p. 72

Book III — The Art of Expounding Scripture p. 246

Book IV — The Catholic Expositors of the Divine Volumes p. 348

Books V–VI — The Annotations on the Old and New Testaments p. 594

Book VII — The Defense of the New Testament p. 1114

Book VIII — The Defense of the Old Testament p. 1191

Each book keeps its own page numbers; the contents and indices of Books V–VI refer to the pages of that part. Page numbers above are those of this combined file.

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK I

With the front matter: the title, the dedication to Pius V, and the general preface. On the divine volumes: their canon, and the order and authority of the sacred books

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, Book I

Note on the Latin sources. This English version is drawn from two copies of Sixtus's *Bibliotheca Sancta.* The front matter and pages 6–108 were translated from the 1586 Cologne edition (Maternus Cholinus), which carries few marginal notes; the marginal glosses were then supplied from a second, more heavily annotated copy of the same work. From page 109 onward the translation is made directly from that margin-rich copy. The printed leaf- and page-numbers in both copies are frequently misprinted, so pages are aligned by content and scan sequence rather than by the printed folios.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — THE HOLY LIBRARY

Title Page

(PDF p. 6 — unnumbered leaf; full-width title page with the printer's device.)

THE HOLY LIBRARY,

gathered by **Friar SIXTUS OF SIENA, of the Order of Preachers**, out of the principal authors of the Catholic Church, and digested into **eight books**, whose inscriptions [titles] the following page will indicate.

To the Most Holy PIUS V, Supreme Pontiff, Best and Greatest.

Revised anew by the same Author before he departed from among the living, and augmented; and now in very many places purged of faults; and enriched with a new Chronographic Table, [drawn up] according to the collation of the times.

A work, after the sacred Bible, supremely necessary to all who profess true and sincere Theology.

With three most copious indices.

THIRD EDITION.

(Printer's device: an ornamental cartouche with a wreathed medallion bearing the motto) — **Psal. 46** [so printed; the verse is Ps. 64:12 Vulg.]: *"Thou shalt bless the crown of the year of thy goodness"* (*BENEDICES CORONAE ANNI BENIGNITATIS TVAE*).

AT COLOGNE, **At the house of Maternus Cholinus. In the year 1586**.

With the Favor and Privilege of His Imperial Majesty (*Cum Gratia & Privileg. Caes. Maiest.*).

[manuscript notes of the Spanish censors on this copy: "Expurgado 1640 — Ba(p). Davila" ("Expurgated, 1640"), and below: "Y corregido según el expurgatorio del año de 1632" ("And corrected according to the expurgatory (index) of the year 1632")]

(PDF p. 7 — unnumbered leaf; full-width.)

THE NUMBER AND ORDER OF THE EIGHT BOOKS which are contained in this work

On the number, partition, and authority of the divine volumes (*De numero, partitione, & autoritate diuinorum voluminum*)	Book 1
On the scriptures and writers of whom mention is made in the sacred volumes (*De scripturis, & scriptoribus, quorum in sacris voluminibus fit mentio*)	Book 2
On the art of expounding the sacrosanct volumes (*De arte exponendi sacrosancta volumina*)	Book 3
On the Catholic expositors of the sacred volumes (*De Catholicis sacrorum voluminum expositoribus*)	Book 4
On the annotations and censures upon the expositors of the volumes of the Old Testament (*De annotationibus, & censuris in expositores voluminum vet. Testamenti*)	Book 5

On the annotations and censures upon the expositors of the volumes of the New Testament (*De annotationibus, & censuris in expositores voluminum noui Testamenti*)	Book 6
On those [writings], or against those [men], who have assailed the volumes of the New Testament (*De his, vel aduersus eos, qui noui Testamenti volumina oppugnarunt*)	Book 7
On those [writings], or against those [men], who have assailed the volumes of the Old Testament (*De his, vel aduersus eos, qui vet. Testamenti volumina oppugnarunt*)	Book 8

The usefulness of these [books] the Preface of the whole Work, following, will demonstrate.

(PDF p. 8 — unnumbered leaf; full-width dedication.)

DEDICATION

To the Most Blessed Father and Supreme Bishop of the Christian Religion, PIUS V, Pontiff Best and Greatest: Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers, [wishes] FELICITY.

Many indeed, and well-nigh innumerable, MOST BLESSED FATHER, are the things illustriously done by you before you were raised, by the gift of the divine benignity and with the immense applause of the whole world, to the summit of the supreme Pontificate. But among the other works of [your] pious solicitude, which you accomplished in contending for the defense of the Catholic religion against all the heresies of this pitiable age, far more admirable is that truly divine providence of yours, whereby you delivered the whole Library of the Christian Commonwealth from the peril of the ruin intended [against it] by the heretics. For when, among the ten most eminent Cardinals with whom rested the supreme authority of the sacrosanct Roman Inquisition, you held the first place, there came forth, with you as its author, that most holy decree concerning the repairing of the Library of the whole Christian Church — which the most abandoned heretics of our times had so corrupted with their diseases and plagues, that nothing else was to be expected but its most certain destruction, had you not suddenly brought aid. For first you commanded that the books of nefarious doctrine be sought out through the whole Christian world and publicly burned. Then you took care that all the writings of Catholic writers — and especially the writings of the ancient Fathers, contaminated with the dregs and infected with the poisons of the heretics of our age — be expurgated and cleansed of blemish. Lastly you ordered that a Catalog, or Index, be published of all authors and books of heretical name, which were to be barred from the ecclesiastical Library and cast away by all Christian readers.

I, kindled by this most burning zeal of your piety, have gathered the eight volumes of the HOLY LIBRARY (*BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE*); in which I have embraced all those things which seem most to pertain, both to the reading and elucidating of all the authors and books which, approved by your most wise judgment, you have declared worthy of the Christian Library; and to the confuting of all the authors and books which, condemned by your most just decree, you have pronounced unworthy of the same Christian Library. And since certain pious and learned men have judged that this — whatever there is of my labor — would profit in no small measure the students of the sacred letters, and on that account have also exhorted [me] to send it forth to the public: I have dared to consecrate it to the most pious name of your Beatitude, judging that it befits no one more that a Holy Library be dedicated [to him] than you, THE MOST HOLY REPAIRER OF THE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY — and by me singularly above all [others]: whom you once recalled from the infernal regions [from the very jaws of death], and dug out from the darkness of errors, and illumined with the light of sincere truth; and, having led [me] to the observance of a loftier discipline, clothed [me] with the habit of your own holy profession — you yourself, with your own vestments, with your own hands; and

adopted [me] as a son reborn by your spirit; and have so cherished me in this sacred Order of Preachers by your benignity and liberality, ever unto this very day, that I am indebted to no one on earth more than to you. And since it is not permitted [me] to attest in any other manner a mind mindful of so many immortal benefits, I have thought that this labor, such as it is — a witness of my not ungrateful will — should be inscribed [dedicated] to your Beatitude: whom, I pray, may God, Best and Greatest, long preserve unharmed for the dignity of the Apostolic See and for the aiding of the Christian Commonwealth, and flourishing in all affluence of felicity.

At Venice, in the year from the Nativity of Christ 1566, on the Kalends of October [October 1].

(PDF p. 9 — unnumbered leaf; full-width with marginal glosses.)

PREFACE of Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers, upon the eight books of the Holy Library

With such clouds of ignorance indeed are all mortals encompassed, and overwhelmed with such darkness of errors, that by their own strength they cannot lift the bedimmed eyes of the mind to that most refulgent splendor of the divine light, in the beholding of which consists the highest and true felicity of man. God, the creator of all things, taking pity on this so profound gloom of the human mind, has bestowed very many remedies upon our blindness: among which that most excellent light of Christian wisdom stands foremost, revealed in the holy books of the divine oracles, whose most brilliant rays show, amid the devious and dark by-paths of this life, the unencumbered way to eternal beatitude.

1

And lest any difficulty either of foreign speech and unknown tongue, or any obscurity of abstruse meaning, should in any part becloud for readers the flashing brightness of the divine volumes, He summoned into His Church, out of all the nations of the whole world, various interpreters, expositors, and doctors, nobly imbued with the secular disciplines and divinely inspired with skill in sacred things, who should pour over the blessed scriptures of both Testaments into the principal languages of the nations, and should unlock the mysteries hidden in them not only with living words and the animated sound of the voice, but should also, with pen and ink, piously and perspicuously unfold them in pages and codices destined to endure the longer — leaving to us, upon all the parts of both the old and the new instrument [Testament], divers works of sacred explanation: that is, Translations, Introductions, Partitions, Annotations, Paraphrases, Enarrations, Homilies, Sermons, Meditations, Disputations, Collations, Coacervations [accumulations], Commentaries, Collectanea, Compendia, and other innumerable writings of the interpretative kind like to these, digested according to the diversity of talents and the variety of the times.

And lest either the carelessness of men, or the injury of time — which obliterates all things — should bring destruction upon such distinguished monuments of letters, God first raised up not a few prelates and pastors of the Church, kindled with ardor for the evangelical doctrine and for ecclesiastical discipline, who gathered up the toils and vigils of the sacred authors, sought out through the whole world not without great labor and enormous expense, and with great fidelity — or rather religious scruple — copied them out in most correct codices; and thereafter out of these erected libraries in the chief churches, in the colleges of priests, and in the monasteries of monks, stocked full with the most precious lucubrations of the holy doctors of the Church: so that the custody of so divine a thing might rest with those whose chief concern it is to pass their whole mortal life in the studies of eternal life, and not only to meditate on the laws of God day and night, according to the sentence of David [2], but also to instruct others delivered over to their care, and to school them both in the evangelical precepts and in the [evangelical] counsels.

3

For nothing is more useful for the training and teaching of the people of the Church than the divine furniture of books, and the writings of the noble chieftains of the Church, containing nothing that does not belong to the celestial and immortal goods. For from these, as from the most fertile and ever-verdant fields bedewed with the dew of Mount Hermon, the Christian people is fed with wholesome nourishment; the thirst of the hearers is quenched as from the purest fountains of living water and from the eternal rivers of paradise; and against spiritual diseases, as from medicinal gardens, are gathered the most efficacious remedies of herbs and flowers that perish by no old age. From these, just as from a most opulent treasury of riches, the poverty of needy souls is enriched; nor otherwise than from the best-furnished armories are weapons taken up, whereby the madnesses of infidels and the furies of heretics are laid low. From these, no otherwise than from a school and training-ground of all the virtues, the whole life, manners, and duties of the Christian man are formed: the unlearned are taught, the learned are exercised, the fallen are helped, that they may rise; the standing [are admonished], lest they fall; the naked are armed with spiritual arms; the armed are led forth into battle; those in the fight are heartened, lest they be conquered; the conquering are admonished, lest they lose their victory. In sum, there is nothing anywhere either honorable, or useful, or delightful — nothing great or rare — which could be desired in these [books] for [attaining] Christian erudition, for piety of life, and for the gaining of true felicity.

4

But, our sins so deserving it, it has come to pass that upon this sacred treasure of the ecclesiastical Library — which God, by such great solicitude of our forefathers, willed [*luit*, →]

[1] The necessity and usefulness of the Holy Library [2] Ps. 1:2 [3] The usefulness of ecclesiastical books [4] The Holy Library has suffered eleven injuries from the wicked men of our age, indicated by the numbers set in the margin

---

(PDF p. 10 — unnumbered leaf; the Preface continues. Running head: "F. Sixti Senensis in octo Bibliothecae sanctae libros praefatio.")

[→] to be preserved for the use of the Church, there have now — O grief! — been brought loss and disaster, to be bewailed with many tears, by the ignorance together with the avarice, the rashness, the ambition, and the impiety of many utterly abandoned men of this wicked age.

[1] Among whom, first, the printers and certain booksellers, seeking nothing by their craft except gain, daily send forth new broods of books — adulterine, supposititious, pseudepigraphous, and bastard — having set upon the frontispieces of the works, without any judgment or shame, the false inscriptions of illustrious authors, that thereby they may sell them both dearer and faster. By this artifice, to be sure, they have foisted upon us, among many spurious births, the *Questions on Genesis* of Philo the Jew; the *Questions to the Gentiles* of Justin, philosopher and martyr; the *Questions to Antiochus* of St. Athanasius; the *Paraphrase on Job* of Origen, and Commentaries of the same on the same book; likewise the *Commentaries on the Psalms* of Arnobius the Rhetor; the *Homilies on the Gospels* of Eusebius of Emesa; the *Explanations on the Apocalypse* of Ambrose; the three books of Jerome *On Proverbs*, and three books *On the Lamentations of Jeremiah*; the eight books of Eucherius *On the histories of Genesis and of Kings*; and along with these very many other works falsely fathered, especially under the names of the ancient Fathers — whose doctrines, style, and times stand farther from their own titles and inscriptions than heaven from earth.

[2] And with a not dissimilar, but more impudent trickery, these same men — as the adage has it, getting themselves two sons-in-law from a single daughter — have oftentimes printed what was the work of but one author separately, and even in the same printing-house, under the diverse titles of two or three authors: exhibiting to us (that I may meanwhile adduce a few little instances out of so many for example) the *Homilies on Leviticus* printed in separate volumes, once under the name of Origen and again the very same under the name of Cyril; bringing forward likewise the same commentaries on the epistles of Paul, inscribed

in some codices to Athanasius, but in others to Theophylact; similarly publishing the same *Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*, first fore-titled with the inscription of Gregory of Neocaesarea, and then, the following year, with that of Gregory Nazianzen; selling the same commentaries on Proverbs, at first claimed for Bede, and soon after for Jerome; divulging also the same commentations on Job, in many volumes, under the name of Philip the Priest, but in most fore-titled with the style of Bede the Priest — under which [name] they have also issued the *Collectanea* of the same Bede *On the Hexameron*, struck off at the same time under the appellation of Junilius the African; and the same explanations of the Psalms, bearing in the earlier edition the inscription of Hugh of [St.] Cher (*Hugonis Carensis*), but in the later, that of Alexander of Hales.

[3] A detriment far greater and graver than these have the impious heretics of our times brought upon the divine Library: who, that they might win credit for their heresies from the authority of distinguished authors, have set upon the books of nefarious doctrine published by themselves the well-graced names and surnames of the Catholic Fathers — by this kind of imposture, forsooth, enticing to themselves greedy and incautious readers, to whom they might vend dregs and excrements for ambrosia and nectar, and death-dealing poisons smeared over with honey for remedies and antidotes. Thus in recent years they published abroad the pernicious volume of Oecolampadius against the Sacrament of the body of Christ under the title of *Bertram the Priest, On the body and blood of the Lord, to Charlemagne*; and, conversely, the work of Carlstadt against the venerators of images, with the inscription of *Charlemagne, On the cult of images, to the sixth synod gathered in the East*. And again they sent forth another work — of Calvin — under the name of *Alcuin, the preceptor of Charlemagne, to the same Emperor Charles*. In this fashion they transformed the book of Henry Bullinger against the visible church into a book of *St. Athanasius, On the true and pure church*. So too they changed the little work of Bucer against the merits of good works into another little work, with the lying inscription of *John, bishop of Rochester (episcopi Roffensis), On the mercy of God*. And with a like fraud they turned the Italian sermons of Bernardino Ochino, apostate and heretic, into the sermons of Thomas [Stella], of the Order of Preachers, bishop of Justinopolis [Capodistria].

[4] **And as though** this detestable metamorphosis of writings might seem, to these Proteuses and masked play-actors, of no moment or of very little: they have again, with a boldness far more pestilent, rushed upon the labors of the orthodox Fathers, usurping to themselves — above all in the writings of the ancients — a certain tyrannical power of judging, of censuring, of calling into doubt, of repudiating, of mutilating, of rescinding, and, at the lust of their fancy, of removing and utterly abolishing whatever did not please their own insane taste. Of these — that I may not review them one by one — let Oecolampadius, Luther, and Erasmus suffice for example. The first of whom removed the books of Ambrose *On the sacraments* out of the Ambrosian works, as if unworthy of Ambrose their parent, for no other cause than that they overthrew his heresy concerning the sacrament. The second cast utterly away all the works celebrated under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite — brought forward now for so many ages, under his authority, by great authors in testimony of the weightiest matters — offended, as he himself says, by their Platonic dreams, and by their unskilled and fri- [*gidis* →]

[1] I. [2] II. [3] III. [4] IIII.

(PDF p. 11 — unnumbered leaf; the Preface continues. Running head: "F. Sixti Senensis in octo…")

[→ *fri-*]gid allegories, in which that author would be forever playing. But the third [Erasmus] — whom the heretics, by way of honor, do not blush to call the *Censor of the ecclesiastical library* — snatched up the censor's rod against sacred authors of great name with such authority (not to say temerity), that out of their distinguished lucubrations he either removed a great part altogether, or reduced it into the lowest classes of worthless writers: taking away from Cyprian well-nigh half of his labors; from Jerome, a fourth; from Ambrose, one tome out of four; from Chrysostom, the half of one tome; from Augustine, more than sixty books or opuscula — of which, though I grant that some were not undeservedly expunged, yet very many

were unworthily and rashly hissed off.

[1] I pass over the innumerable and almost infinite volumes of pontifical law and of scholastic theology, which the impious fury of the heretics has shamefully cast out of the sacred Libraries as tyrannical, barbarous, and sophistical, and has even burned up in public conflagrations of flames.

[2] **I omit,** for brevity's sake, certain profane defilers who, as cockle with wheat and lees with wine, mix into the writings of the Fathers their own trifles, old-wives' songs, and errors, with such a mingling and such a joining that they cannot be torn away from the authors' true works without loss of the whole work, and can only with difficulty even be distinguished: of which kind are Prefaces, Arguments, Coronides [tail-pieces], Appendices, Corollaries, Summaries, Glossemata, Annotations, Scholia, Castigations, Observations, Censures, Antidotes, and a thousand other by-works (*parerga*) of most impudent temerity, conferred [inflicted] by Oecolampadius and Lucianus upon Chrysostom, by Beatus Rhenanus upon Tertullian, and by Erasmus upon Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine — and lately condemned by decree of the holy Roman Church.

[3] And, lest I delay the reader longer in a matter so manifest, I say nothing of the translations and printings of the sacred authors, in so many places deliberately altered, depraved, falsified by the heretics, and violently wrested to their own heresies. I come rather to the blessed writers of both Testaments: whom, though above all — on account of the majesty of the divine word and the undoubted authority of our faith — they ought to have kept untouched and left inviolate, yet against none have these boars, more than sylvan [wild], raged more savagely.

[4] Of whom some, raising the beginning of contention from the very translations of the divine scripture, proclaim with sacrilegious voice that all the editions which the church of the faithful has down to this day venerated as true and certain are for the greater part badly translated, wrongly copied, contaminated, altered, in many places falsified, scraped away, added to, and in every way most vilely handled; and that therefore, for the sincere reading of the holy volumes, there is need of new, true, and emended versions: such as in recent years have been sent forth by Pellican, Zwingli, Luther, Münster, Erasmus, Castellio, and several other authors of profane novelties — who out of the Greek and Hebrew fount have translated the holy Bible into the various tongues of divers nations according to the good pleasure of their own dogmas, with scholia, glossemata, arguments, summaries, titles, and most pestilent indices adjoined: whereby they compel the divine scriptures to speak whatever they themselves have willed, and whatever of impiety they have devised.

[5] Others, having assailed the very authority of the divine letters more criminally and more impiously, diminish for us the number of the volumes of both Testaments and reduce it to a smaller sum: among whom Luther and Zwingli first eliminate from the old Testament the books of Wisdom, of Ecclesiasticus, of Tobias, of Esther, of Judith, of Baruch, of the Maccabees, and a part of Daniel, as apocrypha and writings of uncertain authority and credit. And from the new instrument [Testament] the same men take away from us the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and of Jude, the second of Peter, and the second and third epistles of John, as being too little evangelical and unworthy of the apostolic name. Calvin cuts out of the Gospel of John the history of the adulterous woman. Musculus lops off the last chapter from the Gospel of Mark, of whose author and inscription Erasmus had some time before entertained doubts. Erasmus tears away from the new testament the Apocalypse of John, previously condemned by Luther, and pronounces that they are deceived who believe it to be [the work] of John the Evangelist — from whose earlier [first] epistle he also cut away that most celebrated testimony *Of the Unity of the Trinity* [1 John 5:7], as adventitious and thrust in from elsewhere by the Homousians [defenders of the *homoousion*].

[6] And the raving Fanatics and the Anabaptists proudly boast that the whole body of divine scripture has been corrupted on every side, but especially in the evangelical and apostolic letters: inasmuch as in them many testimonies out of the Mosaic and prophetic books were rashly and falsely inserted by half-Jewish Christians.

[7] Others, on the contrary, wishing to augment the number of the holy books, bring forward under the name of divine authors certain apocryphal writings: such as are the Protoevangelium of James, the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the Gospel of Nicodemus, the epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, the Visions of Esaias, and other things of this kind, lately struck off by the presses of the heretics and illustrated with scholia. Such also are the Hebrew [Gospel] of Mat- [*thaei* →]

[1] V. [2] VI. [3] VII. [4] VIII. [5] IX. [6] X. [7] XI.

(PDF p. 12 — unnumbered leaf; the Preface continues. Running head: "F. Sixti Senensis in octo Bibliothecae sanctae libros praefatio.")

[→ *Mat*-]thew's Gospel; the Hebrew epistle of Paul to the Hebrews; and the Hebrew volumes of Tobias, Judith, and the Maccabees, far different from our vulgate edition — which Münster, having partly translated them himself out of the Latin into the Hebrew speech, and partly fabricated them, has put under the press and published, as though faithfully taken from the ancient archives of the Jews and from the very archetypes of their authors.

And, lest by enumerating each thing singly I weary the reader with too long a preface, let it suffice to have pointed out these things only, by way of example: which indeed, together with the other impostures of this kind — to be plainly detected by us in the course of the present work — have so tossed the precious treasures of the divine Library topsy-turvy, and, rolling them up together with the filthy off-scourings of the heretics, have confounded them into one chaos of undivided commixture, that nothing is now more difficult than, in so great a confusion of writings, to discern the true from the false, the pious from the impious, the pure from the impure; to distinguish the legitimate and truly genuine from the spurious; and to separate the depravations of impostors from the entire and uncontaminated writings of the authors.

Considering — I myself — this so great calamity of the orthodox Library, not without immense sadness of heart and the constant brooding of a grieving mind, I judged that I should be doing a thing neither wholly superfluous, nor at all unserviceable for the repairing of this loss, if out of the most approved writers I should weave together the present work, divided into eight books: whose arguments — that from these you may comprehend at a single glance the matter, the usefulness, and the order of the whole undertaking from its very beginning — I shall briefly set forth in this place.

[1]

The first book, then, treating of the divine volumes of both Testaments, will expound most diligently the several arguments of them, their authors, their authority, and the times of the matters described by their authors.

The second will review all the writings — extant and not extant, the true and undoubted as well as the apocryphal and pseudepigraphous — of all the writers of whom mention is made in the sacred volumes; and will lucidly explicate their arguments, and many obscure things in them.

The third, embracing the art of expounding the holy volumes, will show, by most apt rules and examples, almost sixty modes of explaining the holy writings, employed by the Catholic expositors.

The fourth, containing a catalog of those who have illustrated the divine volumes with Catholic interpretations, will comprehend, of all the expositors who from the three-hundredth year before the birth of Christ down to these times have expounded the holy books rightly and piously: their names, their race [nation], their dignity, their century, the number and variety of their commentaries, their language, their style, their kind of exposition, their method of expounding — and especially the various judgments of illustrious men concerning the principal expositors. To this will be added, in the place of an appendix, an *Index (Elenchus) of the Hebrew expositors of the divine volumes*; and likewise a brief admonition *On the causes of*

false inscriptions, and by what conjectures their falsity may be detected.

The fifth, claiming to itself the censor's right over the expositors of the divine volumes of the old Testament, will contain annotations, censures, castigations, observations, and elucidations of the most erudite doctors of the church upon various passages in the explanations of the nobler expositors — partly to be read with caution, partly to be avoided altogether, partly to be piously interpreted, or at least modestly excused.

The sixth will contain, with the same annotating zeal and order, censures and annotations upon the explainers of the books of the new Testament.

The seventh, contending against those who have attempted to obscure the books of the New testament with their heresies, will most sharply confute — both out of the divine letters themselves and out of the writings of the ancient fathers — all the heresies which from the ascension of Christ down to this day have arisen against the several scriptures of the new Testament.

The eighth, with the same weapons, will overthrow all the heresies stirred up by the heretics against the several volumes of the old Testament.

These things, therefore, digested into eight books according to the order proposed, we have gathered together for no other cause than by a pious zeal of helping to serve the public convenience of all lovers of the sacred letters: that — the ambushes being detected, and the perils and well-nigh all the obstacles being removed, which the fraud of the heretics has set in opposition to those greedy of celestial wisdom — it may be permitted to the students of the holy scriptures to range at large through the ample and pleasant fields of the sacrosanct Library, with the greatest delight of mind, more freely, more boldly, and without stumbling. Wherefore I exhort the pious readers — for whose sake we have undertaken this labor, such as it is, with many vigils, sweats, and the expense of good hours — that, if they find any things in my writings which they judge to pertain to the profit of readers, they give thanks to the excellent authors of the church, from whose immor- [*immor-* →]

[1] The arguments of the eight books of the Holy Library

(PDF p. 13 — unnumbered leaf; end of the Preface. Running head: "F. Sixti Senensis in octo Bibliothecae sanctae libros praefatio.")

[→ *immor-*]tal monuments we have borrowed whatever of good we have contributed hither. But if they detect anything said less than rightly, or strayed into through imprudence (for we too are men, and in many things, as the Apostle says, we all offend), again I beseech and implore them not to attribute it either to arrogance, or to malice, or to any other private affections of mine, but rather to ascribe it to my weakness and slenderness [of powers], modestly correcting and sincerely emending whatever things shall seem to them worthy of castigation. For I myself — a cast-down manikin, and not ignorant of my own lowest condition — not only, as is fitting, do I as a suppliant offer myself and all my writings to the apostolic judgment of the Holy Roman Church, but I also willingly and gladly subject the same to the reckoning [vote] of every candid reader for castigation and emendation: admonishing those who are about to read these things not to exact from me ornaments of words and elegance of elocution — which I neither profess, nor, if I did profess it, could I preserve it in so various and unequal a collection of divers writings — but to receive kindly from me the truth of the matters, set forth in such speech and order as was possible; and to embrace with their whole heart the ready willingness of my mind, my burning desire of helping, and my labor expended for the common profit of all good men: praying our Lord Jesus Christ, that out of His most bountiful goodness He may breathe favorably upon the beginning of our work, and after the beginning may grant prosperous successes even to the end. But now, to the labor of the sacrosanct Library already marked out, let us begin to set our hands.

(End of the Preface. The catchword "F. SIXTI" joins to the title-block of Book One overleaf.)

(printed p. 1 [PDF p. 14], recto — the two-column body of the work begins.)

LIBER PRIMVS — BOOK ONE

Of Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On the Divine volumes — [being] the FIRST BOOK of the *Bibliotheca Sancta* (the Holy Library)

The first book of this sacrosanct Library — in which, as the first foundations of the whole work to come, we have laid down the enumeration of all the divine volumes, their order, partition, authority, authors, arguments, and the times of the matters comprehended in them — we wish to be divided into three Sections: [1] of which the first will contain the holy Scriptures and Writers, of the old as well as of the new testament, placed in the first order of the sacred Canon. The second will review the holy Scriptures and Writers of both testaments pertaining to the second order of the Canon. To the third and last Section we shall relegate the apocryphal Scriptures and Writers, inserted in various places of the old as well as of the new testament — showing all these things, now from the very testimonies of the divine scripture, now from the monuments of the ancient fathers, now from probable arguments, with the utmost fidelity and brevity. But before we expound the order of the proposed partition, the method of teaching seems to require that first of all we explain what the Canonical and the Apocryphal scriptures are, and in what way the Canonical writings of the first and of the second order differ between themselves.

ON THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES AND WRITERS OF THE FIRST ORDER — SECTION ONE

What the Canonical and the Apocryphal scripture, and [their] Writers, are.

The Divine or Canonical scriptures [2] (which the Greeks call διαθηκόγραφα, that is, *Testamentary writings*) are those which, according to the tradition of our forefathers, are believed to have been divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit Himself for our instruction: whose authority is so great, that it is an abomination (*nephas*) to doubt concerning their trustworthiness. And the Divine and Canonical writers [3] are those who, at the dictation of the divine spirit, wrote the canonical scriptures with such constancy of faithfulness, that not to believe them most firmly is impious. Concerning their venerable authority [4] Augustine, writing to Jerome, says this: "I have learned to pay this fear and honor to those writers alone who are called canonical, that I hold most firmly that none of them erred in writing. And if I stumble upon anything in them which seems contrary to the truth, I shall reckon nothing else than either that the codex is faulty, or that the translator has not attained what was said, or that I have by no means understood it — of this I shall have no doubt. But the others I read in such wise that, however much they excel in sanctity or in doctrine, I do not therefore think a thing true because they so judged, but because they were able to persuade me, either through those canonical authors or by probable reasons, that it does not depart from the truth." Thus far Augustine. [5]

Moreover, the canonical books of the old as well as of the new testament are distinguished between themselves by two orders: [6] of which the one is prior, the other posterior — prior, I say, and posterior not in authority, or certainty, or dignity (for each receives its excellence and its majesty from the same Holy Spirit), but in [the Church's] cognition [of them], and in time; by which two things it comes about that the one order precedes, the other follows.

The Canonical [books] of the first order, [7] which it is convenient to call *Protocanonical*, are books of undoubted credit; that is, concerning whose authority there was never in the catholic Church any doubt or controversy; but immediately from the beginning of the nascent Church they were received by the common consent of all the orthodox fathers, and taken up for the confirming of the authority of our faith: such as are,

in the old Testament, the five books of Moses, and in the new Testament the four gospels, and others like to these, to be numbered in their place.

The Canonical [books] of the second order [8] (which of old were called *Ecclesiastical*, and are now by us termed *Deuterocanonical*) are those concerning which — because they came to the knowledge of the whole Church not immediately in the very times of the Apostles, but long afterward — opinion among Catholics was at one time wavering. Such are, in the old Testament, the books of Esther, of Tobias, of Judith, and of Baruch; the epistle of Jeremiah; the wisdom of Solomon; Ecclesiasticus; the prayer of Azariah; the Hymn of the three children; the history of Susanna; the history of Bel; the first and second book of the Maccabees. And similarly in the new Testament: the last chapter of Mark; the history in Luke of the bloody Sweat of Christ and of the apparition of the Angel; the history in John of the adulterous woman; the epistle to the Hebrews; the epistle of James; the second epistle of Peter; the second and third epistle of John; the epistle of Jude; the Apocalypse of John; and other books of the same kind — which of old the ancient fathers of the Church held as Apocryphal and not Canonical, and permitted them to be read at first only among the catechumens, not yet capable of the canonical reading (as Athanasius testifies in the *Synopsis*); then, with time proceeding, they allowed them to be recited among all the faithful (as Rufinus writes in [his exposition of] the *Creed*), not for the confirmation of dogmas, but solely for the instruction of the people; and, because they were read publicly in the Church, they named them *Ecclesiastical* [9]; but at the last they willed that they be taken up among the scriptures of irrefragable authority.

But the Apocryphal — that is, hidden, occult, or doubtful — scriptures are so called in two manners: [10] either because their author is uncertain, in which manner assuredly it can happen that even some of the canonical books are "Apocryphal," [11] since it is not altogether certain and ascertained to the Church which of men was their scribe, although she believes most certainly that their author was the Holy Spirit; or they are called Apocryphal for another reason [12] — that is, of hidden, unknown, uncertain, and obscure authority — because the ecclesiastical fathers did not know with certainty, nor dared to define, whether they were composed by their writers under the breathing [inspiration] of the Holy Spirit; and for this cause they willed not that they be brought forward for the confirmation of the dogmas of the Christian faith, nor be read publicly in the Church for the edification of the people and pronounced in the temples, but permitted them to be read only privately and at home. Such are the third and fourth books of Esdras; the third and fourth book of the Maccabees; likewise the [*Appen-* →]

[manuscript margin note of the Spanish censor beside this last paragraph: "These appendices … are canonical, and by no means to be reckoned among the apocryphal scriptures, according to the decree of the Council of Trent, Session 4."]

---

[1] The first book is distributed into three Sections. [2] What scripture is called Canonical. [3] Who the Canonical writers are. [4] The authority of the Canonical books is greatest. [5] On the authority of the Fathers, what St. Augustine holds: see Epistle 111; Against Julian the Pelagian, book 1 ch. 2, and book 2 near the end; and On Marriage and Concupiscence, book 2 ch. 29. [6] The canonical books are distinguished among themselves by two orders. [7] Which the canonical books of the prior order, or Protocanonical, are. [8] Which the canonical books of the posterior order, or Deuterocanonical, are. [9] Which books are called Ecclesiastical. [10] Scripture is called Apocryphal in two ways. [11] Some canonical books are apocryphal in the first way. [12] No canonical books are apocryphal in the latter way.

(printed p. 2 [PDF p. 15], verso — Section I continues; then the first Supputation table.)

[→ *Appen-*]dix of the book of Esther; the Appendix of the book of Job; the Appendix of the psalter; the Appendix of Paralipomenon; and the scriptures akin to these, which we have put off to the third Section. The name of "apocryphal" is also wont, in the pontifical decrees, to be transferred at times to the interdicted and utterly condemned writings of heretics; [1] but of this signification we make no use for the present, precisely because we believe that in the vulgate Bibles of the catholics there is no part which the apostolic Church has either pronounced heretical or interdicted to christians. Since, then, the whole body of the Bible as it now stands among catholics is distinguished by a threefold difference of books — namely the canonical of the

first order, the canonical of the second order, and the apocryphal — [2] we shall begin from the enumeration and manifold partition of the canonical volumes of the first order which are contained in the old Testament, as well among us as among the Hebrews; intending afterward to do the like for the books of the first order which the scripture of the new Testament embraces.

On the various reckonings of the Canonical books of the old Testament, which are placed in the first order of the sacred canon.

The volumes of the first order, which alone are held in authority among the Hebrews, [3] the Jews are wont to reckon up with a threefold variety of numbers. Some — among whom are Josephus and Philo — reckon the sacred books according to the number of the Hebrew letters: [4] so that, just as among the Hebrews there are twenty-two letters, by which all things that can be said and written are comprehended, so there should be twenty-two volumes in which are contained all things that can be known and declared concerning divine matters. This enumeration, among the Christians, Origen, Epiphanius, Gregory the Theologian, Jerome, and Rufinus have followed. [5] Others of the Jews — of whose number are Aben Ezra and David Kimchi — count twenty-four books of the old testament, [6] according to the same number of letters, the letter *Iod* being nevertheless thrice repeated, in honor of the divine name; for the Jews are accustomed to write that four-lettered name of God — which among them it is an abomination, for reverence of God, to utter with tongue and voice — with the letter *Iod* tripled, after the Chaldaic manner, in this fashion: יייי. [7] This partition some of the ancient Greeks took up, because it agreed most aptly with the number of the twenty-four Greek letters; and very many of the Latins, ancient as well as more recent, embraced it with equal zeal, having regard to that mystic number of the twenty-four elders whom John brought forward in the Apocalypse — adoring the Lamb that opens the book sealed with seven seals, which no one could open, neither in heaven nor on earth, and crying out: "Worthy art thou, O Lord, to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof." [8] Again, some of the Hebrews have been accustomed to number twenty-seven books, [9] according to the number of the twenty-seven Jewish characters, resulting from the twenty-two simple elements of which the whole Hebrew alphabet consists, and from the five final — or repeated, or double — letters. For there are among the Hebrews five geminate or two-formed letters, [10] which at the end of words are written otherwise than at the beginning and in the middle, namely כ *caph*, מ *mem*, נ *nun*, פ *phe*, צ *zaddi*: which at the end of words are noted with these figures — ך *caph*, ם *mem*, ן *nun*, ף *phe*, ץ *zaddi*. Of these three reckonings the examples are these:

THE FIRST SUPPUTATION, enumerating the books of the old Testament as TWENTY-TWO, according to the number of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, with the Jewish inscriptions [titles] of the books adjoined.

#	Letter	Book	Hebrew inscription	Transliteration & meaning
1	א	Genesis	בראשית	*Berescith*, that is, "In the beginning."
2	ב	Exodus	ואלה שמות	*Ve elle schemoth*, i.e., "And these are the names."
3	ג	Leviticus	ויקרא	*Va ijkra*, i.e., "And he called."
4	ד	Numbers	וידבר	*Va iedaber*, i.e., "And he spoke."
5	ה	Deuteronomion	אלה הדברים	*Elle addeuarim*, i.e., "These are the words."

#	Letter	Book	Hebrew inscription	Transliteration & meaning
6	ו	Joshua	יהושע	*Ieoscua*.
7	ז	Judges & Ruth	שופטים ורות	*Sciopthim, ve Ruth*.
8	ח	Kings 1 & 2 [1–2 Samuel]	שמואל	*Scemuel*.
9	ט	Kings 3 & 4	מלכים	*Melachim*.
10	י	Esaias	ישעיהו	*Iescahiiau*.
11	כ	Jeremias	ירמיה	*Irmeiau*.
12	ל	Ezechiel	יחזקאל	*Iechezkel*.
13	מ	The XII minor Prophets	תרי עשר	*Thirehesser* [Terei ■asar] — namely: Osee, Joel, Amos, Obadia, Jona, Micha, Nachum, Chauakkuk [Habacuc], Zephania, Chaggi [Aggeus], Zecharia, Malachi *(each with its Hebrew name in a bracket beside)*.
14	נ	The book of Psalms	ספר תהלים	*Sepher Theillim*.
15	ס	Proverbs	משלי	*Miscle*.
16	ע	Job	איוב	*Iiob*.
17	פ	Daniel	דניאל	*Daniel*.
18	צ	Ezra	עזרא	*Ezra*.
19	ק	Paralipomenon	דברי הימים	*Diure haiamim*.
20	ר	Esther	אסתר	*Esther*.
21	ש	Ecclesiastes	קהלת	*Koeleth*.
22	ת	Canticle of Canticles	שיר השירים	*Scir ha scirim*.

(The number 13 stands misprinted "12" in the original; the twelve minor prophets are gathered by a brace beside entries 8–18 of the right-hand list. Catchword: "SVP-" — the Second Supputation follows.)

[1] In the pontifical decrees the condemned writings of heretics are called apocryphal. [2] The body of the Bible is distributed into canonical books of the first order, of the second order, and apocryphal. [3] The volumes of the first order have authority among the Jews. [4] By Josephus and Philo as many sacred books are numbered as there are Hebrew letters. [5] Some Doctors of the Church approve the opinion of Josephus and Philo on the number of the sacred books. [6] There are 24 sacred books according to Kimchi and others. [7] In what manner the Jews write the name of God. [8] Rev 5:9 [9] Some of the Hebrews number 27 sacred books. [10] There are five geminate letters among the Hebrews.

(printed p. 3 [PDF p. 16], recto — full-width table pages. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

THE SECOND SUPPUTATION, according to the twenty-four Hebrew elements, which result from the twenty-one [sic — twenty-two] Jewish characters and from the letter *Iod* thrice repeated for reverence of the divine name. It contains the books of the old Testament as twenty-four: whose number answers also to the twenty-four letters of the Alphabet of the Greeks, among whom the Greek inscriptions of the books are these:

#	Hebrew	Greek	Book	Greek inscription
1	א	A	Genesis	Γένεσις, that is, Generation.
2	ב	B	Exodus	Ἔξοδος, i.e., Exit, or setting-forth.
3	ג	Γ	Leviticus	Λευιτικόν, i.e., Leviticus.
4	ד	Δ	Numbers	Ἀριθμοί.
5	ה	E	Deuteronomion	Δευτερονόμιον, i.e., the second law.
6	ו	Z	Jesus Nave [Joshua]	Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ.
7	ז	H	Judges	Κριταί.
8	ח	Θ	Kings 1 & 2	Βασιλείων α΄ καὶ β΄.
9	ט	I	Kings 3 & 4	Βασιλείων γ΄ καὶ δ΄.
10	י	K	Esaias	Ἡσαΐας.
11	י	Λ	Jeremias	Ἰερεμίας.
12	י	M	Ezechiel	Ἰεζεκιήλ.
13	כ	N	The XII Prophets	Προφῆται ιβ΄ — namely: Osee Ὡσηέ, Joel Ἰωήλ, Amos Ἀμώς, Abdiu Ἀβδιού, Jonas Ἰωνᾶς, Michaeas Μιχαίας, Naum Ναούμ, Abbacum Ἀββακούμ, Sophonias Σοφονίας, Aggaeus Ἀγγαῖος, Zacharias Ζαχαρίας, Malachias Μαλαχίας *(braced beside)*.
14	ל	Ξ	Psalter	Ψαλτήριον.
15	מ	O	Proverbs of Solomon	Παροιμίαι Σαλομ.
16	נ	Π	Job	Ἰώβ.
17	ס	P	Daniel	Δανιήλ.
18	ע	Σ	Esdras	Ἔσδρας.
19	פ	T	Paralipomenon	Παραλειπομένων, that is, "of things passed over."
20	צ	Υ	Esther	Ἐσθήρ.
21	ק	Φ	Ruth	Ῥούθ.
22	ר	X	Ecclesiastes	Ἐκκλησιαστής.
23	ש	Ψ	Canticle of Canticles	Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων.
24	ת	Ω	Lamentations of Jeremiah	Θρῆνοι Ἰερεμίου.

THE THIRD SUPPUTATION, according to the twenty-seven Hebrew letters — namely the twenty-two simple letters which make up the Hebrew Alphabet, and the five double or repeated letters — containing the books of the old Testament as twenty-seven.

#	Letter	Book
1	א	Genesis
2	ב	Exodus
3	ג	Leviticus
4	ד	Numbers
5	ה	Deuteronomion
6	ו	Joshua
7	ז	Judges
8	ח	Ruth
9	ט	Kings first
10	י	Kings second
11	כ	Kings third
12	ך	Kings fourth
13	ל	Paralipomenon first
14	מ	Paralipomenon second
15	ם	Esdras
16	נ	Nehemias
17	ן	Esther
18	ס	Job
19	ע	Psalter
20	פ	Proverbs
21	ף	Ecclesiastes

(The table continues overleaf, entries 22–27. Catchword: "22 ש".)

(printed p. 4 [PDF p. 17], verso — the Third Supputation concludes; then the partitions of the canon begin. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

(conclusion of the Third Supputation table:)

#	Letter	Book
22	ץ	Canticle of Canticles
23	ק	Esaias
24	ר	Jeremias with the Threni [Lamentations]
25	ש	Ezechiel
26	ת	Daniel
27	ם [final]	The Twelve minor prophets

And let these things suffice to have been said of the supputations of the books of the old testament which are placed in the first order of the sacred canon. Now let us briefly say into how many and what kinds of partitions the same holy volumes are wont to be distributed, by the Greek as well as by the Latin and Hebrew authors.

ON THE VARIOUS PARTITIONS OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS of the old Testament which are placed in the first order of the sacred Canon

Three, as we have already shown, are the modes of reckoning the holy volumes of the old covenant among the sacred expositors: [1] of whom those who follow the third supputation employ, as I judge, no partition for distinguishing the divine books. But they who embrace the first supputation discern the twenty-two books already enumerated by four partitions differing among themselves. And they to whom the second kind of enumeration is more pleasing distribute the twenty-four books into three partitions, each differing from the other: of which the first has three classes of books, the second four classes, and the third likewise four. Their co-ordinations are here subjoined in order.

THE FIRST PARTITION of the two-and-twenty volumes of the old Testament, into three classes [2] — that is, into the books of the Law, of the prophets, and of the Psalms or Songs: which [partition] indeed (as Luke relates) our Lord Jesus Christ used after his resurrection, when, opening to the disciples the sense of the scriptures, he interpreted to them whatsoever things had been written of him in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Josephus also, in the first book against Apion the grammarian, followed the same partition.

The books of the Law, five: [3]

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The books of the Prophets, thirteen: [4]

6. Joshua. 7. Judges & Ruth. 8. Samuel. 9. Melachim [Kings]. 10. Paralipomenon. 11. Esdras. 12. Esther. 13. Job. 14. Esaias. 15. Jeremias & the Threni. 16. Ezechiel. 17. Daniel. 18. The XII minor Prophets.

The books of the Psalms, or Hymns, or Songs, four: [5]

19. David. 20. Proverbs. 21. Ecclesiastes. 22. Canticle of Canticles.

THE SECOND PARTITION of the two-and-twenty Hebrew volumes, which Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, in the book entitled *On the parts of the divine scripture*, and John Damascene, in the 4th book *On the orthodox faith*, digested into four Quinaries [sets of five] — namely the Legal, the Hagiographic, the Poetic, and the Prophetic — and besides these into one Binary [set of two].

The first Quinary, of the Legal [books]:

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The second Quinary, of the Hagiographa:

6. Joshua. 7. Judges & Ruth. 8. The first of Kingdoms with the second. 9. The third of Kingdoms with the fourth. 10. The two of Paralipomenon.

The third Quinary, of the Songs:

11. Job. 12. Psalter. 13. Proverbs. 14. Ecclesiastes. 15. Canticles.

The fourth Quinary, of the Prophets:

16. The twelve minor Prophets. 17. Esaias. 18. Hieremias. 19. Ezechiel. 20. Daniel.

The Binary:

21. Esdras. 22. Esther.

THE THIRD PARTITION of the two-and-twenty ancient books of the first order, distributed into three classes by Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen]: that is, into the historical, the Poetic, and the Prophetic books.

The historical books, twelve:

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. [*5 Deu-* →]

[1] There are three ways in which the books of the Old Testament are numbered. [2] There are three classes of the volumes of the Old Testament. [3] The first class is of the books of the Law. [4] The second class contains the books of the Prophets. [5] The third class comprises the Psalms.

(printed p. 5 [PDF p. 18], recto — the partitions continue. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

(the Third Partition, continued — the historical books:)

5. Deuteronomium. 6. Joshua. 7. Judges. 8. Ruth. 9. Kings first & second. 10. Kings third & fourth. 11. Paralipomenon. 12. Esdras.

The Poetic, or Song-books, five:

13. Job. 14. David. 15. Proverbs. 16. Ecclesiastes. 17. Canticles.

The Prophetic books, five:

18. The twelve minor Prophets. 19. Esaias. 20. Jeremias. 21. Ezechiel. 22. Daniel.

This series of the books Gregory the Theologian, in the book of his poems, briefly comprised in these Greek hexameters, with some pentameters:

Δέχνυσο τοῦτον ἐμεῖο τὸν ἔγκριτον, ὦ φίλ᾽, ἀριθμόν·
ἱστορικαὶ μὲν ἔασι βίβλοι δυοκαίδεκα πᾶσαι,
τῆς ἀρχαιοτέρης Ἑβραϊκῆς σοφίης.
πρωτίστη Γένεσις, εἶτ᾽ Ἔξοδος, Λευιτικόν τε,
ἔπειτ᾽ Ἀριθμοί, εἶτα Δεύτερος Νόμος.
ἔπειτ᾽ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ Κριταί, Ῥοὺθ ὀγδόη,
ἡ δ᾽ ἐνάτη δεκάτη τε βίβλοι πράξεις Βασιλήων,
καὶ Παραλειπόμεναι· ἔσχατον Ἔσδραν ἔχεις.
αἱ δὲ στιχηραὶ πέντε, ὧν πρῶτός γ᾽ Ἰώβ·
ἔπειτα Δαυίδ· εἶτα τρεῖς Σολομώντειαι,
Ἐκκλησιαστής, Ἆσμα καὶ Παροιμίαι.
καὶ πένθ᾽ ὁμοίως πνεύματος προφητικοῦ·
μίαν μέν εἰσιν ἐς γραφὴν οἱ δώδεκα·
Ὡσηὲ κ᾽ Ἀμώς, καὶ Μιχαίας ὁ τρίτος,
ἔπειτ᾽ Ἰωήλ, εἶτ᾽ Ἰωνᾶς, Ἀβδίας,

Ναούμ τε, Ἀββακούμ τε, καὶ Σοφονίας,

Ἀγγαῖος, εἶτα Ζαχαρίας, Μαλαχίας.

μία μὲν οἵδε. δευτέρα δὲ Ἡσαΐας,

ἔπειθ᾽ ὁ κληθεὶς Ἰερεμίας ἐκ βρέφους,

εἶτ᾽ Ἰεζεκιήλ, καὶ Δανιήλου χάρις.

ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκα δύω καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους,

τοῖς τῶν Ἑβραίων γράμμασιν ἀντιθέτους.

Which we have rendered, after a fashion, thus [Sixtus's Latin verses, here Englished]:

> *Receive the number and the names of the holy books: and first the historical, twice six in order. Of these the first is Genesis, then Exodus, and Levites [Leviticus], and Numbers, and the will of the law repeated once again [Deuteronomy]. These Jesus [Joshua], the Judges (Critae), and Ruth the Moabitess follow. Next the ninth and the tenth hold the illustrious deeds of the Kings; in the eleventh come the annals [Paralipomenon]; the last is Esdras. There are likewise five books of song: of these the first is Job; next to him is David the king; and the Three of Solomon — namely Ecclesiastes, and Proverbs, and the Song. After these, next, five volumes of the holy Prophets: of which twice six are held in one book — Oseas and Amos, Michas, and Joel and Jonas, Abdias and Naum, Abacuh and Sophonias, glad Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias: these hold the first book; Esaia holds the second; after these, Irmeias [Jeremiah], called from his mother's womb; Ezechiel, the strength of the Lord; and Daniel the last. These seven, and thrice five, volumes of the old covenant figure forth the two-and-twenty elements [letters] of the men of Jerusalem.*

Nor let it seem strange to you, excellent reader, that in this partition no mention is made by Gregory of the book of Esther, [1] which the Hebrews receive into their canon. For Melito, bishop of Sardis, enumerating the canonical books in his epistle to Onesimus, also passes it by; and St. Athanasius, in the *Synopsis* of the divine scripture, expressly cuts it off from the canonical volumes [2] — because in those times the authority of this book was not yet firm among all the churches, which certain additions ■■■■ [a word inked out by the censor], inserted into the book (as we shall afterwards point out), had rendered suspect.

THE FOURTH PARTITION of the two-and-twenty Hebrew volumes, distributed by the ancient Jews into three classes — that is, into the Legal, the Prophetic, and the Hagiographa — which Jerome, in the preface of the book of Kings, and Isidore, in the sixth of the *Etymologies*, embrace.

The Legal books, five:

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The Prophetic books, eight:

6. Joshua. 7. Judges & Ruth. 8. Samuel. 9. Melachim. 10. Esaias. 11. Jeremias with the Threni. 12. Ezechiel. 13. The twelve minor Prophets.

The books of the Hagiographa, nine:

14. Job. 15. Psalter. 16. Proverbs. 17. Ecclesiastes. 18. Canticles. 19. Daniel. 20. Paralipomenon, or chronicon. 21. Esdras & Nehemias. 22. Esther.

THE FIFTH PARTITION of the four-and-twenty books of the old Testament into three classes — namely the Legal, the Prophetic, and the Hagiographic — in use among the ancient Latins; of which Jerome makes mention in the preface of the book of Kings, and of Daniel.

The Legal books, five:

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The Prophetic books, eight:

6. Joshua. 7. Judges. [*8 Sa-* →]

[1] Why Gregory Nazianzen makes no mention of the book of Esther. [2] Athanasius rejected the book of Esther.

(printed p. 6 [PDF p. 19], verso — the partitions conclude; the treatise on the several books begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

(the Fifth Partition, continued — the Prophetic books:)

8. Samuel. 9. Melachim. 10. Esaias. 11. Jeremias. 12. Ezechiel. 13. The twelve minor Prophets.

The books of the Hagiographa, eleven:

14. Job. 15. Psalms. 16. Proverbs. 17. Ecclesiastes. 18. Canticles. 19. Daniel. 20. Paralipomenon. 21. The two of Esdras. 22. Esther. 23. Ruth. 24. Cinoth, or the lamentations.

THE SIXTH PARTITION, by which the more recent Jews divide the עשרים וארבע *Hesrim ve Arba* — that is, the twenty-four — books of the old Testament into four series: namely into תורה *Thora*, i.e. the Law; into נביאים ראשונים *Neviim Risonim*, i.e. the former Prophets; into נביאים אחרנים *Neviim Acharonim*, i.e. the latter Prophets; and into כתובים *Chethuvim*, that is, the Scriptures — or, as the Greeks say, ἁγιόγραφα, that is, Holy writings.

The books of the תורה *Thora — that is, of the Law, which is also called* חומש *Chomesci, i.e. the Quinary, from the number of its volumes — five:*

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The books of the נביאים ראשונים *Neviim Risonim, that is, of the former Prophets, four:*

6. Joshua. 7. Judges. 8. Samuel. 9. Melachim.

The books of the נביאים אחרנים *Neviim Acharonim, that is, of the latter Prophets, four:*

10. Esaias. 11. Jeremias. 12. Ezechiel. 13. תרי עשר *Thire Hesser*, that is, the Twelve minor Prophets.

The books of the כתובים *Chethuvim, that is, of the Scriptures, eleven:*

14. Psalter. 15. Proverbs. 16. Job. 17. Daniel. 18. Ezra. 19. Paralipomenon. 20. Ruth. 21. Esther. 22. Ecclesiastes. 23. Canticle of Canticles. 24. Lamentations.

THE SEVENTH PARTITION of the four-and-twenty holy volumes of the old Testament, digested by the more recent Latins into four classes: namely into the legal, the Historical, the Paraenetic [hortatory], and the Prophetic.

The Legal books, five:

1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomion.

The Historical books, nine:

6. Joshua. 7. Judges. 8. Ruth. 9. Kings first, with the second. 10. Kings third, with the fourth. 11. The two of Paralipomenon. 12. Esdras. 13. Esther. 14. Job.

The Paraenetic books, three:

15. Proverbs. 16. Ecclesiastes. 17. Canticles.

The Prophetic books, seven:

18. David. 19. Esaias. 20. Jeremias. 21. The Threni. 22. Ezechiel. 23. Daniel. 24. The twelve minor Prophets.

ON THE ARGUMENTS, AUTHORS, AND TIMES of the books of the old Testament which are computed in the first order of the canon

Hitherto we have reviewed in general the diverse enumerations and the various partitions of the ancient books of the first order, which alone the Hebrews receive, and read written in Hebrew: now we shall explain one by one (*particulatim*) the authors of each, their arguments, and the times of the matters described in them.

PENTATEUCH

The book of the Law of the Lord, or the volume of the law of Moses (for by both names the sacred letters call it), is named by the Hebrews תורה *Thora*, that is, "Law," and by the Greeks πεντάτευχος, *Pentateuchus*, that is, the Fivefold volume. This Moses — the son of Amram, grandson of Caath, great-grandson of Levi the patriarch, the leader of the Hebrews and their lawgiver — composed. [1] Which he himself also testifies thus in the book of Exodus: *"And Moses wrote all the discourses of the Lord, and taking up the volume of the covenant of the law, in the hearing of the people…"* [2] And again in Deuteronomy he adds: *"After Moses had written the words of this law, and had completed them, he commanded the Levites who carried the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying: Take this book, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God."* [3] But that which is added at the end of Deuteronomy concerning the death and burial of Moses, down to the close of the book [4], some believe Esdras to have adjoined. Moreover, by what plan Moses digested this whole work into parts, and gave it its titles, is not sufficiently established. [*Hebraei* →]

[1] Moses wrote the Pentateuch. [2] Exod 24:4,7 [3] Deut 31:24,25 [4] Deut 34:5,6

(printed p. 7 [PDF p. 20], recto — the Pentateuch continued; Joshua; Judges & Ruth begins. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *Hebraei*] The Hebrews (as Philo the Jew in the book *On the world*, and Josephus in the first book against Apion, relate) divide the whole volume into five books, and inscribe them from the opening of those same books.

The first book, then, containing the succession of the human stock down to the death of Joseph — that is, the deeds of two thousand three hundred and eight years [1] — is called among them *Berescith*, that is, "In the beginning," because the book begins with these words. **The second,** containing the deeds of one hundred and forty-six years [2] — namely from the death of Joseph to the construction of the tabernacle in the desert — is called *Veellecemoth*, that is, "These are the names." **The third,** containing the history of one month [3] — that is, from the erection of the tabernacle in the desert to the numbering of those who were apt for war — is called *Vaiikra*, that is, "And he called." **The fourth,** containing the narration of 38 years, nine months, and twenty days [4] — that is, from the first day of the second month of the second year of the going-forth from Egypt, to the encampment in the plains of Moab upon the Jordan, where Moses afterward died — is called *Vaedaber*, that is, "And he spoke." **The fifth,** setting forth the deeds of the two last months of the life of Moses in the plains of Moab [5], is called *Helle hadde varim*, that is, "These are the words."

But the Greeks, though following the same partition, inscribe the books far otherwise. For the first among them is called *Genesis*, that is, "generation," because the beginning of the world and the generation of the age are contained in it. The second *Exodus*, that is, "exit," which narrates the exit of the Israelite people from

Egypt. The third is inscribed *Leviticus*, because it comprehends the ministries of the Levites, the sacrifices, the laws, and the rites. The fourth *Arithmi*, that is, "Numbers," because in it those who came out of Egypt are numbered by tribes, and the number of the forty-two halting-places through the wilderness is reviewed. The fifth *Deuteronomion*, that is, "the second law," is so inscribed because in it a repetition of the law is made anew. Philo the Jew thinks that Moses was the author of these latter inscriptions [6], writing thus in the book *On the world*: "MOSES asserted the world to be begotten and incorruptible, in the sacred books; and they are five, of which he himself inscribed the first *Genesis*, which begins in this manner: In the beginning God made heaven and earth." And in the book *On the migration of Abraham*: "Rightly," says he, "did the sacred seer Moses entitle one entire book of the law *Exodus*, by a name agreeing with the oracles contained in it." Thus far he. To me, however, it seems more likely that not Moses, but the seventy interpreters — being Greeks — devised these new and Greek inscriptions of the books. [7]

Now Moses gathered together in these books the history from the beginning of the world down to the hundred-and-twentieth year of his own life — in which, his teeth not loosened nor his eyes grown dim, in his whole body he put off mortality — that is, down to the year after the founding of the world two thousand four hundred and ninety-two, and before the birth of Christ one thousand four hundred and seventy [8], according to the Hebrew supputation of the holy scriptures and of Philo the Jew. But the remaining eight verses, from that place, *AND MOSES DIED*, to the end of the whole volume, Joshua is believed to have supplied after the death of Moses [9]: although Josephus asserts that Moses, being presently to die, wrote of himself in the sacred volumes as dead [10], fearing lest, on account of his excellent virtues, the Jews should proclaim that he had been caught up [rapt] by God.

The Hebrews divide the whole Pentateuch into two-and-fifty distinctions, or titles [11]: that is, Genesis into eleven, Exodus into eleven, Leviticus into ten, Numbers into ten, Deuteronomion into ten. And these distinctions too they inscribe from their initial words, calling the first בראשית *berescit*, that is, "in the beginning"; the second נח *Noach*, or Noe; the third לך לך *lec leca*, that is, "going forth, go forth [get thee out]"; and so on with the others, down to the last. And all the *Pesukim* — that is, the verses — into which the Jews divide the whole Pentateuch, are five thousand eight hundred and thirty. [12]

The same Moses wrote, as Jerome testifies in the epistle to Cyprian [13] — besides these five books (which Philo reports to have been composed by their author in the Chaldaic tongue [14]) — also eleven Psalms [15]: that is, from the ninetieth Psalm, whose title is *THE PRAYER of Moses the servant of GOD*, to the hundredth Psalm, which is fore-titled *IN Confession*. He composed also, as the Rabbins of the Jews hand down, the book of Job [16] — although the vulgate edition of the Greeks, at the end of that same volume, asserts that Moses translated the history of Job out of the Syrian speech into the Hebrew tongue. [17] There are also other writings borne about under the name of Moses, of which something is to be said in the following book.

JOSHUA

The book of Joshua (which the Hebrews call יהושע *Ieoscua*, the Greeks *Jesus [son of] Nave*) took its name from Osee, the son of Nun, whom Moses, changing his name, called Josua [18] — a leader most illustrious in the glory of war as well as of peace; who, as is read in the last chapter of this book, wrote after the death of Moses all the words which the Lord spoke to him, in the volume of the law of the Lord [19], adjoining to it the history *Of the passage of the sons of Israel through Jordan, Of the subversion of the impious kingdoms, Of the division of the land of promise*, and the other memorable sayings and deeds from the death of Moses down to the seventeenth year of his captaincy: in which year — Josephus being witness — this man, renowned in arms and in religion, died, in the hundred-and-twentieth year of his age; that is, in the year from the founding of the world two thousand five hundred and ten, and before the coming of Christ one thousand four hundred and fifty-two. [20] The rest, which stand written from the death of Joshua to the end of this book, Esdras is by report said to have adjoined. [21] Theodoret, however, judges [22] that the whole book, too, was

compiled long after the death of Joshua out of an ancient commentary whose title was *THE BOOK OF THE JUST* — being led by the authority of the words which stand in the tenth chapter of this volume, namely: *"Are not these things"* (no doubt, the deeds of Joshua) *"written in the book of the Just?"* This book contains, among the Jews, six thousand and forty-five verses. [23]

JUDGES, AND RUTH

The book of Judges (which by the Jews is called שופטים *Sciophtim*, by the Greeks κριταί) is so named [24] because in it are contained the deeds of the judges and princes of Israel who were set over the people in the holy land after Joshua, down to the beginning of the kingdom of the Hebrews, in which kings reigned. And it is said that Samuel gathered this book together [25], [*eique* →]

[1] The book of Genesis contains the deeds of 2308 years. [2] In Exodus are the deeds of 146 years. [3] Leviticus comprises the history of one month. [4] The book of Numbers contains the narration of 38 years. [5] Deuteronomy contains the deeds of two months. [6] Philo's opinion on the author of the inscriptions of the books of the law. [7] The seventy interpreters inscribed the books of the law with Greek names. [8] Moses died in the year from the founding of the world 2492, and before the birth of Christ 1470. [9] Joshua wrote the death of Moses. [10] Josephus's opinion was that Moses himself wrote his own death. [11] The Hebrews divide the Pentateuch into 52 titles. [12] The verses of the Pentateuch are 5830. [13] Jerome, Epistle 119, on the life of Moses [14] Philo thinks Moses wrote in Chaldaic. [15] Moses wrote 11 Psalms. [16] In the judgement of the Rabbins he composed the book of Job. [17] Moses translated the book of Job from the Syrian speech into the Hebrew tongue. [18] Moses changed the name of Joshua. [19] What Joshua wrote. [20] Joshua died in the 120th year of his age, in the year from the founding of the world 2510, and before the coming of Christ 1452. [21] Esdras completed the book of Joshua. [22] Theodoret's opinion. [23] The book of Joshua has 6045 verses. [24] The reason for the title of the book of Judges. [25] Samuel is thought to have collected the book of Judges.

(printed p. 8 [PDF p. 21], verso — Judges & Ruth concluded; Kings; Paralipomenon; Esdras. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *eique*] and to have adjoined to it the history of Ruth the Moabitess. There are those who think Ezechias, and those who think Esdras, the authors of both volumes. [1] Now these two books contain the successions of three hundred and seventeen years [2] — namely from the death of Joshua to the first year of the principate of Heli, who began to judge Israel in the year from the founding of the world two thousand eight hundred and ten, that is, before Christ one thousand one hundred and fifty-two. The Jews divide the volume of Judges into six hundred verses, but the book of Ruth into eighty-five. [3]

KINGS FIRST, AND SECOND

The book of Samuel (which the Hebrews call שמואל *Scemuel*, and the Greeks and Latins the first and second of Kings) is believed to have been composed partly by Samuel the prophet, partly by the prophets Nathan and Gad. [4] For Samuel gathered the deeds of Heli, of Saul, of David, and of himself, which are related in the first of Kings down to his own death — that is, down to the twenty-fifth chapter. But Nathan and Gad the prophets wrote the books of Kings from the death of Samuel to the end of the second book: which the first book of Paralipomenon seems to indicate plainly enough, at whose close these words are read: *"The deeds of David, the first and the last, are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the volume of Gad."* [5] And although the latter part of this first volume, from the twenty-fifth chapter to the end of the second book of Kings, comprehends the history of Saul and of David, the whole is nevertheless referred to Samuel, and is inscribed from his name — because he himself established Saul, the first king, in the kingdom [6], and chose David for the king to be, and anointed him. Isidore, bishop of Seville, however, is of opinion that king David wrote [the history] down to the beginning of the third book — that is, down to the year from the founding of the world two thousand nine hundred and thirty, and to the year before the birth of Christ one thousand and thirty-two. The first book of Kings has among the Hebrews seven hundred ninety-seven verses; the second, six hundred seventy-nine: and each embraces the history of almost one hundred and twenty years. [7]

KINGS THIRD, AND FOURTH

The third and fourth book of Kings (which the Hebrews name מלכים *Melachim*, because in these the deeds of the Kings of Juda and of Israel are set forth in order) — by whom it was written is not sufficiently established. [8] Some hand down that Esdras, others — among whom Procopius of Gaza, and Rabbi Moses Kimchi, and Isidore — that Jeremias collected this work into one volume. [9] And this seems to me the nearer to truth, because the last chapter of the book of Kings agrees with the last chapter of the book of Jeremias in style, in words, and in narration. It appears that this volume was collected, by way of compendium, partly out of the books of the Days of the Kings of Juda and Israel, partly out of the writings of the prophets Nathan, Ahias the Silonite, Addo the Seer, and Semeias, Hozai, Jehu, and Esaias, which are very often cited in the third and fourth book of Kings. Now the present work contains the history of five hundred and thirty-seven years [10] — that is, from the last old age of David down to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, which befell in the year after the world was founded three thousand three hundred forty-seven, and before Christ six hundred and fifteen. [11] The third book of Kings has among the Hebrews eight hundred and nine verses; the fourth, seven hundred and twelve. [12]

THE TWO BOOKS OF PARALIPOMENON

These two books (which the Hebrews call דברי הימים *Diure haiamim*, that is, "Words of the days," or Annals, or Chronicles) the Greeks call Παραλειπομένων, *Paralipomenon*, that is, "of things passed over" [13]: because they explain, briefly and summarily, those things which, either in the Pentateuch, or in the books of Joshua, of Judges, and of Kings, were either omitted or not fully described. These books have no certain author [14]; yet Rabbi Salomon and Rabbi Moses Kimchi write, from the judgment of the elders, that Esdras was the author of both [15], and that he compiled in them an epitome and chronicle of all the preceding books — namely, from the beginning of the divine scripture to the end of the fourth of Kings. Among the Hebrews the present history is contained in but a single book; which, by the Greeks as well as by the Latins, was divided on account of the greatness of the volume into two books [16] — as some have done even with the dialogue *Brutus* of Cicero, distinguishing it into three parts. These two books, then, contain the sum of three thousand three hundred and forty-seven years. [17]

THE TWO BOOKS OF ESDRAS

Esdras, or עזרא *Ezra* (whom the first book of Paralipomenon calls [the son of] Josedech the priest, and whom the Hebrews think to be Malachias, the last of the prophets) [18], son of Saraias, the son of Azarias, twelfth [in descent] from Aaron the high priest, a scribe of the law of the Lord, ingenious and swift, published the book fore-titled with his own name — [written] indeed in Hebrew letters, and those first devised by himself [19], but digested in the Chaldaic speech: in which he described the return of the Israelite people out of the Babylonian captivity into Judaea, and the restoration of the city of Jerusalem, and the building-up of the new temple. But the other book, which is inscribed the Second of Esdras, and treats through the same history, Nehemias wrote [20] — the son of Helchias, a priest, and, in the captivity, cupbearer of king Artaxerxes; whence also the preface of his book is: *The words of Nehemias, the son of Helchias*; and he, in almost all the chapters of his book, speaks of himself in the first person. Now this book is allotted the name of Esdras for two causes: first, because it contains the things which were done jointly by Esdras and Nehemias; next, because the two books, among the Hebrews as among the Greeks, are joined together into one volume, [though] among the Latins divided into two. Yet the Greek fathers dissent from us in this part: for the book which we inscribe the third of Esdras, and cast back among the Apocryphal writings, they place in the sacred canon [21], and set it first in the order of the books of Esdras — deciding that the things which are narrated in it were done before those which are contained in the books of Esdras and Nehemias; and these [latter], which among us are the first and the second, they comprehend both under the second volume of Esdras. Wherefore among them the beginning of the first of Esdras runs thus: Καὶ ἢ- [-γαγεν →]

[1] Some make Ezechias, and some Esdras, the author of the books of Judges and Ruth. [2] The books of Judges and Ruth contain the deeds of 317 years. [3] The book of Judges has 600 verses; Ruth 85. [4] The book of Samuel was written partly by Samuel and partly by Nathan and Gad. [5] 1 Par 29:29 [6] Saul the first king of the Hebrews was established by Samuel. [7] The first book of Kings has 797 verses; the second 679; and each covers the history of about 120 years. [8] It is not established who wrote the 3rd and 4th books of Kings. [9] Jeremias is thought to have written both books. [10] The 3rd and 4th books of Kings comprise the history of 537 years. [11] When the destruction of the city of Jerusalem happened. [12] The 3rd book of Kings has 809 verses, and the 4th 712. [13] The reason for the title of the books of Paralipomenon. [14] No certain author of the books of Paralipomenon. [15] In the judgement of some, Esdras wrote both books. [16] The Hebrews have Paralipomenon in a single book, which the Greeks and Latins divided into two. [17] The books of Paralipomenon contain the deeds of 3347 years. [18] The Hebrews think the Esdras who wrote the first book of Esdras was Malachias the prophet. [19] Esdras devised the letters which the Hebrews now use. [20] Nehemias wrote the second book of Esdras. [21] The Greeks think the third book of Esdras canonical.

(printed p. 9 [PDF p. 22], recto — Esdras concluded; Esther deferred; Job; the Psalter begins. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ Καὶ ἤγαγεν] Ἰωσίας τὸ πάσχα ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ — that is, *And Josias kept the pasch in Jerusalem*; and it is divided into one hundred and nine chapters. But the second begins thus: Καὶ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει Κύρου βασιλέως Περσῶν — that is, *And in the first year of Cyrus, king of the Persians*; and it is cut into eighty chapters. There are borne about also other volumes under the name of Esdras, which you will find in the second book of this work. Esdras flourished together with Nehemias, restoring the city and the temple, in the year from the founding of the world three thousand four hundred and twenty-one [1] — which was the third of the Jewish liberation, and before Christ the five hundred forty-first. And he died in extreme old age, after he had most faithfully restored from memory — and not without the divine power of the Godhead — almost all the divine scriptures [2], burned by the Chaldaeans in the destruction of Jerusalem, as they were before; new letters, readier for writing, having been devised — lest the Jews should be mingled with the Samaritans, who had come from the gentile nations into Judaea; for before, down to that very time, they had had other letters, delivered namely by Moses, in common with the Samaritans [3]; and the letters which the Jews now use differ only in figure [shape] from the Samaritan, or Mosaic.

ESTHER

The book אסתר *Ester* — although according to the order of the Hebrew canon and of Jerome's partition it should be reviewed in this place — nevertheless, because Melito bishop of Sardis, St. Athanasius, and Gregory the Theologian, on account of certain ■■■■ [word inked out by the censor] additaments (as we have already advised above) separated it by name from the other Testamentary writings, we too shall describe it in the following Section, in the very first place among the writings pertaining to the second order of the canon. [4]

JOB

Of the book איוב *Iiob*, some judge the author to be Job himself [5], the son of Zareth, of the sons of Esau, fifth from Abraham, fourth from Esau; who, after the happy issue of his afflictions, by his own hand fulfilled [the desire of] writing down his victories — the very thing he had chiefly wished for in his calamity, saying: *"Who will grant me that my discourses may be engraved in a book — or with an iron stylus, and a plate of lead, and a chisel — that they may endure forever, be hewn out in the rock?"* [6] And in another place: *"Who will grant me that the almighty may hear my desire, and that he who judges would himself write a book, that I may carry it on my shoulder, and put it round me as a crown; and proclaim it at my every step, and offer it as to a prince?"* [7] There are those who think it was written either by the friends of Job, or by some one of the prophets. Origen — with whom the Rabbins of the Jews also agree — says that Moses first translated this holy history [8], composed either by Job or by his friends, out of the Syrian eloquence into the Hebrew speech, for the consolation of the Hebrews who, captives in Egypt, were oppressed by Pharao with unworthy servitude: that reading the vehement and terrible pains of the blessed man they might console one another; and might bear with patience and giving of thanks the evils that had encompassed them; and that, hearing of the most excellent recompense which God bestowed upon blessed Job after his endurance, they too might

hope for deliverance and await the benefits of the blessed reward of their labors.

This book was written, as Jerome testifies, in the Hebrew tongue, with Arabic and Syriac locutions at times intermingled [9]; and from the beginning of the volume to the start of the third chapter it proceeds, among the Hebrews, in loose [prose] oration; but from the beginning of the third chapter to the beginning of the forty-second chapter it glides along in Hexameter verses; from which place to the end the book concludes in prose. Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson, in his commentaries upon Job, writes that there were formerly those who rejected the eleven later chapters of this book — that is, from the thirty-second to the last — as adventitious [10]; for the reason that at the end of the thirty-first chapter, in the Hebrew codices, there is found written תמו דברי איוב *thammu diure Iob*, that is, *"The words of Job are ended."* [11] Their opinion the same Rabbi Levi disapproves, saying that that versicle is to be referred, not simply to the end of all the discourses of Job, but only to the end of the disputations which Job had had with his three friends, Elipha, Baldad, and Sophar: after which disputations there follow at once the colloquies of the same Job with Eliu, the fourth of the friends. Now Job wrote the present book about the year of the founded world two thousand three hundred [12], comprising in it all the battles, victories, and triumphs of his spiritual warfare in most learned and most eloquent speech. And he suffered, as Athanasius witnesses, when he was seventy years old — so that all his years were two hundred and forty [13]; for after the plagues received he lived yet a hundred and seventy years: albeit the Hebrew verity testifies that from his recovered health he lived but a hundred and forty years. The Greeks divide the volume into thirty-two chapters; the Latins into forty-two. And there are those who among the Greeks distribute the same into twenty colloquies, in this order:

Of GOD to the Devil, one.	Of JOB to his friends, nine.
Of ELIPHAZ to Job, three.	Of SOPHAR to Job, two.
Of BALDAD to Job, three.	Of ELIU to Job, one.
Of GOD to Job, one.	

THE PSALTER

Concerning the author of the volume of the psalms (which in Hebrew is called ספר תהלים *Sepher theillim*, that is, the Book of Hymns; in Greek, Ψαλτήριον) there is a twofold opinion. [14] Chrysostom and Augustine judge that David, king and prophet, was the author of all the psalms [15] [16]; of which he himself sang some with his own mouth, but of the rest of the psalms put forth only the arguments, and delivered them to the singers ordained by himself in the temple of God: who, taking the arguments received, wrote them out in songs, and fitted them to various chants and musical instruments, and inscribed them with their own names. This opinion appears to be drawn from the books of Kings and of Paralipomenon [17], in which David is read to have been the distinguished psalmist of Israel, who with his own mouth sang to the lord certain psalms — as psalm 17, when the lord had delivered him out of the hand of Saul and of all his enemies, and psalm 104, when the ark of the lord was being brought back. And the same [David] appointed in the temple four thousand psalmists, singing to the lord upon instruments; among whom the chief were three who, beside him, should sing canticles in the temple on harps, psalteries, and cymbals — namely Eman, Idithun, and Asaph; who, Esdras testifies, praised God "by the hands of David the king," that is, by psalms written by the hand of king David [18]. But Jerome [*mus* →]

[1] At what time Esdras lived. [2] Esdras restored the sacred Scriptures. [3] The Samaritans use the characters of the letters devised by Moses. [4] In the Synopsis of divine Scripture: the author's judgement on the book of Esther is to be approved. [5] The author of the book of Job. [6] Job 19:23-24 [7] Job 31:35-38 [8] Origen's opinion (in the first book on Job) on the author of the book of Job. [9] In what language the book of Job was written, according to St. Jerome in his preface on Job. [10] The error of certain persons refuted. [11] Job 31. [12] At what time the book of Job was written. [13] In the Synopsis of divine Scripture: Job lived 240 years. [14] Two opinions about the author of the Psalms. [15] David the author of all the Psalms, as Chrysostom (in the proem on the Psalms) and Augustine (City of God 17.14) will have it. [16] 2 Kings 23:1 [17] 2 Kings 22:1; 1 Paral. 16:4-5; 1 Paral. 23:5-6 [18] 2 Paral. 15

(printed p. 10 [PDF p. 23], verso — the Psalter: its several authors. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *Hierony*-]mus, in the epistles to Sophronius and to Cyprian [1], following the opinion of Athanasius, determines that they err who judge all the psalms to be David's [2], and not [the psalms] of those with whose names they are inscribed — namely of Asaph, of Idithun, of the sons of Corhe, of Eman the Ezrahite, of Moses, and of Solomon, and of the rest, whom Esdras comprehends in the first volume of Paralipomenon. [3] According to this opinion, then, there will be ten authors of this volume, whose names are set in the titles of the psalms: namely David, Salomon, Moses, Asaph, Ethan the Ezrahite, Eman the Ezrahite, Idithun, and the three sons of Corhe. Of whom:

DAVID, the son of Isai the Bethlehemite, king of Jerusalem, and prophet, put forth seventy-three psalms, fore-noted with his name in the Hebrew exemplars, namely:

> *III. IIII. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. XI. XII. XIII. XIIII. XV. XVI. XVII. XVIII. XIX. XX. XXI. XXII. XXIII. XXIIII. XXV. XXVI. XXVII. XXVIII. XXIX. XXX. XXXI. XXXII [printed "XXII," a second time — a misprint]. XXXIIII. XXXV. XXXVI. XXXVII. XXXVIII. XL. XLI. LI. LII. LIII. LIIII. LV. LVI. LVII. LVIII. LIX. LX. LXI. LXII. LXIII. LXIIII. LXV. LXVIII. LXIX. LXX. LXXXVI. CI. CIII. CVIII. CIX. CX. CXXII. CXXIIII. CXXXI. CXXXII. CXXXIII. CXXXVIII. CXXXIX. CXL. CXLI. CXLII. CXLIII. CXLIIII. CXLV.*

He founded also, besides these, another nine-and-thirty psalms *anepigraphoi* — that is, which are placed in the psalter without anyone's name — namely:

> *I. II. X. XXXIII. XLIII. LXVI. LXVII. LXXI. CII. CIIII. CV. CVI. CVII. CXI. CXII. CXIII. CXIIII. CXV. CXVI. CXVII. CXVIII. CXIX. CXX. CXXI. CXXIII. CXXV. CXXVI. CXXVII. CXXVIII. CXXIX. CXXX. CXXXIII. CXXXV. CXXXVII. CXLVI. CXLVII. CXLVIII. CXLIX. CL.*

Of which seven are cited under the name of David in the divine scriptures, namely:

- **The second psalm,** in the book of Acts, chap. XIII.
- **The seventeenth psalm,** in the second of Kings, chap. XXII.
- **The hundredth psalm,** in the first of Paralipomenon, chap. XVI.
- **The hundred-and-fifth psalm.**
- **The hundred-and-sixth psalm.**
- **The hundred-and-seventeenth psalm.**
- **The hundred-and-thirty-fifth psalm** — of which [last four] mention is made in the first volume of Esdras.

SALOMON, the son of king David, wrote one psalm [4], namely the seventy-second, which begins, *"O GOD, give thy judgment to the King"* — which some think was put forth by David on behalf of Solomon his son. Athanasius in the *Synopsis*, besides this psalm, attributes also two others to Solomon: that is, the sixty-sixth, whose beginning is, *"May GOD have mercy on us, and bless us"*; and the hundred-and-twenty-seventh, which begins, *"UNLESS the lord build the house."* Origen, in the third book *Peri Archon* [περὶ Ἀρχῶν, On First Principles], relates that there were not wanting those who said that the psalms which are inscribed *THE CANTICLES OF THE STEPS [Gradual psalms]* were composed by Solomon. Among the Hebrews, however, the seventy-second psalm alone is inscribed to Solomon.

MOSES, the man of God (whom Aben Ezra the Jew thinks to have been one of the singers of David; but Jerome, in the explanation of the ninetieth psalm, to Cyprian, asserts that he is Moses the writer of the divine law and leader of the Hebrews), wrote eleven psalms [5] — that is, from psalm XC, whose title is *THE PRAYER OF MOSES THE MAN OF GOD*, and whose beginning is, *"LORD, thou hast been made our refuge,"* up to the hundredth, which is inscribed *IN CONFESSION*, and begins, *"SHOUT with joy to God, all the earth."* And since what is read in psalm XCVIII concerning Samuel the prophet — who was born many

ages after Moses — seems to oppose his [Jerome's] opinion, he says that the name of Samuel, on account of the excellence of his merit, was foreseen by Moses at the instinct of the prophetic spirit, and noted down in the letters [text].

ASAPH, the son of Barachias, chief of the singers who sounded upon cymbals of brass, and praised the lord, and ministered in the sight of the ark, composed twelve psalms [6], namely:

L. LXXIII. LXXIIII. LXXV. LXXVI. LXXVII. LXXVIII. LXXIX. LXXX. LXXXI. LXXXII. LXXXIII.

EMAN the Ezrahite — or, as the Greeks read, Heman the Israelite — a singer, son of Joel of the sons of Caath, most skilled with cymbals and trumpet, and in erudition and wisdom in a certain manner the equal of Ethan himself, composed one psalm, namely the eighty-eighth, whose beginning is, *"O LORD, the God of my salvation."* And because he gave it to the sons of Corhe to be sung, he inscribed it as well with his own name as with theirs. Philo, however, in the book *On the times*, hands down [*tradit* →]

[1] Jerome, Epistles 134 and 139 [2] In the judgement of St. Athanasius and St. Jerome, David did not compose all the psalms. [3] 1 Par 15:17; 1 Par 25:1 [4] Which psalms Solomon composed. [5] Moses composed several psalms. [6] Which psalms Asaph composed.

(printed p. 11 [PDF p. 24], recto — the Psalter concluded; the Three Books of Solomon begin. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *tradit*] that this psalm was put forth long afterward, in the captivity of Babylon, and chanted assiduously through the seven years in which Joakim, king of the Jews, was unjustly oppressed in the prisons of Babylon.

ETHAN the Ezrahite, son of Chusi, of the sons of Merari, sounding upon cymbals of brass, endowed with such wisdom that — as the third book of Kings testifies — no mortal ever, save Solomon alone, was wiser than he [1] [2], put forth one psalm [3], namely LXXXIX, whose title is *THE ERUDITION [Maschil] OF ETHAN*, and its beginning, *"The MERCIES of the lord I will sing forever."* Which psalm the same Philo, in the book cited a little before, writes was put forth many years later, for an act of thanksgiving, when Evilmerodach, king of the Assyrians, brought Joakim the king out of prison and began to hold him in honor at his court. There are those who affirm that Eman and Ethan — to whom Solomon is preferred in the third volume of Kings — neither put forth psalms nor were singers of psalms; but that the authors and psalmists both of this and of the foregoing psalm were that Eman and Ethan whom the first of the Annals [1 Paralipomenon], in the sixth chapter, reviews among the singers of the family of Levi. Let others more diligent than I sift this opinion.

The THREE SONS of Korach, or Chorhe, whose names are reviewed in the first of Paralipomenon — namely Asir, Elkana, and Abiasaph — these three with common labor composed eleven psalms [4], that is:

XLII. XLIIII. XLV. XLVI. XLVII. XLVIII. XLIX. LXXXIIII. LXXXV. LXXXVII. LXXXVIII.

IDITHUM, a most eminent singer, who upon the harp prophesied over those who confessed and praised the lord, set to melody one psalm [5], which is the thirty-ninth in number, and begins, *"I SAID, I will keep my ways."*

AND these are the authors of the whole psalter, inscribed at the heads of the psalms according to the Hebrew verity: besides whom certain others also are set at the beginnings of the psalms in the Greek codices, as for instance:

EZECHIEL AND JEREMIAS, to whom is ascribed the sixty-fifth psalm, *"A hymn, O God, becometh thee in Syon."*

The SONS OF JONADAB, with whose name is inscribed the seventy-first psalm, *"IN thee, O lord, have I hoped; let me not be confounded forever."*

JEREMIAS the prophet, to whom is ascribed psalm CXXXVII, *"UPON the rivers of Babylon."*

AGGAEUS AND ZACHARIAS, the prophets, with whose names are inscribed the psalms written below, namely:

CXXXVIII.	*I WILL CONFESS to thee, O lord.*
CXXXIIII [CXXXIX].	*LORD, thou hast proved me.*
CXLVI.	*PRAISE the lord, O my soul.*
CXLVIII [CXLVII].	*PRAISE the lord, O Jerusalem.*
CXLIX [CXLVIII].	*PRAISE ye the lord from the heavens.*

Thus far of the authors of the book of Hymns — which Jerome affirms to consist, among the Hebrews, of various kinds of verse [6], not otherwise than the poems of Pindar among the Greeks and of Horace among the Latins. Rabbi David Kimchi teaches that this is the custom of the Hebrew poets: that the songs in which certain illustrious arguments are treated they dispose according to the series of the Hebrew alphabet, that they may be more easily imprinted on the memory, and, once imprinted, may cleave the more tenaciously. And in this order, as Cardinal Cajetan also shows, seven of the more excellent psalms of this volume were composed [7], namely:

XXV.	whose beginning is, *TO THEE, O lord, have I lifted up.*
XXXIIII.	which begins, *I WILL BLESS the lord.*
XXXVII.	*BE NOT emulous* — which proceeds by an interpolated alphabet.
CXI.	*I WILL CONFESS to thee, O lord.*
CXII.	*BLESSED is the man that feareth the lord.*
CXLV.	*I WILL EXALT thee, O God* — which are contained in a simple alphabet.
CXVIII.	*BLESSED are the immaculate in the way* — which consists of eightfold alphabets, with eight verses always beginning from the same letter.

Jerome, however, in the epistle to Paula Urbica [8], writes that only five psalms are found disposed alphabetically [9], and that they are deceived who reckon more. Epiphanius, in the book *On weights and measures*, writes that the volume of the psalms is distinguished among the Jews into five small books, or sections: of which the first runs from the first [psalm] to the fortieth; the second from the forty-first to the seventy-first; the third from the seventy-second to the 88th; the fourth from the eighty-ninth to the hundred-and-fifth; the fifth from the hundred-and-sixth to the last. And at the end of all of these is set a double *Amen*, which the LXX rendered *Fiat, fiat* [So be it, so be it]. Chrysostom judges that Esdras, after the Babylonian captivity, gathered these psalms, dispersed here and there, into this volume which we now have. [10] But Athanasius in his *Synopsis* writes that this was done before the captivity by the friends of king Ezechias — asserting that out of the psalms of David, which he affirms to have been three thousand, they collected only a hundred and fifty [11], the rest being hidden away, lest they should come into the hands of all. All the aforesaid ten psalmographers flourished at nearly the same times [12] — namely about the year of the founded world 2940 [printed *bis 1940*], but before Christ 1400 [so printed; the figures do not agree]. There are borne about also other writings under the name of David, which are reviewed in the following volume.

THE THREE BOOKS OF SOLOMON

SALOMON — or שלמה *Scelomo*, who in the sacred letters is called also ידידיה *Iedidia*, and קהלת *Koeleth* — son of king David, and king of Jerusalem [13]; whose like God himself testified never to have been before,

nor to have been after, nor to be hereafter: he composed, according to the number of his names, three books. [14] Of which the first the Hebrews call משלי *Misle*, the Greeks Παροιμίαι, the Latins *Proverbia* [Proverbs]; because in it adages, similitudes, and certain common sentences concerning the various events of human affairs [*eventi-* →]

[1] Ethan's wisdom was great. [2] 3 Reg 4:31 [3] Ethan composed one psalm. [4] The sons of Korah composed several psalms. [5] Idithun composed one psalm. [6] Among the Hebrews the psalms consist of various kinds of verse. [7] Seven psalms are arranged according to the order of the alphabet. [8] Jerome, Epistle 155 [9] Jerome thinks only 5 psalms are arranged alphabetically. [10] Chrysostom thinks Esdras collected the psalms into one volume; but Athanasius attributes this to Ezechias. [11] Out of three thousand psalms only 150 survive. [12] At what time the psalmographers flourished. [13] 3 Kings 3:1 [14] Solomon wrote three books.

(printed p. 12 [PDF p. 25], verso — the Three Books of Solomon concluded; Esaias; Jeremias. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *eventi*-]bus are referred [gathered], necessary for the ordering of life. Its latter part — namely from the twenty-fifth chapter to the end — Sebna and the other scribes of Ezechias, king of Juda, collected out of other volumes. [1] Now the book of Proverbs contains, as the author of the *Hebrew Questions upon the third book of Kings* writes, nine hundred and fifteen verses; in which three thousand parables are comprehended [2] — those, no doubt, of which it is written in the third volume of Kings: *"And Salomon spoke three thousand parables."* [3]

The SECOND book Salomon himself inscribed קהלת *Coheleth*; the Greeks, Ἐκκλησιαστής, *Ecclesiastes*; we may call it *the Preacher* (*Concionator*) [4]: because his discourse, as Jerome says [5], is directed not to one man in particular, as in the Proverbs, but to all men generally — teaching that all things which are in the world are perishable and brief, and for this cause to be desired not at all. But the Hebrews, judging a little otherwise, will have both Salomon himself and this book to be called קהלת *Koeleth* on account of the admirable wisdom which was copiously gathered together in Salomon and in this volume.

The THIRD is called by the Hebrews שיר השירים *Scir hascirim*, by the Greeks Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, by us the *Canticle of Canticles* [6]: because it is more excellent and more illustrious than the other canticles, whether of Salomon or of other authors — containing, under the metaphor of the bridegroom and the bride, wondrous mysteries, and the ineffable philanthropy [loving-kindness] of God toward the soul of man. This book — together with the exordium of the book of Genesis, and the beginning and end of Ezechiel — the ancient hebrews, on account of its hidden senses, attended with such veneration that they would not have it read except after the thirtieth year of age. [7] [8] And among Christians very many expositors of no contemptible name, led by the same reverence, have judged that the explanation of this little book is not to be touched in youth, but to be reserved as a solace of Christian old age and a viaticum of the holy passage — after the example of those holy men Bernard of Clairvaux, Gilbert of Hoyland, Thomas Aquinas, and John Gerson, to whom it befell happily to put off mortality in the meditation and exposition of this work. [9] There are those who say that the sentences of these three books were collected by Esaias the prophet [10] out of the various books of Canticles and of Proverbs which the divine scripture records to have been composed by Salomon; and that they were preserved by the instinct of the holy spirit, as being more useful than the rest, and compacted into these three little books. These Isidore, from Josephus and Jerome, affirms to have been written by Salomon in hexameter and pentameter verses [11], and that the last part of the book of Proverbs is closed with an alphabet [acrostic], which is reckoned in Iambic trimeter. It is agreed that Salomon, besides these books, wrote other volumes also, among which the book of Wisdom is counted; but of these we shall speak in the following volume. Salomon died in the year from the founding of the world two thousand nine hundred and seventy, in the ninety-second year before the nativity of Christ [so printed; read: the nine hundred ninety-second].

ESAIAS

IESCAEIAHU ישעיהו — or, as we say, Isaias, or Esaias, or Jesaias, which is interpreted *the Salvation of the lord* — prophet, son of Amoz, a citizen of Jerusalem, noble in race, of the tribe of Juda, wrote the book of his prophecies: which, the holy spirit enlightening him, he pronounced under four kings of Juda succeeding one another [12] — namely Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias — against Judaea and Jerusalem, and against the nations, chiefly the Babylonian, Philistine, Damascene, Egyptian, Idumaean, and Tyrian. And in this book, as Jerome says, whatever of Physics, of Ethics, of Logic — whatever of the mysteries of the holy scriptures the human tongue and the sense of mortals can receive — he embraced, with a grace of speech and an elegance of polished diction supreme above the other prophets. [13] The narration of the whole book is prose, distinguished by cola and commata and finished in all its rhythms, except three canticles — namely of the Vineyard, of the city of Syon, and of king Ezechias — which, together with the prayer of Esaias, Isidore testifies to march in hexameter and pentameter verses. Now Esaias brought forth, concerning the advent of Christ our savior, his incarnation, miracles, preaching, life, passion, death, resurrection, and glory, testimonies so many, so magnificent, and so open, that he seems not to prophesy of his events to come, but rather to write a history of his deeds already past — and to fill the part of an evangelist rather than of a prophet. [14] And hence, I judge, our lord JESUS Christ chose for himself this one among all the prophets, to read and expound publicly first in the synagogue of his own country. [15] Esaias dies under the most impious king Manasses, cut asunder into two parts by his command [16], because he had called the nobles of the royal house princes of the Sodomites, and had said that he had seen God sitting upon a lofty throne. And he was buried under the oak of Rogel, in the tribe of Benjamin, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand two hundred and forty, and before the birth of Christ the seven hundred twenty-eighth. He is said to have written besides these things others also, which we shall note in the book next following.

JEREMIAS

IRMEIAHU ירמיהו — or, as we say, Jeremias, that is, *the Exalted* — prophet and priest, from Anathoth, a hamlet three miles from Jerusalem, son of Helchias the high priest, who in the eighth year of Josias, king of Juda, found in the house of the lord the book of the divine law [17], lost for many years through the negligence of the preceding kings: he began, when still quite a youth, to prophesy, and to commit his vaticinations to letters — in a speech indeed unpolished, and well-nigh rustic [18], but sublime in the majesty of its senses. Now he wrote — Baruch, the son of Neerias, taking it down from his mouth [19] — the book of his prophecies and visions, which he received from heaven, concerning the disaster of the Jews and the future church of Christ, through two-and-forty years: that is, from the thirteenth year of king Josias down to the destruction of the city and the removal of the remnants of Juda into Egypt. To which volume Baruch adjoined a last chapter, borrowed in almost the same words from the end of the fourth book of Kings, so that, by the commemoration of the disaster of Jerusalem which is related in that chapter, he might pave a way for readers to the next following book — איכה *Eca*, or קינות *Kinoth*, that is, the book of *Lamentations*: in which Jeremias the prophet bewailed with mournful song the lamentable overthrow of the city and the captivity of the people, [the songs] being digested [*digestis* →]

[1] Who wrote the last part of the Proverbs. [2] The book of Proverbs contains 915 verses, comprising 3000 parables. [3] 3 Reg 4:32 [4] Why the second book of Solomon is called Ecclesiastes. [5] Jerome, on Ecclesiastes ch. 1 [6] Why the third book of Solomon is entitled the Canticle of Canticles. [7] Diligently note, against the heretics of our time, who contend that the scriptures are to be read by all. [8] Jerome, in the preface of the commentary on Ezechiel. [9] Four most illustrious men died while expounding the Canticle of Canticles. [10] Isaias is thought to have collected the sentences of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles out of the books of Solomon. [11] In the judgement of some, these three books were written in verse. [12] Under which kings Isaias wrote. [13] Great praise of Isaias. [14] Isaias rather an evangelist than a prophet. [15] Luke 4:17 [16] The death of Isaias, and its cause. [17] Jeremias' father found the book of the law in the house of the lord. [18] Jeremias' speech is unpolished. [19] Baruch, the scribe of Jeremias.

(printed p. 13 [PDF p. 26], recto — Lamentations concluded; Ezechiel; Daniel. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *digestis*] [the songs] being digested into Alphabetic order by verses, in such a manner that the first should begin from *Aleph*, the second from *Beth*, the third from *Ghimel*, and so on to the end — imitating in this David and Salomon, of whom the latter composed the last part of the Proverbs, the former seven psalms, in metrical alphabets. Now in these lamentations there are four alphabets: of which the two first, as Jerome testifies, are written in a verse not very unlike the Sapphic meter, since a *comma* [closing colon] of heroic verse concludes three versicles which are joined to one another and begin from a single letter; but the third alphabet is woven in trimeter, and the triple verses begin from three letters each — but the same [letter thrice]; the fourth alphabet is like the first and the second. Rabbi Salomon judges this book of Lamentations to be that which — as you have it in Jeremias, chapter thirty-six — the profane king Joachim, when its beginning had been read, cast into the fire, and in hatred of the prophecy burned up; and that Jeremias, summoning Baruch the scribe, at God's command dictated it anew, and added the fourth alphabet with its threefold series of letters, whereas in the earlier exemplar he had set down only three simple alphabets. Jeremias lived under the kings Josias, Joachim, and Sedechias, down to the removal of the remnants of Juda into Egypt — whither he too was carried off by Joanan, son of Caree; and he perished in Taphnes [*Thaaphnes*], overwhelmed with stones by his own people [1], and was buried in that same place, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand three hundred and fifty: although Victorinus the martyr and very many other most ancient fathers opine otherwise, who taught that he is still alive [2], and is to be slain, together with Elias, by Antichrist in the last age of the world. There are borne about also certain other writings under his name, of which we shall speak in the following book.

EZECHIEL

IECHEZKEL יחזקאל, or Ezechiel — which is interpreted *the strength* or *the dominion of the lord* — prophet and priest, son of Buzi a priest, and himself a priest, of the land of Sarera, wrote a prophetic book of the visions and oracles revealed to him by God within the space of twenty years — that is, from the fifth year of the deportation of king Jechonias, with whom he himself was led away into Chaldaea (and he began to prophesy by the river Chobar), down to the twenty-fifth year of the same deportation, which was the first captivity of Juda, when the wrath of God dropped down upon Jerusalem. His style is neither eloquent enough, nor altogether rustic, but tempered out of both. Moreover, the mysteries of his narration are wrapped in such obscurities that among the Hebrew Rabbins it has been provided by tradition that no one should ever dare to explicate the first chapter of the book, nor the end — that is, the eight later chapters — unless he have completed the 30th year of his age. [3] Jerome — who first of all expositors dared to compose commentaries on the whole of Ezechiel [4] — expressed the most abstruse difficulty of this book by the most apt similitude of the Cretan labyrinth [5], in these verses of Virgil:

> *Here is the toil, that house, and the inextricable maze; as once in lofty Crete, the labyrinth, they say, held a path woven between blind walls, and a doubtful deceit of a thousand ways, whereby the unretraced and irretraceable wandering might baffle the signs of those who followed.*
>
> *May the Spirit himself unloose the wiles and windings of that house; and, I pray, its blind traces — thou being our guide, O Christ!*

Ezechiel dies in Chaldaea, cut down by the leader of his own nation [6], whom he had rebuked for the worship of idols; and he was buried in the land of the Spyrians, in the field of Maur, in the tomb of Sem and Arphaxad, the forefathers of Abraham, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand three hundred and sixty. Josephus, in the tenth of the *Antiquities*, relates that Ezechiel, besides this book, composed also another volume of vaticinations; concerning which, see in the book that follows next after this one.

DANIEL

DANIEL דניאל, that is, *Judged by the lord*, a prophet of the tribe of Juda, born of the royal nobles in upper Bethebero, not far from Jerusalem — while he was yet a boy, was led away to Babylon with Joakim, king of Juda, in the third year of his reign; and he was made an eunuch of the king of the Chaldaeans, that in him might be fulfilled the vaticination of Esaias, which he uttered over king Ezechias, saying: *"Of thy sons, who shall be born of thee, they shall take away, and they shall make eunuchs in the house of the king."* [7] He put forth the book of his prophecy, in which he comprehended illustrious and most certain vaticinations concerning all the kingdoms of the whole world, and especially concerning the glorious and eternal kingdom of Christ [8]; and he compressed into the same volume all the histories of all nations which were written after his times. For the exact understanding of which, Jerome admonishes that a manifold history of the Chaldaeans, Greeks, and Latins is necessary [9] — namely of Sutorius [Callinicus], Diodorus, Hieronymus [of Cardia], Polybius, Posidonius, Claudius Theon, Andronicus, and Josephus, and of those whom Josephus adduces; but chiefly of Titus Livius, Trogus Pompeius, and Justin, who narrate the whole history of Daniel's last vision, and describe, from Alexander down to Caesar Augustus, the wars of Syria and Egypt — that is, of the Seleuci, the Antiochi, and the Ptolemies.

It is to be observed, moreover, that this whole book is completed in four parts: of which the first — that is, from the beginning to those words of the second chapter, namely, *THE CHALDAEANS ANSWERED THE KING IN SYRIAC* [10] — is narrated in the hebrew speech. The second, which proceeds thence to the vision of the third year of Balthasar — that is, to the end of the seventh chapter — is written in Hebrew letters indeed, but in the Syrian, that is, the Chaldaic, tongue. The third, to the end of the twelfth chapter, is written again in hebrew eloquence. The fourth and last, concerning Susanna and Bel, was written in greek, out of the Greek edition of Theodotion of Ephesus — who also inserted the prayer of Azarias and the hymn of the three children, put forth by himself in greek, into the third chapter of the same book. This book, moreover, begins, among us as among the Hebrews, thus: *In the third year of the reign of Joachim, king of Juda, came Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, etc.* But the vulgate edition of the greeks, and the very *Synopsis* of Athanasius (in which the beginnings of all the sacred volumes are recorded), take the beginning of the book from the history of Susanna — because it befell while Daniel was yet a boy [11] — in these words: Καὶ ἦν ἀνὴρ οἰκῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, καὶ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωακείμ, that is, *And there was a man dwelling in Babylon, and his name was Joa-* [*-chim* →]

[1] Jeremias was stoned by the Jews [2] Some thought that Jeremias lives together with Elias [3] It was not lawful for the Jews before the 30th year of age to read the first and the eight last chapters of Ezechiel [4] Jerome, in the preface to book 1 of his Commentary on Ezechiel [5] The same, in the preface to book 14 of his Commentary on Ezechiel [6] Ezechiel was slain by the leader of the Jews in Chaldaea [7] Esa. 39.d [8] Daniel prophesied most excellently of the eternal kingdom of Christ the Lord [9] Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Daniel [10] Dan 2:4 [11] The history of Susanna befell while Daniel was still a boy

---

(printed p. 14 [PDF p. 27], verso — Daniel concluded; Osea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas; Michaeas begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *-chim*], etc., down to the end of the same history, which in our codices also is contained in chapter 14 [so printed; the history of Susanna stands as chapter 13 in our codices]. Which being completed, there follow immediately those words, *In the third year of the reign of Joachim* — whence our exemplars, together with those of the Hebrews, take their beginning. Now this same book, according to the hebraic verity, ends in those words: *But thou, Daniel, go to the appointed end, and thou shalt rest, and shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days* — which among us are read at the close of the twelfth chapter; but the Greeks, together with us, finish the present book in those words of the history of Bel and the dragon: Καὶ κατεβρώθησαν παραχρῆμα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ — that is, *And they were devoured in a moment before him.* Daniel lived in the captivity of Babylon, most acceptable to the kings of the Assyrians; and he died in the times of Cyrus, king of the Persians, in Babylon, and there was buried with great honors, about the year from the founding of the world *ter 1400* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand four hundred]. [1] His book, together with the volume of Ezechiel, Isidore reckons to have been written down by the wise men of the Hebrews. The Greeks

divide the whole volume into twelve visions: of which the first contains the history of Susanna, the last the destruction of the Dragon and the rapture of Abakuk.

OSEA

HOSCEA הושע, that is, *Saviour*, son of Beeri, sprung from the town of Belometh, in the tribe of Isachar, wrote a book *commatice* [in short clauses], and as it were digested by sentences, of the prophecies put forth by himself against the ten tribes of Israel under the name of Ephraim, of Samaria, and of the house of Joseph: in which, beyond the other prophets, he vaticinated of the vocation of the gentiles and the reprobation of the Hebrews. [2] He lived under Ozia, Joathan, Achaz, and Ezechia, kings of Juda, synchronous with Esaias the prophet; and he died, and was buried in his own country, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand three hundred and forty. [3]

JOEL

IOEL יואל, that is, *Beginning*, son of Pethuel, sprung from the field of Bethor, of the tribe of Ruben, wrote a little book of prophetic forewarnings; in which he foretold what great evils hung over the world [4], and especially over the two tribes which are called Juda and Jerusalem, and Jacob, on account of its many and grievous crimes — announcing also mysteries concerning the kingdom of Christ and the mission of the holy spirit. He was famous under king Joram, son of Achab, king of Israel: in whose times he both foresaw and experienced the great famine that was to be in the land; and he departed this life a little after, and with glory and honor was buried in Bether, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand and fifty, but before Christ the nine hundred and eighth. [5]

AMOS

AMOS עמוס, that is, *Bearing*, from the town of Thecue — which Epiphanius places in the tribe of Zabulon, but Jerome hands down to be six miles distant, toward the southern quarter, from holy Bethlehem, in the tribe of Juda [6] — since he was not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but a plebeian man and a shepherd [7], plucking the mulberries of the brambles, suddenly and by divine miracle called into the order of prophets: he prophesied against the ten tribes of Israel, some things also against the nations neighboring the land of Israel, and against the kingdom of Juda, preaching even against the temple itself; and he transmitted his vaticinations to posterity in a single volume. He was famous under Ozia, king of Juda, and Jeroboam, son of Joas, king of Israel: by whom, and by the son of Amasias, priest of Bethel — whom he himself had rebuked concerning the two golden calves — he fell, transfixed with a nail through the temples, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand one hundred and ten. [8]

ABDIAS

OVADIA עבדיה, or Abdias, that is, *the Worshipper of God*, was born, as Epiphanius writes, in Sichem [*Sichera*] in the field of Leththacmar. He, before he began to prophesy, bore the dignity of a Semicenturion, or Quinquagenarius [captain of fifty], under Ochozias, king of Israel: by whom when — after two companies of fifty had been consumed by celestial fire — he had been sent to apprehend Helias the prophet, deserting the king he adhered to him, and was made his disciple. But Jerome judges that he was that man who [9], as is read in the third book of Kings [10], in the times of Achab and Jezabel fed a hundred prophets hidden away in caves. Certain of the Rabbins think that he was a proselyte from Idumaea [*Aedomea*], because his little book of prophecy was written chiefly against the Edomites [*Aedomeos*] — that is, the Chaldaeans [so printed] — and the nations which afflicted Israel. He lived about the year from the founding of the world three thousand and sixty [11]: whose sepulcher in the times of Jerome was to be seen in Sebaste, which of old was Samaria, together with the mausoleum of Heliseus the prophet and of John the Baptist.

JONAS

IONA יונה, whose name signifies a *Dove*, as is had in the third volume of Kings [12], was the son of Amithai the prophet, from the region of Opher, from the hamlet of Geth — which in the times of Jerome was called Diocaesaria [so printed; Jerome says rather that it lay at the second milestone from Sepphoris, itself then called Diocaesarea], situated at the second milestone from Sephorim toward Tyberias, in the tribe of Aser. Yet Epiphanius hands down that he was born in Gath, or in Chauathamaum, in the tribe of Dan, not far from Azotus, a city of the Palestinians, near the sea; and that he was the son of the widow of Sarepta, whom Helias the prophet raised up when dead at Sarepta of Sidonia [13] — the mother afterward saying to him, *NOW I have known that thou art a man of God, and the truth is in thy mouth* [14]: and for this cause the boy was called the son of Amithai, that is, *of truth*, because, Helias the prophet speaking true, he was brought forth again into this light. He, when he had come to man's estate, prophesied first of the restitution of Damascus, and of Hemath, and of the borders of the kingdom of Israel, made through Hieroboam, king of Israel; then, sent to Ninive, the metropolis of the Assyrians, founded by king Ninus beside the river Lycus, he converted that city by his preaching to penitence: and this history — in which the death and resurrection of Christ is figured — he committed to a small book. He lived in the times of Osea, Amos, and Esaias; and he died in the land of Saar, and in the same place was buried in the cave of Cenezaeus the judge, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand two hundred and forty. [15]

MICHAEAS

MICHA מיכה, that is, *Humility*, prophet, born in Morasti [*in Morastite*] — which, near Eleutheropolis of Palestine, in the tribe of Ephraim, is a hamlet not great; or, as Jonathan the Chaldaean hands down, from the city of Maresa, which is in the tribe of Juda — wrote a book of the vaticinations which [*in* →]

[1] Daniel died in Babylon in the year of the world 3400 [2] Osea, beyond the other prophets, foretold the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Hebrews [3] Osea died in the year of the world 3340 [4] Joel foretold the evils that hung over the whole world [5] Joel died 908 years before Christ the Lord [6] Jerome, on chapter 6 of Jeremiah [7] Amos was a herdsman of cattle [8] Amos was slain in the year of the world 3110 [9] Jerome, in his commentary on the first chapter of Abdias [10] 3 Kings 18 [11] Abdias lived in the year of the world 3060 [12] 3 Kings 14 — so printed (matching the body's "third volume"), but the margin-rich edition reads 4 Kings 14:25, the true reference for Jonas son of Amittai [13] Jonas was thought to be that son of the widow of Sarepta whom Elias restored to life [14] 3 Kings 17:24 [15] Jonas died in the year of the world 3240

(printed p. 15 [PDF p. 28], recto — Michaeas concluded; Nahum, Abacuch, Sophonias, Aggaeus, Zacharias, Malachias; the Kimchi appendix begins. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *in*] the days of Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda, he pronounced over Samaria and Jerusalem — vaticinating against the kings, judges, priests, and false prophets, who had cast away the word of the lord and had followed impiety; and the advent also of Christ the Saviour, and the place of his nativity, he openly foretold. [1] He dies cast headlong from a high place; and he was buried in Morasti, his own country, near the Polyandrium [common burying-place], in the year from the founding of the world almost three thousand two hundred and forty. [2]

NAHUM

NACHUM נחום, or Nahum, that is, *the Consoler*, as Epiphanius asserts, born in the town of Elkesei beyond the river Jordan toward Begabar, of the tribe of Simeon — or, as it pleases Jerome, from Helchesei, which was a ruined hamlet in Galilaea [3] — vaticinated, after Jonas the prophet, against the Ninivites, because, after the pardon obtained from God, they had again perpetrated heavier crimes; and he concluded in a small volume his prophecy *Of the subversion of Ninive* and of the whole kingdom of the Assyrians — which is thought to have been afterward accomplished by Nabuchodonosor in the first year of his empire. [4] He dies under the impious king Manasses, and was buried in Bagabar, about the year from the founding of the world

three thousand two hundred and forty-five. [5]

ABACUCH

CHAVAKKUK חבקוק, or Abacuch, that is, *the Wrestler*, prophet, sprung from the field of Bezochar, of the tribe of Simeon: at God's command — as is written in the second chapter of his own prophecy — he drew up a book of vaticinations against Babylon and Nabuchodonosor, king of the Chaldaeans, who overthrew Jerusalem and the temple, and brought upon the kingdom of the Jews evils so great as they had never suffered from any tyrant. He lived in the age of the Babylonian captivity [6]; at which time also he was carried off with a dinner by an angel into Chaldaea, to Daniel shut up in the den of the Lions [7]; and he departed this life two years before the return of the Judaic people from Babylon, and with great honors was interred in his own field, in the year from the founding of the world *ter 1400 and 16* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand four hundred and sixteen]. [8] There is numbered also another Apocryphal writing of Abacuch, in the following volume.

SOPHONIAS

ZEPHANIA צפניה, or Sophonias, that is, *the Secret* [hidden one] *of the lord*, prophet, a Sarabathide — that is, from the mountain Sarabatha — son of Chusi, grandson of Gedalias, great-grandson of Amarias, great-great-grandson of Ezechias, composed one book, in which with wondrous and luminous brevity he ran through the vaticinations put forth by himself concerning the overthrow of Jerusalem and the devastation of the whole kingdom of the Jews. He was famous under Josias, king of Juda, synchronous with Jeremias the prophet, in the year from the founding of the world three thousand three hundred and thirty. [9]

AGGAEUS

CHAGGI חגי, or Aggaeus, that is, *Festive* and *Glad*, returned while quite a youth from Babylon into Judaea, and by his vaticinations impelled the people to the re-edification of the temple of God, threatening them with innumerable evils unless they pressed on with the building: and he saw with his own eyes the structure of the temple completed, and there, first of all men, sang ALLELUIA in the praise of God [10]; and his joyful prophecies — of the return of the people, of the re-edification of the temple, and of the overthrow of the hostile nations — he left digested in a very short book. He dies at Jerusalem fifty years after the return from Babylon, in the year from the founding of the world *ter 1469* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand four hundred and sixty-nine]. [11]

ZACHARIAS

ZECHARIA זכריה, that is, *Mindful of the lord*, prophet, and son of Barachias, grandson of Iddo, from the land of the Chaldaeans [printed *Chalst■orum*], wrote a book, beyond the other twelve prophets the longest and the most obscure, having almost the same argument as Aggaeus — of the re-edification of the temple, yet treating more fully of the city of Jerusalem than of the temple — and containing visions exceedingly obscure, not unlike the visions of Daniel; in explicating which many illustrious wits, as well of the Jews as of the Christians, have sweated. He passed away, worn out with long old age, in Judaea, and was interred next to Aggaeus the prophet, about the year from the founding of the world *ter 1450* [i.e. three thousand four hundred and fifty].

MALACHIAS

MALACHI מלאכי, or Malachias, that is, *my Angel* or *my Messenger*: he is thought by some to have been an Angel, who coming from heaven assumed a body, that he might vaticinate to Israel the things which had been commanded by God — which opinion Jerome fastens upon Origen. [12] But Epiphanius writes that he

was born in the town of Sopha, in the tribe of Zabulon, and obtained the name of Angel because he was of surpassing beauty, and endowed with most blameless manners. Jonathan the Chaldaean and the rest of the Hebrews hold that he was Esdras the scribe and priest, because all the things which are contained in his book this prophet also commemorates, saying: *THE LIPS of the priest keep knowledge, and they require the law from his mouth, because he is the angel of the lord.* [13] But whosoever he may have been who wrote the book under the name of Malachias, it matters little; since the authority of his book labors under no suspicion, but is cited by the Evangelists in testimony of the truth. Malachias was famous about the year from the founding of the world three thousand four hundred [14], in the year before Christ almost the five hundredth; and he wrote this book against the impure life of his people, and especially against the wicked manners of their priests: who, after the return from Babylon and the restoration of the temple, having turned back again to their former foulnesses, had begun to offer the oblations and the divine sacrifices with contaminated souls and bodies.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX FROM THE BOOK OF THE WAYS OF THE HOLY TONGUE of Rabbi Moses Kimchi: in which, according to the tradition of the Rabbins, are most briefly run through the writers of the holy books of the first order, which alone are in authority among the Hebrews.

MOSES, the man of God, wrote the five fifths of the law — that is, the Pentateuch — except eight verses, from these words, *AND MOSES DIED*, etc., to the end of the law; and the book of Job.

JEHOSCUA [Joshua] wrote his own book, and the eight verses of the law.

[*SA*- →]

[1] Michaeas openly foretold the advent of the Saviour and the place of his birth [2] Michaeas died in the year of the world 3240 [3] Jerome, in the preface to Nahum [4] Nineveh was overthrown by Nabuchodonosor [5] Nahum died in the year of the world 3245 [6] Abacuch lived in the time of the Babylonian captivity [7] Dan 14:35 [8] Abacuch died in the year of the world 3416 [9] Sophonias flourished in the year of the world 3330 [10] Aggaeus, first of all, sang Alleluia in the temple rebuilt after the Babylonian captivity [11] Aggaeus died in the year of the world 3469 [12] Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Malachias [13] Malach. 2 [14] Malachias flourished in the year of the world 3400

(printed p. 16 [PDF p. 29], verso — the Kimchi appendix concluded; the New Testament first-order canon; Matthaeus; Marcus begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *SA*-]**MUEL** wrote his own book — that is, the first and second of Kings, as we call them — and the book of Judges, and Ruth.

ISAIAS wrote his own book, and the book of Proverbs, and the book of the Canticle of Canticles, and the book of Ecclesiastes.

JEREMIAS wrote his own book, and the book of Kings, and the book of the Threni [Lamentations].

THE MEN OF THE GREAT SYNAGOGUE wrote the book of Jehezekel, and the book of the Twelve — that is, of the Twelve minor prophets — and the book of Daniel, and the volume of Esther.

DAVID AND THE TEN PROPHETS wrote the book of Hymns, that is, of the psalms.

EZRAS wrote his own book, [and] the genealogies of the words of the days — that is, of Paralipomenon — as far as those words, *AND THE SONS OF JOSAPHAT HAD BRETHREN*.

THE NUMBER of the verses of the law: five thousand eight hundred and forty-five.

OF THE PROPHETS: nine thousand two hundred and ninety-four.

OF THE HAGIOGRAPHA: eight thousand and sixty-four.

THERE IS FOUND, therefore, as the sum of all the verses of the reading of the Bible: twenty-three thousand two hundred and three verses.

OF THE SCRIPTURES AND WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, which are numbered in the first order of the Canon

THE various supputations and the diverse partitions of the scriptures and writers of the old testament being completed — of the Protocanonical, which are placed in the first order of the canon — we must now proceed to the books of the same order which are had in the new testament: of which the most certain index, and through all the successions of the catholic fathers the undoubted and most approved, is this:

1	Ματθαῖος,	Matthaeus.
2	Μάρκος,	Marcus.
3	Λουκᾶς,	Lucas.
4	Ἰωάννης,	Joannes.
5	Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων	The Acts of the Apostles.
	Παύλου ἐπιστολαὶ ιγ′.	The epistles of Paul, XIII — namely:
6	Πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους,	To the Romans.
7	Πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθίους α′.	To the Corinthians, the first.
8	Πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθίους β′.	To the Corinthians, the second.
9	Πρὸς τοὺς Γαλάτας,	To the Galatians.
10	Πρὸς τοὺς Ἐφεσίους,	To the Ephesians.
11	Πρὸς τοὺς Φιλιππησίους,	To the Philippians.
12	Πρὸς τοὺς Κολοσσαεῖς,	To the Colossians.
13	Πρὸς τοὺς Θεσσαλονικεῖς α′.	To the Thessalonians, the first.
14	Πρὸς τοὺς Θεσσαλον. β′.	To the Thessalonians, the second.
15	Πρὸς τὸν Τιμόθεον α′.	To Timothy, the first.
16	Πρὸς τὸν Τιμόθεον β′.	To Timothy, the second.
17	Πρὸς τὸν Τίτον,	To Titus.
18	Πρὸς τὸν Φιλήμονα,	To Philemon.
19	Πέτρου ἐπιστολὴ α′.	The epistle of Peter, the first.
20	Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολὴ α′.	The epistle of John, the first.

MATTHAEUS

MATTHAEUS — who is also Levi, an Apostle from a publican [1] — first of all, in Judaea, for the sake of those who had believed from the circumcision, composed the Gospel of Christ, as Irenaeus witnesses, in Hebrew letters and words. [2] Who afterward first translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain. Moreover, Jerome testifies that the author's Hebrew exemplar itself was preserved in his own times in the library of Caesarea, which Pamphilus the Martyr had built up; and that he himself obtained the faculty of copying it from the Nazaraeans, who, dwelling in Beroea, a city of Syria, used a similar Hebrew volume. Hence it is that, since Matthaeus wrote in Hebrew, in bringing forward the testimonies of the old scripture he does not follow the edition of the seventy interpreters cited by the other evangelists, but produces each testimony according to the Hebraic verity. [3] This gospel is divided by the more ancient latins, according to the partition of Hilary, into 33 canons; and according to the section of Christian Drutman [Druthmar], into 67 canons; but among the more recent Latins into 8 chapters; among the Greeks, according to Euthymius, or Oecumenius, into 68 chapters; but according to Suidas into 68 titles, and 355 chapters; Ammonius similarly, and Eusebius,

into 355 chapters. This gospel was written, as Eusebius relates, in the third year of the Emperor Caius Caligula — that is, in the eighth year from the ascension of Christ. [4] Its author Matthaeus, having set out into Aethiopia for the preaching of Christ, and thence returned, fell asleep in Hiera, a city of Parthia, and there was buried, in the year from the birth of Christ 50. He is reported to have written certain other things also, of which it shall be spoken in the following book.

MARCUS

MARCUS, bishop of Alexandria, and evangelist, whose name was John, had for mother Mary — she who in her own house kindly received the apostles, as Lucas in the Acts of the Apostles thus testifies: *But Peter, CONSIDERING, came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, who was surnamed Marcus; where many were gathered together, and praying.* [5] He first, as Origen says, before the dominical pas-[-*sio* →]

[1] Luke 5:27 [2] St. Matthew wrote the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew [3] Matthew brings forward the testimonies of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew verity [4] Matthew's Gospel was written in the eighth year from the ascension of Christ [5] Acts 12:12

(printed p. 17 [PDF p. 30], recto — Marcus concluded; Lucas; Joannes; the Acts of the Apostles begins. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ -*sio*]n, followed Christ among the seventy-two disciples [1]; then, after the ascension of Christ, he was joined to Barnabas his uncle, and to Paul — as Lucas commemorates in the same book, and as Paul indicates, making mention of him in the epistle to the Colossians and in the second to Timothy. [2] Lastly — as Papias in the first book of *The Dominical Words*, and Clemens in the sixth book of the ὑποτυπώσεις [Hypotyposes, Outlines], write — he gave himself to Peter, the prince of the apostles, as companion, disciple, and interpreter: which the former epistle of Peter also demonstrates, in which he himself called Marcus his son according to the spirit. [3] Being asked therefore at Rome by the brethren, he wrote a brief gospel in the Greek speech [4], according to that which he had heard Peter relating — agreeing in all things so closely with those which Matthaeus had written a little before, that he seemed to be his follower and abbreviator. When Peter had heard this, he approved it, and by his own authority delivered it to the church to be read; whence also by some it has been called the gospel of Peter. [5] But Marcus, taking his own gospel, went on into Aegypt; and there, first of all announcing Christ at Alexandria, he established a church of such doctrine and continence of life that Philo, the most eloquent of the Jews, wrote a most lauded book about it. He died in the eighth year of Nero, leaving behind the codex of his gospel, which — after the tenth year from the assumption of the saviour, as Chrysostom says — he had published abroad in Aegypt. [6] Our countrymen divide this gospel into 16 chapters; the Greeks, in Suidas, into 48 titles and 56 chapters; in Ammonius and Eusebius, into 235 chapters; in Oecumenius and Euthymius, into 48 chapters — of which the last, fore-noted *OF THE ASKING FOR THE BODY OF THE LORD*, ends in these words: *Trembling and fear had seized upon them; and they said nothing to any man: for they were afraid* [7] — but the rest which follow, up to the end, they do not enumerate. It is said that some things besides these were written by Marcus, which are noted in the following volume.

LUCAS

LUCAS the Evangelist — whom Paul, writing to the Romans, called Lucius [8] — Antiochene by country, physician by profession, most skilled in the Greek speech [9]: first, as Origen writes, he adhered to Christ with the other seventy disciples, and received from him the seeds of piety; but afterward, made a follower of Paul and the inseparable companion of all his peregrination, he wrote — fifteen years after the assumption of the Saviour, by the permission of Paul, to Theophilus, a man most faithful and most loving of God — a gospel in the Greek tongue: of whom the same Paul says, *We have sent with him our brother, whose praise is in the gospel through all the churches* [10]; and to the Colossians, *Lucas, the most dear physician, saluteth you* [11]; and

to Timothy, *Only Lucas is with me* [12]. There are nevertheless those who think that Lucas was not with the lord in the flesh, and wrote not according to the things which he had seen, but as he had learned from Paul and the other apostles — which he himself seems thus to have shown in his preface: *ACCORDING as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning themselves saw, and were ministers of the word.* [13] Chrysostom judges that as often as Paul in his epistles says, *ACCORDING TO MY GOSPEL* [14], he signifies the volume of Lucas. But Origen, in the dialogue *Of the right faith in God*, writes that Paul learned the narration of the evangelical history from Lucas and Marcus. Lucas lived eighty-four years, having no wife; and when he had preached the gospel to the Alexandrians, and to the whole region which lies adjacent to it, as far as Pentapolis, he died at Alexandria; and there he was buried in Bucolis with Ictas [*cum Ictare* — so printed], who was the first martyr in Lycia; whom Alexander the bishop translated, and laid where all the bishops are buried. His bones were translated to Constantinople in the twentieth year of Constantius. Simon Metaphrastes wrote his life in Greek. Oecumenius and Euthymius distribute this gospel into eighty-three heads; Ammonius and Eusebius into 343 chapters; Ambrose into one hundred sixty-four titles; Beda into 93 chapters; but the more recent Latins dissect it into twenty-four chapters.

JOANNES

JOANNES, Apostle and Evangelist, brother of James the greater, son of Zebedee, from the village of Bethsaida of the region of Galilaea, a fisherman by trade, learned letters neither before nor after his vocation [15]: but when at the supper he reclined upon the breast of the lord, he drank in such knowledge as no one of mortals has ever obtained. [16] He therefore, the last of all, many years after the taking of Jerusalem, wrote a gospel in the Greek speech, being asked by the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and chiefly against the dogma of the Ebionites then rising up [17], who asserted that Christ was not before Mary — whence he was even compelled to declare his divine nativity. But they report also another cause of this writing: that, when he had read the volumes of Matthaeus, Marcus, and Lucas, he approved indeed the text of the history, and confirmed that they had spoken true things, but [saw] that they had woven the history of one year only — that in which he also suffered — after the imprisonment of John. Passing over, therefore, the year whose acts had been set forth by the three, he narrated the deeds of the earlier time, before John was shut up in prison — as can be manifest to those who shall diligently read the volumes of the four gospels. Which thing also takes away the dissonance which seems to be between the other evangelists and the gospel of Joannes. This gospel our men distinguish into 21 chapters; Oecumenius and Euthymius — not counting the title of the woman taken in adultery — distribute it into eighteen chapters or titles; Ammonius and Eusebius, the same title being passed over, divide it into 232 chapters. He lived almost a hundred years, of which he passed nearly forty at Ephesus, down to Domitian, by whom he was banished to the island of Pathmos; on his being slain, and his decrees rescinded, under Nerva he returned to Ephesus, and there persevering until Trajan, he founded and ruled all the churches of Asia; and, worn out with old age, he died in the 68th year after the passion of the lord, and was buried near the same city. [18] Many of the ancient Greeks judge that he is still alive, on account of those words which the lord spoke: *THERE ARE some of them standing here that shall not taste death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom* [19]; and, *SO I will have him to remain till I come; what is it to thee?* [20] Simon Metaphrastes, a Greek author, wrote his life. Josephus the Jew, the Tiberine Count [Count Joseph of Tiberias], found his gospel, translated into the Hebrew speech by an uncertain author, in the treasury [*gazophylacium*] of Tyberias, and delivered it to the church in the year from the birth of Christ 370. But of the remaining writings, if any have been put forth under his name, we shall speak in the second volume of this work.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

THE BOOK whose title is Πράξεις ἀποστόλων — that is, the acts of the Apostles — Lucas the Evangelist wrote in the Greek speech to Theophilus, a most perfect man, after his gospel was finished: which, although

it be inscribed the Acts of the Apostles, yet chiefly [*acta* →]

[1] Mark was one of the seventy-two disciples of the Lord [2] Coloss. 4:10; 2 Tim. 4:11 [3] 1 Pet 5:13 [4] Mark wrote his Gospel in Greek [5] Mark's Gospel is called by some the Gospel of Peter [6] Mark published his Gospel in the tenth year after the Lord's ascension [7] Mark 16:8 [8] Rom. 16:21 [9] Lucas of Antioch, a physician and one of the seventy-two disciples, wrote his Gospel fifteen years after the Lord's ascension [10] 2 Cor. 8:18 [11] Coloss. 4:14 [12] 2 Tim. 4:11 [13] Luke 1:2 [14] 2 Tim. 2:8 [15] John the Evangelist learned letters neither before nor after his calling [16] John 13:23 [17] John wrote his Gospel against Cerinthus and the Ebionites [18] John lived almost a hundred years, and died in the 68th year after the Lord's passion [19] Matt. 16:28 [20] John 21:22

(printed p. 18 [PDF p. 31], verso — the Acts concluded; the Epistles of Paul, with the death of Paul. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *acta*] it contains the acts of the holy spirit [1]: so that, as the gospels comprehend the actions of Christ, so this book narrates the actions which the holy spirit wrought through the apostles after he descended into them — fulfilling that vaticination which Christ had promised in the gospel, saying: *AMEN I say to you, he that believeth in me, the works that I do, he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do.* [2] Which indeed this book testifies to have been fulfilled in the apostles: whose tongue converted the whole circle of the earth to the true worship of God, and the very shadow of whose body, and whose half-girdles [aprons], put forth unheard-of miracles. [3] Moreover, the greatest part of the things which are treated here are the acts of Paul, who labored more than all, and underwent greater perils than the rest [4]: which Lucas, knowing exactly — as one who had journeyed together with him and lived in his company — wrote most diligently [5], from the beginning of his conversion down to the two years of Paul's abiding at Rome; that is, down to the fourth year of Nero, which was the sixty-first from the birth of Christ. This book — translated into the Hebrew tongue — Josephus the Jew, the Tiberine Count, found in the Treasury of the Jews of Tyberias, in the year from the birth of Christ three hundred and seventy. The Greeks distinguish this volume into forty chapters; but the Latins into twenty-eight chapters. There is a report that Lucas wrote some things beyond these, to be noted in the following book.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL

PAULUS the Apostle — who before was Saul, outside the number of the twelve apostles; of the tribe of Benjamin, from Gischala, a town of Judaea; brought up at Tarsus of Cilicia; erudited in the law at Jerusalem by Gamaliel; and compelled to the faith by Christ through an unlooked-for revelation [6] — wrote the thirteen epistles written below.

TO THE ROMANS, one, sent from Corinth by Phoebe, a minister of the church of Cenchrae: in which he strives to recall to mutual concord the Romans, lately converted from the Jews and from the gentiles, who were contending with grave and perilous altercation among themselves about the dignity and merits of those who were to be admitted to the Christian religion and chosen for the ecclesiastical ministries. This epistle is divided among the Greeks into 20 chapters; among the more recent Latins into sixteen chapters; but among the old Latins — as appears from the commentaries of Ambrose — into 50 chapters.

TO THE CORINTHIANS, two. Of which he wrote the former from Ephesus, by Stephanas and Fortunatus [printed *Fortunarum*], studying to allay their dissensions and the diverse factions which certain arrogant professors of worldly wisdom had stirred up, chiefly concerning the preachers of the gospel, concerning the divine sacraments, and the ministers of the sacraments. It has among the Greeks 9 chapters; among the younger Latins sixteen; among the old, seventy-three.

THE LATTER he sent from Philippi of Macedonia, by Titus and Lucas, admonishing them to follow the sincere ministers of the Gospel and dispensers of the sacraments, but to reject the false and evil. It is distinguished by the Greeks into ten chapters; by the neoteric Latins into thirteen; by the ancients into twenty-seven.

TO THE GALATIANS, one, from Rome: in which he gravely chides the Galatians, drawn back to Judaism by false Apostles, and recalls them from the servitude of the Mosaic law, into which they had relapsed, to Evangelical liberty. It contains among the Greeks 12 chapters; among the Latins, six.

TO THE EPHESIANS, one, from Rome, by Tychicus, out of the prisons: in which he briefly prescribes the form of Christian life which they, already built up in the faith, had earnestly asked of him at Ephesus. It has among the Greeks ten chapters; among the Latins, six.

TO THE PHILIPPIANS, one, from the prisons of the city of Rome, by Epaphroditus: exhorting the clergy of the Philippians to mutual concord, and to the guarding of Ecclesiastical unity against the pseudo-apostles who were thrusting in Judaism and contriving the division of the Church. The Greeks divide it into eight chapters; the Latins into 4.

TO THE COLOSSIANS, one, written from Ephesus, out of bonds, by Tychicus: in which he corrects the Colossians, still entangled in many Jewish and Greekish superstitions, showing that there is no access to God from any other quarter than through Christ. In Greek it is divided into ten chapters; in Latin into four.

TO THE THESSALONIANS, two. Of which he wrote the former from Athens, by Tychicus, animating them that, as they had stood firm in the faith once received, so they should bear the persecutions brought upon them for Christ with an eager and unbroken spirit. It has among the Greeks seven chapters, and among the Latins likewise.

THE LATTER he wrote from the same place, and by the same man: again confirming their souls to the manly toleration of afflictions for Christ's sake, promising that neither should the reward be wanting to them, nor vengeance to their adversaries. It has among the Greeks five chapters; among the Latins, three.

TO TIMOTHY, two. Of which he sent the first from Laodicea of Phrygia, by Tychicus the deacon, instructing him in the things which become a master and pastor of the church. It has among the Greeks eighteen chapters, but six among the Latins.

THE SECOND, however, from Rome, out of bonds: confirming him, detained in the Church; and at the same time admonishing him not to be cast down by the storms of persecutions, but by his [Paul's] example to prepare his soul for martyrdom. The Greeks part it into 9 chapters; the Latins into four.

TO TITUS, one, from Nicopolis of Macedonia: instructing him how — the ministers of the church being ordained, and the false Apostles hissed off — he should govern the sheep entrusted to him. The chapters of the Greeks are four; of the Latins, three.

TO PHILEMON the Phrygian, one, from the bonds of the city of Rome, by Onesimus: in which he reconciles the same Onesimus — the fugitive slave of Philemon, and a pilferer — to his master, demonstrating the duties of a lord toward his slave and of a slave toward his lord. The Greeks divide it into two chapters; the Latins into none.

PAULUS the Apostle DIES in the city of Rome — after he had preached thirty-five years, from Jerusalem even into Spain — beheaded in the thirteenth year of Nero, that is, in the seventieth year from the advent of the Saviour, on the twenty-ninth day of the month of July. [7] And he is reported, besides these, to have written very many things, which are reviewed in the second book of this work.

[*EPI-* →]

[1] The Acts of the Apostles chiefly contain the acts of the Holy Spirit [2] John 14:12 [3] Acts 5:15; 19:12 [4] 1 Cor 15:10 [5] St. Luke accurately described the deeds done by St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles [6] Acts 22:3, 7 [7] St. Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome in the year of the Lord 70

(printed p. 19 [PDF p. 32], recto — the Catholic epistles of Peter and John; SECTIO SECUNDA begins mid-page. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE OF PETER

[→ *EPI-*] **SIMON PETRUS,** son of Joannes, of the province of Galilaea, of the village of Bethsaida, brother of Andrew the Apostle, and prince of the Apostles — after the episcopate of Antioch, bishop of the Roman Church and first pontiff of the whole Christian church — wrote, by Sylvanus, a faithful brother, one epistle, which is named Catholic, to the Christians of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, who had lately come from Judaism to the faith of Christ: confirming them in the faith, and admonishing them that, their former life being left behind, they should enter upon a new one, and, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from carnal desires, prepared to render an account of all things in the day of judgment. This epistle the Latins divide into four chapters, but the Greeks into eight. He dies at Rome, when he had held the pontifical chair for twenty-five years, in the last year of Nero: by whom he was fastened to a cross with his head turned to the ground and his feet raised on high, asserting that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same manner as his lord. And he was buried at Rome in the Vatican, beside the triumphal way, in the year from the birth of Christ the seventieth. Writings of various kinds are cited by the ancient fathers under the name of Peter, noted by us in the following book.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE OF JOHN

JOANNES, Apostle and Evangelist, whom our Lord Jesus Christ loved exceedingly, wrote one epistle, which is styled Catholic, to every age of Christians — boys, young men, and old men. In it he treats Theologically of the eternal word, teaching the causes of his advent and manifestation; and he discourses most copiously of the charity of God toward us, and of the mutual love to be exercised among us. It is divided among us into five chapters, but by the Greeks into seven chapters. The divine Augustine, in the second volume of the *Evangelical Questions*, seems to indicate that this epistle was sent by Joannes to the Parthians, writing thus: *IT WAS SAID by Joannes in the epistle to the Parthians: DEARLY BELOVED, now we are the sons of God, and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be; we know that when he shall appear we shall be like to him, because we shall see him as he is* [1] — which words indeed are read in the third chapter of this epistle. This same thing Higinus, the seventh pontiff of the Roman Church after Peter, insinuates in his first epistle to all the faithful of Christ, where he has these words: *AND AGAIN Joannes the Evangelist himself to the Parthians: THERE ARE THREE, saith he, that give testimony in heaven — the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one* [2] — which words are contained in the 5th chapter of this epistle.

OF THE DIVINE SCRIPTURES AND WRITERS of both Testaments belonging to the second order of the Canon — SECTIO SECUNDA

SINCE in the first Section of this work we have enumerated the Protocanonical authors of the books of both Testaments, which pertain to the First order of the sacred canon, it follows that in this second Section we should briefly designate the Deuterocanonical writers of the books as well of the old as of the new Testament, which are placed in the Second order of the same canon: beginning from the books of the old Testament, concerning which the orthodox fathers of old entertained doubts, and which the Hebrews — the book of Esther excepted — do not receive among the divine writings. Of these the index is this:

1	ρήθσΈ אסתר,	Esther.
2	τίβωΤ טוביה,	Tobias.
3	θίδυοὶ יהודית,	Judith.

4	χύοραΒ ברוך,	Baruch.
5	Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰερεμίου	The Epistle of Jeremias.
6	Σοφία Σαλομῶντος,	The Wisdom of Salomon.
7	Σοφία Σειράχ,	The Wisdom of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus.
8	*The supplement of Daniel, that is:* Προσευχὴ Ἀζαρίου, Ὠδὴ τριῶν παίδων, Σωσάννης Ἱστορία, Περὶ Δράκοντος τοῦ Βήλ,	The Prayer of Azarias. The Hymn of the three children. The history of Susanna. Of the Dragon Bel.
9	Μακκαβαίων α′.	The first of Maccabees.
10	Μακκαβαίων β′.	The second of Maccabees.

ESTHER

THE BOOK of ESTHER אסתר, as Isidore supposes, Esdras wrote. [3] Eusebius in the Chronicles judges that the author of this book was later than Esdras, and that the history which is described in this book happened after the death of Esdras: because it is not likely that Esdras would have passed over so [*cele-* →]

[1] 1 John 3 [2] 1 John 5 [3] The opinions of the learned on the writer of the book of Esther

(printed p. 20 [PDF p. 33], verso — Esther concluded; Tobias; Judith begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *cele-*]brated a history, if it had happened in his own times. Philo the Jew, in the volume of his chronography, asserts that the writer of this book was Joachim, Pontiff of the Hebrews, son of Jesus the high Priest: who — Mardochaeus the Hebrew, the adoptive father of Esther herself, exhorting him by letters — committed this history to writing; and instituted the solemnity of פורים *Purim*, that is, *of Lots*, in memory of the Judaic liberation, which the present history commemorates to have been wrought by the counsel and prayers of Esther. [1] Very many of the Latins hand down that this volume was written in Hebrew by Mardochaeus; whom those words of the ninth chapter of this book also seem to favor: *And so Mardochaeus WROTE all things, and, comprehending them in letters, sent them to the Jews*; and a little below, *And the Jews RECEIVED the things which Mardochaeus had commanded by letters to be done... and all the deeds which are contained in the volume of the epistle — that is, of this book.* [2] Now Mardochaeus wrote all the things which are had from the beginning of the book down to those words which are set at the beginning of the tenth chapter in this manner: *Mardochaeus, of Judaic race, was second from king Assuerus, and great among the Jews, and acceptable to the people of his brethren, seeking good things for his people, and speaking the things which pertained to the peace of his seed.* [3] But the remaining six chapters, to the end of the book, were added by an uncertain Greek writer out of diverse histories, but chiefly out of the eleventh book of the *Antiquities* of Josephus — from which the copy of the letters of Aman, and the copy of the epistle of king Artaxerses, which are recited in the thirteenth and sixteenth chapters of this book, were taken word for word. The beginning of this book, according to the Hebraic verity and our vulgate edition, stands thus: *In the days of king Assuerus, who reigned from India even unto Aethiopia*, etc. But in the [Greek] vulgate translation, thus: ἔτους δευτέρου βασιλεύοντος ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μεγάλου, τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ νισὰν, ἐνύπνιον εἶδε μαρδοχαῖος — that is, *In the second year, Artaxerxes the great reigning, on the first day of the month Nisan, Mardochaeus saw a dream*, etc. — which things in our codices are contained in the whole eleventh and twelfth chapters; after which are straightway subjoined the words already set down, *In the days of king Assuerus, who reigned from India.* Now the end of this book among the Hebrews is concluded in that sentence, *Seeking good things for his people, and speaking the things which pertained to the peace of his seed* — which sentence in our exemplars is the beginning of the tenth chapter. But among the Greeks this book receives its end where the eleventh chapter of our edition begins — namely in those words, *In the*

fourth year, Ptolemaeus and Cleopatra reigning, etc., as far as, *son, in Jerusalem*. Our codices, however, interpose six chapters from this place to the end of the volume. And it came to pass that, on account of these rags of appendices, inserted here and there by certain writers ■■■■ [a word inked out by the censor], this book — although Hebrew, and received by the Hebrews — very late received canonical authority among the Christians. *[printed margin: Why the book of Esther was for a time not received by all catholics (Cur aliquando liber Esther non fuerit ab omnibus catholicis receptus). MS note in ink: the whole book is canonical according to the Tridentine synod (integer liber est canonicus iuxta Tridentinam).]* Whence neither Melito, bishop of Sardis, nor Gregory Nazianzen enumerated it among the sacred books; and Athanasius cast it out by name from the catalog of the canonical volumes as spurious [*nothum*]. At last the third council of Carthage computed it among the sacred volumes. Mardochaeus was famous together with Joachim, son of Jesus the high priest, under Artaxerses, king of the Persians and Medes; [4] and he died in the 198th year of his life, about the year from the founding of the world *ter 1600* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand six hundred].

TOBIAS

TOBIA טוביה — which sounds among us *the Goodness of the lord* — son of Tobiel, grandson of Hannanael, of the tribe and city of Nephthalim, which is in Galilaea toward the western border (as is had from his history, which goes about, put forth in the Hebrew speech): at the command of Raphael the Archangel, who cured him of his blindness, he wrote his book in the Chaldaic tongue; [5] in which he digested the calamities and the divine consolations which he, a captive with all his family, experienced in Ninive, in the time of Salmanasser, king of the Assyrians — who, in the ninth year of Osee, king of Israel, and the sixth year of Ezechias, king of Juda, Samaria being taken, carried Israel over to the Assyrians, and placed them in Hayla and in Abor, beside the river Goza, in the cities of the Medes. The divine Jerome translated this book out of the Chaldee speech into Latin, with the labor of a single day; and the third council of Carthage — at which Augustine was present, about the year of the Lord CCCCX — received it into the canon of the holy scriptures: although long before, the most holy pontiffs Clemens the first, Roman, Anacletus, and Alexander had used its testimonies for the proving of the dogmas of our faith. We saw in former years, under the name of TOBIAS, a book written in Hebrew letters and tongue, brought from the city of Constantinople; [6] in which Tobias himself, speaking of himself in the first person from the beginning to the end of the volume, narrated his own history; and its beginning was of this fashion: זה ספר טובי בן טוביאל בן חננאל בן אריאל בן נכאל בן עשאל — that is, *This is the book of Tobi, son of Tobiel, son of Hannanael, son of Ariel, son of Gabeel, son of Hasael*, etc. Which when we had read through, we found that many things abound in it which are not in our canonical book of Tobias, and that far more are lacking in it which are had among us. This hebrew book seems to have some similitude with the greek volume of Tobias, in which Tobias, speaking of himself in direct narration, is brought in through many chapters; and the exordium of the history has the same words, written in this manner: Βίβλος λόγων Τωβὶτ τοῦ Τωβιήλ, τοῦ Ἀνανιήλ, τοῦ Ἀριήλ, τοῦ Γαβαήλ, τοῦ Ἀσαήλ — that is, *The Book of the words of Tobi, son of Tobiel*, etc., as above. Tobias lived, according to the vulgate edition of the Latins, CII years; but according to the translation of the Greeks, CLVIII years; and he died and was buried honorably in Ninive, about the year from the founding of the world *ter 1370* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand three hundred and seventy]. In his volume, the things which are read concerning his death and burial are believed to have been superadded by Tobias the son of Tobias, and are not had in the hebrew exemplar. The Greeks divide the present book into nine hundred and three chapters [*nongenta tria* — so printed; perhaps for *nonaginta tria*, ninety-three], the Latins into fourteen.

JUDITH

JEHUDITH יהודית: [7] Philo the Jew, in the volume of his Chronography, asserts that this book was written by Joachim the high priest, son of Jesus the high priest; who described in it the victory of Jehudith the Bethulian, of the tribe of Ruben — a rare and incomparable woman — and the liberation of the besieged fatherland, which was wrought through her in the 13th year of Artaxerses the first; who in the divine scripture is surnamed Assuerus, and Nabuchodonosor; and who with his colleague Cyrus first held empire over the Medes, Persians, and Assyrians [*impe-* →]

[1] Esth. 9:24 [2] Esth. 9:20, 23 [3] Esth. 10:3 [4] At what time Mardochaeus lived [5] Tobias wrote his book in the Chaldaic tongue [6] The author saw a book under the name of Tobias written in Hebrew letters and tongue [7] Who wrote the book of Judith

(printed p. 21 [PDF p. 34], recto — Judith concluded; Baruch; the Epistle of Jeremias; the Wisdom of Salomon; Ecclesiasticus begins. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *impe-*]rium, as is read in the first book of Esdras and in the volume of Daniel. This book Jerome made Latin from the Chaldee; and — it having been put forth before in greek by an uncertain interpreter — the sacrosanct synod of Nicaea had adopted it into the canon of the holy scriptures, about the year of the Lord CCCXXIIII. Judith lived, as Philo witnesses, a hundred and twenty-five years: of which she persevered for a hundred and five years, after the fatherland had been liberated by her, in holy widowhood, departing from human affairs about the year from the founding of the world *ter 1560* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand five hundred and sixty]. Joachim the priest, the writer of her history, is believed to have survived her by a little. The beginning of this book, which among us is, *Now Arphaxat, king of the Medes, had subjugated many nations to his empire*, in the vulgate codices of the Greeks begins in these words: ἔτους δωδεκάτου τῆς βασιλείας Ναβουχοδονόσορ ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν νινευῆ τῇ πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἀρφαξὰδ, ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν μήδων ἐν ἐκβατάνοις — that is, *In the twelfth year of the reign of Nabuchodonosor, who reigned in Assyria in Ninive the great city, in the days of Arphaxad, who reigned over the Medes in Ecbatana,* etc. Many things also are had scattered here and there in the same Greek exemplars which our vulgate edition does not acknowledge. The Greeks cut this book into sixty chapters, the Latins into sixteen.

BARUCH

BARUCH ברוך, that is, *Blessed*, prophet, son of Neerias, grandson of Maasias, [1] great-grandson of Sedechias, great-great-grandson of Sedei, disciple and scribe of Jeremias the prophet: when after the overthrow of the city he had come into Babylon from Aegypt — whither he had been carried off with Jeremias — he wrote in the Hebrew speech a prophetic book, in which he bewept the calamity of the Chaldaic captivity and the causes of that same calamity — namely the incredulity and ingratitude of the Judaic people — with vaticinations intermixed concerning the happy return of the Jews into their fatherland, concerning the promise of the New testament, and concerning the coming of the son of God into flesh. Which book when he himself had read — the whole people which was captive in Babylon hearing and weeping — before king Jeconias and his nobles, it pleased them all that the book, together with moneys, should be sent to Jerusalem (or rather to the ruins of Jerusalem, already burnt) to Joachim, son of Helchias, and to the other priests who remained in the city from the remnants of the captivity: that with assiduous prayers they might supplicate God for the salvation of the captive people and for the safety of king Nabuchodonosor. The book was put forth, read, and sent to Jerusalem in the fifth year of the devastation of Jerusalem and of the Babylonian captivity, in the first month, on the seventh day of the month. This book the council of Florence and the council of Trent enumerate in the canonical catalog; Cyril likewise, bishop of Jerusalem, a thousand and two hundred years ago, reviews the same among the divine writings of irrefragable authority, in the fourth of the orations which are had among his catecheses. Hilary, in the fourth book *Of the trinity*, cites the testimonies of this book under the name of Jeremias [2] — which others of the ancients also are wont to do, attributing, namely, what is the disciple's to the master.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JEREMIAS (*IEREMIAE PISTOLA II.* [so printed, for EPISTOLA])

THE LITTLE BOOK — whether admonition, or second epistle, of Jeremias the prophet — which is annexed to the volume of Baruch in the vulgate edition, Jeremias dictated, Baruch his scribe taking it down; and after the overthrow of the city he delivered it to the people, soon to be led away into captivity by the Chaldaeans: that by this writing he might admonish them, lest, having entered Babylon, when they should see the golden gods of that region, they should desert the worship of their own God and adore the idols of the Chaldaeans. The author of the second book of the Maccabees remembers this writing, in chapter 2, in these words: [3] *IT IS FOUND in the descriptions of Jeremias the prophet, that he commanded those who were transmigrating to take fire; and he gave them a law, that they should not forget the precepts of the lord, and that they should not err in their minds, seeing the idols of gold and silver, and their other ornaments.* This also is numbered among the other Testamentary writings.

THE WISDOM OF SALOMON

THAT the author of the BOOK of Wisdom was Salomon is established from those things which the author himself wrote of himself in the ninth chapter of this volume, saying: *BUT THOU, O LORD, hast chosen me to be king of thy people, and judge of thy sons and daughters; and hast said that I should build a temple in thy holy mount, and an altar in the city, a similitude of thy tabernacle which thou preparedst from the beginning.* It appears also that the sentences of this book, although founded by Solomon, were nevertheless collected by a greek writer, and written down in greek in this volume. [4] Augustine at one time judged the writer of this book to have been Jesus, son of Syrach; which afterward, inquiring more diligently, he retracted in the second volume of the *Retractations*. There are those who think the work to be of Philo the Jew the younger, a man most celebrated for greek eloquence, who discharged an embassy on behalf of his nation to the emperor Caius. Others judge it to be of the other, the elder Philo the Jew, who flourished almost a hundred and seventy years before the advent of our Saviour, in the times of Onias the high priest. With whose opinions not only do the aforesaid words of this volume seem to conflict, but Josephus himself also most openly protests, when in the first book against Apion he reviews the elder Philo not among the Jews, but among the ethnic historians — and those especially who never read the sacred books. But of this matter it shall be spoken by us more fully, God approving, in the eighth book of this work. The third synod of Carthage, the great council of the Lateran, and Pope Gelasius fitted it into the order of the canonical volumes.

ECCLESIASTICUS

THE WISDOM of Syrach is inscribed *Ecclesiasticus* for this cause, [5] because, as Augustine says, it merited to be received into the Authority of the Church, and to be numbered among the prophetic books; but by the Greeks it has been called Πανάρετος [All-virtuous], from every virtue which is contained in it. This book Jesus, son of Syrach, of Jerusalem, wrote in the Hebrew tongue; and Jerome testifies, in the preface of the Proverbs to Chromatius, that he found it written in Hebrew. But his grandson, himself also called Jesus — and, as Damascene hands down in the fourth book of the *Orthodox faith*, having Syrach for father — turned the volume from hebrew into Greek. Isidore, in the sixth book of the *Etymologies*, judges that the interpreter of this book, who in the preface [calls himself] the grandson of Jesus, [*nomi-* →]

[1] The argument of the book of Baruch [2] The testimonies of the book of Baruch are cited under the name of Jeremias [3] 2 Macc. 2:1 [4] The sentences of the book of Wisdom are indeed Solomon's, though collected by some Greek writer [5] Why Ecclesiasticus is so titled

(printed p. 22 [PDF p. 35], verso — Ecclesiasticus concluded; the Supplement of Daniel; the two books of Maccabees. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *nomi*-]nates himself the grandson of Jesus the high priest, lived in the times of Aggaeus and Zacharias — which indeed seems absurd to very many, because three hundred years intervened between this man and that. For the interpreter of the present work, the grandson of Jesus, was famous when Ptolemaeus Euergetes was reigning as king of AEgypt, in the year from the founding of the world three thousand seven hundred. The third Council of Carthage, in chapter 43, received the present volume among the canonical writings — yet under the name and title of SALOMON; [1] inscribing it so, perhaps, either because, as Augustine noted in the book *Of the city of God*, the custom of those times prevailed that it should be called by the appellation of Salomon; or because the volume itself either had been collected out of the sentences of Salomon, or at least seemed not unworthy of Salomon. Subscribing to the decree of this council, the most blessed pontiffs Innocent and Gelasius inserted the same book among the canonical scriptures.

THE SUPPLEMENT OF DANIEL

THE SUPPLEMENT of the book of Daniel — which is not had in the Hebrew, but was transcribed by Jerome out of the Greek edition of Theodotion — contains four things: namely the prayer of Azarias and the hymn of the three children (which among us are read in the third chapter of Daniel); the history of Susanna (which the Greeks set at the beginning of the book of Daniel); and the narration of Bel, placed at the end of the volume as well in our codices as in the Greek. Concerning these there was of old a huge altercation among the highest nobles of the church. [2] Athanasius, in the *Synopsis*, teaches that this whole appendix was written by the prophet Daniel himself, and received among the canonical scriptures. Origen, in tractate 31 on Matthew, witnesses that the same was of old retained in the church with the highest veneration. Eusebius and the younger Apollinarius judge that this matter pertains not at all to the prophecy and deeds of Daniel the prophet, of the tribe of Juda, which are had in the sacred canon; but that it is part of a certain history or prophecy which Abakuk, son of Juda, of the tribe of Levi — a different man from him who is numbered among the twelve prophets — wrote concerning another certain Daniel, a priest, son of Abda. Which thing they confirm from the title and beginning of the history of Bel, which among the seventy interpreters is set down in the manner that follows: Προφητεία τοῦ ἀββακοὺμ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἰουδᾶ, ἐκ φυλῆς Λευί — that is, *The Prophecy of Abbakum, son of Juda, of the tribe of Levi.* After which title the exordium of the book begins thus: ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ἱερεὺς ὀνόματι Δανιήλ, υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀβδᾶ, συμπότης τοῦ Βασιλέως τῆς Βαβυλῶνος — that is, *There was a certain man, a priest, by name Daniel, son of Abda, table-companion of the King of Babylon.* Julius Africanus conjectures this part to be the fabrication of a Greek writer, on account of the words which are contained in the history of Susanna, where Daniel answers the elders — ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου σχίσαι, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου πρίσαι [from the mastick tree, to cleave; from the holm oak, to saw] — which etymologies cohere so with the Greek speech that they cannot be accommodated to the Hebrew tongue. [3] But of this kind of controversy we have discoursed enough and more in the 5th and 8th books of this work. The Catholic Church — from the times of the Apostles even until now chanting daily the hymn of the three children among the divine praises, and every year repeating the prayer of Azarias, together with the history of Susanna and of Bel and of Abakuk the dish-bearer, in the sacred mysteries of the forty-day fast — has won canonical authority for this appendix. There have also been feigned certain things, written under the title of DANIEL, to be reviewed in the following volume.

THE FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF THE MACCABEES

THE HISTORY of the Maccabees — whom the Jews call חשמונאי *Chasmonai*, that is, born of Asamoneus — comprehended in two volumes, seems to have been written by three diverse authors. [4] That its first book is of a Hebrew author, and written in Hebrew, the very phrase indicates; and Jerome, in the Preface of Kings, confirms that he read it written in the Hebraic tongue. The second book — which, its first chapter and half of the second being removed, begins thus: *Of Judas Machabaeus, and his brethren*, etc. — a Greek writer, from thence to the end of the whole Work, contracted into an epitome out of the five books of Jason of Cyrene;

which he himself confesses in the Preface, saying: *The five books comprehended BY Jason of Cyrene we have attempted to abridge in one volume.* [5] This abbreviator Jerome, in the second volume against the Pelagians, judges to have been Josephus, son of Mathathias; but Honorius, presbyter of Autun, in the book *Of the Ecclesiastical writers*, thinks it was Philo the Jew. The Third part of this history — which is compressed into the two epinician [victory] epistles from the beginning of the second book to the middle of its second chapter — the Senate of Jerusalem wrote: one of these epistles being sent to the Jews inhabiting Aegypt, the other to Aristobulus, preceptor of the King of Aegypt. And these, since they touch upon the victories described in the two books of the Maccabees, were deservedly placed by the Fathers after the end of the former volume and before the beginning of the latter, as looking equally to both. That these books, as well the first as the second, were received by the Church of God into the sacred Canon a thousand two hundred years ago, [6] Augustine asserts in the 18th [book] *Of the City of God*: *The books OF THE MACCABEES*, he says, *not the Jews, but the Church holds for Canonical, on account of the vehement and wondrous passions of certain Martyrs, who, before Christ had come in the flesh, contended for the law of God even unto death, and endured evils most grievous and horrible.* Thus he. Josephus nevertheless, at the close of the book which he inscribed *Of the Maccabees*, most constantly affirms that the martyrdoms of the old man Elezar, and of the seven sons with their mother, comprehended in the second volume of this history, are held even among the Hebrews among the sacred letters. Now the first book of the Maccabees contains the wars which, against the impious nations, [7] on behalf of the people of God, four most valiant captains of the Hebrews — namely Mathathias the priest, great-grandson of Asamoneus the priest, and thereupon his three sons, Judas, Jonathas, and Simon, one after the other — waged through two-and-forty continuous years: namely from the year of the founded world *ter 1788* [thus mixed in the print; i.e. three thousand seven hundred eighty-eight] — which is the year CLXXIV before Christ, and the CXXXVII of the kingdom of the Greeks noted at the beginning of this book — down to the year from the founding of the world three thousand eight hundred and thirty, which is the year [*annus* →]

[1] Why Ecclesiasticus is said to be Solomon's [2] The varied opinion of the learned on the appendix of the supplement of Daniel [3] Book 5, annotation 243, and book 8, Heresy 6 [4] By whom the history of the Maccabees was written [5] 2 Macc. 2:24 [6] The books of the Maccabees were canonical in the time of St. Augustine [7] The argument of the first book of Maccabees

(printed p. 23 [PDF p. 36], recto — Maccabees concluded; the sum of Old Testament years; the second order of New Testament scriptures begins; the End of Mark. Running head: LIBRI PRIMVS [sic].)

[→ *annus*] the year before the birth of Christ 132, and 178 of the kingdom of the Greeks: in which year Simon was slain by the fraud of Ptolemaeus; in whose death the whole canonical history of the Maccabees is concluded. For the history which is narrated in the latter book [1] is almost nothing else than a broader and fuller repetition of the things done by Judas Maccabaeus under the two Antiochi, father and son, down to the first year of king Demetrius and the slaughter of Nicanor — which are narrated in the first seven chapters of the first of Maccabees. But since these two volumes have taken their title from the illustrious surname of the Maccabees, it is pleasing here briefly to subjoin what I myself have read concerning the origin of this surname in the commentaries of Rabbi Isaac ben Schola; it stands thus: JUDAS, son of Mathathias, when he was about to enter battle against Antiochus, the enemy of the Jews, gave to his soldiers, as a watchword of war, that sentence of Moses in Exodus, chapter 15: מי כמוך באלים יהוה *Mi chemocha baelim Iehoua* — that is, *Who is like unto thee among the strong, O lord?* — and he commanded it to be inscribed on the standards of each of the ranks, as an omen of certain victory, by these four letters מכבי, that is, M, C, B, I; which are the initials of the four words aforesaid, and signify their sense entire. [2] But when the common run of the soldiers had begun, for brevity's sake, to pronounce these four letters not according to the entire sentence which they render, but according to the single word only which first results from their combination — namely MACCABAEI — little by little the military custom prevailed, that the author of this watchword, Judas, and their posterity, should be called by the surname of MACCABEES.

THE SUM, therefore, of all the books of the old testament embraces the number of three thousand eight hundred and thirty years, that is: [3]

FROM the beginning of Genesis to the death of Moses, described at the end of the Pentateuch, two thousand four hundred ninety-two years.

THENCE to the construction of the first temple, which is had in the third of Kings, chapter six, four hundred and forty years.

HENCE to the restoration of the second temple, which is read in the volume of Esdras, 125 years [so printed].

THENCE to Christ, according to the supputation of the weeks of Daniel, there are four hundred and ninety years: that is, from the restoration of the second temple to the death of Simon — which imposes the end upon the canonical writings of the ancient testament — three hundred fifty-eight years; and from the death of Simon to Christ, 132 years.

THERE ARE therefore, from the founding of the world to Christ, three thousand nine hundred sixty-two years. [4]

OF THE SECOND ORDER of the Scriptures of the new Testament

THUS FAR of the Second order of the scriptures of the old testament, which the Jews reject; there follows now the Second order of the scriptures of the new testament, concerning which there was at one time controversy among orthodox Christians. Their catalog is this:

1	The last chapter of Mark.
2	Luke's history of the bloody sweat of Christ, and of the angelic consolation to him; which is contained in the twenty-second chapter of the same gospel.
3	John's history of the woman taken in adultery; which is read in the eighth chapter of the same gospel.
4	Paul's epistle to the Hebrews.
5	The epistle of James.
6	The second epistle of Peter.
7	The second epistle of John.
8	The third epistle of John.
9	The epistle of Jude.
10	The Apocalypse, that is, the Revelation of John.

THE END OF MARK

THE END of MARK — that is, the last chapter of his gospel, namely from that place, *AND JESUS RISING EARLY THE FIRST DAY OF THE SABBATH*, [5] to the end, in which the apparition of Christ to Magdalen and his ascension into heaven is narrated — as appears from the monuments of the ancients, was not straightway from the beginning of the nascent church received among the canonical scriptures. [6] Jerome, in the third question to Hedibia, dissolving the contradiction which seems to be between Matthew, saying that Christ rose on the evening of the sabbath, and Mark, saying that Jesus rose early on the first day of the sabbath, writes thus: *OF THIS question the solution is twofold: for either we do not receive the testimony of Mark, which is carried in but few gospels — almost all the books of Greece not having this chapter at the end —*

especially since it seems to narrate things diverse and contrary to the other Evangelists; or this must be answered: that both speak true — Matthew showing when the lord rose, on the evening of the sabbath; but Mark, when Magdalen saw him. Thus Jerome; to whom Euthymius subscribing, in the explanation of the same chapter, immediately after those words of Mark, *THEY SAID NOTHING TO ANY MAN, FOR THEY WERE AFRAID*, etc., speaks thus: *CERTAIN of the interpreters assert that in this place the gospel of Mark was completed, and that the things which follow are a more recent addition; yet it behooves to explain this also, since it is in no way repugnant to the truth.* I judge that this last chapter was at one time suspect to some of the fathers on account of certain apocryphal periods, rashly inserted by an uncertain author; of which Jerome, in the second dialogue against the Pelagians, cites certain words in this manner: *IN CERTAIN exemplars*, he says, *and chiefly in the Greek codices, according to Mark, at the end of his gospel it is written: AFTERWARD, when the eleven had sat down at table, JESUS appeared to them, and upbraided their incredulity and the hardness of their heart, because they had not believed those who had seen him rising again. And they made satisfaction, saying: THIS AGE is the substance of iniquity and incredulity, which suffereth not, through the unclean spirits, the true virtue of God to be apprehended; therefore even now reveal thy justice*, etc. Which addition indeed — because it smacks of the dogma of the Manichaeans — has deservedly been cut away and cast out of all exemplars, as well Greek as Latin. Augustine, in the third book *Of the consent of the Evangelists*, receives the present chapter from beginning to end with the same veneration as the whole gospel of Mark, [7] and under the name of Mark the Evangelist harmonizes this same with the sayings of the other Evangelists. Beda, near the end of the fourth book of the commentaries on Mark, [says] this [*hoc* →]

[1] The argument of the second book of Maccabees [2] Whence the Maccabees received their name [3] How many years the books of the Old Testament comprise [4] How many years elapsed from the founding of the world to Christ [5] Mark 16:9 [6] Many of old doubted about the last chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark [7] St. Augustine acknowledges the last chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark as part of sacred Scripture

(printed p. 24 [PDF p. 37], verso — the End of Mark concluded; the Bloody Sweat; the Pericope of the Adulteress; the Epistle to the Hebrews begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *hoc*] recognizing this last chapter, by the authority of the whole church, as the proper and genuine [chapter] of Mark the Evangelist, and expounding it, says these things: *IT IS TO BE NOTED that, by as much as Mark began his gospel later than the rest, by so much he stretched forward to longer times in his writing: for, writing nothing of the nativity of the lord himself or of his precursor, nor of his infancy or boyhood, he began from the beginning of the evangelical preaching, which was done by John, and arrived in his narration at that time in which the Apostles disseminated that same word of the gospel through the whole world by their preaching.* To these fathers the whole chorus of the Latin fathers, before and after them, assents without any hesitation; and the universal church of Christians every year, in the feasts of the lord's assumption [ascension], pronounces and chants with so open a voice that it is Mark the Evangelist's, that of its author as well as of its authority no one but an impious man can doubt. [1]

THE HISTORY OF THE BLOODY SWEAT OF CHRIST, and of the Angel's consolation to him, from the Gospel of Luke, Chap. XXII

THE HISTORY of the bloody sweat of Christ, and of the Angelic consolation to him, which Lucas describes in the 22nd chapter of his gospel, is placed in the second order of the canonical scriptures for this reason: that some of the ancients at one time entertained doubts about it, [2] and that many very old codices of the catholics did not have it — as Hilary testifies in the tenth [book] *Of the trinity*, in these words: *NOR indeed must we be ignorant that in very many codices, both greek and Latin, nothing is found written either of the coming of the Angel or of the bloody sweat of Christ. For those in doubt, therefore, whether these things in the various books are either lacking or superfluous, this is left uncertain to us because of the diversity of the books.* This Jerome also, in the second dialogue against the Pelagians, seems to indicate,

saying thus: *IN certain codices, as well greek as Latin, it is found, Luke writing: There appeared to him an Angel from heaven, comforting him — no doubt, the lord Saviour.* By which form of speech the divine Jerome intimates that not all codices had those words. But I suspect that this history was of old rejected by certain orthodox men with a zeal pious indeed, but simple, [3] because it seemed to favor the Arrian heretics, who from this and testimonies like it built up [the claim] that the son of God is not in the same nature of the impassible God with the father. For another testimony also, concerning the weeping of Christ, similar to this one, was for this cause removed from the gospel of Luke by some catholics — Epiphanius plainly shows it in the book *Anchoratus*, writing these things: *Christ WEPT also, as it is had in the Gospel according to Luke in the uncorrupted exemplars; and holy Irenaeus uses that testimony in the work against heresies, against those who say that Christ appeared in appearance [only]. But certain of the orthodox took the word away, fearing, and not understanding its end and force and strength. For Christ, set in anxiety, sweated; and his sweat was as drops of blood; and an Angel was seen comforting him.* Thus Epiphanius. It is established that this history — which Dionysius the Areopagite cites and approves in the book *Of the celestial hierarchy* — was received into the canon of the sacred volumes by the common consent of the whole Church; and it was provided by ecclesiastical sanction, under pain of anathema, that no one should dare to contemn its authority. Whence also among the other ecclesiastical anathematisms which are enumerated by Athanasius in the sixth volume *Of the beatitude of the son of God*, this one too is reviewed: *IF ANY MAN SHALL DENY THAT THE TRUE MAN, WHOM THE SON OF GOD ASSUMED, SWEATED BLOOD — ANATHEMA TO HIM.*

THE FORMER PART OF THE EIGHTH CHAPTER of the Gospel according to John

THE HISTORY of the WOMAN taken in adultery, [4] which is had in the eighth chapter of John, the Church received into the canon many years after the Gospel of John, and declared it to be part of the Gospel of John — although before, it was not extant in many exemplars of the Greeks and Latins; as Jerome writes in the second volume against the Pelagians, and as Euthymius, in the commentaries on the same chapter, has left witnessed in these words: *But it BEHOOVES TO KNOW that the things which are had from this place up to that where it is said, AGAIN THEREFORE JESUS SPOKE TO THEM, SAYING, I AM THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD* [5]*, in the more exact exemplars either are not found, or are pierced through with the obelus, because they seem illegitimate and added; and the argument for this is, that no one has interpreted them. To us nevertheless the mind is to declare these things also, because they are not without utility — as also the Chapter concerning the woman taken in adultery, which is placed among them.* Thus he. But certain of the more ancient judge that the present history was translated hither out of a certain Apocryphal Gospel *according to the Hebrews*, in which Eusebius, in the third [book] of the *Ecclesiastical history*, indicates from the testimony of Papias that such a narration was described, in these words: *PAPIAS at the same time also subjoins a certain history of an adulterous woman, who was accused by the Jews before the lord; and this parable is had, written in the Gospel which is called ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.* But the sacrosanct Church — every year, in the time of the Quadragesimal fast, chanting this history in the sacred mysteries under the name of the Gospel — has conferred on it an authority equal with the other chapters of the same Gospel; and the divine Ambrose, in the second epistle to Studius, asserts that this same [history] was always celebrated in the Church, and chanted by the mouth of all the faithful as an evangelical writing of John.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

THE EPISTLE to the Hebrews effects two things chiefly. [6] First, against certain hebrews lately converted, who thought the observance of the law was to be mingled with the Gospel, it shows that from the advent of Christ the shadows of the Mosaic law have ceased, and that in place of the old testament a new and far more excellent one has succeeded. Then it consoles those who, for the faith of Christ, were bearing persecutions and various afflictions [*per-* →]

[1] He is impious who doubts the authority of the last chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark [2] Some of the ancients doubted about the bloody sweat of Christ the Lord [3] Why the history of the bloody sweat of Christ was suspect to the ancient Doctors [4] There was once doubt about the history of the woman taken in adultery [5] John 8 [6] The argument of the epistle to the Hebrews

(printed p. 25 [PDF p. 38], recto — Hebrews concluded; the epistle of James; the second of Peter; the second and third of John. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *per*-]severingly bearing. Concerning this epistle — its author as much as its authority — there was of old no light controversy between the Greek and Latin fathers [1]: very many of the Latins asserting that it is not Paul's, and for this cause not receiving it among the canonical scriptures; as appears from the writings of Jerome, who, making mention of its authority on the sixth chapter of Esaias, says thus: *PAULUS, in the epistle to the Hebrews, which the Latin custom does not receive,* etc.; and on chapter 8 of Esaias: *The BLESSED Apostle, in the epistle which is written to the Hebrews, although the Latin custom does not receive it among the canonical scriptures,* etc. Of the author also the same Jerome, in the catalog of illustrious men, writes thus: *The EPISTLE which is carried to the Hebrews is believed even to this day not to be Paul's, on account of the distance of its style and speech; but either Barnabas's, according to Tertullian, or Luke the Evangelist's, according to some, or even Clement's, of the city of Rome.* Yet it must be known that the most ancient nobles of the church, of the Latin as well as of the Greek church, venerated this epistle as a writing of Paul — even as Jerome, in the epistle to Dardanus, confesses in these words [2]: *The EPISTLE which is inscribed to the Hebrews is received as [the epistle] of Paul the Apostle, not only by the churches of the Orient, but by all writers of the Greek speech — although very many judge it to be either Barnabas's or Clement's. But it matters nothing whose it is, since it is of an ecclesiastical man, and is celebrated daily in the reading of the churches. And if the custom of the Latins does not receive it — neither indeed do the churches of the Greeks receive the Apocalypse of John with the same liberty* [3] *; and nevertheless we receive both, by no means following the custom of this time, but the authority of the ancient writers, who for the most part use the testimonies of each, not as they are sometimes wont [to use] the apocrypha, but as ecclesiastical and canonical.* Thus Jerome, of the author and authority of this epistle — of which we shall discourse most copiously in the seventh book of this work. Paul therefore wrote, or dictated, this epistle in the hebrew speech [4]; but Lucas the Evangelist, or Clemens the Roman Pontiff, adorned it in the greek speech, yet not in its senses. This epistle the most sacred synod of Nicaea received among the sacred volumes as written by Paul the Apostle; and the council of Laodicea, the third of Carthage, and the council of Orange [*Aurusicanum*] referred it into the sacred catalog. It was sent from the city of Rome, out of bonds, by Timothy; and it is divided among the Latins into thirteen chapters, but among the Greeks into 22 chapters.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

JACOBUS the Apostle, son of Alphaeus, by surname *the Just* (whom Paul, writing to the Galatians, calls the brother of the lord [5], and Mark calls the less [6]), was the first bishop of Jerusalem [7]. Him Epiphanius thinks to have been the son of Joseph, the spouse of the virgin Mary; but Jerome [thinks him] begotten of Mary, the sister of the lord's mother, the wife of Alphaeus. He wrote to the twelve tribes of the dispersion, then first converted to Christ, one epistle — of the variety of temptations; of faith justifying out of works; of the things which become as well the rich as the poor; of the utility of patience; and of the priests to be brought in over the sick. [8] Which epistle was neither believed, immediately in the very times of the apostles, to be James the Apostle's, nor taken up among the canonical writings — Eusebius, in the second volume of the ecclesiastical history, and Jerome, in the catalog of ecclesiastical writers, affirm it; but long afterward it was numbered among the canonical books by the sacrosanct councils of Laodicea, of Carthage, and the others following. This epistle the Latins have distinguished into five, the Greeks into seven chapters. Jacobus the Apostle dies, cast headlong from the highest summit of the temple of Jerusalem, in the seventh year of Nero, when he had presided over the church for thirty years; and he was buried beside the temple, where he had been cast down,

in the year from the birth of our Saviour the sixty-third [9]. Jerome, on the seventeenth chapter of Esaias, indicates that some of the ancient authors exempted this Jacobus, the brother of the lord, from the number of the twelve apostles whom Christ first chose, and called him the thirteenth apostle — as also [they called] Paul the fourteenth. There are extant under the name of this Apostle diverse writings, which shall be reported in the book next following.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

SIMON PETRUS, the author of that epistle which is placed in the former order of the canon, wrote also another epistle to those Hebrews who had lately believed [10]: *Of the faith of Christ, fore-announced by the prophets through the Holy Spirit; Of seducers to be avoided; Of the time to be passed not negligently; Of the preparation for the imminent day of judgment.* The argument and order of which epistle Peter himself explains in its third chapter [11], saying thus: *BEHOLD, this second epistle I write to you, my dearly beloved; in which I stir up by way of admonition your sincere mind, that you may be mindful of those words which I foretold, [spoken] by the holy prophets, and of the precept of us, who are apostles of the lord* — and the rest which follows. Concerning the author and authority of this epistle, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome hand down that there was at one time doubt; the sacrosanct synod of Laodicea and the council of Carthage decreed that it should be inserted among the canonical volumes under the name of Peter. The Latins have dissected it into three, the Greeks into four chapters.

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN

JOANNES, Apostle and Evangelist, besides that first epistle always approved by all the churches, wrote also two other epistles [12]: the one, *of the right faith to be kept, and of heretics to be shunned*, to Gaius; the other, *Of hospitality*, to Electa. Which [latter], as Jerome indicates, certain of the orthodox judged to be of another certain John, a presbyter, whose sepulcher was shown in the city of Ephesus — because in these he wrote himself "the presbyter," and wrote to one woman and to a single Gaius, against the custom of the catholic epistles; which for this reason are called catholic, that is, universal, or encircling [13], because they were written not distinctly to one person, nation, or city, but universally to all the faithful. Both, how-[-*ever* (*men* →)]

[1] Concerning the epistle to the Hebrews there was long doubt whether it was canonical [2] The epistle to the Hebrews was canonical in the time of St. Jerome [3] The church of the Greeks did not formerly receive the Apocalypse [4] The epistle to the Hebrews was written in Hebrew [5] Gal. 1:19 [6] Mark 15:40 [7] St. James was the first bishop of Jerusalem [8] The argument of the epistle of St. James [9] St. James the apostle died in the year of the Lord 63 [10] The argument of the second epistle of St. Peter [11] 2 Pet. 3:1 [12] The arguments of the two epistles of St. John [13] Why the epistles are called Catholic

---

(printed p. 26 [PDF p. 39], verso — the epistles of John concluded; Jude; the Apocalypse; SECTIO TERTIA begins mid-page. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *men*] the aforesaid most sacred councils received both into the canon as John's. Of these the Greeks divide the former into two chapters, the latter into three.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

JUDAS the Apostle — who is also Thaddaeus, or Lebbaeus; brother, as he himself testifies in the salutation of his epistle, of James the less, and the same, as Matthaeus writes, a brother of our Lord Jesus Christ, born of Alphaeus and Maria of Cleophas, sister of the virgin Mary — wrote to those who had already believed a certain small epistle, *Of the faith once received, to be manfully defended*, and *Of seducers to be fled from*, over whom a great punishment hung. [1] Which epistle — because its author took up a testimony out of the apocryphal book of Enoch, and brought forth, out of another obscure volume which is inscribed the *Ascension of Moses*, the history of Michael disputing with the devil about the body of Moses — very many of the ancients, as Jerome and Eusebius testify, cast out of the canon; but by its antiquity and use it earned

authority even to the times of Jerome, and was computed among the holy scriptures by the aforesaid holy synods. The greeks distinguish it into three chapters, the Latins into none. This apostle died at Berytus, and there was buried, in the year of the lord LX [2], after he had for a long time preached the gospel to the Edessenes and to all Mesopotamia.

THE APOCALYPSE

THE APOCALYPSE — that is, the Revelation — of Joannes the Evangelist, which contains a prophecy of the future tribulations of the church, from the beginning of the nascent church to the end of the world: certain of the most ancient greek fathers thought it should be cast off from the canon as foreign to the diction and tongue of Joannes the Evangelist, referring it to Joannes the presbyter, who obtained a monument at Ephesus not far from the sepulcher of Joannes the Evangelist. Yet Dionysius the Areopagite, Papias, Justinus, Irenaeus, Dionysius bishop of the Corinthians, Basil, Epiphanius, Gregory the Theologian, and with these the universal assembly of the Latin fathers, counted it among the legitimate and genuine writings of John the apostle; and the aforesaid most sacred councils reviewed it among the canonical volumes. Andreas, Archbishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, dissected the book — according to the mystery of the four-and-twenty elders who are described in it — into four-and-twenty parts, and distinguished each of these, in honor of the most blessed Triad, into three chapters, so that the sum of all the chapters is LXXII; which among the Latins XXII chapters comprehend. Eusebius in the chronicles noted that the Apocalypse was put forth in the fourteenth year of the emperor Domitian, by whom Joannes the apostle was banished into the island of Pathmos, [where] he saw the revelations described in this book, in the year from the birth of Christ 97. [3] Yet Andreas and Arethas, bishops of Caesarea, following the opinion of Tertullian and Epiphanius, hand down that the Apocalypse was written about thirty-eight years before this time, under Nero (in the second year of whose empire Joannes, after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, was carried off to Pathmos); and that in this volume are contained many visions and vaticinations of the future destruction of Jerusalem, and of the everlasting casting-away of the Judaic nation.

OF THE APOCRYPHAL SCRIPTURES INSERTED INTO THE DIVINE SCRIPTURE — SECTIO TERTIA

WE HAVE RUN THROUGH, in the two preceding Sections, all the canonical writings as well of the first as of the second order — which the Greeks call Διαθηκόγραφα, *that is, Testamentary, and which all catholic doctors profess to be true, native, and genuine. It remains that in the third and last Section of this book I should run through certain Apocryphal scriptures — that is, of obscure author and of ambiguous authority — which many of the ancient fathers reproved as illegitimate, and mingled among the sacred volumes by uncertain writers. Their catalog is this:*

1	The Accession of the second book of Paralipomenon.
2	The third book of Esdras.
3	The fourth book of Esdras.
4	The Appendix of the book of Esther.
5	The Appendix of the book of Job.
6	The Augment [*Auctarium*] of the Psalter.
7	The Addition to the book of Ecclesiasticus.
8	The little Preface of the Lamentations of Jeremias.
9	The third book of Maccabees.
10	The fourth book of Maccabees.

THE APPENDIX OF THE SECOND BOOK OF PARALIPOMENON

THE APPENDIX of the second book of Paralipomenon [4] — which some think was copied out of the books of Hozai, a most ancient writer — contains the prayer of Manasses, king of Jerusalem, when he was detained captive in Babylon; which is had neither in the hebrew nor in the greek vulgate exemplars. Yet it is most certainly established that this king, in the bonds of Babylon, offered to God a prayer from his inmost heart — the divine scripture witnessing this in the latter volume of the annals, in these words: *THE PRINCES of the king of the Assyrians took Manasses, and bound with chains and fetters they led him into Babylon; who, after he was straitened, prayed to the lord his God, and did penance exceedingly before the God of his fathers; and he entreated him, and besought him intently; and God heard his prayer* [5]; and a little after: *But his prayer, and the hearing thereof, are written in the words of Hozai* [6] — although the greek edition, in place of Hozai, has ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν ὁρώντων, that is, *In the words of the seers.* But whether Manasses brought forth this prayer or another, nothing certain is had. The Latin fathers received it among the holy writings, and, as appears from the ordinary gloss, illustrated it with annotations applied. This prayer is said to be extant in Greek in the Bibles of the library of Saint-Victor of Paris [*bibliothecae Victorinae Parisiorum*].

[*LIBRI* →]

[1] The argument of the epistle of Jude the Apostle [2] Jude departed this life in the year of the Lord 60 [3] At what time the Apocalypse was written is disputed among weighty authors [4] What the Appendix of the second book of Paralipomenon contains [5] 2 Par. 33:11-13 [6] 2 Par. 33:19

(printed p. 27 [PDF p. 40], recto — the Appendix of Esther; the third and fourth books of Esdras begin. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

THE APPENDIX OF THE BOOK OF ESTHER

[→ *LIBRI*] **THE APPENDIX of the book of Esther** [1] — which embraces the seven later chapters, that is, from about the beginning of the tenth chapter to the end of the book — is woven of various rags and patchworks [*centones*]; of which nothing at all is extant in the exemplars of the Hebrews, but in the Greek these are had, namely:

THE EPISTLE, OR EDICT, OF ARTAXERXES FOR THE DESTROYING OF THE NATION OF THE JEWS: which our edition has transferred from the third chapter of the Greek codex (according to our supputation) into the thirteenth chapter.

THE PRAYER OF MARDOCHAEUS; THE LAMENT OF ESTHER, AND HER ENTRANCE, TERRIFIED, TO THE KING: which among us are had in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth chapters; in the Greek codices they are had near the end of the fourth chapter, immediately after those words, Καὶ βαδίσας Μαρδοχαῖος ἐποίησεν — that is, *And Mardochaeus, going, did all things which Esther had commanded him.*

LIKEWISE THE EDICT OF ARTAXERXES FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE JEWS: which our codices report in the sixteenth chapter; in the Greek exemplars it is placed a little before the end of the eighth chapter, immediately after those words, *Now the sum of the epistle was this.*

LIKEWISE THE DREAM OF MARDOCHAEUS, OF THE LITTLE FOUNTAIN GROWING INTO A GREAT RIVER: which among us is contained in the tenth chapter; and the rest, up to those words of the eleventh chapter, *In the second year, Artaxerxes reigning*, etc., are had among the Greeks at the end of the whole volume.

THE DREAM ALSO OF THE TWO DRAGONS: which is narrated from about the beginning of the eleventh chapter — that is, from those words, *In the second year, Artaxerxes reigning* — to the end of the twelfth chapter, has been borrowed from the first chapter of the Greek edition.

JOSEPHUS, in the eleventh book of the Hebrew *Antiquities*, chapter six, recites the two aforesaid epistles, or edicts, of king Artaxerxes in the same words, from head to foot, so faithfully that it is uncertain to us whether he received these from the vulgate edition of the Greeks, or whether the author of the Greek edition copied the same out of Josephus.

BUT IT COMES TO MIND in this place at once to admonish and to exhort the pious and benevolent Reader, that he not accuse me of temerity because I have removed these seven last chapters from the canonical writings and reduced them into this last order of the Apocrypha [2] — as if I had forgotten the decree of the Holy synod of Trent, which under the threat of anathema commands all the books to be received entire, as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and are had in the old vulgate Latin edition. For that canon is to be understood of the true and genuine parts which look to the integrity of the books, not however of certain torn Appendices and ragged additions, rashly set on by some unknown author and sewn on anyhow. And of such a sort, surely, are these last chapters — which not only Hugo the Cardinal, Nicolaus of Lyra, Dionysius the Carthusian, and the other more recent interpreters deny to be canonical, but the divine Jerome also cuts them away from the whole volume of Esther as a vitiated part, and (that I may use his own words) one patched together out of ragged endings of words — out of things which could be said and heard on the spur of the moment, as scholars in the schools are wont to devise upon a theme taken up: "which words he could have used who suffered the injury, or he who did the injury." Origen also, in the epistle to Julius Africanus, hisses off these same additions. *[MS note in ink beside this passage, in a cursive hand, apparently: This opinion — let it not conflict with the Council of Trent, which the author wrongly twists and interprets (Haec sententia ne repugnat Concilio Tridentino, quod autor male torquet, et interpretatur).]*

THE THIRD AND FOURTH BOOKS OF ESDRAS

THE THIRD BOOK of Esdras [3] — in which almost all the same things are repeated which are narrated in the first and second volumes of Esdras — is not had among the Hebrews, but is extant only among the Greeks, distinguished into one hundred and nine chapters, or titles. But the fourth book, embracing the visions and chiefly the nocturnal dreams of Esdras himself, is neither among the Greeks nor among the Hebrews. Jerome, in the preface of that same work, rejects both among the Apocrypha, as writings as much of obscure author as of uncertain authority, and calls the things which are narrated in them dreams. The Greeks however not only receive the third book in the sacred canon, but even place it before the two legitimate and undoubted volumes of Esdras and Nehemias in the catalog of the divine scripture, for the cause which was spoken above. [4] Among whom Athanasius, writing the third book against the Arrians, brings in the testimony of Zorobabel, noted in the third chapter of this volume, as of a scripture of solid authority, against the followers of Arrius. But among the Latins, Augustine, acknowledging this same third book as genuine [a book] of Esdras, writes thus in the eighteenth [book] *Of the city of God*: *ABOUT THE SAME time of the liberation of the people from the Babylonian servitude, Esdras also wrote — who has been held a writer of deeds rather than a Prophet; unless perhaps he is to be understood to have prophesied in this, that, a question having arisen among certain young men as to what was of most avail in things — when one had said KINGS, another WINE, the third WOMEN, which for the most part command kings — yet that same third demonstrated that truth is victorious over all things. For, the Gospel being consulted, we know that Christ is the truth.* The divine Ambrose also thinks the fourth book was put forth by Esdras himself not without divine revelation, asserting that Paul the Apostle followed the opinion of Esdras in those things which, near the end of the former epistle to the Corinthians, he had written of the diverse orders of the brightness and glory of the elect rising again. And this opinion Ambrose himself received as a testimony of

the weightiest authority for confirming the dogma of the dwelling-places of holy souls after their separation from the body, writing thus in the book *Of the good of death*: *But that there are dwelling-places of souls is strongly proved by the testimonies of scripture; since in the books of Esdras also we read that, when the day of judgment shall have come, the earth shall give back the bodies of the departed, and the dwelling-places shall give back the souls which were commended to them. These are the habitations of which the lord says that there are many mansions with his father. And I have used the writings of Esdras, that [the gentiles] may know* [*cant* →]

[1] What the Appendix of the book of Esther contains [2] This opinion of Sixtus is not to be approved, since it conflicts with the fourth session of the Council of Trent, which he himself twists so that he may not seem to conflict with it — a printed marginal annotation in the later edition, hostile to Sixtus, paralleling but distinct from the Spanish censor's manuscript note recorded below [3] The arguments of the third and fourth books of Esdras [4] What the Doctors of the Church report concerning the third and fourth books of Esdras

(printed p. 28 [PDF p. 41], verso — the third and fourth books of Esdras continued: their authority and suspect dogmas. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *cant*] *the Gentiles that those things which are admired in the books of philosophy have been translated from ours.* And below he adds: *WHICH was the earlier, Esdras or Plato? For Paulus followed the sayings of Esdras, not of Plato: for Esdras revealed, according to the revelation conferred upon him, that the just shall be with Christ and with the saints. Hence also that famous Socrates says that he hastens to those his own Gods. Ours, assuredly, are the things which stand supreme in the letters of the philosophers. Let us not therefore fear that end owed by all, in which Esdras found the remuneration of his devotion, the Lord saying to him: FOR THOU shalt be received up with men, and shalt converse with the residue, with my son, and with those like thee.* Thus Ambrose; who also, in the second commentary on Luke, alleges out of the seventh chapter of this book a prophecy of the time of the advent of Christ, and of his death, and of the future conversion of the world to Christ. And the words of the vaticination are these: *MY SON JESUS SHALL BE REVEALED, with those who shall rejoice with him, who are left, in four hundred years; and it shall be after these years, and my son Christ shall die, and the world shall be converted.* Finally, in the epistle to Horontianus, which is the twenty-first in number, he persuades that the fourth book of Esdras should be read, because in it the soul is demonstrated to be of celestial substance, and the trifles of the philosophers concerning its substance are confuted. From these things it appears of how great authority this book was with Ambrose: out of which, many years before, the divine Cyprian seems to have taken what he wrote against Demetrianus — namely that the world is growing old, and is now hastening to its imminent end; and that this is easily perceived from the decrement of all things, since the powers of the elements, of plants, and of animals have been diminished and weakened, and the bodies of men especially are now smaller and feebler than they were of old. Which opinion, indeed, there is no doubt that Cyprian drew from the fifth chapter of this book, where these words are read: *THE WORLD now draweth near to old age. Ask her that beareth, Wherefore they whom thou hast now brought forth are not like to those who were before thee, but lesser in stature? and she herself shall say to thee: Some there are who were born in the vigor of youth, and others who were born under the time of old age, when the womb was failing. Consider therefore thou also, that ye are of lesser stature than those who were before you, and those who come after you [shall be] lesser than you, as of creatures now growing old, and passing beyond the strength of youth.* [1] The Catholic Church also venerates this book: she who, every single year, on the third day [Tuesday] of Pentecost, begins the sacrosanct mysteries of the mass from that sentence which is read in the second chapter of this volume: *RECEIVE the delight of your glory, giving thanks to God, who hath called you to the celestial kingdoms* [2]; and in the solemnities of martyrs she chants out of the same chapter, concerning the rewards of those who have valiantly fallen for Christ, that verse: *NOW they are crowned, and receive the palm.* [3] From the authority, therefore, of these witnesses and testimonies I judge it to have come about that this book was joined to the divine scriptures; which afterward, more diligently examined, the common consent of almost all the fathers judged should be held among the Apocrypha [4] — and that, as I suppose, on account of certain

suspect dogmas handed down in it, which seem openly to contradict the rules of the orthodox faith. Of which sort are these:

IN THE FOURTH CHAPTER he says that the souls of the saints are detained in certain hidden store-chambers in the lower world [5], until the number of all the elect be fulfilled, and the day of the last and supreme judgment come, in which all shall be led out thence together. And in the fifth chapter, pursuing the same opinion, he likens the day of the last judgment and retribution to a crown: in which, as there is neither first nor last, but all things at once, so in the retribution of eternal felicity the swiftness of the former souls shall not outstrip the tardiness of the last, but all together, and at the same time, shall obtain the awaited beatitude. Which opinion, although the divine Ambrose, in the book already cited, seems to have approved, yet the later fathers, in the council of Florence, reproved.

LIKEWISE, chapter 6, he relates that God on the fifth day, among the other animals, created two greatest living creatures, the one called Henoch [Behemoth], the other Leviathan; whose immense masses of body since not even the seventh part of the earth could hold together in fellowship, God disjoined them in place: and he placed Henoch in one of the seven parts of the earth, in which there are a thousand mountains; but Leviathan he set in another of the seven parts of the earth, in which are all the waters which God on the third day commanded to be gathered into one place; and there he keeps him, that he may prepare food out of him for whom he will, and when he will. Which narration indeed seems to have affinity with that fable of the Jews [6] which I remember to have read of old in the Thalmudic books, in the fourth order, third tractate; in which the Rabbins write that God on the fifth day created two fishes of well-nigh boundless magnitude, called Leviathans; the vastness of whose bodies when he weighed with himself in his mind — fearing lest every kind of fish should be swallowed down by such great beasts, and lest by them the whole sea should be rendered impassable to ships, and thus the commerce of the human race be utterly taken away if offspring were propagated from them — he slew the female, and out of her salted flesh prepared most delicate salt-meats, to be eaten by the just and his elect after this life; but the male he reserved alive for himself, that he might play with him daily in six hours of the day, according to that sentence of the hundred-and-second psalm [so this edition prints — *psalmi centesimi secundi*; the correct citation is Psalm 103:26 (= Hebrew Ps 104:26), which the alternate edition gives as *centesimi tertij*, with the margin *Psal. 103. 26*]: *THAT DRAGON, whom thou hast formed to mock him* — for which the Hebrews read לויתן זה יצרת לשחק בו *Leuijathan ze iatsartha lesachek bo*, that is, *this Leviathan, whom thou hast created, that thou mightest play with him. [In this primary scan the type is damaged just here: the Hebrew is broken and gapped, the transliteration drops the word* lesachek *(printing only "Leuijathan zeia-zaretha … hekuo"), and the gloss leaves a blank where* eo *should stand ("ut cum ■ luderes"). The complete reading given above is supplied from the alternate copy, its PDF p. 46, where the sentence prints entire and undamaged.]*

LIKEWISE, in the fourteenth chapter, teaching at what time the world shall have its end [7], he hands down that the last old age of the world is at hand, and the end of mundane duration; whose whole time is divided into twelve parts: of which, since ten parts and the half of the eleventh part have already passed, nothing remains beyond, save what is left after the half of the eleventh — that is, the residue of the eleventh part, with the twelfth part, the last of all. Which things, if they were true, the world must needs have ceased a thousand five hundred years ago. For if the time which intervened from the creation of the world to Esdras contains, according to the supputation of the divine scripture, about three thousand four hundred and seventy years, and this sum of years embraces ten parts and a half of the twelve parts of the whole mundane age, it follows that the residue of time from Esdras to the end of the world should not exceed the number of 500 years; whereas nevertheless from Esdras even to the pre-[-*sent*] [*sentem* →]

[1] 4 Esd. 5:50-55 [2] 4 Esd. 2:36-37 [3] 4 Esd. 2:45 [4] Why the fourth book of Esdras is held apocryphal [5] The author of the fourth book of Esdras thinks the souls of the saints are detained in the lower world until the day of judgment; which opinion is condemned by the Church and conflicts with the scriptures [6] A fable [7] The author of the fourth book of Esdras is a false prophet

(printed p. 29 [PDF p. 42], recto — the fourth of Esdras concluded; the Appendix of the book of Job, with the Septuagint genealogy in Greek. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ *sentem*] year MDLX, in which we write these things, almost two thousand years have flowed by. Besides these things, Jerome, in the declamation against Vigilantius, objects to Vigilantius himself that in confirmation of his heresy he brought forth a certain Apocryphal book of Esdras, in which it was written that after death no one may dare to pray for another. I suspect that the book cited by Vigilantius is this very one; because there is reported in it a certain sentence not altogether unlike that other sentence of John in the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse — from which Vigilantius, as Jerome testifies, strove to build up [the claim] that after death no one's prayer for another is to be heard; especially since John asserts that the souls of the holy martyrs, set beneath the altar of God, could not obtain even for themselves the judgment and retribution which they earnestly sought, crying with a great voice: *HOW LONG, O lord, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?* — and it was said to them that they should wait until the number of their fellow-servants should be fulfilled. [1] To which place plainly very similar is another place, in the sixth chapter of this book, in which it is narrated how the souls of the saints, shut away in their store-chambers, demand of God the day of judgment and retribution, saying: *HOW LONG, O lord, do we hope thus? and when shall come the fruit of our reward?* [2] — and answer is made to them that they should wait until the number of the elect among them be fulfilled, and the measure of the times of the whole age be fulfilled; before whose completion their bodies are not to be raised. It is likely that Vigilantius coupled this testimony with the aforesaid authority of John, and twisted both to his own purpose. For these causes, therefore, I should believe this book was rejected by the fathers. Some also judge it to be of another Esdras than he who is the author of the first book: since this one, at the beginning of this book, writes that he descended from Aaron through nineteen generations; but that one, in the seventh chapter of his book, writes that he was begotten from Aaron through only fifteen generations.

THE APPENDIX OF THE BOOK OF JOB

THE BOOK of Job, in all the exemplars of the Greeks, as well ancient as recent, has at its very end — immediately after the last period of the volume — annexed, out of the edition of the seventy interpreters, a certain genealogy of Job and of his friends, alluding not a little to the genealogy of the sons of Esau described in the book of genesis; which is read neither in the Hebrew nor in the latin codices. Its words are these: γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ' ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν. οὗτος ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς συριακῆς βίβλου, ἐν μὲν γῇ κατοικῶν τῇ αὐσίτιδι, ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις τῆς ἰδουμαίας καὶ ἀραβίας. προϋπῆρχε δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα ἰωβάλ. λαβὼν δὲ γυναῖκα ἀράβισσαν, ἐγέννα υἱόν, ᾧ ὄνομα ἐννών. ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς πατρὸς μὲν ζαρὲ τῶν ἡσαῦ υἱῶν υἱός, μητρὸς δὲ βοσόρρας· ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ. καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν ἐδώμ, ἧς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦρξε χώρας· πρῶτος βαλὰκ ὁ τοῦ βεώρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ δενναβά. μετὰ δὲ τὸν βαλὰκ ἰωβὰλ ὁ καλούμενος ἰώβ. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἀσὼν, ὁ ὑπάρχων ἡγεμὼν τῆς θαιμανίτιδος χώρας. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἀδὰδ υἱὸς βαδὰδ, ὁ ἐκκόψας μαδιὰν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ μωάβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ γεθθαίμ. οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν φίλοι, ἐλιφὰζ τῶν ἡσαῦ υἱῶν, θαιμανῶν βασιλεύς· βαλδὰδ ὁ σαυχαίων τύραννος· σῶφαρ ὁ μιναίων βασιλεύς. The sense of which narration, that I may render word for word, is this: *Now it is written that he shall rise again with those whom the Lord raiseth up. This man is interpreted out of the Syriac book [as] dwelling in the region Ausitis, on the borders of Idumaea and Arabia; and his name before was Jobal. Taking therefore an Arabian wife, he begot a son by name Ennon. And he was himself the son, by his father, of Zare, of the sons of Esau; by his mother, of Bosorra; so that he is himself the fifth from Abraham. And these are the kings who reigned in Edom — over which region he himself also ruled: first Balach, son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba; and after Balach, Jobab, who is called Job; and after these Ason, who was captain of the Thamanitid region; after him Adad, son of Badad, who smote Madian in the region of Moab, and the name of his city was Getthaim. And the friends who came to him: Eliphaz, of the*

sons of Esau, king of the Themanites; Baldad, tyrant of the Sauchaeans; Sophar, king of the Mynaeans. And these words, although they are extant neither among the Hebrews nor among the Latins, yet all the Greek Fathers receive them with the highest veneration, and very many even expound them diligently. There are still read — in the Greek catena of explanations on Job, which, written by hand, I keep in my own Library — various annotations upon this genealogy, by Origen, Chrysostom, Julianus, Severus, Euagrius, and Olympiodorus.

ORIGEN, at the end of the commentaries on Job, which the royal Library of the French [Bibliotheca regia Gallorum] lately sent forth into the light, after the aforesaid context of the genealogy subjoins another addition, out of the thirty-third chapter of Genesis [so printed], taken over in almost the same words; and he expounds it with a brief little annotation. The words of the addition are these: ἀπέθανε δὲ ἀδὰδ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ σαμαδὰ ἐκ μασσεκάς. ἀπέθανε δὲ σαμαδὰ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ σαοὺλ ἐκ ῥοβεὼθ τῆς παρὰ ποταμόν. ἀπέθανε δὲ σαούλ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ βαλλαενὼν υἱὸς ἀχοβώρ. ἀπέθανε δὲ βαλλαενὼν υἱὸς ἀχοβώρ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἀρὰδ υἱὸς βαράδ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ φογώρ. ὄνομα δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ μετεβεήλ, θυγάτηρ ματραΐθ υἱοῦ μαιζοώβ. That is: *And Adad died, and Samada of Masseca reigned in his stead. [And Samada died,] and Saul of Robooth, which is by the river, reigned in his stead. And Saul died, and Ballaenon, son of Achobor, reigned in his stead; and he being dead, Arad, son of Barad, reigned in his stead, and the name of his city was Phogor; and his wife was called Metebeel, daughter of Matraith, son of Mazoob.* Then follow these things also: θεμὰν υἱὸς ἐλιφὰζ ἡγεμόνος ἰδουμαίας. οὗτος ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς συριακῆς βίβλου, ἐν μὲν γῇ κατοικῶν αὐσίτιδι, ἐν πέρασι τοῦ εὐφράτου· προϋπῆρχε δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα ἰώβ, καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ πατὴρ ζαρὲ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου. That is: *Theman, son of Eliphaz, captain of Idumaea. This man is interpreted out of the Syriac book [as] dwelling in the land Hussitis, within the bounds of the Euphrates; and his name before was Job, and his father was Zare, from the rising of the Sun.* Thus far the Addition of the genealogy of Job; which Jerome rejects as uncertain and foreign to the Hebraic verity, writing thus in the questions upon Genesis: *THE FIRSTBORN* [*Na-* →]

[1] Rev. 6:10-11 [2] 4 Esd. 4:35

(printed p. 30 [PDF p. 43], verso — the Appendix of Job concluded; the Appendix of the Psalter, with Psalm 151 in Greek and Latin; the Appendix of the Wisdom of Syrach begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *Na-*]*chor, the brother of Abraham, by Melcha his wife: of his daughter was born Huz, from whose stock Job descends — even as it is written in the exordium of his volume:* THERE WAS A MAN *in the land of Huz, by name Job. Wrongly, therefore, do certain men suppose Job to be of the race of Esau; since that which is had at the end of his book — namely, that it was translated out of the Syrian speech, and that he was the fourth from Esau — and the rest of the things which are contained there, are not had in the Hebrew volumes.* Thus he [Jerome].

THERE IS EXTANT also, in certain ancient [Bibles] of the Latins, and in all the Bibles of the Greeks, a certain little speech [*oratiuncula*] of the wife of Job, expounded by well-nigh all the Greek interpreters; which Origen, in the epistle to Julius Africanus, denies to pertain to the verity of the Hebraic scripture. It is contained in the second chapter of this book, in these words: χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, μέχρι τίνος καρτερήσεις λέγων, ἰδοὺ, ἀναμένω χρόνον ἔτι μικρὸν, προσδεχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου. ἰδοὺ γὰρ, ἠφάνισταί σου τὸ μνημόσυνον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, ἐμῆς κοιλίας ὠδῖνες καὶ πόνοι, οὓς εἰς τὸ κενὸν ἐκοπίασα μετὰ μόχθων. σύ τε αὐτὸς ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων κάθησαι, διανυκτερεύων αἴθριος. κἀγὼ πλανῆτις καὶ λάτρις, τόπον ἐκ τόπου περιερχομένη, καὶ οἰκίαν ἐξ οἰκίας, προσδεχομένη τὸν ἥλιον, πότε δύσεται, ἵνα ἀναπαύσωμαι τῶν μόχθων μου καὶ τῶν ὠδίνων, αἵ με νῦν συνέχουσιν. ἀλλὰ εἰπέ τι ῥῆμα πρὸς κύριον, καὶ τελεύτα.

That is: *Now when much time had gone before, his wife said to him: How long wilt thou persevere, saying, Behold, I await yet a little time, receiving the hope of my salvation? For behold, thy memorial is blotted out from the earth — the sons and daughters, the pangs and labors of my womb, whom in vain I brought forth laboriously, with vexations; and thou thyself sittest in the rottenness of worms, passing the night under the open sky; and I, a wanderer and a drudge, going about from place to place and from house to house, awaiting the sun, when it shall set, that I may rest from my labors and my pangs, which now hold me fast. But speak some word against the lord, and die.*

THE APPENDIX OF THE PSALTER

THERE IS EXTANT in the Greek Psalters, according to the edition of the seventy interpreters, immediately after the end, a psalm inscribed to David outside the number of the hundred and fifty psalms; of which I have hitherto been able to find some mention in no explanator of the divine scripture — whether Greek, or Hebrew, or Latin — save in the one divine Athanasius; who, in the Synopsis of the divine scripture, reviewing this psalm by name among the canonical writings, writes thus: *AGAINST GOLIATH, PSALM 151. This psalm is inscribed peculiarly to David, and outside the number of the rest, when in single combat he had laid low Goliath.* And the same [Athanasius], at the end of the same work, the testimony of the book of Paralipomenon being cited, adds that David put forth three thousand psalms; out of which the friends of king Ezechias selected only a hundred and fifty, but hid away the rest. And it is possible that this is one of those; which, because it is short, it has pleased [me] to insert here, as well in Greek as in Latin, together with its own inscription.

Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ἰδιόγραφος τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐστι, καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα ψαλμῶν, ὅτε ἐμονομάχησε πρὸς τὸν Γολιάθ.

Μικρὸς ἤμην ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου· καὶ νεώτερος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ πατρός μου, ἐποίμαινον τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρός μου.

Αἱ χεῖρές μου ἐποίησαν ὄργανον, καὶ οἱ δάκτυλοί μου ἥρμοσαν ψαλτήριον.

Καὶ τίς ἀναγγελεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ μου; αὐτὸς κύριος, αὐτὸς εἰσακούει.

Αὐτὸς ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦρέ με ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ ἔχρισέ με ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῆς χρίσεως αὐτοῦ.

Οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καλοὶ, καὶ μεγάλοι, καὶ οὐκ εὐδόκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος.

Ἐξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ ἀλλοφύλῳ, καὶ ἐπικατηράσατό με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτοῦ.

Ἐγὼ δὲ σπασάμενος τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ μάχαιραν, ἀπεκεφάλισα αὐτὸν, καὶ ἦρα ὄνειδος ἐξ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

TRANSLATION

This psalm was written by David himself, outside the number of the hundred and fifty, when in single combat he had engaged with Goliath.

LITTLE was I *among my brethren, and younger in the house of my father: I pastured the sheep of my father.*

MY HANDS *constructed an instrument [organum], and my fingers fitted together a psaltery.*

AND WHO *shall announce [it] to my lord? the lord himself — he himself hears.*

HE HIMSELF sent *his angel, and took me from the sheep of my father, and anointed me with the oil of his anointing.*

MY BRETHREN *[were] fair and great: and the lord was not well pleased in them.*

I WENT OUT *to meet that alien [Goliath]: and he cursed me by his idols.*

BUT I, *wresting from him his own sword, beheaded him, and took away the reproach from the sons of Israel.*

EVTHYMIVS touched upon this Psalm in passing, in the Preface of the commentaries on the Psalms.

THE APPENDIX OF THE WISDOM OF SYRACH *[the heading's italic Y is worn and prints almost as a T: "S■RACH"]*

THERE IS FOUND, in almost all Latin codices, after the end of the Wisdom of Syrach, or Ecclesiasticus, a certain prayer of Salomon; which is nothing else than a fragment, or the former part, of that prayer which Salomon put forth at the dedication of the temple, copied word for word out of the eighth chapter of the third book of Kings. Which prayer, although it has a certain author, one of irrefragable credit, and is not apocryphal, yet — since it has been cut off from thence by some unknown author, lopped like a limb from its proper body, and has been added into this place superfluously and rashly, against the credit of the Hebrew and Greek exemplars — it has pleased [me] to cast it back among the apocryphal additions. It is likely that the adder of this fragment, whoever he was, added to this volume just so many lines out of the aforesaid prayer of Salomon as would suffice to fill up the space which, on the last [leaf], as gener-[-*ally*]

[*runque* →]

(printed p. 31 [PDF p. 44], recto — the Syrach Appendix concluded; the little Preface of the Lamentations; the third and fourth books of Maccabees. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS. Signature: E 4.)

[→ *runque*] [as gene]*rally* happens, had remained empty on a page of the book; which [lines] afterward, through the imprudence of those who copy out all things without any discrimination, whatsoever they be, were spread abroad into the other Latin codices.

THE LITTLE PREFACE OF THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAS

THE LITTLE PREFACE of the Threni [Lamentations], which the Latin codices carry before the beginning of the Lamentations of Jeremias, is not among the Hebrews; who begin this book — written throughout in a fourfold alphabet [four alphabetic acrostics] — from the word אכה [so printed, lacking the yod of איכה] *Eca*, that is, *How*, commencing from א Aleph, the first letter of the Hebrew Alphabet; and from this word they name the book אכה *Ecà*. But the other words which are read before this word were added, as is believed by many, by the seventy interpreters, wishing to connect the lamentation of the devastated city with the narration of the devastation of the same city, which is described at the close of the book of Jeremias. Now these are the words of this preface among the seventy interpreters: Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐρημωθῆναι, ἐκάθισεν ἱερεμίας κλαίων, καὶ ἐθρήνησε τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ εἶπεν — that is: *And it came to pass, after Israel was brought into captivity, and Hierusalem was made desert, Jeremias sat weeping, and wailed this lamentation over Hierusalem, and said.* The Hebrews do not receive this argument, because it does not seem to them likely that Jeremias wrote, or saw in the spirit, these Threni after the destruction of Hierusalem, but before the destruction: for it is a prophecy. Whence they also hand down that king Joachim read these Threni before the overthrow of the city; and, some verses out of them having been read, cast the book into the fire: which the prophet a little afterward wrote out again much more copiously; even as he himself testifies in the 36th chapter of his own prophecy.

THE THIRD BOOK OF MACCABEES

THE THIRD BOOK of Maccabees [1] — whose argument is the marvelous and ever-memorable liberation of the Jews, whom, bound in troops with chains, Ptolemaeus Philopater, fourth king of Egypt, exposed in the Hippodrome of the city of Alexandria, to be trampled down by maddened elephants — is utterly unknown to the Hebrews; although Josephus, in the second volume against Apion, touched briefly, in passing and quite summarily, on the sum of this history. Yet it is had everywhere in almost all the codices of the Greeks, and even in very many volumes of the Latins. Athanasius makes mention of this book in the Synopsis; and Eusebius in the chronicles: which [book] Clemens, the third Roman pontiff after Peter, in the book of the apostolic canons, canon 84, had long before numbered among the canonical books. There are those who judge it to have been put forth by Josephus, from the similarity of the style. But the things which are narrated in it were done before those which are reported in the first and second books of Maccabees, by almost fifty years — that is, under Antiochus the great, most friendly to the Jews, about the year from the founding of the world three thousand seven hundred and thirty-eight [*ter millesimum septingentesimum trigesimum octauum*]; and it pertains not at all to the history of the Maccabees, although they [these copies] carry its inscription. The beginning of the book is: Ὁ δὲ Φιλοπάτωρ μαθὼν παρὰ τῶν ἀνακομισθέντων τὴν γενομένην τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κρατουμένων τόπων ἀφαίρεσιν ὑπὸ Ἀντιόχου — that is: *But Philopater, learning from those who had returned that the places which he himself had held had been taken away, Antiochus [being the taker]* [as printed in the italic Latin: *At Philopater, cognoscens ex his, qui redierant, locos, quos ipse tenuerat, Antiochum abstulisse* — "But Philopater, learning from those who had returned that Antiochus had taken away the places which he himself had held"].

THE FOURTH BOOK OF MACCABEES

THE FOURTH [book] of Maccabees, [2] which the Synopsis of Athanasius reviews among the apocryphal writings, contains a history of one-and-thirty years — that is, the deeds of Joannes Maccabaeus, who from the conquered Hyrcanus received the surname of Hyrcanus. He, after his father Simon had been slaughtered by the fraud of Ptolemaeus, obtained the pontificate of his nation together with the principate; and immediately led out an army against his father's striker-down. Then he joined a league with Antiochus, king of Syria; upon whose death he took many cities of Syria by force. First of all the captains of the Jews, he hired foreign soldiery at his own pay [3]: he dug out three thousand talents from the sepulcher of David. He renewed the league with the Romans, already entered upon by his father: he routed Antiochus Cizygenus [Cyzicenus], king of Syria, conquered in war: Samaria, the rival of the city of Hierosolyma, captured after a whole year of siege, he leveled to the ground; and, torrents having been led into it, he removed by the flooding of the waters even the very ruins of the destroyed city, and all its traces: the walls of Hierosolyma, collapsed with age, he restored. Which things happily accomplished, he dies in the thirty-first year of his rule — a man most illustrious under a threefold name, that is, in priesthood, in principate, and in prophecy — namely in the hundredth year before the birth of Christ. In which [year] the fourth and last book of Maccabees leaves off: whose beginning, out of a Greek codex which we read at Lyons, written by hand, in the Library of Sanctes Pagninus, a most learned man, among the preachers [the Dominicans], runs thus: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ἰωάννης υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀντ' αὐτοῦ — that is: *And after Simon was slain, Joannes his son was made high priest in his stead.* The series of the history and the narration is almost the same as that in Josephus, in the thirteenth book of the Antiquities; but the style, abounding in Hebraic idioms, is far unlike. It is likely that this [book] was translated by an unknown interpreter out of the book of the days of the priesthood of Joannes; of which, at the close of the first of Maccabees, it is written thus: [4] *THE REST of the discourses of Joannes, and of his wars, and of the good virtues in which he bore himself bravely, and of the building of the walls which he erected, and of his deeds — behold, these are written in the book of the days of his priesthood and principate.*

From these things it is gathered, not obscurely, that they are deceived who think the fourth book of Maccabees to be that one in which Josephus described the agony of the Maccabee mother and of her seven

sons; which also is had in some Bibles of the Greeks, with the inscription ἰωσίππου εἰς τοὺς μακκαβαίους [*of Josippus (Josephus), On the Maccabees*].

[*RECA-* →]

[1] The argument of the third book of Maccabees [2] Argument of the fourth book of Maccabees [3] John Maccabaeus, first of the Jewish captains to hire foreign soldiery at his own pay [4] 1 Macc 16:23-24

(printed p. 32 [PDF p. 45], verso — the RECAPITULATION of all the volumes of both Testaments begins: Augustine's partition. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

RECAPITULATION OF ALL THE VOLUMES OF BOTH TESTAMENTS

[→ *RECA-*] **THIS FIRST BOOK being finished** — which we took upon ourselves to write concerning the divine volumes, or concerning the scriptures and the holy writers — we at length exhibit to thee three Partitions of all the scriptures of both testaments and of both orders: the first, that of the divine Augustine; the second, that of the recent scholastics; but the third, that which is our own.

THE FIRST PARTITION OF THE BOOKS OF THE DIVINE SCRIPTURE

THE FIRST PARTITION of the books of the divine scripture — pertaining as well to the first as to the second order of the sacred canon — was dissected by the divine Augustine, in the second book *Of Christian doctrine*, into two sections: the one of the old, the other of the new testament. Of which the former contains the four-and-forty old books, distinguished into two classes, that is, the Historical and the Prophetical; the latter contains the eight books of the new testament.

OF THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT — SECTIO PRIMA

Historical books, XXII.		*Prophetical — that is, of those who are properly called Prophets — books XXII.*	
1	Genesis	23	David
2	Exodus	24	Proverbia
3	Leviticus	25	Ecclesiastes
4	Numeri	26	Cantica
5	Deuteronomion	27	Sapientia
6	Josue	28	Ecclesiasticus
7	Judicum	29	Esaias
8	Ruth	30	Hieremias with the Threni
9	Regum primus [1 Kings]	31	Ezechiel
10	Regum secundus	32	Daniel
11	Regum tertius	33	Osee
12	Regum quartus	34	Joël
13	Paralipomenon primus	35	Amos
14	Paralipomenon secundus	36	Abdias

Historical books, XXII.		*Prophetical — that is, of those who are properly called Prophets — books XXII.*	
15	Job	37	Jonas
16	Tobias	38	Michaeas
17	Esther	39	Nahum
18	Judith	40	Abacuch
19	Esdrae primus	41	Sophonias
20	Esdrae secundus	42	Aggaeus
21	Maccabaeorum primus	43	Zacharias
22	Maccabaeorum secundus	44	Malachias

OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT — SECTIO SECVNDA

OF THE GOSPELS — of Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas, and Joannes — four books. **OF THE EPISTLES** of Paul, fourteen: one book. **OF THE APOSTOLIC ACTS:** one book. **OF THE CATHOLIC epistles** — that is, II of Peter, III of Joannes, I of Jacobus, and I of Jude: one book. **OF THE APOCALYPSE** of Joannes the Evangelist: one book.

WHICH BOOKS indeed of the new Testament — the volume of the Apocalypse being omitted — Gregorius the Theologian [Gregory Nazianzen], some years before Augustine, in the same place which we cited above, sang not inelegantly in these verses:

> ἤδη ἀρίθμει καὶ νέου μυστηρίου.
>
> Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραψεν ἑβραίοις θαύματα χριστοῦ.
>
> Μάρκος δ′ ἰταλίῃ. λουκᾶς ἀχαΐαδι.
>
> Πᾶσι δ′ ἰωάννης, κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης.
>
> ἔπειτα πράξεις τῶν σοφῶν ἀποστόλων.
>
> Δέκα δὲ παύλου τέσσαρές τ′ ἐπιστολαί.
>
> ἑπτάδε καθολικαὶ, ὧν ἰακώβου μία. *[the word* ἰακώβου *is printed in a heavily ligatured, compressed form]*
>
> Δύω δὲ πέτρου, τρεῖς δ′ ἰωάννου πάλιν.

[That is: *Now number also (the books) of the new mystery. Matthaeus wrote for the Hebrews the miracles of Christ; Marcus for Italy; Lucas for Achaia; but Joannes, the great herald, the heaven-walker, for all. Then the Acts of the wise apostles; and ten and four epistles of Paul; and seven catholic, of which one is of Jacobus, two of Peter, and three again of Joannes…*]

[Ἰούδα →]

(printed p. 33 [PDF p. 46], recto — Gregory's verses concluded, with the Latin rendering; the second Partition, of the scholastics. Running head: LIBER PRIMVS.)

[→ Ἰούδα]

> Ἰούδα δέ ἐστιν ἑβδόμη. πάσας ἔχεις.
>
> Εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτὸς, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις.

which may be turned thus:

Now indeed run through the mysteries of the new law.

Matthaeus gave to the Hebrews the miracles of Christ;

Marcus wrote for Italy; for thee, Graecia, Lucas:

heaven-wandering Joannes scattered his writings for all [Caeliuagus — the italic type could also be read Calinagus; caelivagus, "sky-wandering," renders the Greek οὐρανοφοίτης*].*

Joined to these, thou shalt presently discern the famous apostolic deeds.

Next number the twice-seven little books of Paul;

the seven Catholic [epistles], among which the first is of Jacobus,

and the twin ones of Peter: then follow the three of Joannes;

seventh after these succeeds the epistle of Jude.

They will hardly be legitimate, if any writings be carried about outside these.

THE SECOND PARTITION OF ALL THE BOOKS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

THE SECOND PARTITION of all the books of holy Scripture — pertaining as well to the first as to the second order of the sacred canon — was distinguished by the scholastics into two Sections: the one of the old, the other of the new testament; of which each is digested into four classes of volumes, that is, into the Legal, Historial, Sapiential, and Prophetal books.

OF THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT — SECTIO PRIMA

Legal books, five.		*Sapiential books, five.*	
1	Genesis	23	Proverbia
2	Exodus	24	Ecclesiastes
3	Leviticus	25	Cantica
4	Numeri	26	Sapientia
5	Deuteronomion	27	Ecclesiasticus
Historial books, XVII.		*Prophetal books, XVII.*	
6	Josue	28	David
7	Judicum	29	Esaias
8	Ruth	30	Hieremias with the Threni, & Baruch
9	Regum primus	31	Ezechiel
10	Regum secundus	32	Daniel
11	Regum tertius	33	Oseas
12	Regum quartus	34	Joël
13	Paralipomenon primus	35	Amos
14	Paralipomenon secundus	36	Abdias
15	Esdras primus	37	Jonas
16	Esdras secundus	38	Michaeas
17	Tobias	39	Nahum
18	Judith	40	Abacuch

Legal books, five.		*Sapiential books, five.*	
19	Esther	41	Sophonias
20	Job	42	Aggaeus
21	Maccabaeorum primus	43	Zacharias
22	Maccabaeorum secundus	44	Malachias

THE SECOND SECTION, OF ALL THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, digested into the same four Classes

LEGAL, FOUR BOOKS; that is: Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas, Joannes.

HISTORIAL, ONE BOOK; that is: The Acts of the Apostles.

SAPIENTIAL, TWO BOOKS; that is: The fourteen epistles of Paul the Apostle, The seven Catholic epistles.

PROPHETAL, ONE BOOK; that is: The Apocalypse of Joannes.

[*PAR-* →]

(printed p. 34 [PDF p. 47], verso — the third Partition, Sixtus's own: protocanonical, deuterocanonical, apocryphal. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

THE THIRD PARTITION — ΒΙΒΛΙΟΓΡΑΦΩΝ (*PARTITIO TERTIA* ΒΙΒΛΙΟΓΡΑΦΩΝ)

[→ *PAR-*] **That is, of the biblical scriptures,** distributed by us into three Sections: of which the first contains the Πρωτοκανονικὰ, that is, the canonical writings of the first order; the second the Δευτεροκανονικὰ, that is, the canonical scriptures of the second order; the third the Ἀπόκρυφα, or all the additions of scriptures of uncertain authority.

ΠΡΩΤΟΚΑΝΟΝΙΚΩΝ — THAT IS, OF THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE FIRST ORDER. SECTIO PRIMA. (ΠΡΩΤΟΚΑΝΟΝΙΚΩΝ, *ID EST, SCRIPTVRARVM CANONICARVM PRIMI ORDINIS. SECTIO PRIMA.*)

FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.		*FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.*	
1	Genesis.	1	Matthaeus.
2	Exodus.	2	Marcus.
3	Leviticus.	3	Lucas.
4	Numeri.	4	Joannes.
5	Deuteronomion.	5	The Acts of the Apostles.
6	Josue.	6	To the Romans.
7	Judicum, & Ruth.	7	To the Corinthians, the first.
8	Samuelis, first & second.	8	To the Corinthians, the second.
9	Melachim [Kings], first & second.	9	To the Galatians.

FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.		*FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.*	
10	The two books of Paralipomenon.	10	To the Ephesians.
11	The two books of Esdras.	11	To the Philippians.
12	Job.	12	To the Colossians.
13	Psalterium.	13	To the Thessalonians, the first.
14	Proverbia.	14	To the Thessalonians, the second.
15	Ecclesiastes.	15	To Timothy, the first.
16	Cantica.	16	To Timothy, the second.
17	Esaias.	17	To Titus.
18	Jeremias with the Threni.	18	To Philemon.
19	Ezechiel.	19	The first epistle of Peter.
20	Daniel.	20	The first epistle of Joannes.
21	The twelve Prophets.		

ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΚΑΝΟΝΙΚΩΝ — THAT IS, OF THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE SECOND ORDER. SECTIO SECVNDA. (ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΚΑΝΟΝΙΚΩΝ, *ID EST, CANONICARVM secundi ordinis scripturarum. SECTIO SECVNDA.*)

FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.		*FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.*	
1	Esther.	1	The last chapter of Marcus.
2	Tobias.	2	The history of the agony of Christ, & of the Angel's consolation.
3	Judith.	3	The history of Joannes concerning the adulterous woman.
4	Baruch.	4	The epistle to the Hebrews.
5	The epistle of Hieremias.	5	The epistle of Jacobus.
6	Sapientia.	6	The second epistle of Peter.
7	Ecclesiasticus.	7	The second epistle of Joannes.
8	The Addition of Daniel, i.e. {the Prayer of Azarias; the Hymn of the three boys; the history of Susanna; the history of Bel} [printed as a bracketed cluster beside the entry]	8	The third epistle of Joannes.
9	Maccabaeorum, the first.	9	The epistle of Jude.
10	Maccabaeorum, the second.	10	The Apocalypse.

ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΩΝ — THAT IS, OF SCRIPTURES OF A HIDDEN AND UNCERTAIN KIND. SECTIO TERTIA. (ΑΠΟΚΡΥΦΩΝ, *HOC EST, OCCVLTI ET INCERTI generis scripturarum. SECTIO TERTIA.*)

1	The appendix of the second book of Paralipomenon.
2	The third book of Esdras.
3	The fourth book of Esdras.
4	The appendix of the book of Esther.
5	The accession of the book of Job.
6	The appendix of the Psalter.
7	The preface of the Lamentations.
8	The appendix of Ecclesiasticus.
9	Maccabaeorum, the third.
10	Maccabaeorum, the fourth.

[*HÆC* →]

(printed p. 35 [PDF p. 48], recto — the leaf is MISNUMBERED "47" (a pagination misprint). Book I's closing paragraph and FINIS; Book II's title-block opens mid-page. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *HÆC*] **THESE THINGS, in sum, we have had to say** concerning the holy scriptures comprehended in the vulgate codex of the Bibles; hereafter, in the following book, we shall narrate the writers and writings which are cited by the divine authors of the sacred volumes — concerning which Origen, in the first homily on the Canticle of Canticles, writes thus: *IT IS LABORIOUS, if we should wish to inquire how great a commemoration of many books is made in the divine scriptures, of which no reading at all has been handed down to you; nay, not even among the Jews have we found the use of readings of this kind. Which [books] — whether because they contained some things above human intelligence, it pleased the holy spirit to take them out of the midst; or because they were of those scriptures which are called Apocrypha, inasmuch as many things are found in them corrupted, and handed down by the elders against the true faith — it did not please them that place be given them, nor that they be admitted to authority. It is above us to pronounce concerning such things. Yet this is manifest: that many examples have been brought forth, whether by the Apostles or by the Evangelists, and inserted into the new testament, which we never read in these scriptures which we hold canonical; yet they are found in the Apocrypha, and are evidently shown to have been taken up out of them.* Thus far the words of Origen; with which it is fitting to set an end to the present book.

THE END OF THE FIRST BOOK

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK II

Of the books, writers, and writings of which mention is made in the holy volumes

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, Book II

Note on the Latin sources. This English version is drawn from two copies of Sixtus's *Bibliotheca Sancta.* The front matter and pages 6–108 were translated from the 1586 Cologne edition (Maternus Cholinus), which carries few marginal notes; the marginal glosses were then supplied from a second, more heavily annotated copy of the same work. From page 109 onward the translation is made directly from that margin-rich copy. The printed leaf- and page-numbers in both copies are frequently misprinted, so pages are aligned by content and scan sequence rather than by the printed folios.

LIBER SECVNDVS — BOOK TWO

OF F. SIXTUS OF SIENA, OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS: THE SECOND BOOK OF THE HOLY LIBRARY — of the books, writers, and writings of which mention is made in the holy volumes

PREFACE

IN THE FIRST volume of this work we reviewed the number, order, partition, authority, authors, and arguments of all the books of the divine scripture: now, in this second book, we are going to collect the volumes, books, writers, and writings — all of them, extant and not extant, as well undoubted as doubtful and uncertain — which are commemorated here and there by the authors in the sacrosanct Bibles. Now these are distinguished from one another by a threefold discrimination: by collection, by understanding, and by authority. And first, according to the division which arises from collection — that is, from the various modes of collecting — all the scriptures which we have gathered together here are divided into the Transcribed, the Abridged, and the Alleged [*in Transcriptas, Abbreuiatas, & Allegatas*].

THE TRANSCRIBED are those which have been faithfully copied out of other more ancient writings; and, just as they had once been put forth by their own authors, have been inserted word for word into the sacred letters: such as are the many epistles of the kings and princes of the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Jews, and other nations, which have been mingled into the divine volumes for the completion of the sacrosanct history.

THOSE SCRIPTURES ARE CALLED ABRIDGED which — since they had earlier been written by their own authors with a profuse abundance of speech, and extended into many volumes — were afterward contracted into a compendium by the divine writers, and fitted in among the holy books. Such, it is established, are the 5000 books of the Canticles of Salomon; the 3000 books of his Parables; and also his immense work of Natural disputations; the 3000 Psalms of David, which the divine Athanasius affirms to be cited in the books of Paralipomenon; the four-and-two-hundred [204] books of Esdras; the commentaries of Nehemias; the Volumes of the histories of Samuel, and of Nathan and Gad the prophets; the Divinations of Ahias the Silonite; the Vaticinations of Iddo the prophet; the discourses of Chozai, and of Semeias, and of Jehu [*Hieu*] the prophets; the Books of the days of the kings of Juda and of Israel; the Descriptions of Jeremias; the Com[mentaries] of Judas Maccabaeus [*Com. Iudae Maccabaei*, so abbreviated]; the Ephemeri-[*-des*]

[*das* →]

(printed p. 36 [PDF p. 49], verso — the leaf is MISNUMBERED "48" (a pagination misprint). Book II's Preface concludes: the Alleged scriptures and the divisions of sacred writings. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE [printed "BIBIOTHECAE", missing an L].)

[→ *das*] the Ephemeri-*des* of the priesthood of Joannes [Hyrcanus]; the 5 books of the histories of Jason of Cyrene; and many other volumes of this kind — out of whose fountains chiefly the greatest part of those things which are now had in the sacrosanct letters is believed to have been drawn.

THOSE SCRIPTURES ARE CALLED ALLEGED [*Allegatae*] of which, in the divine books, either the authors' names alone, or only the titles of the books, are commemorated; or only the arguments of the works are touched upon most briefly; or at least some testimonies out of them are cited and alleged: such as are the Book of Henoch, the Book of the wars of the lord, the Book of the Just, the Book of the words of the ancients, the Annals of the kings of the Persians & Medes, the Commentaries of Assuerus, the Commentaries

of Cyrus, the sacred Books of the Spartans, the *Phaenomena* of Aratus, the poems of Callimachus, the [work] of Epimenides on oracles, the comedies of Menander, and very many other most ancient monuments of antiquity like to these: all of which, together with countless others of the writings of various nations, partly the injury of time consumed, partly the incursions of barbarians and the madness of tyrants destroyed, in the overthrows of kingdoms — and above all in the very destruction of the holy city, in which so many thousand volumes of that sacrosanct Library of Hierosolyma were burnt up, first by the Assyrians, then by the Greeks, and last of all by the Romans.

MOREOVER, the second division of the scriptures, taken from their understanding and sense, contains two varieties of scriptures: namely, the Historical, and the Mystical or Symbolic.

THOSE ARE NAMED HISTORICAL which signify only the order of things done or written; or in which, beyond the historical knowledge, nothing of a more secret or symbolic sense needs to be searched out for the understanding of them. Of this number are very many epistles of the princes and kings of the Chaldaeans, Egyptians, Jews, and Romans, inserted into the sacred books: in which only the outer sense of the letter is to be regarded.

MYSTICAL AND SYMBOLIC are those which, under visible or imaginary symbolic images and showings of books, volumes, codices, and scriptures of every kind, represent hidden and sublime mysteries: such as the Sealed Book, the Rolled-up Book, the Flying Book, the Book of life, the Book of the life of the Lamb, the book of the seven seals, the Volume of the book written within and without, the Devoured Book, the Book of the memorial, the Book of the divine repudiation [bill of divorce], the Book of death, the Scripture of the two woods, the Killing Letter, the Handwriting of the decree [*chirographum decreti*], the Adamantine Scripture, the Epistle of Christ, the Scripture of the house of Israel, and many other writings of this kind: into which, unless thou look through to the mystical and latent senses, thou shalt understand nothing at all.

THE THIRD DIVISION of the scriptures is distributed into the Undoubted, the Apocryphal, and the Pseudepigraphal writings.

UNDOUBTED [*Indubitata*] are those which it is most certainly established to be of those by whose names and titles they are entitled: as the Scripture of king Ezechias [Hezekiah, Isa. 38], the prophecy of Agur [Prov. 30], the Institutes of Samuel [1 Kings 10:25], the Epistle of the apostolic Council [Acts 15], and very many such, which — with the names of their authors prefixed — have been mingled into the sacred volumes.

APOCRYPHAL, that is, obscure and ambiguous, are those concerning whose authors and authority there is doubt, or concerning whom it is disputed whether they ought to be attributed to the writers who are mentioned in the sacred letters: as the Gospel of the Hebrews, the gospel of Bartholomaeus, the Mass of Jacobus the apostle, the three books of Hermas — that is, the *Pastor*, the *Church*, the *Similitudes*; the epistle of Barnabas, the vaticinations of Heldad and Medad, the epistles of Clement, the prayer of Joseph, the Canons of the Apostles, the Testament of the 12 patriarchs, the preaching of Peter, the altercation of Jason and Papiscus, and very many other volumes of this kind — inscribed with [the names of] men celebrated as illustrious in the divine scripture; which are also called Ecclesiastical, for this reason, namely, that in the beginning of the nascent church they were read publicly in the temples and in the common assemblies of Christians for the edification of the people, and were taken up in the writings of the ancient Doctors for the instruction of morals, and sometimes also for the confirmation of the faith.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHAL, that is, falsely entitled, are those which divers heretics — under the name of men as much illustrious as obscure, whom the divine letters name here and there — maliciously feigned, that out of their counterfeit titles they might win credit and authority for their errors: of which sort are the Books of Seth the son of Noe [so printed; Seth was son of Adam — apparently a misprint for *filii Adae*], the Scripture of Cham the son of Noe, the revelation of Abraham, the ascension of Moses, the volume of Jamnes and Mambres, the Apocalypse of Elias, the ascension of Esaias, the incantations of Salomon, the books of Jesus

Christ concerning hidden wisdom, to Peter and Paul, the rapture of Paul, the acts of Pilate, the gospel of Judas Iscariot, and the rest of the execrable inventions of impiety of this kind.

ALL THESE KINDS, therefore, of writers and of writings I have determined to fit together in the present volume under the alphabetical order of the letters (since no more convenient plan of arranging the work presented itself): and to indicate the authors, arguments, occasions, and times of the writings of every single kind whatsoever; and to explain very many places in them that are obscure, clearly and briefly, as far as it can be done.

[Α΄ καὶ → — the catchword is a Greek mark opening the alphabetical catalog; the letter-A section begins on the next leaf.]

---

*(printed p. 37 [PDF p. 50], recto — the alphabetical catalog of Book II begins with letter **A**: Alpha & Omega, Abacuk, Abraham, Adam, and the Adamantine Scripture. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

A

Α καὶ Ω — **ALPHA, AND OMEGA** — is one of the sacred surnames of our lord Jesus Christ [1], by which indeed he himself calls himself, in the beginning and at the end of the Revelations of Joannes [2], saying: Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α, καὶ τὸ Ω, that is, *I AM the Alpha itself, and the Omega itself.* Tertullian, in the book *Of the prescriptions of heretics*, relates that Marcus and Colarbasus, heretics, took occasion from this place to devise a new heresy upon the Greek Alphabet: for these men said that no truth at all is found without these letters [3] — nay, that the whole plenitude and perfection of truth is disposed in the numbers which these letters signify; and for this cause also they affirmed that Christ had pronounced *I AM* α & ω, that by this saying he might provoke us to search out the most hidden mysteries of divine things, which are concluded in the several letters of the Alphabet and in the numbers of the letters. Epiphanius, in the book *Anchoratus*, judges that by the figures of these letters is signified the twofold nature of Christ — namely, by the A, which is open below, the human nature; but by the Ω, which is open above, the divine Word. [4] Origen, in Tome 1 on John, writes many things concerning the mystical signification of each letter, which, consulting brevity, I pass over. The true interpretation of this name is that which Christ himself in the same place gives, saying: *I AM* α *&* ω*, the beginning and the end.* For by these letters he compares or expresses himself [5]; because, as α is the beginning of all the elements, and ω the end and terminus, so he alone is the beginning whom none precedes, and the end without end whom no end succeeds; the beginning also of all things, from whom are all, and the end for whose sake all things were created; and likewise the terminus to which all things tend and aspire, and in which at last all things rest.

ABACVK [Habakkuk], Apocryphal — Athanasius reviews in the Synopsis, indicating (if I mistake not) a certain hidden prophecy, of which Epiphanius also makes mention in the life of Abakuk; or perhaps a history which Abakuk — not he who is placed among the twelve prophets, but another, of the tribe of Levi, son of Iuda — wrote concerning Daniel the priest, son of Abda. See above, in Book 1, in the Appendix of Daniel the prophet.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM — the Sethian heretics invented, as Epiphanius writes in the first [book] of the *Panarion*. Origen, in homily 35 on Luke, takes a testimony from a certain apocryphal scripture of Abraham, in which are brought in angels of iniquity and of justice, disputing about the salvation and the destruction of Abraham. In the Synopsis of Athanasius, a book which is called the ASSUMPTION OF ABRAHAM is enumerated among the rejected books. There is reported among the Hebrews a book under the name of Abraham the patriarch, whose title is יצירה *Iezirà* [Yetzirah], that is, OF CREATION; which not a few learned men assign to Rabbi Akiba.

ACHIAS THE SHILONITE — or אחיה השילוני, *Achiiah ha-Shiloni* [printed *Asceloni*], of the tribe of Iuda, sprung from Silo, where once had been the tabernacle and the ark of the Lord — he is that same prophet who, to Jeroboam, prefect of Salomon, going out from Hierusalem, met [him] on the way [6]; and, his new cloak (in which the prophet himself went clothed) being torn, and ten parts of it given to Jeroboam, prophesied that not long after it would come to pass that the kingdom of Salomon — who, having forsaken his God, had worshipped the idols of his harlots — would be rent into twelve tribes; of which ten, the empire of Roboam son of Salomon being cast off, would attach themselves to Jeroboam as king; whose whole family and entire progeny God, after some years, would utterly overthrow for his sins. This prophet, therefore, wrote of the deeds done by king Salomon one book, of which the second book of the sacred annals makes mention in the ninth chapter [2 Par. 9]. [7] He lived in Silo, and there ended his day; and not far from a huge oak which was in that place he obtained a sepulcher, in the year from the founding of the world 2990 [*bis millesimo nongentesimo nonagesimo*; printed *hongentesimo*]. The Hebrews hand down that this man was most long-lived, and say that he was one of the seven men who were the continuers of the whole of human life; concerning which matter, see below in [the entry] Helias.

THE GENEALOGY OF ADAM — or ספר תולדת אדם, *Sepher Tholdoth Adam*, that is, the Book of the generations of Adam; or, as the seventy interpreters rendered it, βίβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων, that is, the Book of the generation of men — the same which is the enumeration, or catalog, of the posterity of Adam, set down by Moses in the fifth chapter of Genesis [8]; in which thou shalt observe two things. First, that in it the generations which are from Adam through Cain down to Noe are passed over in silence, as reprobate and unworthy to be inscribed in the sacred volumes and preserved in the memory of men. [9] But the genealogy from Adam through Seth down to Noe is described entire, because from this holy stock descend Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the progenitors of Christ Jesus, who is the end of all scripture. Secondly, thou shalt note that the translation of the LXX interpreters, in computing the years of those who are contained in this catalog, is opposed to the Hebrew scripture: for whereas Moses, in it, reckons from Adam down to the flood only 1656 years, the seventy interpreters superadd 786 years [so printed — but 1656 + 786 = 2442, whereas the total is next given as 2242, which would require an addition of only 586; the printed figures are inconsistent], so that the sum of years from Adam down to the flood is 2242. From which diversity of computations arose the controversy concerning the reckoning of the years of the world between the Hebrews and the Greeks. [10] For the Hebrews number, from the founding of the world down to Christ, 3954 years; but the Greeks and Latins, 5199 years. But concerning this we shall speak somewhat more fully in the fifth book of this work, when we shall have come to the annotations on the fifth chapter of the book of Genesis.

THE REVELATION OF ADAM — which Adam himself saw, when God sent a sleep upon him, the Gnostic heretics first of all devised, as Epiphanius is author in the first [book] of the *Panarion*. Augustine, against Faustus, writes that the Manichaeans attached [to Adam] a book concerning the Genealogy, or the sons and daughters of Adam; which Gelasius, in the fifteenth distinction — together with another book, which is called the *Penitence of Adam* — enumerates among the damned scriptures.

THE ADAMANTINE SCRIPTURE — concerning this Jeremias speaks in these words: *THE SIN of Iuda is written with a pen of iron, with a point of adamant [diamond], graven upon the table of their heart, and on the horns of their altars* [11]. The irremissible sin, of which the prophet here speaks, is not only idolatry, but the death of Christ and the putting to flight of the apostles [12]; which sin [-*tum* → *peccatum*]

[*tum* →]

---

[1] A & Ω, one of the surnames of Christ the Lord [2] Apoc. 1:8 & 22:13 [3] Certain heretics thought that no truth can be found without the letters of the Greek alphabet [4] The twofold nature of Christ the Lord is signified by the letters A & Ω [5] Why Christ the Lord expressed himself by the letters A & Ω [6] 3 Kings 11:29-31 [7] Achias wrote a book of the deeds done by Salomon; 2 Par. 9:29 [8] Gen. 5 [9] The generations from Adam through Cain down to Noe are passed over as reprobate [10] Whence arose the disagreement between Hebrews and Greeks about the reckoning of the years of the world [11] Jer. 17:1 [12] The irremissible sin in Jeremias is the killing of Christ and the putting to flight of the Apostles

(printed p. 38 [PDF p. 51], verso — pagination back on track (37→38). The Adamantine Scripture concludes; the Gospel of the Egyptians; and the long entry on the Wisdom of the Egyptians. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *tum*] which [sin] is remitted neither in this world nor in the world to come, as concerns certain obstinate pharisees. Now it is said to be "Written" in a threefold manner. [1] First, in the heart of the Jews, because that sin of hatred against Christ and his cross sits very deeply in their most tenacious, hard, and impenitent heart. For even unto this present day the cross is a scandal to the Jews, and they curse it, approving the sin of their fathers. Secondly, it is said to be "Written on the horns of the altar," because the sin of idolatry had so settled in the hearts of the Jews that, as often as they stood by the altars, they exasperated God; for still the love of idols and of the high places sat in their minds, and only from fear did they abstain from worshipping them, and they longed rather to serve vain idols than the true God. So also now, in their synagogues and rites, the sin is "on the horns of the altars," for this reason: that the memory of the slain Christ is pleasing to them, and their inborn hatred still clings to the mind, and is as it were fresh in the hand; and by recollecting the ancient abominations of their fathers they delight themselves, blaspheming Christ in their prayers, and imprecating dire execrations upon Christians — though vain and without any effect. Thirdly, it is "Written with a point of adamant," that is, in the eternal memory of God, engraved in an indelible kind of writing; and the punishment of that very sin is incised, in perennial sculpture, in the immovable determination of the divine will.

THE GOSPEL OF THE EGYPTIANS — or According to the Egyptians — was in use among the Valentinian heretics. Clement of Alexandria, in the third [book] of the Stromata, refuted certain testimonies which, out of this work, Julius Cassianus and other followers of Valentinus brought to the confirmation of their dogmas. Epiphanius, in the second book of the *Panarion*, testifies that the Sabellians attempted, out of this gospel, to build up that the person of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is one and the same.

THE WISDOM OF THE EGYPTIANS — in Hebrew חכמת מצרים, *Chochemath Mizrijm*; in Greek Σοφία Αἰγυπτίων. This Stephen the protomartyr, in the Acts of the apostles, attributed to Moses, the leader of the Jews, for great praise, saying: *AND MOSES WAS LEARNED in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in works and in words* [Acts 7:22]. The Wisdom of the Egyptians, Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius, Iamblichus, Philo the Jew, and Eusebius of Caesarea indicate to have been divided into four parts, namely into the Mathematical, the Natural, the Divine, and the Moral. [2]

Now the Mathematical — which is distinguished into Geometry, Astronomy, Arithmetic, and Music — the ancient Egyptians exercised very greatly. For they cultivated Geometry out of necessity: since they especially had need of it, when, the bounds of the fields being disturbed as the Nile rose, after the river had returned into its own bed, each man's own [land] had to be restored to him; nor could the measurement of the fields hold good by any other means than by employing that [art] which, grown together out of fixed principles, could not deceive skilled measurers. Geometry, therefore, is so named as though [it were] "the measure of the earth." [3] To Astronomy they gave themselves for [this] advantage: that — since they always had serene nights, and beheld the tract of heaven lying widely open, disturbed by no clouds and no mists [4] — they could easily observe the risings, settings, progressions, and regressions of the stars; which thing was both most delightful for knowledge, and most fruitful for life, and worthy of the exercise of human wit. To these two arts, Geometry and Astronomy, was added Arithmetic, the knowledge of numbers — serving, as it were, both, and by whose ministry these two cannot go without. [5] But Music they only tasted, so far as seemed to them enough for chanting the praises of the gods, and of kings, and of heroes.

THE SECOND part of Egyptian Wisdom — which handles the principles, causes, elements, and works of natural things, called Physics — differs not much from the Peripatetic philosophy. [6] For they too lay down that Matter is the principle of all things, and out of it thereafter the four distinct elements, from which all mixed things and living creatures arise; that Heaven is round, after the likeness of a sphere; that all the Stars

have a certain fiery heat, by whose tempered commixtures all things upon the earth are born; that the Planets, or wandering stars, have their own souls; that rains come to be from the mutations of the air; and likewise very many other things similar to these.

THE THIRD part of this Wisdom, embracing the divine [matters], which is called Theology, has divers dogmas [7]: namely, that the World is begotten, and by its own nature mortal; that Men, in the first origin of all things, were first produced in Egypt — partly because of the temperateness of the climate, partly because of the Nile (for the region is oppressed neither by wintry colds nor by the ardors of the summer Sun, and the land is so fruitful by the irrigation of the Nile that no land is more fertile for the supply of nourishments); that the Human soul is perennial, and migrates from body into body; that God is one, the father and prince of all the gods, but that from him [come] the other gods, and that the Sun and the Moon are gods — the one called Osiris, the other Isis; that Temples, moreover, and statues are to be fabricated for the divers gods with divers images, because the true image of the gods is unknown; that Many of the gods were at first mortal men, but afterward, on account of their virtues and the outstanding benefits conferred upon men, attained divinity, and were honored by men with divine honors; that Images of animals — engraved by the leaders and emperors of the Egyptians upon their helmets and shields, and wont to be borne in battle against the enemy — [these], victory being thereafter obtained, they referred among the gods: the animals whose effigies the victorious leaders had borne, as though by them they had repelled the onset of war from the enemy.

THE EGYPTIAN THEOLOGIANS ALSO HAD a certain peculiar kind of writing, mystical and secret [8], in which they hid the more sublime mysteries of Theology and of divine worship, which they were above all unwilling to have divulged. Concerning which matter Clement, speaking in the fifth book of the Stromata, distinguishes the whole sum of Egyptian writing by a threefold discrimination: namely, into the Ἐπιστολογραφική, that is, the Epistolary, apt for writing common letters; into the Ἱερογραμματική, that is, the Sacerdotal, which they use who write of sacred things; and into the Ἱερογλυφική, that is, the Sacred, which is engraved. [9] Of which last there are indeed two kinds: the one Κυριολογική, that is, Properly-speaking, which is written by the letters themselves and the alphabetic elements, but with mystical and figured words; as, for example, "the Ibis partakes of the beauty of the Hawk from the Scarab" — that is, the Moon partakes of the beauty of God from the Sun, namely light, which is the image of the divine beauty. [10] But the other [kind is] Συμβολική, that is, Symbo-[lic]

[*lica* →]

[1] The sin of the Jews who killed Christ is said to be written in a threefold manner [2] The wisdom of the Egyptians was divided into four parts [3] The Egyptians cultivated Geometry [4] The sky in Egypt is disturbed by no clouds [5] Arithmetic serves Geometry and Astronomy [6] The part of Egyptian wisdom called Physics differs not much from Peripatetic philosophy [7] The theological dogmas of the Egyptians [8] The Egyptian theologians had a peculiar kind of writing [9] Egyptian writing is threefold: epistolary, sacerdotal, and sacred [10] What the "properly-speaking" writing was among the Egyptians

---

(printed p. 39 [PDF p. 52], recto — the Egyptian symbolic writing (with the Scythian riddle); Hermes Trismegistus; Moses's Egyptian learning; the entry on Agur begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *lica*], that is, Symbo-*lic*, or signifying by signs: which is threefold — namely, the Imitative, the Tropical, and the Aenigmatic. [1] Of which the Imitative is that which designates things by characters very like the things themselves: as they who wish to write "the Sun" draw a circle; and, wishing to signify "the Moon," they paint the image of two lunar horns. The Tropical, or Translative, is that which transfers the various forms and figures of divers things — especially of animals — to signify the dignities, fortunes, manners, virtues, vices, affections, and actions either of gods or of men. According to which signification, among the Egyptian theologians, the image of a Hawk signifies God; the figure of a Scarab, the Sun; the picture of an Ibis, the Moon; the form of a Man, prudence and skill; a Lion, fortitude; a Horse, liberty; a Crocodile, shamelessness; a Fish, hatred. [2] The Aenigmatic is that which results from the conjunction and mutual mingling of these images — in which manner the Sphinx, an image composed of a human head and a lion's

body, is engraved upon temples, altars, and other sacred things, to signify that all divine things are to us aenigmatic and obscure. [3] The Sun stamped upon a Crocodile — which is nourished no less in water than on land — signifies that the Sun, after the likeness of the Crocodile, takes its nourishment for the meteoric things partly from water, partly from earth. The royal Scepter, upon whose top an eye and an ear stand, signifies God moderating, seeing, and hearing all things. They report that with this symbolic kind of writing the Scythians also were delighted [4]; whose king Idanthyras — as Pherecydes the Syrian relates — when king Darius, having crossed the river Ister, threatened war by letters and the devastation of the region unless the Scythians should obey him, sent back to him, in place of letters, a symbol: a mouse, a frog, a bird, an arrow [*iaculum*], a plough. And when, as was fitting, a doubt had arisen concerning these things, Orontopagas, a tribune of the soldiers, said that they [the Scythians] would deliver their empire to Darius — [reading] habitations out of the mouse, waters out of the frog, air out of the bird, arms out of the arrow, and fields out of the plough. But Xyphodres, interpreting to the contrary, said: *Unless forthwith, like the birds, we fly away; or, like the mice, go under the earth; or, like the frogs, enter the water — we shall not escape their arrows [*iacula*]; but their fields, being slain, we shall fatten, or, being taken and sent under the yoke, we shall cleave with the plough.* [5]

THE FOURTH and last part of Egyptian Wisdom looks to morals and to the political manner of living; whose laws and institutes Laertius refers to Mercurius — whom the Greeks called Trismegistus, that is, Thrice-greatest, because he was both a greatest philosopher, and a greatest priest, and a greatest king. Under whose name there now are extant two Dialogues, the *Pimander* and the *Asclepius*; in which he brought forth so many oracles worthy of admiration concerning God, the Trinity, the advent of Christ, and the last judgment, that he seems not a philosopher only, but a prophet foreknowing things to come. [6] Iamblichus, in the book *Of the mysteries of the Egyptians*, relates that this Mercurius was the author and prince not only of philosophy, but of the whole of Egyptian Wisdom; and he produces the testimony of Seleucus and of Manetho [*Menetus*], ancient authors, asserting that he wrote, concerning the whole wisdom of the Egyptians, thirty-six thousand five hundred and twenty-five books [36,525]; in which are reviewed, part by part, *Of the empyrean gods* a hundred books, *Of the aethereal gods* a hundred books, *Of the celestial gods* [→] a thousand books. [7] Of which the most part have been translated out of the Egyptian tongue into Greek by men not unskilled in Philosophy; and for this cause they seem written in the Greek style. Of these, Clement, in the sixth [book] of the Stromata, writes that in his own age there were extant among the Egyptians the books written below — that is: *Of the whole philosophy of the Egyptians*, thirty-three books; *Of medicine*, six books; *Of the sacerdotal [matters]*, ten; *Of astrology*, four books.

AND LET THESE THINGS have been said concerning the Wisdom of the Egyptians; in which Philo, in the first book *Of the life of Moses*, affirms that Moses was most fully instructed [8], writing thus: *MOSES, therefore, took from the Egyptian teachers numbers and geometry, and the whole of music — rhythmic, harmonic, metric, whether contemplative or bringing itself forth in divers manners by voices and instruments; but above all the occult philosophy, described by the letters which they call hieroglyphic, that is, by the marks of animals, which they themselves venerate for deities. And the Chaldaeans, called out from the neighboring regions, taught the science of the stars; and this too he [Moses] learned from the Egyptians.* Justin, philosopher and martyr, dissenting somewhat from Philo, in the book of Questions set forth by the Gentiles, asserts that Moses, the study of all the Mathematics (which were then common and cheap in Egypt) [9] being laid aside, applied his mind to the Hieroglyphic disciplines alone — which then among the Egyptians alone were in honor and price, and were delivered secretly, in hidden places, not to any whomsoever, but to chief and most approved men. These, when Moses had learned them, nevertheless he never said or did anything according to them which was contrary to the worship of the one true God. For that which Stephen, immediately after those words, *MOSES WAS LEARNED IN ALL THE WISDOM OF THE EGYPTIANS*, added — *AND HE WAS MIGHTY IN WORKS AND IN WORDS* [10] — is not so to be understood that we should believe Moses to have worked any miracles by the power of Egyptian wisdom, but to have

accomplished wondrous works by the power of the true God alone. Clement, in the fifth [book] of the Stromata, writes that Moses, according to this custom of the hieroglyphic doctrine, delivered many precepts of the moral life hidden under the tropical and mystical symbols of animals, open only to the lovers of the divine law: such as are, *NEITHER OF THE SWINE, NOR OF THE EAGLE, NOR OF THE HAWK, NOR OF THE RAVEN IS ONE TO EAT.* [11] For the Swine, because it is an animal given to pleasure and unclean, is a symbol of gluttony and of lust, signifying the greed of foods, and intemperance in the venereal act, and a life defiled, lying in the mire of vices — which is fattened unto slaughter and destruction. [12] But by the interdict of the Eagle, the Hawk, and the Raven, he shows that those are not to be imitated who, by labor and virtue, neither know nor will to provide themselves a living, but live by rapine and iniquity: for the Eagle signifies rapine, the Hawk injustice, the Raven avarice.

AGVR the Jew, son of Iake [Jakeh], at the exhortation of his friends Ithiel and Uchal, put forth a certain parenetic [hortatory] prophecy [13] — *Of two things to be sought from God; Of the four kinds of worst men; Of the four difficult things; Of the four smallest living creatures, endowed with exceeding wisdom; Of the four animals that go well* — the sum of which is reported in the thirtieth chapter of Proverbs. [14] Aben Ezra thinks this Agur [→ *Agurem*]

[*Agurem* →]

[1] The symbolic writing of the Egyptians is threefold [2] Imitative writing; Tropical writing [3] Aenigmatic writing; what the Sphinx signified among the Egyptians [4] The Scythians used symbolic writing [5] The Scythian riddle [6] In the dialogues of Trismegistus there are many things worthy of admiration [7] The books of Mercurius Trismegistus on the wisdom of the Egyptians — 36,525 [8] Moses was perfectly instructed in the wisdom of the Egyptians [9] The mathematical disciplines in the time of Moses were common in Egypt [10] Acts 7:22 [11] Lev. 11 [12] Why certain animals were forbidden to the Jews by Moses [13] The prophecy of Agur [14] Prov. 30

(printed p. 40 [PDF p. 53], verso — leaf physically stamps "38" (the print duplicates folios 38–39; intended folio 40). The Agur entry concludes; Alexander the Great and his letters; Alexander Balas; the Acts of Andrew. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *Agurem*] this Agur to have been a certain man of upright life and of great wisdom, whose sayings and sentences Salomon translated into the book of his Proverbs. Kubenaki [so printed — a Hebrew authority; the name is uncertain] of the Hebrews thinks this [Agur] to have been Salomon himself. For אגור *Agur* sounds "the Gatherer"; and Salomon gathered together the words of Wisdom, and drew them forth — which is what יקה *Iake* [Jakeh] signifies. And he called it a prophecy on account of איתיאל *Ithiel*, that is, the Wives, of whom he had very many. But אכל *Vchal* signifies "I shall be able"; for Salomon presumed many things, and was able [to do them]. And to this opinion our vulgate edition seems to favor, which, in place of that which is read in the Hebrew — אבל ... המשא נאם הגבר לאיתיאל לאיתיאל ואכל ... דברי אגור בן יקה, *dibre Agur ben Iake, ha-massa neum ha-gever le-Ithiel, le-Ithiel ve-Vchal* — that is, *The words of Agur, son of Iake; the Prophecy which that man spoke to Ithiel — to Ithiel, I say, and to Vchal* — thus translated [it]: *The words of the Gatherer, son of the Vomiter; the vision which the man spoke, with whom is God, and who, God abiding with him, was strengthened.* And this sense Jerome, or rather Beda, follows in the commentaries on the Proverbs. Lyranus adds that there are some among the Jews who think this to be a prophecy of the penitent Salomon, after he had returned to his senses from the error into which, now an old man, he had slipped through love of his concubines; whose opinions the same Lyranus confutes with many arguments. [1]

ALEXANDER, king of the Macedonians, surnamed the Great — whose deeds are most briefly touched at the beginning of the book of Maccabees [2] — gave pains, no less accurate than pleasing, in writing letters to his friends; in which, however (as Plutarch writes in [the life of] Phocion), after Darius had been conquered by him, and the surname of Great had been taken up, he bade no mortal "health," except Phocion the Athenian and Antipater the Macedonian [3]: whom two, for honor's sake, he bade to be greeted at the beginning of his letters. Plutarch, in [the life of] Alexander, reviews the letters of Alexander written below:

• **TO ANTIPATER** the Macedonian, concerning things done by himself in Asia and India, very many letters; which the writers of Alexander's history used as commentaries.

• **TO DARIUS,** king of the Persians, whom he invited kindly to himself, two letters.

• **TO PHOCION,** refusing his gifts, a lamentatory letter.

• **TO PHILOXENUS,** the prefect of his fleet, studious of a preposterous lust, an upbraiding letter.

• **TO LEONIDAS,** his pedagogue, a letter.

• **TO OLYMPIAS,** his mother, concerning the hidden oracles and vaticinations of Hammon, a letter.

• **TO THE ATHENIANS,** one letter.

• **TO PEUCESTES,** one letter.

• **TO HEPHAESTION,** one letter.

• **TO MEGABYZUS,** that he should offer no violence to one fleeing to the sacred temple, a letter.

• **TO ATTALUS** and Alcetas, concerning the conspiracy of Hermolaus, a letter.

• **TO ALEXIPPUS** the physician, a Eucharistic [thanksgiving] letter.

• **TO PAUSANIAS** the physician, one letter.

• **TO ARISTOTLE,** his preceptor, concerning the books of the Metaphysics published by him, a letter; of which this is the extant copy:

ALEXANDER TO ARISTOTLE, FELICITY.

Not rightly hast thou done, that thou hast published the speculative disciplines. For in what shall we excel the rest, if those things in which we have been instructed begin to be common to all? For I had rather excel in singular learning than in power. Farewell.

This desire for glory Aristotle so consoled, that he excused the books as being published just as if they had not been published. Cyprian, in the treatise *On the vanity of idols*, relates that Alexander wrote to his mother a notable volume, in which he signified that it had been revealed to him by a certain priest in what manner the men of the [pagan] gods had been. Augustine, in books 8 and 12 *Of the city of God*, makes mention of the letter of Alexander to Olympias; in which is recited the narration of a certain high-priest of the Egyptian rites, who, among the other things which he brought forth out of the secret Egyptian letters concerning the hidden mysteries of the gods, laid this also open concerning the times of the kingdoms: namely, that the kingdom of the Assyrians preceded the kingdom of the Persians by five thousand years; but that the empire of the Persians and Macedonians, down to Alexander (to whom the priest was speaking), had lasted more than eight thousand years. Which narration Augustine there shows to be fabulous and false, not only from the sacred letters, but from the histories of the nations also. Alexander dies in the 31st year of his age, before the birth of Christ 323, on the 28th day of the month of June, about sunset. [4]

ALEXANDER the King, son of Antiochus king of Syria [Alexander Balas], wrote, for entering a league with the Jews, to Jonathan the pontiff of Jerusalem, one letter; whose copy thou hast in 1 Macc. 10. [5]

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW — reproved by Gelasius in distinction 15, as Innocentius writes in the decretal epistle to Exuperius — Nexocharidas and Leonidas the Philosophers forged. [6] Philastrius, in the catalog of heresies, chapter 48: *THE MANICHAEANS have,* he says, *the Apocrypha of the blessed Apostle Andrew, that is, the acts which he did coming from Pontus into Greece; which his disciples then wrote down, following the Apostle.* Augustine, in the book *On faith, against the Manichaeans*, narrates that Leucius the Manichaean committed to writing certain Acts of Andrew, in which, concerning Andrew the Apostle and Maximilla the wife of Egeas, many things worthy of laughter are read; which there, if thou be at leisure, thou canst see in chapter 38. Eusebius, in the 3rd [book] of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 25: *OF ANDREW*, he says, *and of the other Apostles, the Acts are nowhere at all mentioned in the writings of the*

ancients who succeeded the Apostles; in which the very style is found much diverse from the ecclesiastical custom; the sense too, and all the things which are inserted in them, are far dissonant from the apostolic faith. Whence they are proved to be fictions of heretical depravity; wherefore they are not to be placed even among those writings of which we have said there is doubt, but, as utterly alien and discrepant from the rule of piety, to be driven away. Thus Eusebius.

[*AN-* →]

---

[1] Prov. 30 [2] 1 Macc. 1 [3] Alexander the Great, after Darius was conquered, gave a greeting to only two men in his letters [4] Alexander dies 323 years before the birth of Christ [5] 1 Macc. 10 [6] The Acts of the Apostle Andrew are apocryphal

---

(printed p. 41 [PDF p. 54], recto — leaf physically stamps "39" (a duplicate; intended folio 41). The three Antiochi with their edicts and letters, then the writings ascribed to the Apostles. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS. Signature: D 3.)

ANTIOCHVS, by surname Epiphanes — that is, illustrious, or noble — the eighth king of Syria and Asia, after he had violated the treaty which he had entered with the Jews, and had despoiled the holy city of its riches and the temple of its votive-gifts and all its ornaments, sent into Judaea books published by himself, *Of transferring the Jewish worship into the Greek religion*; and compelled all the Jews to live according to the laws prescribed in them. Of which the chief chapters, gathered by us out of the books of Maccabees and of Josephus, were these: [1]

1. Let all the JEWS, the worship of their God being abjured, henceforth worship the deities of the Greeks; and, the laws and institutes of their fathers being cast off, let them transfer themselves to the laws, rites, and manners of the Greeks. They who shall have done otherwise, let them be afflicted with the utmost and greatest punishments. 2. Let the VOLUMES of the Jewish law, wheresoever they shall have been found, together with those with whom it shall have happened that they be found, be burnt up with flames. 3. Let the TEMPLE which is in Jerusalem be dedicated to Jupiter Olympius, and be called by his name. But the temple which is situated on the Garizite mount of Samaria [Mount Gerizim], let it receive the dedication and appellation of Jupiter Hospitalis [Ξένιος, the God of guests]. 4. Let the HOLOCAUSTS, the propitiations, and the rest of the sacrifices of the Jews — the Sabbaths also, and their other feasts, whether monthly or annual — be utterly abrogated. 5. Let an ALTAR be placed in the midst of the Jerusalem temple; and, the image of Jupiter Olympius being erected upon it, let swine's sacrifices — most alien from the Jewish superstition — be offered daily upon it. 6. Let there be BUILT, town by town throughout all Judaea, [altars] upon temples and altars sustaining the statues of the Greek deities; and let swine victims be slaughtered upon them on every single day. 7. IF ANY men or women shall, after these things, have dared to circumcise their infants, let them, tortured with most cruel torments, while yet alive and breathing, be affixed to crosses; and their children, strangled, be hung from the necks of the parents.

THE SAME Antiochus, when, for the unjustly afflicted nation of the Jews, he was divinely tormented with an intolerable disease [2], wrote a little before death a suppliant letter to the Jews; in which, with all submission of words, he besought them that, mindful of the benefits which they had formerly received from the kings of Asia, they would keep inviolate faith and obedience toward Antiochus the king, his son and successor. Which writing, amid horrible torments, worms flowing from his whole body, he miserably perished, in the year before Christ was born 161. [3]

ANTIOCHVS Eupator, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, the ninth king of Syria and Asia, wrote two letters: one to Lysias, the procurator and overseer of his affairs; the other to the senate of the Jews — by which he magnificently restored to the nation of the Jews the worship of God, the use of the temple, and the observance of the ancestral law, taken away by his father — in the year before Christ was born 161. The copy of each is read in the second book of Maccabees, chapter 11.

ANTIOCHVS Sedetes [Sidetes], the thirteenth king of Syria and Asia, who, adopted as a son by his brother Demetrius, succeeded him in the kingdom, wrote to Simon the high priest, and to the senate of the Jews, one letter, asking in it that it might be lawful for him to lead his army against his enemies through the regions of the Jews without any harm, in the year before Christ was born 137.

THE VARIOUS WRITINGS OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, as well received as rejected, are cited among the ancient authors [4]; of which, those that now come to our memory are these:

THE EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLES, written from the third [council] of Jerusalem to the brethren of Antioch of Syria and Cilicia, is had in Luke, Acts chapter 15. See below, letter C, under the word *Concilium*.

THE SEALING [OR ATTESTATION] OF THE LIVES OF THE APOSTLES, or of all the disciples — a scripture of honorable antiquity, which Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth catechesis reviews by name among the canonical Scriptures of the new testament. There are those who think this "sealing" to be nothing else than the Symbol of the Apostles, of which we shall speak soon. [5]

SOME CANONS OF THE APOSTLES, published through Clement, John Damascene, in the fourth book *Of the faith*, chapter 18, places in the catalog of the divine Scriptures of the new testament.

THE FIFTY CANONS OF THE APOSTLES, written by Clement — of which the first is, *Let a BISHOP be ordained by two or three bishops* — Pope Leo IX, against the epistle of Nicetas the Abbot, receives among the writings of orthodox faith; but Isidorus, in the preface of the Councils, rejects among the Apocrypha. See below in [the entry] *Clemens*.

THE SIXTY CANONS OF THE APOSTLES Pope Zephyrinus approves, in his first epistle, in these words: *SIXTY sentences the Apostles prescribed, together with very many other bishops, which they judged ought to be kept.*

THE EIGHTY-FIVE CANONS OF THE APOSTLES the third Constantinopolitan council — which is called the Sixth synod — confirms and wills to be ratified, in the second chapter.

THE CONSTITUTIONS AND TRADITIONS OF THE APOSTLES, brought forth in writing, Epiphanius frequently alleges, especially in the 3rd book of the *Panarion*; where he recites three canons in particular: the First, of Pascha not to be celebrated on the fourteenth Moon; the Second, by which, under penalty of anathema, the fasting of the Lord's day is forbidden; the Third, by which priests are forbidden to cut off the beard. See in [the entries] *Audiani* and *Massaliani*.

THE SYMBOL OF THE APOSTLES [the Creed] — which Erasmus, in the preface of the Paraphrase on Matthew, most openly says he knows not whether it was brought forth by the Apostles — all orthodox fathers affirm to have been founded by the Apostles themselves. [6] Among the rest, Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, in the preface of the exposition on the Symbol of the Apostles published by him, writes thus about this matter: *OUR ELDERS hand down, that after the ascension of the Lord, when, through the advent of the Holy Spirit, tongues of fire had settled upon each one of the Apostles, that they might speak with divers speeches, this precept was given them by the Lord: to preach the word of God, and to set out each to the several nations. About to depart, therefore, from one another, they first constitute for themselves in common a norm of the future preaching, lest perchance some, led elsewhere, [should teach] a diverse [→ diversum]*

[*sum* →]

[1] Impious laws passed by Antiochus [2] Antiochus, for having unjustly afflicted the Jews, was tormented with a most grievous disease [3] Antiochus died 162 years before the birth of Christ [4] The various writings of the twelve Apostles [5] The "sealing" of the Apostles is thought to be the Symbol of the Apostles [6] The Symbol of the Apostles was set forth by the Apostles themselves

(printed p. 42 [PDF p. 55], verso — leaf physically stamps "40" (running ~2 low; intended folio 42). The Apostles' Creed with its twelve clauses, and a long run of apocryphal apostolic writings. Running head:

BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *sum*] [lest perchance some, led elsewhere, should teach a diver]*se* something to those who were being invited to the faith of Christ. All of them, therefore, being set in one place, and filled with the Holy Spirit, by conferring into one that brief token — as we have said — of their future preaching, compose that which each one felt; and they establish that this is to be given to believers as a rule. And they willed this to be called the Symbol, for many and most just causes. Thus Rufinus. [1] But the divine Augustine, in the second sermon of Palm Sunday, expounding what part of the Symbol each several Apostle [the print reads *quinque*, "five" — apparently for *quique*, "each"; the clauses below are twelve, one per Apostle] contributed, speaks in this manner: *That which in Greek is called Symbol, in Latin is named Collation [a bringing-together]. It is therefore called a Collation, because the faith of the whole catholic law, brought together into one, is gathered in the brevity of the Symbol; whose text we shall now tell you, God assenting:*

- **PETER** said: *I believe in God the Father almighty.*
- **JOHN** said: *Creator of heaven and earth.*
- **JAMES** said: *And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.*
- **ANDREW** said: *Who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary.*
- **PHILIP** said: *Suffered under Pontius Pilate, crucified, dead, and buried.*
- **THOMAS** said: *He descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead.*
- **BARTHOLOMEW** [said]: *He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father almighty.*
- **MATTHEW** said: *Thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.*
- **JAMES [son] of Alphaeus** [said]: *I believe also in the Holy Spirit, the holy Catholic Church.*
- **SIMON Zelotes** said: *The communion of Saints; the remission of sins.*
- **JUDAS [son] of James** said: *The resurrection of the flesh.*
- **MATTHIAS** completed: *Life everlasting. Amen.*

THE BOOK OF THE APOSTLES, which they, gathered together at once in Jerusalem, wrote, the Christian Ethiopians — translated into the Ethiopic tongue — venerate with equal honor as the divine volumes. Witness is Francisco Alvarez, in the Ethiopic itinerary, chapter 81.

THE EIGHT BOOKS OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, written in Greek, Carolus Capellus the Venetian lately found in Crete, and translated their Greek epitome into Latin; which is inserted in the first tome of the councils. But the whole and entire books Joannes, bishop of Osma [*Ostuniensis*], a man notable for piety and erudition, translated.

SOME CANONS OF THE APOSTLES, published by heretics, Gelasius reproves in the Decretals, distinction 15; and Isidorus, in the decretals, distinction 16.

CERTAIN ACTIONS OF THE APOSTLES Clement is testified to have written, by the eighty-fourth canon — which is had under the name of Clement at the beginning of the first tome of the councils.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES ACCORDING TO EBION, stuffed with error and impiety, Epiphanius reviews among the writings of the Ebionites, book 1 against the heresies.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, devised by Leucius the Manichaean, Augustine refutes in the book *Of faith, against the Manichaeans*.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES under the name of Luke, full of fables, a certain Asian presbyter, studious of Paul, forged; whom Jerome, in the book *Of illustrious men*, reports to have been convicted of the fraud. See below in [the entry] *Paulus*.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES is rejected by Athanasius in the Synopsis, and by Eusebius in the 3rd [book] of the ecclesiastical history, chapter 25.

THE GOSPEL OF THE APOSTLES, or the gospel which is entitled *According to the Twelve Apostles*, Origen, in the 1st homily on Luke, enumerates among the Apocrypha. Jerome, in the 3rd book against the Pelagians, indicates that the Gospel *According to the Apostles* is the same as that of the Nazarenes, or the Gospel of the Hebrews.

THE ITINERARY OF THE APOSTLES is repudiated in the fifth Action of the second Nicene council.

THE MEMORIAL OF THE APOSTLES was a work very familiar to the Priscillianist heretics; which Orosius mentions in the epistle to Augustine, concerning the errors of the Priscillianists.

THE LOTS OF THE APOSTLES are reproved in the Decretals, distinction 15, and in cause 26, question 7, chapter *NON OBSERVETIS* [Ye shall not observe].

WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLES counterfeited by Dictinnius the heretic, are condemned in the council of Braga [*Bracarense*], canon seventeen.

THE LIVES OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES. These — as James, Archbishop of Genoa [Jacobus de Voragine], in the book of the annual solemnities, and Peter, bishop of Equilium [Petrus de Natalibus], in the 9th book of the catalog of Saints, report — Abdias, first bishop of Babylon, ordained by the Apostles themselves, wrote in Hebrew; which Eutropius, disciple of Abdias, translated from Hebrew into Greek, and Julius Africanus into Latin — but, as I think, Julius wrote not in Latin, but in Greek. Lately, out of Germany, under the title of this Abdias, came forth ten books *Of the history of the Apostolic contest*, printed by the types of Oporinus; which Pope Paul IV, as unworthy of credit, rejected among the writings condemned by him. [2]

THE REVELATIONS OF THE GREAT APOSTLE. Of this work Gaius, disciple of Origen, in the dialogue of his disputations, writes thus: *CERINTHUS, by certain revelations, which he would have to be thought written as by the Great Apostle and revealed to him through angels, introduces to us such portents [as these]: that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ shall be earthly, in Jerusalem, and that men shall again have, in the flesh, a manner of life subject to lusts and vices. Against the faith of the scriptures also he designates a thousand years, in which he says there shall be many works of corruption, and festivities of marriages, for the deceiving of those who are given to lust.*

THE APOSTOLIC BOOK is a volume gathered by Marcion the heretic out of the testimonies of the epistles of Paul, many of them adulterated and mutilated. Its copy is inserted by Epiphanius in the 1st book against the heresies, in the confutation of Marcion. Epiphanius and Theodoret have recorded that Manes — or Manichaeus the Persian, who said he was the Paraclete [3] — took to himself twelve disciples, whom he called Apostles, each [→ *singulos*]

[*singu-* →]

[1] St. Augustine's judgment concerning the Apostles' Creed [2] Abdias's ten books on the history of the Apostolic contest were rejected by Paul IV, yet not by the Index of prohibited books of the Council of Trent [3] Manes asserted himself to be the Paraclete

(printed p. 43 [PDF p. 56], recto — leaf physically stamps "41" (running ~2 low). The inscription of the Athenian altar (Paul at the Areopagus); Aratus; Aristobulus; Ahasuerus. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS. Signature: D 3.)

[→ *singu-*] [each]-*lar one*, imposing on each of them one name out of the names of the Apostles of Christ. These, when they had published many volumes of their doctrine with the names of those [Apostles] prefixed, easily obtained that their writings should be believed to be [the writings] of the holy Apostles.

THE INSCRIPTION OF THE ATHENIAN ALTAR. There was once at Athens a certain Altar with an inscription — as Oecumenius reports — of this kind: Θεοῖς Ἀσίας, καὶ Εὐρώπης, καὶ Λιβύης, θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ, καὶ ξένῳ. That is, *To the gods of Asia and Europe and Libya, to an unknown and foreign God.* From this, Paul the Apostle — when he was about to speak before the assembly to the Athenians in the court of Mars [the Areopagus] — most artfully drew the argument of his speech, in these words (as Luke writes in the Apostolic Acts), beginning: *MEN of Athens, in all things I see you as it were superstitious. For passing by, and seeing your simulacra, I found also an altar on which was written, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this I announce to you: God, who made the world, and all things which are in it,* &c. [1] By which words Paul, with a certain color and rhetorical craft, [2] shows that he persuades them nothing else than that they should do what they were already doing of their own accord — that is, that they worship God, whom they already worshipped, and had marked beforehand on an altar under the name of the unknown.

Now Oecumenius reports two causes why that inscription was had, ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. [3] The one: that when the Athenians had sent messengers to the Lacedaemonians, to pray that they might come to their aid against the army of the Persians invading Greece, a spectre of Pan appeared to the messengers near the Parthenium, accusing the Athenians that, neglecting him, they worshipped other gods; and he promised that he would be a help to them for the future, out of his good will toward them. When therefore the Athenians had obtained the victory, they erected a temple to him, and built an altar; and — as it were taking heed lest the same, or something like it, should befall them, if they should pass over any god unknown to them — they erected that altar, inscribing, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD: as if to say, *If any other God is yet unknown to us, in his honor we erect this altar, that he may be propitious to us — although, since he is unknown, he is not [now] worshipped.* But the other cause he brings is this: The Athenians once labored under a most grievous plague; and when they had implored the aid of all the gods whom they worshipped, with many vows, prayers, and sacrifices, they felt no help. Understanding therefore that there was perhaps some strong God whom they had left without honor, who, being angry, was sending the plague, they built a new altar, and inscribed it, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD; which done, at once the plague ceased. This inscription, therefore, Paul, having by chance descried it, twisted into an argument of the evangelical preaching — using the artifice of that place which the rhetoricians call *from Chance-occurrences* [*a Fortuitis*], when, that is, they turn certain chance events into an argument for the things whereof they are about to speak: as Philostratus writes, in the *Sophists,* concerning Leo of Byzantium the sophist. [4] Who, when he had come forth to the Athenian people (as he was of a fat and very corpulent body) to persuade concord, and the people, at the sight of the man's enormous bulk, straightway began to laugh, he, nothing moved, said: *Ye laugh? — my wife is fatter than I; and yet one little bed holds us, when we agree; but when we disagree, not even the whole house.* And when at these words the people had raised a greater laugh, he presently added [the moral]; and thus he turned the chance laughter into [an argument] for persuading concord.

ARATVS, a most learned poet, and physician of Antigonus the Macedonian king, of Soli, a city of Cilicia (which took its name from Solon, son of Lindus, and was afterward called Pompeiopolis), was born of Athenodorus — or, as some prefer, of Mnaseas his father, and Leonodora his mother; and under Dionysius Heracleotes, Aristoteres [Ariston?] the mathematician, and Persius the poet, he gave himself to liberal studies in the city of Athens. He had also three brothers, Myris, Calondas, and Athenodorus; the first of whom is said to have contradicted Zoilus, who wrote against the poesy of Homer. He himself, among the various works of his studies, published an astronomical book, Φαινόμενα — that is, "APPEARANCES foreknown" — in which he most elegantly sang, in heroic verses, the constitution of the whole celestial sphere, and the images, figures, risings, and settings of all the fixed stars. This, into the Latin tongue and hexameter verse, [5] translated M. T. Cicero, Germanicus Caesar (son of Octavius Augustus), Sextus Avienus Rufus (contemporary with the divine Jerome), and very many others, whom it would be long to enumerate. From this [Aratus] Paul the Apostle — as is read in the 17th chapter of the Apostolic Acts, when in the Areopagus,

which is the court of the Athenians, he was preaching to the people — took a testimony that we are all of God, saying: *IN HIM we live, and are moved, and are; as also certain of your poets have said:* [6]

> Τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν — *that is,*
>
> *For we are also his offspring.*

Which hemistich the Phaenomenon poet brought forth, in his preface, concerning Jove; for when he had begun the work from that verse, ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα [*Let us begin from Jove*], a little after he inserted, *We are also his offspring.* Which [saying] Paul, having observed to have been attributed to Jove perversely and altogether unjustly, restored most justly to God. Aratus flourished in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and lived illustrious in the court of Antigonus, son of Demetrius, who took the empire of the Macedonians in the hundred and fifth olympiad. [7]

ARISTOBVLVS, a priest and philosopher, by race a Jew — to whom is extant the letter of the senate of Jerusalem, which is read at the beginning of the second book of Maccabees — wrote to Ptolemy Philometor, his disciple, most learned commentaries on Moses (which Eusebius records in the Chronicles), and a book, to the same, *Of the members of God*; from which Eusebius produces a testimony, in the 8th book of the evangelical Preparation. See this same thing more fully in the fourth book, in the entry *Aristobulus the Younger*.

ASSVERVS [Ahasuerus], whom the Greeks [call] Artaxerxes, [and] Josephus hands down [to be] Cyrus, son of Xerxes, wrote various things, of which [some] are cited in the sacred volumes:

- **THE COMMENTARIES OF THE DIVINE ACTIONS** [*Divinarum Actionum commentarij*]. Esther 12.
- **TO THE PREFECTS** of the hundred and twenty-seven provinces of his empire, concerning the utterly destroying of the nation of the Jews, one letter. Esther 8 & 13. Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, chapter 6.
- **TO THE SAME,** for the safety and security of the whole Jewish nation, another letter, revocatory of the former. 1 Esdras 8 & 16. Josephus in the same place.

[*BA-* → (catchword; signature D 3)]

---

[1] Acts 17:22-24 [2] Paul the supreme rhetorician [3] Two causes why the altar was inscribed to the unknown God [4] A witty and pointed saying of Leo of Byzantium [5] Many translated the book of Aratus into the Latin tongue [6] Acts 17:28 [7] 2 Macc. 1

---

*(printed p. 44 [PDF p. 57], verso — leaf physically stamps "42" (running ~2 low). The catalog reaches letter **B**: Balaam; Barnabas (with fragments of his epistle); Bartholomew; the Book of the Wars of the Lord. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

B

BALAAM, son of Beor, of the region of Ammonitis, by profession a diviner and soothsayer, whose vaticinations Moses wrote down in the book of Numbers, is believed to have left books of his divinations to his posterity. Concerning which Origen, in the thirteenth homily on Numbers, writes thus [1] [2]: *IF the Prophecies of Balaam are inserted by Moses into the sacred volumes, how much more were they written down by those who then inhabited Mesopotamia — among whom Balaam was held in high renown, and whose disciples it is agreed were [masters] of his art? From him, finally, the race and institution of the Magi is reported to flourish in the parts of the Orient; who, having among themselves all the things described which Balaam had prophesied, had also this written, that A STAR SHALL RISE OUT OF JACOB, AND A MAN SHALL ARISE OUT OF ISRAEL. These writings the Magi had among themselves; and therefore, when Jesus was born, they recognized the star, and understood the prophecy to be fulfilled — more than they*

[themselves knew], since the people of Israel despised to hear the words of the holy prophets. They, therefore, out of these only which Balaam's writings had left, recognizing that the time was at hand, came; and, seeking him, straightway adored him. The author of the Imperfect Work on Matthew, chapter 2, subscribing to Origen, says: *I HAVE READ, in a certain author, that these Magi received, out of the books of Balaam the diviner, the knowledge of this star that was to appear — whose divination is placed in the old testament: A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a man shall arise out of Israel, and shall rule over all nations.*

THE DOCTRINE OF BALAAM cited in the 2nd chapter of the Apocalypse — this, as some falsely suppose, is not a certain hidden scripture, but the wicked counsel by which he himself admonished king Balac: that, if he wished to destroy the nation of the Jews, he should draw the sons of Israel to fornication and the worship of idols, sending to them most beautiful women who might allure and inflame them to lust, and by this pact lead the allured into the rites of the gentiles. See this history in Numbers, chapter 24.

BARNABAS the Cyprian (who [is] also Joseph the Levite, one of the seventy-two disciples of the Lord, ordained with Paul an Apostle of the gentiles, and afterward separated from Paul on account of John the disciple, who was also called Marcus) [3] exercised the work of evangelical preaching enjoined upon him until the seventh year of Nero; in which he fell, crowned with martyrdom by his own Cyprians. [4] Clement the Roman pontiff, in the first book of the Recognitions, writes that he came into Italy; and Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, in the Synopsis, testifies that he was the first bishop of the city of Milan. He wrote one epistle pertaining to the edification of the church; out of which, in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria, I found these fragments, or testimonies, scattered here and there:

Fragments of the Epistle which is attributed to Barnabas

> *MORE SIMPLY I write to you, that ye may understand. May God, who is Lord of the whole world, give to us also wisdom and understanding, knowledge, and the cognition of his justification, and tolerance. Before we believed God, the habitation of our heart was obnoxious to destruction, and weak — truly a temple built by hand, because it was full of the worship of idols, and was a house of demons, in that it did whatsoever things are contrary to God. Take heed, that the temple of the Lord may be gloriously built: learn ye to have received the remission of sins, and to have hoped in [his] name. Wherefore in our habitation God dwells; in us is the word of faith, the calling of his promise, the wisdom of the justifications, and the mandates of the doctrine. With your faith, therefore, that ye may have also perfect knowledge — let fear and tolerance be co-adjutors of faith. But those which bring help to these are longanimity and continence; with which, abiding chastely, together with them rejoice wisdom, knowledge, understanding, and cognition.*

THESE things out of Clement; whose disciple Origen, in the third book *Periarchon* [*Of principles*], writes thus: *BARNABAS, in his epistle, declares that there are two ways, one of light, the other of darkness; over which he says that certain angels preside — over the way of light, indeed, the angels of God; but over the way of darkness, the angels of Satan.* Thus much concerning the epistle of Barnabas — besides which, Tertullian thinks that [the epistle] which is inscribed under the name of Paul to the Hebrews was composed by him. [5] [6] He also translated the Gospel of Matthew from Hebrew into Greek; of which Theodorus the reader, in the second book of the Collectanea, makes mention in this manner: *THE RELICS of Barnabas the Apostle were found in Cyprus, under a carob tree, having under the breast the Gospel of Matthew, written by the hand of Barnabas himself.* [7] *On which occasion the Cyprians came off victors — that their metropolis should have a free episcopate, and not be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Antiochene bishop. But that Gospel the emperor Zeno reserved in his own palace.* There is also another gospel under the name of Barnabas, which, by Gelasius, distinction 15, is computed among the Apocrypha.

BARTHOLOMEW the Apostle, who delivered the Gospel of Matthew, written in Hebrew letters, to the Indians who are called *Fortunati* [the Fortunate], [8] is thought to have written a Gospel; and out of it Dionysius the Areopagite, at the beginning of the Mystical Theology, is thought to have brought forth a testimony in these words: *IF THEREFORE the divine Bartholomew says that theology is both much and*

least, and the gospel broad and great, and again narrow — to me indeed he seems, understanding [it] supernaturally, [to mean] that [God] is at once the most eloquent cause of all things, and brief of speech, and without word. Gelasius, distinction 15, together with the other Apocryphal writings, decrees that this gospel be avoided.

THE BOOK OF THE WARS OF THE LORD, in Hebrew ספר מלחמת יהוה, called *Sepher Milchamoth Iehova*, is cited in the book of Numbers, chapter 21; [9] and out of it Moses brought forth a testimony, to demonstrate the things which had been done at the torrents of Arnon, in the borders of the Moabites, in these words: *WHENCE it is said in the book of the Wars of the Lord: As he did in the Red Sea, so he did at the torrents of Arnon: the rocks of the torrents were bowed, that they might rest at Arnon, and lie down in the borders of the Moabites.* [10] This book Rabbi Menachem says was the narration of God which had been revealed to Moses — to whom [God] had made manifest that he would do the same at the torrents which he had once done at the Red Sea. Aben Ezra thinks it to be the book of Judges, because in it many wars waged against the Amorrheans are read. There are also those among the Jews who suppose this to be the very book of Numbers, because ספר *sepher* [book], which our interpreter [→ *interpres*]

[*pres* →]

[1] Num. 11 — so printed, but a misprint for Num. 24: the Origen citation concerns Balaam's star-prophecy, "A star shall rise out of Jacob" (Num. 24:17), which the entry itself cites below as "Numbers, chapter 24" [2] Origen's opinion concerning Balaam [3] Acts 15:39 [4] Barnabas was crowned with martyrdom by the Cyprians [5] Tertullian [6] He thinks the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed by St Barnabas [7] The relics of St Barnabas found in Cyprus, with the Gospel of St Matthew [8] Bartholomew delivered the Gospel of St Matthew to the Indians [9] Num. 21:14-15 [10] What the Book of the Wars of the Lord was

*(printed p. 45 [PDF p. 58], recto — leaf physically stamps "43" (running ~2 low). The Book of the Wars of the Lord concludes and the Boxwood Book; then letter **C** begins (Callimachus, Cambyses, the Wisdom of the Chaldeans). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ *pres*] [our] *inter*-preter translated "book," signifies also "Numbering," as Lyranus says it is [there] called — because in it are narrated wars, done by the Lord through the hands of the Hebrews. Augustine, bishop of Chisamum, judges the Book of the Wars of the Lord to be not some volume in which wars are written together, but a certain narration which was then told among the Hebrews by the common mouth and voice of all: because that which Jerome rendered "book" is in Hebrew called ספר *sepher* — which signifies not so much "book" as "narration" and "enumeration," from the verb ספר *sipher*, that is, "he narrated," "he numbered." And that word, "It is said" [*Dicitur*], which with us is put in the present, among the Hebrews is put in the future, יאמר *ieamar*, that is, "It shall be said" — which indicates that Moses speaks not of a thing already written, but of a thing to be narrated hereafter: so that the sense of his words is, *Whence it shall be said in the book of the Wars of the Lord* — that is, when the wars of God shall be reviewed by posterity, this also shall be said, that as God did in the Red Sea, so he did at the torrents of Arnon. But the divine Augustine, in the eighteenth book of the City of God, says that it is not to be denied that this book, together with very many others, was written even before the times of Moses.

THE BOXWOOD BOOK, or the Scripture engraved on a boxwood tablet, is commemorated by God himself, who, in Isaiah chapter 30, [1] thus commands the prophet: *WRITE for them upon boxwood, and in a book diligently engrave it; and it shall be, in the last day, for a testimony unto eternity.* In which words, for that which is in Hebrew על לוח אתם *al luach itam*, the seventy interpreters translated ἐπὶ πυξίου, that is, "on boxwood"; Symmachus, ἐπὶ πλατεῖ [*epi platei*], that is, "Upon a very broad tablet"; Pagninus, "On a tablet with them"; but some, "on their tablets." And these think that by these words neither boxwood tablets, nor of any other wood, are signified, but that, by a periphrasis and idiom of the Hebrew tongue, this sacred book of the prophecies of Isaiah is described. [2] Jerome, however, believes that God commanded the prophet to write on tablets, and those especially of boxwood, [3] because the box is a tree of perpetual green foliage, whose wood, on account of its most firm solidity, is almost imputrescible, and remains through many ages: that in

these the divine predictions might be extant for everlasting time — by which God threatened perpetual and irreparable destruction to the ungrateful and unbelieving Jews, who would not hear the prophets warning them well, and despised their vaticinations. For God willed them to remain written for eternal time, that after they were fulfilled, the Jews might, to their own great harm, at last perceive those to have been true oracles which he had commanded to be written on the tablets, or in the codices, of his prophets. And let it not escape thee that this precept, concerning the writing of tablets, is expounded by divers expositors in divers ways: some think it was commanded by God to Isaiah the Prophet, as he was entering to his people; others — and the Hebrews especially — judge this to be a precept of God to Jeremiah, that when he shall have entered Egypt with the other fellow-captives, he should write these things. And, lest it seem absurd to any that God speaks to Jeremiah, who was not yet born, [remember that] before God — who calls the things which are not, as though they were, and before whom all times are joined together — even Jeremiah, though he was not yet, was as present. But howsoever that be, it matters not much, since the spirit and sense of the mandate is one and the same, accommodated to whichever of these prophets thou wilt.

C

THE STONE, or the white pebble, inscribed with a new name. Of this Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in the second chapter of the Apocalypse, [4] says: *TO THE CONQUEROR I will give a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no one knows, except him who receives it.* Which words Arethas, bishop of Caesarea, expounding, in the commentaries on the Apocalypse, writes thus: *TO THE CONQUEROR of the devil God promises a white stone — that is, [a reward] shining with reward, honor, and fame. And he put in this place the white stone, because it was known to those who contended in the theatres and stadiums, and was given to the victors. But the new name is the reward of eternal beatitude, which in the present life is unknown: since those goods which God has prepared for those who love him, the eye has not seen, nor has the ear heard, nor have they ascended into the heart of man;* [5] *but they are new to us, when, after this life, we enter into their possession.* Thus Arethas. It is also known that among the ancient Ethnics [pagans] the days of victories, engraved in the public tablets of the fasti, were wont to be marked beforehand with a white pebble, that they might more clearly be discerned from the other days. [6] To which custom alluding, Zoenzonius [so printed — the poet's name is uncertain], a Christian poet, sang the triumphal day of our Saviour in this hendecasyllable:

O day festal to the peoples, and white day,

who, returning, makest us blessed —

this [day], O Muse, mark every year

with a snowy pebble.

CALLIMACHVS the Cyrenean, among the Greeks a noble poet, who lived from [the time of] Ptolemy Philadelphus down to Euergetes, attained every kind of poem. Against an adversary he wrote a most bitter poem, whom, under a feigned name, he called IBIS; whence Ovid the poet borrowed the name and argument of the work in his *Ibis.* [7] He published elegies, epigrams, and hymns to the gods. Chanting the praises of Jove, he accuses the Cretans, and, as vain and lying, refutes them — because they boasted that they had among them the sepulcher of Jove, who is an immortal God. [8] The sentence of these verses, as Origen is witness, Paul (against the Cretans, in the epistle to Titus) turned [to his own use]. See below, in [the entry] *Epimenides.*

CAMBYSES, whom Esdras names Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes, son of Cyrus king of the Persians, wrote to Rheum Beelthee[m] [Rehum Beelteem], and the other prefects of Samaria, a letter, by which he ordered the building of the Jewish temple to be entirely hindered. See the first book of Esdras, chapter four.

THE WISDOM OF THE CHALDEANS, in Hebrew חכמת כשדים *Chochemath Chasceddim* — which is called also Aramaean, and Assyrian, and Syriac, and Babylonian — in which Daniel the prophet writes that he, together with his three companions, was made learned among the Babylonians, [9] in these words: *AND the king commanded Asphenez [Ashpenaz], that he should bring in, of the sons of Israel and of the royal seed, boys in whom was no blemish, comely in form, and apt to be instructed in all wisdom, and docile in all discipline, that he might teach them the letters and the tongue of the Chaldeans.* [10] And after a few things he adds: *But to these boys God gave knowledge and discipline in every book, and wisdom; and every word of wisdom and of understanding which the king inquired of them, he found in them tenfold above all the soothsayers and magi who were in his whole kingdom.* [11] These things Daniel; who, in the same volume [→ *volumine*]

[*volumine* →]

[1] Isa. 30:8 [2] What the Scripture on the boxwood tablet is [3] Why God commanded the prophet to write on a boxwood tablet [4] Rev. 2:17 [5] Isa. 64:4; 1 Cor. 2:9 [6] The days of victories, engraved in the public tables of the fasti, were wont to be marked with a white pebble [7] Why Ovid entitled a certain work of his 'Ibis' [8] Callimachus refuted the Cretans as vain and lying, because they boasted that the sepulcher of the immortal Jove was among them [9] Daniel was instructed in the wisdom of the Chaldeans [10] Dan. 1:3-4 [11] Dan. 1:15,20

(printed p. 46 [PDF p. 59], verso — leaf stamps "44". The Wisdom of the Chaldeans continues: the five orders of Babylonian sages, with much on Zoroaster and the Magi. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *volumine*] testifies that there were then, among the Babylonians, several diversities of wise men, and reports that all these were summoned by the kings Nebuchadnezzar and Balthasar for the interpretation of difficult dreams, saying: *THE king Nebuchadnezzar therefore commanded that the soothsayers, magi, malefics, and Chaldeans should be called together, to declare to the king his dreams.* [1] And below: *THEN there came in to king Nebuchadnezzar the soothsayers, magi, Chaldeans, and haruspices.* [2] And in the fifth chapter: *THE king Balthasar therefore cried out mightily, that they should bring in the magi, Chaldeans, and haruspices.* [3] From which words it appears that the wisdom of the Assyrians, or Chaldeans, was at that time distinguished into five orders of wise men; whose names, written in Chaldee in the book of Daniel, are these: כשדים *Chascedim,* that is, Chaldeans; אשפים *Asaphim,* that is, Magi; חרטמים *Chartumim,* that is, Soothsayers; מכשפים *Mecasphim,* that is, Malefics; גזרים *Gazarim,* that is, Augurs, or Haruspices. Concerning which, those things which I have read among various writers, I thought should be here annexed.

CHASCEDDIM, that is, the name of the Chaldeans [4] (under whose appellation sometimes either all, or the several sects of the Babylonian wise men, are designated), properly and particularly in Daniel — as Jerome says — signifies the kind of men whom the common sort calls Mathematicians and Genethliacs [astrologers]. These, Pliny says, had their beginning from Belus Jove [Bel], father of Ninus king of the Assyrians, [5] the first inventor of the sidereal science. [6] These most diligently observed the motions of the heavens, and were occupied about the reckonings of astronomy, and the predictions which are made from the observation of the stars. Of these Philo, in the book *On Abraham,* makes mention in this manner: *THE CHALDEANS, exercised among the first in the sidereal science, attributed all things to the motions of the stars, from which they believed the powers of the world to be dispensed — [powers] which consist of numbers and their proportions. These venerated visible things, not perceiving the invisible and intelligible, but following only their order; and so, from the circuits of the Sun, the Moon, the wandering and the fixed stars, and the distinction of the year into four seasons, and the consensus of celestial and terrestrial things, they thought the world itself to be God — by a profane opinion making the creature like to the creator.* These things Philo, concerning the Chaldeans; whom Jerome, in the epistle to the Hebrews [*ad Paulinum*], says asserted that the matter of this visible world is eternal, and produced by none. [7]

ASAPHIM, [8] who by the ancient interpreter of the Latin edition [are called] Philosophers, by the LXX μάγοι, and by Jerome likewise Magi, philosophized concerning the causes of all things, as well divine as human. Origen thinks their author was Balaam, son of Beor, [9] whom Balac, king of Moab, summoned to execrate the people of the Hebrews with his dire imprecations; by whose vaticination-writings the Magi, admonished after many ages, set out from the east into Judaea, about to adore Christ. Diogenes Laertius, in the first book *On the philosophers,* writes that Zoroaster the Persian was prince of the Magi; [10] and that the Magi, as priests of the gods, were free for [their] worship, [11] and were wont to offer to them prayers, vows, and sacrifices, as if [the gods] would be heard [entreated] from these alone. Their dress was white, their bed the ground, their food herbs, cheese, and bread; they used a reed for a staff, on whose top a cheese fixed they applied to the mouth and ate.

Now their Dogmas and tenets were these: [12] first of all, that there is One God, the first of all and eternal. And that Zoroaster taught this, Eusebius, in the first book of the *Evangelical Preparation,* asserts in these words: *ZOROASTER the Magus, in the sacred book in which he collected Persian matters, writes thus word for word: GOD is the first of incorruptibles, eternal, unbegotten, without parts, most like to himself, the origin of all goods, expecting no rewards, best, most prudent, the father of right, thoroughly taught justice without instruction, perfect by nature, wise, the sole inventor of the sacred nature.* Thus Eusebius. They also posited other second gods, or genii, whose substance they said was either fiery, or watery, or earthy. They reprehended the images and statues of the gods, and reproved the error of those who say that males and females are gods. They said that souls are immortal after this life, and that all things which are here endure by their [the gods'] prayers, and that men shall rise again; and that [it is] wicked and impious to burn the bodies of the dead with flames. Concerning justice also, and the other virtues, they disputed much. They interdicted the use of gold and silver. Philo, in the book *Of special laws,* thus speaks concerning the wisdom of the Magi: [13] *THAT true Magic indeed — that is, the speculative science, by which the works of nature are discerned more clearly — as honorable and to be sought, not only common men follow, but even the greatest kings of kings, especially the Persians, [who are] so curious of these arts that it is not lawful [for one] to reign unless he have dealt familiarly with the Magi.* [14] To which subscribing, Jerome, in the interpretation of this place, says: *MAGI are those who philosophize concerning individual things. But common custom takes "Magi" for malefics; who are held otherwise among their own nation, in that they are philosophers of the Chaldeans — and to the science of this art the kings also and princes of that nation direct all things. Whence they themselves first, at the nativity of the Lord Savior, understood his rising [birth], and, coming to Bethlehem, adored him.*

CHARTVMMIM, [15] who by the LXX interpreters [are called] ἐπαοιδοί, that is, Incantators [enchanters], and by Jerome are named Harioli, [being] given to the excantations of demons, took their origin (as Pliny, Justin, and Augustine hand down) from Zoroaster, the other [a second Zoroaster], king of the Bactrians and a Magus, the first corruptor of true Magic; [16] who alone among all mortals laughed on the day on which he was born, [17] and whose brain so palpitated that it repelled a hand placed upon it — a presage, namely, of his future madness, by which he first drew down that admirable wisdom of the Magi, received from his elders, to the deliriums of incantations. Whence, by the just judgment of God, he was conquered in war by Ninus, king of the Assyrians, and expelled from his kingdom. Those, therefore, who followed him posited two principles (as Laertius reports), [18] the one good, the other evil: [saying] that the good God is [God] of heaven, from whom all goods proceed, but the evil [one is] god of the lower regions, whence they judged all evils [to come]; which dogma the Manichaeans afterward divulged among the Christians. They said that the air is full of demons, which appear to them thinly, and as it were like evaporations; they professed divinations and predictions out of the colloquies of demons; and they thought it just that [a man] be mingled with mother and with daughter.

MECASPHIM, [19] who by the LXX interpreters [are called] φαρμακοί, that is, are called Venefics [poison-workers]. Jerome calls them Malefics; and thinks them to be those who use blood and vic-[tims] [→ *victimis*]

[*mis* →]

[1] Dan. 2:2 [2] Dan. 4:4 [3] Dan. 5:7 [4] Chascedim, or those who were once called Chaldeans [5] The Mathematici and Genethliaci took their beginning from Bel Jove [6] Belus was the first inventor of the sidereal science [7] The Chaldeans asserted the matter of the world to be eternal, produced by none [8] The Magi, who were of old so called [9] Origen thinks the author of the Magi was Balaam [10] Zoroaster was the prince of the Magi [11] The diet and occupation of the Magi, according to Diogenes Laertius [12] The dogmas of the Magi [13] The wisdom of the Magi [14] The Persian kings dealt familiarly with the Magi [15] Who the Arioli (soothsayers) were [16] Zoroaster, king of the Bactrians, was the first corruptor of true Magic [17] This Zoroaster laughed on the very day he was born [18] The dogmas of the Arioli [19] Who the Malefics were

(printed p. 47 [PDF p. 60], recto — leaf stamps "45". Mecasphim and Gazarim conclude the Chaldean orders of diviners, followed by the Scripture of Ham, the Mark of the Beast, and the Handwriting of the Decree. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *mis*] and often touch the bodies of the dead, and divine from these.

GAZARIM, [1] which the LXX interpreters rendered Γαζαρηνούς, that is, Gazarenes; Jerome, Haruspices — there are [those] who divine by inspecting the intestines of victims. Others by *Gazarim* understand Augurs, namely those who foretell future things either from the flight and song, or from the feeding of birds.

THESE, THEREFORE, were, under king Nebuchadnezzar, the parts and species of Babylonian Wisdom; in which, although the Prophet Daniel was most fully instructed by his Babylonian preceptors — as also of old Moses had been learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians — nevertheless, as Justin Martyr, in the book of the questions objected by the gentiles, rightly admonishes, he neither ever used these nor ever approved [them], [2] but especially four parts of this wisdom he shuddered at, as contrary to the laws of his God; for which he did not fear to be cast to the lions once and again. There was also another wisdom divinely infused among the Chaldeans, by whose gift the Sibyl of Cumae, daughter of Berosus the Babylonian priest, [3] put forth many prophetic oracles concerning the events of future times, and especially concerning Christ our Savior. Of which thou hast [more] below, in the entry *Sibylla.*

CHAM [Ham], the Scripture of the son of Noah, is a work of prodigious and malefic impiety, containing the elements and the practice of the necromantic art. [4] Ciccus Asculanus [Cecco d'Ascoli] makes mention of this volume in the commentaries which he published on the *Sphere;* which, without any doubt, was fabricated by most iniquitous men, and by the same inscribed and divulged under the title of the Scripture of Cham — occasion being taken from those things which Serenus the Abbot reports, concerning the magic arts invented and written by Cham, in John Cassian, in the eighth Conference, chapter 21, in these words: *THE SEED of Seth, receiving the science of all natures through the successions of the generations, by paternal tradition even from Adam himself — so long as it remained divided from the sacrilegious stock of Cham — as it had holily received it, so also exercised it, either for the worship of God or for the utility of the common life. But when it had been mingled with the impious generation, it derived, by the instinct of demons, to profane and noxious uses those things which it had piously learned; and curious arts of malefices, and prestiges [illusions], and magic superstitions, it audaciously instituted, teaching its posterity that — that sacred worship of the divine name being forsaken — they should venerate and worship either these elements, or fire, or the aerial demons. This knowledge, therefore, of curious things — how it did not perish in the flood, and became known to the succeeding ages — I think ought to be briefly touched.* [5] *As far as the ancient traditions report, Cham, son of Noah, who was infected with these superstitions and sacrilegious arts, knowing that he could by no means carry any memorial book about these things into the ark (into which he was to enter together with his just father and his holy brothers), engraved the wicked arts and profane inventions upon plates of divers metals, which forsooth could not be corrupted by the injury of the waters, and upon the hardest stones; which — the flood being over — seeking out again with the same curiosity with*

which he had hidden them, he transmitted to posterity as a seed-bed of sacrileges and of perpetual wickedness. And by this reasoning, therefore, that opinion of the vulgar, by which they believe that angels delivered malefices to men, is in truth fulfilled [in Cham]. Thus far the words of Cassian. Peter Comestor, in the Scholastic History, writes that Cham, son of Noah — whom he thinks was called Zoroaster by the ancients — [6] when he reigned in Thracia [so printed; Comestor has Bactria], invented the magic art and the seven liberal arts, which he wrote upon fourteen columns: seven of bronze against the floods of the waters, and seven of brick against the burnings of fire. There was also of old another work, entitled *THE PROPHECY OF CHAM*, from which Isidorus, the disciple of Basilides, received testimonies, as Clement, in the sixth [book] of the Stromata, is author. See below, in the entry *Seth.*

THE CHARACTER OF THE BEAST is had in the Apocalypse, chapter thirteen, [7] under these words: *AND HE MAKES all, small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to have characters [marks] on their right hand or upon their forehead; that no one may be able to buy or sell, save he who has the character of the beast.* And chapter fourteen: [8] *THEY HAVE no rest, day and night, who adore the beast and its image, and whosoever receives the character of its name.* And in the sixteenth chapter: [9] *THERE WAS MADE a grievous sore upon the men who had the character of the beast.* And in the Apocalypse, chapter twenty: [10] *THEY WHO received not the character of the beast on the forehead and in their hand, lived and reigned with Christ.* Arethas, bishop of Caesarea, expounding these, says: *THE BEAST is the devil; the Image of the beast is Antichrist; the Character of the beast is the note, sign, and demonstration of the imitation of the devil and of Antichrist in reprobate men — such as those have not who have the sign of the living God upon their foreheads, and who have faces signed with the light of the divine countenance. But that the impious bear the character of the beast impressed upon their hands and foreheads,* [11] *signifies that their hands are full of evil works; but the forehead — which is above the eyes — [is] encompassed with mist and darkness, so that they see nothing that is right and honest. Or, the Character of the beast upon the hands designates their diabolical actions; but on the forehead, the shameless impudence of the same, when without any concealment or shame they openly show forth what they are, preaching their sins, and esteeming iniquity [to be] glory and praise.*

THE HANDWRITING OF THE DECREE, or, as it is read in the Greek exemplars, Χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι, that is, the Handwriting of the dogmas, ordinances, or decrees, is reviewed by Paul in the epistle to the Colossians in these words [12]: *AND YOU, when you were dead in [your] sins, and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, he quickened together with him; forgiving you all sins; blotting out the handwriting of the decree which was against us, which was contrary to us: and this he took out of the midst, affixing it to the cross; and, despoiling the principalities and powers, he led [them] confidently, openly, triumphing over them in himself.* Now there is a Handwriting of this kind, as concerns the Jews: that famous promise-bond by which the Jewish people had once bound itself to God in the worship of perpetual servitude. For when God, on Mount Sinai, proposed the law to the people, and promised that he would take up the nation of the Hebrews for his own peculiar [treasure] before the other nations of the earth, if it were willing to receive and to keep that law — the whole multitude of the sons of Israel cried out: *ALL things which God has commanded us, we will do.* [13] Which accla-[mation] [14]

[*accla* →]

[1] Who the Haruspices were [2] Daniel never used the wisdom of the Chaldeans [3] The Cumaean Sibyl was the daughter of Berosus [4] The Scripture of Ham is an impious work [5] By what means the magic arts were preserved in the time of the flood [6] Ham was called Zoroaster by the ancients; he invented the magic arts, according to Peter Comestor [7] Rev. 13:16-17 [8] Rev. 14:11 [9] Rev. 16:2 [10] Rev. 20:4 [11] What it signifies that the impious bear the character of the beast impressed on their hands and foreheads [12] Coloss. 2:13-14 [13] Exod. 19:8 [14] What the Handwriting of the decree is

(printed p. 48 [PDF p. 61], verso — leaf stamps "46". The Handwriting of the Decree concludes (the Adamic decree, Chrysostom's Greek reading, a Hebrew idiom); then the Census of the returned exiles, and the

entries Cephas, Chozai, and Claudius Caesar. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ *accla*]mation, emitted by the common consent of all, as it were out of a bond [*syngrapha*], rendered the Jews debtors for the keeping of the whole law. And this bond, lest at any time hereafter the nation of the Jews should deny it to be its own, was noted more than once in the decrees of the divine law, but especially in the book of Exodus, chapter 19 and chapter 24. Again, there is also another Handwriting far more ancient, and binding the whole race of mortals [1] — namely that old decree which God had made to Adam, and had written in his heart: *OF THE TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL THOU SHALT NOT EAT; FOR IN WHATSOEVER DAY THOU SHALT EAT, THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH.* [2] This decree, when Adam had violated it by his disobedience, he made himself and all his posterity obnoxious to sin and to death. And the devil, out of this handwriting, urged the whole race of mortals, and showed them guilty of everlasting punishment, bringing forth against us the handwriting of the divine decree, written by the hand of God in the heart of our first parent. Christ, therefore, pitying our calamity, whatsoever could be exacted from us out of this handwriting, he himself paid on the cross; on which, undergoing punishment for us, he cut apart and tore in pieces that handwriting which was against us; and, lest it should thereafter have any power over us, he utterly took it out of the midst; and Satan — who by this handwriting of the law was making us guilty, and threatening death — that we might no further fear his accusations and threats, he destroyed, dying on the cross; and all the satellites of his principate, and the tartarean powers, he routed and broke, openly triumphing over them, and bearing off rich spoils; of which he suspended a magnificent trophy on the cross, a perpetual monument of his victory, that it might be the more conspicuous to all from on high. Chrysostom, expounding this place of Paul somewhat differently, [3] thus reads: ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον, that is, *The handwriting which was against us being blotted out;* and then, a comma being set, he adds τοῖς δόγμασιν, that is, *by the Decrees* — finding by this distinction that Christ cut apart that old handwriting by the new decrees promulgated, namely the evangelical pacts and promises, which confer on us the remission of sins and the inheritance of the celestial kingdom. Thou shalt also observe that which is read in Greek in the dative case, χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι, that is, *the Handwriting to the decrees*, is to be rendered *the Handwriting of the decrees*, in the genitive case. For it is an idiom customary to the Hebrews that they frequently use the dative for the genitive: [4] as in the inscriptions of the psalms, in which they put מזמור לדוד, that is, *A PSALM TO DAVID HIMSELF*, for *A PSALM OF DAVID;* and as in the second [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 12, where Paul says, ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί, that is, *There was given to me a sting to the flesh,* for *of the flesh.* This phrase I find used also by Cato, who, in the books *Of country matters*, often wrote *Ornaments to the oxen* [*Ornamenta bobus*] for *Ornaments of the oxen;* and *Instruments to the rustics* for *Instruments of the rustics.*

CENSVS, [5] or the Book of the Census of the sons of Israel, is a catalog which Nehemias found in Jerusalem, containing in itself the names, surnames, and number of those who, first dismissed from the captivity of Babylon by king Cyrus, returned under the leader Zorobabel into Judaea; whom it is agreed were chiefly of the two tribes of Juda and Benjamin, besides the priests and Levites who were mingled with these. But thou shalt observe the names of the twelve chiefs, who in this catalog are narrated to have led the people back, to be reviewed somewhat differently in the catalog which is had in 1 Esdras, chapter 2; yet they are the same. For those who here are named Azarias, Raamias, Belsar, Mespharath, Beggoni, and Naum, in the catalog of Esdras are called Saraia, Rahelia, Belsan, Mesphar, Begnai, Reum. But Naamin, who here is numbered among the twelve, is excluded by Esdras, who reviewed only eleven. Moreover, in that enumeration of families and census of heads which follows, so great is the diversity both of the men and of the calculation, that it must be confessed either that the catalog of Nehemias is diverse from the catalog of Esdras, or, if it be the same, that it was vehemently corrupted by the carelessness and unskillfulness of the copyists — which Origen frequently complains to have happened in the other catalogs of divine scripture also. See the catalog of Nehemias, chapter seven.

CEPHAS, who is also Martialis, bishop of Limoges [*Lemovicensis*], and Apostle of the Gauls. Him Clement of Alexandria, in the fourth book of the *Dispositions* [*Hypotyposes*], says was one of the seventy disciples, [6] having a surname the same as Peter the Apostle; and asserts that this is that Cephas of whom Paul, writing to the Galatians, [7] says: *BUT WHEN Cephas had come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was reprehensible.* He is reported to be the author of two epistles, which lately, the Lord revealing, were found in the sacrarium of the Basilica of Saint Peter in the city of Limoges [*Lemovica*], where they had hitherto lain hidden, buried in a stone chest under the earth, which, from their exceeding antiquity, could scarcely be read: of which one is to the Bordelais [*Burdegalenses*], the other to the Toulousans [*Tolosani*] — each redolent of the veneration and piety of antiquity. But whether this Cephas be that one reprehended by Paul, see below, in the sixth book, in the annotations on the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians.

CHOZAI חוזי, a most faithful writer of Hebrew antiquities, wrote concerning the repentance and liberation of Manasses, king of Jerusalem, one book. The author of the sacred annals recalls this work in the 2nd book [of Paralipomenon], chapter 33 [8], thus writing: *BUT THE REST of the deeds of Manasses, his prayer also, and its hearing, and all his sins, and [his] contempt, the places also in which he built high places, and made groves and statues before he did penance, are written in the words of Chozai.* There still remains, from the monuments of this prophet, a small fragment, containing the prayer of king Manasses; which in certain Bibles is wont to be set immediately after the two books of Paralipomenon. The author of the annotations on Paralipomenon which are attributed to Jerome reports that it has been handed down to memory by some that this prophet Chozai was Esaias himself; who, his name being changed, was called Chozai, that is, *My Vision* [*Visio mea*].

CLAVDIVS Caesar, under whose empire Lucas, in the Acts, reports that great famine to have been foretold by Agabus the prophet, [9] and, a few years after, all the Jews to have been driven from Rome by his command [10], wrote in the Greek tongue:

- **THE BOOKS OF HISTORIES, twenty-eight** [11] — that is, twenty books of *Tyrrhenica* [Etruscan history], eight books of *Carchedoniaca* [Carthaginian history]: for whose sake a new [Museum] was added to the old Museum of Alexandria [→ *novum*]

[*uum* →]

[1] A more ancient Handwriting, indeed one which binds all mortals [2] Gen. 2:16-17 [3] Coloss. 2:13-14 [4] The Hebrews frequently use the dative case for the genitive [5] What the Census of the sons of Israel was [6] Martialis was one of the 70 disciples [7] Gal. 2:11 [8] 2 Par. 33:18-19 (printed "1. Par. 33") [9] Acts 11:28 [10] Acts 18:2 [11] Books written by Claudius Caesar

---

(printed p. 49 [PDF p. 62], recto — leaf stamps "47". Claudius Caesar's remaining works and Claudius Lysias, then the long Clement of Rome entry begins: his catalog of writings, the two canonical epistles, and the antipodes/plurality-of-worlds discussion. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *novum*] added [Museum] from his own name; and it was appointed that every year, in the one [Museum] the books of the *Tyrrhenica*, in the other the *Carchedoniaca*, on set days, as in a public auditorium, should be recited entire by individuals in turn.

HE ALSO WROTE, in Latin eloquence, forty-three books: that is, of the things from the murder of Caesar to the civil peace, two volumes; from the civil peace to his own times, one-and-forty books.

HE ALSO COMPOSED, of his own life, eight volumes — more ineptly than inelegantly.

LIKEWISE a defense of Cicero against the books of Asinius Gallus, sufficiently learned.

OF THE THREE LETTERS added by himself to the Latin alphabet, one book.

OF THE DICING ART [*Ars Aleatoria*], one book. [So] Suetonius, in [the life of] Claudius.

CLAVDIVS LYSIAS, tribune of the Roman soldiery in Jerusalem, wrote to Felix, prefect of Judaea, an apologetic epistle for the Apostle Paul. See the Acts of the Apostles, chapter twenty-three.

CLEMENS (concerning whom the Apostle, writing to the Philippians [1], says: *WITH CLEMENT, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are written in the book of Life*) was by country a Roman, son of Faustinus, from the region of the Coelian mount. He, when first he had been made bishop of Sardica, and afterward [was] second in the Apostolic chair — or, as some prefer, fourth after Peter — when he had held [it] nine years, at length, after the relegation of exile, crowned with martyrdom, fell in the third year of the emperor Trajan; that is, in the year from the advent of Christ our Savior 103. [2] His writings are said to be these:

- **EPISTLE,** canonical, to the Corinthians, the first.
- **EPISTLE,** canonical, the second.
- **TO JAMES,** the brother of the Lord, epistle the first.
- **TO JAMES,** the brother of the Lord, epistle the second.
- **TO ALL fellow-bishops,** one epistle.
- **TO JULIUS and Julianus,** one epistle.
- **TO THE BRETHREN of Jerusalem,** dwelling with James, one epistle.
- **THE TRANSLATION** of the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, from Hebrew into Greek.
- **OF THE APOSTOLIC liturgy,** one book.
- **OF THE APOSTOLIC canons,** one book.
- **THE RECOGNITIONS** of the former [set], to James the brother of the Lord, ten books.
- **THE RECOGNITIONS** of the latter [set], to James the brother of the Lord, ten books.
- **THE ITINERARIES** of Clement, ten books.
- **THE EPISCOPAL PRECEPTIONS,** eight books.
- **THE DISPUTATIONS** of Peter with Apion, one book.
- **THE RESPONSES** of Peter to the interrogations of the Tripolitans, several books.
- **HISTORIES,** six books.
- **OF THE PREACHINGS and Acts of Peter,** one book.
- **OF APOSTOLIC ACTIONS,** one book.
- **THE LIFE of Clement,** one book.

THESE, inscribed with the name of CLEMENT, I found among divers authors; concerning which, what we think, we shall indicate as briefly as we can.

CLEMENT'S first canonical Epistle to the Corinthians [3] — although it is little known in our times, yet there is no doubt that it is Clement's, who wrote it in the person of the Roman church, as Jerome, Damasus, and especially Irenaeus attest; who, in the third book against the heresies, explains the occasion and argument of the epistle in these words: *THEREFORE, under Clement, no small dissension having arisen among those who were brethren at Corinth, the church which is at Rome wrote most powerful letters to the Corinthians, gathering them into peace, and repairing their faith, and announcing the tradition which it had lately received from the Apostles — announcing one omnipotent God, maker of heaven and earth, former of man, who brought on the cataclysm and called Abraham, who led the people out of the land of Egypt, who spoke with Moses, who set forth the law and sent the prophets, who prepared fire for the devil and his angels; and that this is the father of our Lord Jesus Christ,* &c. Eusebius, in the 4th book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 38, reports that Clement in this epistle made mention of Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, and

used its testimonies also. Jerome, in the Catalog of ecclesiastical writers, indicating the style of this epistle, adds: *CLEMENT wrote, in the person of the Roman church, to the church of the Corinthians, a very useful epistle, which seems to me to agree with the character of the epistle which is carried under the name of Paul to the Hebrews. And in many senses of the same epistle it even makes use [of it] according to the order of the words. Altogether there is great similitude in each.* The same [Jerome] also, in the commentaries on the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians, citing a testimony from this epistle, says: *IT IS BETTER, if we say "the prisoner of the Lord," [to say] "bound in the charity of Christ." Of which thing Clement also, to the Corinthians, is witness, writing: THE BOND of the charity of God — who shall be able to declare it?* Clement of Alexandria, in the first, fourth, and sixth volumes of the Stromata, recites many fragments of this epistle.

CLEMENT'S second canonical [epistle]. That this was written by Clement after the first canonical epistle, Pope Damasus testifies in the *Pontifical Book: HE,* he says, *made two epistles, which are called canonical.* Epiphanius also, writing against the Ebionites, in the first volume of the *Panarion,* hands down that not one only, but several encyclical — that is, orbicular, or universal — epistles were written [by him] [4], which in his time were read in the holy churches. Although Eusebius, in the book which we cited a little before, reports that the second epistle of Clement was unknown to him, and Jerome affirms the same to have been reproved by the ancients. I suspect that Jerome, either from this or from the former epistle, brought forth that opinion of Clement concerning the plurality of worlds, when, in the second book of the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians [5], he thus wrote: *WE INQUIRE what it is that Paul says, ACCORDING TO THE AGE OF THIS WORLD — whether there be also another age which pertains not to this world, but to other worlds; concerning which Clement also, in his Epistle, thus writes: THE OCEAN, and the worlds which are beyond it,* &c. Which opinion Origen, long before Jerome, explained no less piously than learnedly, in the second book *Periarchon,* in these words: [6] *CLEMENT indeed, the disciple of the apostles, makes mention of those whom the Greeks name* ἀντίχθονας *[Antichthones], and of that part of the globe of the earth to which none of ours can approach, nor can any of those who are there cross over to us — which he also called worlds [→ mundos]*

[*lauit* → (signature E)]

[1] Philippians 4:3 [2] Clement was crowned with martyrdom in the year of the Lord 103 [3] Clement wrote an epistle to the Corinthians [4] Clement the Roman wrote many encyclical epistles [5] Ephesians 2:2 [6] Clement the Roman makes mention of those whom we call the antipodes

---

(printed p. 50 [PDF p. 63], verso — leaf stamps "48". CLEMENS continues: the "worlds" discussion concludes, then the first Epistle to James (the Linus–Cletus–Clement succession problem, with Rufinus, John of Antioch, and Torquemada), the Four Epistles, the Translation of Hebrews, and the Apostolic Liturgy. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ he] washed, when he says: *THE OCEAN is impassable to men, and those worlds which are beyond it, which are governed by these same dispensations of the Lord God.* Concerning this epistle likewise, and the former, I judge Jerome to have been of [the same] opinion, when in the first book against Jovinian he said: *CLEMENT, successor of the Apostle Peter, whom Paul the Apostle mentions, writes epistles, and wove together almost his whole discourse on the purity of virginity.* [1]

CLEMENT'S first Epistle to James, the brother of the Lord, Damasus commemorates in the *Pontifical Book,* in the life of Clement — without, however, indicating the name of its author. Anacletus the Pope, alleging a testimony out of it, says its author is Clement, his predecessor. Yet concerning this [epistle] it has been doubted by many, because that seemed absurd which is written in it concerning Clement — namely, that he received the see of the Roman episcopate from Peter [2], before whom it is agreed that Linus and Cletus were bishops of the city of Rome. Wishing to remove this inconsonance, Rufinus, the interpreter of this

epistle, in the preface to the *Recognitions* of Clement addressed to Gaudentius, wrote thus: *CERTAIN [persons] inquire how, since Linus and Cletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself, writing to James, says that the chair of teaching was delivered to him by Peter. Of which matter we have received this to be the reason: that Linus and Cletus were indeed bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, but while Peter yet survived; that is to say, that they might bear the charge of the episcopate, while he himself fulfilled the office of the Apostolate — as is found to have been done also at Caesarea, where, though he himself was present, he yet had Zachaeus, ordained by himself, for bishop. And in this manner both will appear true: that they too are numbered bishops before Clement, and that Clement nevertheless received the chair of teaching after the death of Peter.* Thus Rufinus. John, patriarch of Antioch, in the book *On the power of a general council above the Pope,* endeavors to show that the Roman pontiff can be deposed by the universal church even apart from the cause of schism and of heresy, alleging the words of Clement — who in this epistle brings in Peter thus speaking to him: *FOR IF thou shalt be occupied with mundane cares, thou wilt both deceive thyself and those who hear thee; for thou wilt not be able to distinguish more fully those things which pertain to salvation to whomsoever [needs them]. And from this it comes to pass that thou, as one who hast not taught the things that pertain to the salvation of men, art deposed.* Meeting these words, John Torquemada [Turrecremensis], presbyter Cardinal, in the second volume of the *Ecclesiastical Summa,* chapter 110, rejects utterly the whole authority of this epistle, as obscure and doubtful, denying that it could at all be that Clement wrote this epistle to James — published after the death of Peter — the brother of the Lord, whom Eusebius in the *Chronicles* testifies to have fallen, stoned by the Jews, nearly ten years before the death of Peter. He adds also that the word *Deponaris* [thou art deposed] is corruptly had in this epistle, for which *puniaris* [thou art punished] should be read; yet in such wise that thou understand the pontiff to be punished not by men, but by God alone.

CLEMENT'S four Epistles. Concerning these there is nothing whereof I should here admonish the reader, save that out of that which is the second to James, and that which is directed to the fellow-bishops, and out of the last, which is inscribed to the dwellers of Jerusalem, many things word for word have been excerpted in the decretals of the pontiffs — especially in the distinctions the second, the fifth, the twenty-third, and the thirty-eighth; and in the *Causes,* the second, question first and seventh; and in the eleventh, question third; and in the twelfth, question first; and in the sixteenth, question seventh. Which surely is no small indication of the antiquity of these epistles.

CLEMENT'S Translation of the epistle to the Hebrews [3] Eusebius reviews in the fourth book of the *Ecclesiastical History,* chapter 38, in these words: *IT IS AGREED that the Apostle wrote the epistle to the Hebrews — as being to be sent to Hebrews — in his native tongue; and, as certain hand down, that Luke the Evangelist, but as others [hold], this same Clement, translated it. Which is also the more true: because the very style of Clement's [own] epistle concords with this, and the sense, forsooth, of each writing bears very great similitude.* Thus Eusebius. Clement of Alexandria, in the fourth book of the *Stromata,* recites a fragment out of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians not unlike those things which are had in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews.

CLEMENT'S Apostolic Liturgy. Concerning this, Proclus, Archbishop of Constantinople, in the booklet *On the tradition of the divine Mass,* engraved these words: *MANY indeed, and other divine pastors, who succeeded the Apostles, and doctors of the church, expounding the reason of the mysteries of that divine Mass, delivered [it] to the Church committed to writings. Among whom the first and most illustrious is blessed Clement, the disciple and successor of that chief of the Apostles: who brought into the light those sacrosanct mysteries, revealed to him by the holy Apostles.* [4] Nicolaus, bishop of Methone, in the book *On the truth of the body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar,* brings forth out of this liturgy a certain prayer which the Greeks use for the consecration of the sacrament of the Eucharist [5]; in which, after those dominical words, *This is my body, and this is the chalice,* &c. [6] [7] (by which the Latin Church believes the bread and

wine to be transmuted into the body and blood of Christ), these deprecatory words are added: *Thou, who needest none, vouchsafe, O God, to send thy holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that it may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this chalice the blood of thy Christ. Amen.* Which words Marcus, [a] Bishop, in the book *On the sanctification of the divine gifts,* and Nicolaus Cabasilas in the book *On the interpretation of the Mass,* [8] would have to be so necessary to the form of consecration, that without them the words of Christ, uttered by the priest, would avail nothing to the consecration of the sacrament. Meeting these, Bessarion, patriarch of Constantinople, in the book *On the sacrament of the Eucharist,* says that the authority of Clement's words could easily be eluded, as deduced from Apocryphal scripture; yet that it is not to be spurned, because the same words were used in their Liturgies by James, the brother of the Lord, [by] Basil, and especially [by] Chrysostom — who, after the dominical words of transmutation recited by the priest, adds: *Make this bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this chalice the precious blood of thy Christ, changing [it] by thy holy Spirit. Amen.* Which words indeed seem to contain the form and force of transmuting the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. For this cause therefore, that such hesitation may be taken away, *It is to be known,* he says, *that the dominical body is twofold — to wit, the true, and the mysti-* [9]

[*cum* →]

[1] Clement in his epistles praises virginity [2] By what reason Clement is said to have received the see of the Roman episcopate from St. Peter [3] Clement the Roman translated the epistle to the Hebrews out of the Hebrew tongue into Greek [4] Clement brought into the light the sacrosanct mysteries of the Mass, revealed to him by the Apostles [5] By what words the Sacrament of the Eucharist is consecrated [6] Matthew 26:26 [7] Luke 22:20 [8] The error of Marcus the bishop and of Nicolaus Cabasilas [9] The body of the Lord is twofold

---

(printed p. 51 [PDF p. 64], recto — leaf stamps "49". CLEMENS continues: the twofold body concludes, then the Apostolic Canons (their authority and disputed number, 84/85), and the Recognitions, with the ten arguments of the first decade of books. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ mysti]-cal; and that the former indeed is confected by the words of the Lord himself, whose body it is; but this, which we ourselves are, is completed by the superadded words — whether of Clement, or of Basil, or of Chrysostom — and by the prayers by which, after the consecration of the mystery, the priests suppliantly pray that, through the worthy taking of the Eucharist, we may be made one body with Christ. Which is easy to understand, if one diligently observe the Masses set forth by the aforesaid fathers. *Thus Bessarion. Confirming whose opinion, Chrysostom, in the homily* On Judas the traitor, *manifestly confesses that the bread is turned into the dominical body by the virtue of this discourse of Christ,* THIS IS MY BODY, uttered by the priest. Thou hast these things more copiously explained in the 6th book, annotation 3.

CLEMENT'S Apostolic Canons. Of these, some indeed are fabricated under the false title of Clement by heretics, [their] author uncertain, which Gelasius the Pope, in the decrees, distinction 15, utterly rejects; but others are 84 in number, which Clement, having received them from the Apostles, wrote in Greek, beginning with these words: ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω, that is, *Let a bishop be ordained.* These a certain Dionysius, an ancient interpreter, moved by the prayers of his brother Laurentius, made Latin [and dedicated] to Pope Stephen. Concerning these it is inquired among the skilled in pontifical law, whether they be canonical or Apocryphal [1]. Gratian, distinction 16, bringing forth divers opinions on this matter, establishes nothing certain. For he says they were approved by the judgment of Adrian the second in the epistle to Tharasius of Constantinople; of which matter, however, Adrian makes no mention in that epistle. For in the fourth Action of the seventh synod, those words by which the sixth synod is commended, and its canon, are Tharasius's, and not Adrian's. Yet at the end of the aforesaid fourth action, that very fourth action is confirmed by the council and by the legates of Pope Adrian — by which the canons of the sixth synod are approved, in the second of which the 85 canons of the Apostles are received [2]. The question here therefore is twofold: the one part concerns the authority of these Canons, the other the number. Now the part of the former assertion is most certain, namely that the authority of the Canons of the Apostles has been received and undoubted. For

Athanasius enumerates them among the Hagiographa, and John Damascene, in the fourth book *Of the orthodox faith,* places them in the Canon of the divine scriptures. Epiphanius, in the third book against the heresies, confuting the Audians, cites the *Institution of the Apostles,* while he treats of the celebration of the Pascha — although this canon is not found among those which we have. Tertullian, against Praxeas, says these Canons of the Apostles were delivered by [their] hands. But the emperor Justinian also very often introduces mention of these in the *Novels,* and professes that he frames his laws according to them; and in express words he calls [them] the CANONS of the Apostles. Thus far concerning their authority; now of the number must it be spoken.

ISIDORE reviews only fifty; the sixth synod, in its second canon, approves 85 — although they are but 84; but the twelfth in the Latin is divided into two in the Greek codex. Zephyrinus, five hundred years prior to the fifth synod, admits sixty only. Leo the Ninth, nearly three hundred and fifty years later than the sixth synod, in the epistle to Michael the patriarch, enumerates just as many. In the last Canon of the Apostles the Gospel of John is received, which was written under Nerva. But the Canons are said to have been set forth while Peter was yet living — [Peter] who was slain long before, under Nero — as is gathered from the twenty-eighth Canon, in which it is written, *BY ME PETER.* This, however, seems very absurd, unless we say that that little clause concerning the approbation of the Gospel of John crept into the text out of the margin of the book, where it had been added by some smatterer [*sciolus*]. There are also in these sanctions certain [things] which do not agree with the present dogmas of the church — as in canon 52, in which it is commanded that those who eat flesh with the blood be deposed; and in canon 56, in which fasting is forbidden as well on the Lord's day as on the Sabbath. There are [those] who think these canons were contaminated by the Nicolaitan heretics [3], and besprinkled with many other Apocryphal [matters].

CLEMENT'S Recognitions, which are inscribed in Greek ἀνάγνωσις, or ἀναγνωρισμός, that is, *Recognition,* or ἀναθεώρησις [so read for the printed ἀναθεώρισμος], which is *Revision* — certain [persons] distinguish by a twofold partition, namely into ten Prior books and ten Posterior books. In the prior [ones], which are now wanting to us, Clement collected, at Peter's precept, whatsoever Peter discoursed at Caesarea of Palestine through three continuous months, and transmitted [them] to James, the brother of the Lord. The several arguments of these are read [4], written in these very words, in the third volume of the posterior Recognitions which are now had:

- **THE FIRST book of the Recognitions** treats of the true Prophet, and of the property of the understanding of the law, according to that which the tradition of Moses teaches.
- **THE SECOND,** of the principle [beginning] — whether it be one, or many? and that the law of the Hebrews is not ignorant [of] what immensity is.
- **THE THIRD,** of God, and of those things which were instituted by him.
- **THE FOURTH,** that although many be called gods, there is only one true God, according to the testimonies of the scriptures.
- **THE FIFTH,** that there are two heavens: whereof one is this visible firmament, which shall also pass away; but the other eternal and invisible.
- **THE SIXTH,** of good and evil, and that all things are subjected to good by the Father; but evil — from what [cause], in what manner, and whence it be; and that it cooperates indeed with good, but not with good as its purpose; and what [are] the signs of good, and what of evil; and what is the difference of duality and of conjunction.
- **THE SEVENTH,** [of the things] which the twelve Apostles pursued among the people in the temple.
- **THE EIGHTH,** of the words of the Lord which seem to be contrary to themselves, and are not; and what is the resolution of these.
- **THE NINTH,** that the law placed by God is just and perfect, and that it alone can make peace.

• **THE TENTH,** of the nativity of carnal men, and of the generation which is through Baptism; and what is the succession of carnal seed in man; and what [is] the reckoning of his soul; and how in it there is liberty of will: which, because it is not inborn but was made, could not be immovable from good.

THESE, therefore, are the arguments of the Recognitions, which Clement reports himself to have written in the city of Caesarea concerning those things which were discoursed by Peter in the same city. That these books were in great part contaminated by heretics [5], Rufinus is witness, who in the *Apology of Origen* left these things written: *CLEMENT, the disciple of the Apostles, put forth books which are called in Greek* ἀναγνωρισμός*, that is, Recognition, in which, when out of the person of Peter the Apostle*

[*Aposto* →]

[1] Whether the Canons of the Apostles be canonical or apocryphal is disputed among the jurisconsults [2] The 85 canons of the Apostles were received in the sixth Synod and approved by the ancient Doctors [3] Some think the Canons of the Apostles were contaminated by heretics [4] The arguments of Clement's Recognitions [5] The heretics contaminated the books of Clement's Recognitions

(printed p. 52 [PDF p. 65], verso — leaf stamps "50". CLEMENS continues: Rufinus on the interpolation of the Recognitions and on his translation method; then the arguments of the ten Posterior books, Sixtus's doubt of Clementine authorship, and notices on Jacobus of Genoa and Bede. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ the] doctrine of the Apostle [Peter], as though truly apostolic, is in very many places expounded, in some [places] the dogma of Eunomius is so written [in] that he is believed to dispute nothing other than [what] Eunomius himself [would] — asserting the Son of God to have been created out of things not existing. Then also that adulterous kind [of teaching] is inserted, [namely] that a quality, [and] not the malice of a purposed will, produced the nature of the devil and of the rest of the demons, but [as] an excepted and separated creature. There are also some other [things] inserted in his books which the ecclesiastical rule by no means receives; which perverse men, for the assertion of their own dogmas, inserted under the name of holy men, as [being thereby] the more easily to be believed; which [things] he is to be believed neither to have thought nor to have written. Thus Rufinus.

CLEMENT'S ten Posterior books of the Recognitions, which we now have under the title *THE RECOGNITIONS OF CLEMENT TO JAMES, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD,* and whose beginning is *I, CLEMENT, BORN IN THE CITY OF ROME,* are believed to be those which Gennadius testifies were translated by Rufinus; whose preface also is had at the beginning of the whole work, in which — whether Rufinus, or some other under the name of Rufinus — thus writes concerning the manner of his translation, to Gaudentius the bishop: *IT IS SURELY fair to thee, who wilt read these things also in Greek, lest perchance thou think the order of translation in some places less kept by us, that I indicate the counsel of our interpretation. I think it does not escape thee that of this Clement's [work] there are had, in the Greek of the same work — the* ἀναγνώσεις *[Recognitions], that is — two editions, and [that] there are two bodies of the books, in some things indeed diverse, in many nevertheless of the same narration. In fine, the last part of this work, in which the transformation of Simon is related, is had in the one body, in the other is not had at all. There are also certain [things] in each body disputed concerning the unbegotten God and the begotten [Son], and concerning some others; which — that I say nothing more — exceeded our understanding. These therefore, as being above my powers, I chose rather to reserve to others than to bring forth less full. But in the rest, as far as we could, we gave diligence to depart not only not from the sentences, but not even sufficiently from the discourses and locutions. Which thing, although it renders the eloquence of the narration less ornate, yet renders it more faithful.* Thus Rufinus concerning the edition of these volumes; whose arguments it pleases [me] here to subjoin, that from the collation of them with the foregoing arguments of the Prior Recognitions it may appear how great is the difference of each work:

• **THE FIRST book,** [1] then, contains the education of Clement in the city of Rome and his study of the truth; the coming of Barnabas out of Judaea into the city; the fellowship entered into by Clement with Barnabas; the navigation of both into Palestine, and the entrance of both into Caesarea to Peter the Apostle; likewise the colloquy of Peter with Clement — in which Clement testifies that he heard from Peter a few [things] concerning the true prophet, and committed them to letters in a single volume. There is added at the end a brief course of the histories of the Old Testament.

• **THE SECOND,** [2] Nicea reporting [it], narrates the wisdom, eloquence, miracles, race, and parents of Simon Magus; likewise some [things] of the power of demons over men; then also the first disputation of Peter with Simon held in the same city — in which, in very few words, it is shown that there is one God, author of the world, and not many.

• **THE THIRD** [3] relates the second meeting of Peter with Simon in the same city; in which some [things] are discussed concerning free will. It is inquired also why God did not make man impeccable; why heaven was made; why it must be dissolved by fire; whether they shall see the true God with the heart of the world [*mundi corde*]; and whether the soul be truly immortal. Lastly it describes the desertion of Simon by his own, and his flight out of Caesarea into Syria.

• **THE FOURTH** [4] [narrates] the setting-out of Peter and Clement from Caesarea to Dora, Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon, [and] Berytus, and their entrance into Tripolis — in which city Peter wintered. It recites also a sermon of Peter held in the same city, in which is a brief course of the ages of the world, from its creation even unto Christ.

• **THE FIFTH** [5] has another sermon of Peter in the same city.

• **THE SIXTH,** [6] likewise another sermon of Peter in the same city.

• **THE SEVENTH,** [7] the departure of Peter out of Tripolis, and his setting-out first to Orthosias, then to Antaradus, then to the island Aradus, to see glass columns of immense magnitude. It reports also the mother of Clement to have been found by Peter in the same island, and then first recognized by her son Clement. Peter sails out again from the island Aradus to Antaradus; thence by a foot-journey he betakes himself to Balnea; thence he passes through Pathos and Gabala; at last he comes to Laodicea, where Clement first recognizes Faustus and Faustinianus, his brothers.

• **IN THE EIGHTH** book [8] Peter, in a more secret place of the port of Laodicea, disputes against a certain old mathematician [astrologer] asserting that all things are governed by fate.

• **THE NINTH** [9] pursues the same disputation against the mathematicians, who say that all things come to pass by the impulses of the stars.

• **THE TENTH** [10] narrates the transmutation of Simon Magus into Faustinianus, the brother [so; father] of Clement. Then it adds some [things] concerning the genealogy of the gods of the gentiles. Lastly it sets in order the departure of Peter from Laodicea, and his coming to Antioch — in which city the people delivered to him the chair of teaching.

So many, therefore, are the volumes of the Posterior Recognitions; concerning which — that I may freely pronounce what I think — I suspect [them] not to be Clement's [11]. For besides that many things in them, under the person of Peter the Apostle, are drawn from the inmost philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, two whole leaves also are recited under the person of Peter in the ninth book of this work, transcribed word for word out of the book *On fate, against Abydas,* of Bardesanes the Syrian astronomer — who, Epiphanius witnessing, flourished under the emperor Marcus, seventy years after the death of Clement [12]. Which same writing of Bardesanes, Eusebius, in the sixth book *On the evangelical preparation,* recites in the very same words, not one diction being changed. There are also in these books most things uncertain, many fabulous, some moreover repugnant to catholic dogmas. Out of which Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa [Jacobus de Voragine], noted some [things] in the life of Clement, inserted by him in the book of annual festivities. Bede, however, in the tract *On the reckoning of times,* expounding the beginning of Genesis out of the words which

are contained in the 6th volume of these recognitions, calls this work *The books of the histories of St. Clement, Roman Pontiff,* and confesses that he receives that exposition out of the 6th volume of these.

CLEMENT'S Odeporicon, or *Itinerary* — Atha-

[*nasius* →]

[1] The argument of the first book of the Posterior Recognitions of Clement [2] The argument of the second book of the Recognitions [3] The argument of the third book of the Recognitions [4] The argument of the fourth book of the Recognitions [5] The argument of the fifth book of the Recognitions [6] The argument of the sixth book of the Recognitions [7] The argument of the seventh book of the Recognitions [8] The argument of the eighth book of the Recognitions [9] The argument of the ninth book of the Recognitions [10] The argument of the tenth book of the Recognitions [11] The author suspects these ten books not to be Clement's [12] When Bardesanes the Syrian lived

---

(printed p. 53 [PDF p. 66], recto — leaf stamps "51". CLEMENS concludes: the Itinerary/Odeporicon, the Disputation of Peter against Apion, the Episcopal Preceptions, and the Life of Clement. New headwords follow: ***THE GENERATION OF HEAVEN AND EARTH*** *(Gen 2:4), and the opening of* ***THE EPISTLE OF THE THIRD COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM.*** *Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ Atha]nasius, in the *Synopsis,* and Leo the Pope, in the epistle against Nicetas, number [it] among the Apocryphal writings [1]; and Gelasius, distinction 15, reviews [it] among the books reproved by the Church, saying: *THE ITINERARY of Peter the Apostle, under the name of Clement, eight books, is apocryphal.* This Trithemius divides into ten books, whose beginning is, *WHEN IN THE CITY OF ROME,* &c. I suspect this work to be the same as that which, among some authors, is inscribed *The Peregrinations,* or *Circuitions,* or *Circuits, of Peter.* Concerning which Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion,* confuting the heresy of Ebion, says thus: *THE EBIONITES use also other books — namely, those called the CIRCUITIONS OF PETER, written by Clement — corrupting many things in them, and leaving few [things] true; even as Clement himself refuted them throughout in the encyclical epistles which he wrote, which are read in the holy Churches; because his faith and his discourse have another character from those things which by them, under his name, were corrupted in the Circuitions.* Thus Epiphanius concerning the Circuitions, or Itinerary — which indeed, unless my opinion deceive me, is the very same as the above-mentioned work of the POSTERIOR RECOGNITION, adorned by the copyists with such a title, and transformed by a Preface of Rufinus either fabricated or fetched from elsewhere; that they might render this volume, condemned under the name of *Itinerary,* commendable to buyers by this artifice — as well from the more gracious inscription of the RECOGNITIONS as from the authority of the interpreter Rufinus. Now that which makes me easily believe this is the very number and context of the books; in which, from head even to heel, almost nothing else is narrated than the peregrination of Peter and Clement out of Italy into Palestine, and from Palestine even into Antioch, through the several cities and places which are between Caesarea of Palestine and Antioch. To this is added that Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa, who wrote this same peregrination in the life of Clement, testifies that he collected it summarily out of the Apocryphal Itinerary of Clement. Which surely indicates that the books of the Recognitions and the Itinerary of Clement are the same work [2]. This, in the last years, the Senate of the Holy Roman Inquisition commanded to be inscribed in the Index of the volumes condemned by the church.

CLEMENT'S book On the disputation of Peter against Apion Jerome cites in the *Catalog,* saying: *THERE IS CARRIED [ABOUT] also a Disputation of Peter and Apion, composed in a long discourse,* which Eusebius, in the third volume of the *Ecclesiastical History,* refutes [3]. Now this place cited by Jerome is had in Eusebius, chapter 38, book 3, in these words: *BUT other little works of Clement, not the least [of them], are reported to be held by some — such as the Disputation of Peter and Apion; which is very little found to have been in use among the ancients, because the rule of Apostolic faith is not perceived to have remained pure and uncorrupted in them.*

CLEMENT'S Episcopal Preceptions. Concerning these, at the end of the canons of Clement — where also the book of the ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, put forth by the same author, is commemorated — I found it thus written: Διαταγαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις δι' ἐμοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐν ὀκτὼ βίβλοις προσπεφωνημέναι, ὡς οὐ δεῖ δημοσιεύειν ἐπὶ πάντων, διὰ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς μυστικά; that is, *Preceptions dedicated to you bishops through me, Clement, in eight books — these it behooves not to divulge to all, on account of the arcane things which are contained in them.* These eight books of Apostolic Preceptions, or Constitutions, John, bishop of Osma [*Ostuniensis*], a man endowed with every kind of learning, lately turned into Latin and illustrated with scho-lia.

CLEMENT'S work On the responses of Peter to the interrogations of the Tripolitans. Of this I have nothing certain to report, save that in the fifth volume of the Posterior Recognitions it is written that Clement collected interrogations of this kind, together with the responses of Peter, in several books.

CLEMENT'S Epitome Κηρυγμάτων τοῦ Πέτρου, that is, *Of the Preachings of Peter the Apostle.* Of this work Clement of Alexandria makes mention in the sixth book of the *Stromata,* and Origen, his disciple, in the 13th tome on the Gospel of John — bringing forth from it certain fragments, which thou shalt be able to see below, in [the entry] *Peter.*

CLEMENT'S Life. Concerning this I have nothing clearly ascertained, besides that which Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa, affirms in the life of Clement put forth by him — [that] the life of Clement is contained in the ITINERARY which is carried under his name.

THE GENERATION OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, or *The Book of the generation of heaven and earth.* [4] Although of this book there be no mention in the sacred codices of the Hebrews, yet where, in the second chapter of Genesis, the Hebrew verity has אלה תולדות השמים והארץ, *Elle tholdoth hascaimim ve haarez,* that is, *These are the generations of heaven and earth,* the LXX interpreters rendered Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος Γενέσιος [so printed, for γενέσεως] οὐρανοῦ, καὶ γῆς — to wit, *This is the book of the generation of heaven and earth.* [5] Which version indeed all the Greek expositors follow and expound in this place. Philo the Jew says that Moses by these words indicated what he wished to be the inscription of the first volume of the whole Pentateuch. Approving which, Chrysostom says it is not to be marveled at if Moses so inscribed the book, although besides the generation of heaven and earth so many [things] are contained in it concerning the lives of illustrious men, and concerning very many other matters; because under this general appellation of the generation of heaven and earth he willed to comprehend all creatures, as well celestial as terrestrial, together with their operations and events. The Rabbins of the Hebrews, inquiring the cause why in this place the word תולדות *tholdoth,* that is, *Generations,* is written perfectly — that is, by six letters [6] — whereas everywhere in the divine volumes it is written imperfectly, that is, by five letters only, תולדת, except in the genealogy of David at the end of the book of Ruth [7] — answer that by this is mystically signified that the world was in the beginning perfectly produced by the Lord, but by the sin of Adam corrupted manifoldly, and [is] to be restored through the Messiah, son of David; in whose genealogy, as has already been said, this word *Tholdoth* is reintegrated to the pristine number of letters. Others of the Jews believe that Moses, by the six letters of this word, willed to express the number of the six days of the mundane generation.

THE EPISTLE OF THE THIRD COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM. [8] When the Christians out of the Jews and out of the gentiles, lately converted to the faith, gravely contended concerning the observance of the legal [precepts] — the Jews asserting that, together with the Gospel, the Mosaic law was necessarily to be kept, [and] the gentiles [asserting] that it was to be utterly rejected — the Apostles and the elders, gathered in the third council at Jerusalem, wrote to the brethren of Antioch, of Syria, and of Cilicia, converted to the faith out of the gentiles, an epistle; by which they pronounced them free from all observance of the legal [precepts], yet with these

[*tamen* →]

[1] Clement's Itinerary is apocryphal [2] Clement's Itinerary and the Posterior Recognitions are the same [3] The Disputation of Peter against Apion is rejected by Eusebius [4] Gen. 2:4 [5] Why it is called the Book of the generation of heaven and earth [6] Why תולדות (tholdoth) is written with six letters — Gen. 2:4 [7] Ruth 4:18 [8] Acts 15:23-24

(printed p. 54 [PDF p. 67], verso — leaf stamps "52". The Council of Jerusalem epistle concludes (the four exceptions, the twofold exposition, Ambrose on the corrupted reading). Then two new headwords: ***THE [LOST EPISTLE OF THE] CHURCH OF THE CORINTHIANS*** *to Paul, and* ***THE BOOKS OF CURIOUS ARTS*** *(Acts 19:19), with a taxonomy of magic. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ with these] four excepted, that is, things offered to idols, blood and the strangled, and fornication — from which they decreed them to abstain [1]. This decree of the Apostles the interpreters expound in two ways [2]. Chrysostom and Oecumenius, because in the new law nowhere is an observance of legal [precepts] found to be commanded, think that by *the Strangled* and *Blood* the effusion of human blood, and homicide of whatsoever kind, is forbidden. But Augustine, in the 32nd book against Faustus, understands both according to the Jewish rite — that is, of the blood which Moses forbids to be eaten in the seventh chapter of Leviticus, saying: *YE SHALL EAT THE BLOOD OF NO ANIMAL, AND OF THE FLESH OF SWINE, FROM WHICH THE BLOOD WAS NOT POURED OUT.* For these things, although after the resurrection of Christ they could lawfully be eaten not by the gentiles only, but by the Jews also, were nevertheless interdicted by the Apostles, lest by this occasion there should be taken away, in that primitive Church, the peace and common life of the gentiles with the Jews — who, from the inveterate custom of the law, abhorred the eating of these things. Afterward, the splendor of evangelical preaching increasing, this manner of legal observance was abrogated [3], which the Apostles had commanded for a short time for the mutual concord of each people. But the prohibition of fornication, which the gentiles esteemed no sin, remained unshaken; because by God's command it had long before been interdicted in the Decalogue [4]. Nor is this to be passed over here, that Ambrose, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, judges this place to be corrupted, saying that by the Apostles three precepts only were [given], that is, abstinence from things offered to idols, from whoredom, and from blood; but the fourth, concerning the strangled, was added by certain rash Greeks. See the 6th book, annotation 273. This epistle was written in the fourteenth year of the conversion of Paul — that is, in the fourth year of Claudius Caesar, and the eighteenth from the ascension of Christ [5].

THE CHURCH OF THE CORINTHIANS, agitated by intestine seditions on account of certain rich and powerful [men] who were calling the common people away from the doctrine of Paul to the doctrine of the philosophers, as to those who taught more excellent [things] than the Apostle, wrote to Paul — through Fortunatus, Stephanas, and Achaicus — one epistle concerning the peril and cause of its own sedition; at the same time also consulting him concerning marriages and the choice of foods: that is, whether it behooved to abstain from matrimony, and whether the use of foods which had been immolated to idols was to be shunned. To these things Paul abundantly responded in the first epistle to the Corinthians, in the seventh chapter of which he makes mention of this epistle [written] to him by the Corinthians [6].

THE BOOKS OF CURIOUS ARTS, or βίβλοι περίεργοι, that is, *Curious Books.* [7] Concerning these it is read in the Acts of the Apostles, that when Paul at Ephesus was casting demons out of possessed bodies, many of those who had exercised curious arts brought together their books and burned them before all; and, the prices of them being reckoned, they found fifty thousand [pieces] of silver [8]. Chrysostom, Augustine, Oecumenius, and Bede, by the *books of Curious arts,* understand writings pertaining to magic arts — not of whatever kind, but only to those which are forbidden as well by divine as by human laws [9]. For there is a twofold kind of Magic, the true and the false [10]. True magic is that which, from the knowledge and the mutual application of natural virtues — of things acting and things being acted upon in turn — teaches [one] to work admirable things, which are called miracles of nature [11]. Concerning this Philo, in the book *On the special laws,* says: *TRUE Magic — that is, the Perspective [contemplative] science, through which the works of nature are discerned more clearly — as honorable and to be sought, not the common sort only follow, but*

even the greatest kings of kings, especially the Persians, so curious of these arts that it is not lawful [for one] to reign unless he have dealt familiarly with the Magi. Jerome, on the second chapter of Daniel, says: *THE MAGI are those who philosophize concerning individual things, and are not malefics, but philosophers of the Chaldeans; and to the science of this art the kings also and princes of that nation direct all things. Whence the Magi too, at the nativity of the Savior, first understood his rising, and, coming to Bethlehem, adored him.* Justin Martyr, in the book *Of the Questions propounded by the gentiles,* questions 24 and 26, asserts that Apollonius of Tyana, a magician, worked many admirable [things] out of the skill of true magic [12], writing thus: *APOLLONIUS indeed, a man endowed with the science of natural faculties and of the consents and contrary affections which are in them, brought forth operations out of that art; for which cause, in all [his] operations there was necessary to him the assumption of accommodated matter, by whose help he accomplished that which was being effected.* These things concerning true Magic. But false Magic, and the most fraudulent of all arts, is that which works, either truly or in appearance, out of commerce with demons [13]. The author of this Augustine reports to have been Zoroaster, king of the Bactrians. Pliny [reports] Zoroaster the Persian, who most diligently wrote two hundred thousand verses concerning this whole art [14]. Philo derives its origin from true magic, adulterated and depraved by malefic men. Pliny reckons it to have sprung from three arts, which it also drew back into itself — that is, from medicine, from mathesis (or divinatory astrology), and from religion. He enumerates also, out of Hostanes (who wrote in the times of Alexander the Great), several species of magic [15]: namely that which promises colloquies of shades and of the infernal [powers]; and that which teaches [one] to divine by water, by spheres, by air, by stars, by a basin, by lamps, by axes, and by many other ways. Augustine, in the tenth book *Of the City of God,* chapter nine, distinguishes this magic, out of the opinion of Porphyry, into Theurgy and Goetia: Theurgy is the invocation of beneficent demons for the effecting of some good, which is done through certain consecrations and sacrifices [16]. But Goetia, which is also Necromancy, is done by the constraint of the dead, and by invocation [of them] also. For it is so called from the wailing [*planctus*] which is made about the sepulchre [17]. Philo, in the book above cited, adds to these a third species also, which is called Pharmacy [*Pharmacia*] [18]. This is done when something is offered to someone to be taken by mouth, which by certain incantations shall bring on love, or hatred, or madness, or death. All these things are condemned not only by the divine sayings, but also by the most ancient laws of the Romans [19] — among whom many were arraigned for Magic, as Apollonius of Tyana before Domitian Caesar, and Apuleius before Claudius Maximus, prefect of Africa. There are [those] who by these *books of Curious arts* understand not only magical books, but all the volumes of judiciary astrology, which in the primitive church were no less forbidden than the magical [20]; and they bring in as witnesses of this matter Epiphanius and Augustine — of whom the former, in the book *On weights and mea-*

[*mensuris* →]

[1] The Apostles pronounced Christians free from all observance of the legal precepts, excepting things offered to idols, blood, and the strangled and fornication [2] What the Apostles understood by the names 'the strangled' and 'blood' — Acts 15 [3] The prohibition of blood and the strangled was wholly abrogated as Christ's Church grew [4] Fornication is forbidden in the Decalogue, which the gentiles thought no sin [5] The epistle of the Apostles, which is had in Acts 15, was written in the eighteenth year from the Ascension of the Lord [6] 1 Cor. 7:1 [7] Acts 19:19 [8] The price of the curious books burned at Ephesus was 50,000 [pieces] of silver [9] Which books are called [books] of curious arts [10] Magic is twofold [11] What true magic is [12] Apollonius of Tyana out of the skill of true magic worked many admirable things [13] What false magic is, and who was its author [14] How many thousands of verses Zoroaster wrote on false magic [15] False magic [has] many species [16] What Theurgy is [17] What Goetia is [18] What Pharmacy is [19] Not only divine law but also civil law condemns magic [20] The books of judiciary astrology were forbidden when Christ's Church was being born

(printed p. 55 [PDF p. 68], recto — leaf stamps "53". CVRIOSARVM concludes (the ancient custom of burning wicked books), then ***THE SCHEDULES OF KING DARIUS'S GUARDS*** *(the contest of the three pages, 3 Esdras 3–4) and* ***CYRUS.*** *The letter* ***D*** *opens with* ***DANIEL'S Dream-book****, the two* ***DARIUS*** *entries,* ***DAVID****, and* ***THE DESCRIPTION OF THE TEMPLE.*** *Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ mea]sures, writes that Aquila, the first interpreter of the divine scripture, was cast out of the church by the fathers for no other cause than this — that he was given to the inspections of nativities and the divinations of birth-hours [1]; but the latter [Augustine], as appears at the end of his exposition on the 91st psalm, does not receive a Mathematician [astrologer] into the Church, save a public and solemn penance being first performed [2]. We are admonished, finally, by this example that the custom among Christians of burning books of nefarious doctrine is ancient, and no newly-found thing, as the heretics of our times iniquitously complain [3]. For that this same thing was in use among the other nations also, the histories of the Greeks and Latins are witnesses; in which it is found — that I be silent of the rest — that the books of Diagoras and of Protagoras, who taught that there are no gods, were publicly burned by the Athenians [4]; and likewise it was done by the Romans with the books of Numa, found in the field of Petilius, because they seemed to dissolve the worship of the Roman deities [5]. See below, in the entry *Sennacherib* of this book, and book 4, in [the entry] *Julian, bishop of Eclanum*, and in the Annotations of the sixth book: where thou hast more concerning the not-reading of the books of heretics.

THE SCHEDULES OF THE GUARDS OF KING DARIUS. [6] Esdras, in the 3rd book, reports these writings, [their] words, and the occasion of the words, to have been of this kind. When Darius, son of Hystaspes, roused after a brief rest in his bed, could not recall sleep, he proposed to the three guards of his body a question [7]: *What thing among all human affairs is mightiest?* — [decreeing] that whosoever should more prudently resolve it should obtain a reward, [namely] the second dignity after the king. Then they, when they had somewhat deliberated silently among themselves, offered their solutions to the king, briefly noted on three separate schedules.

- **THE FIRST WAS:** ΥΠΕΡΙΣΧΥΕΙ Ο ΟΙΝΟΣ, that is, *WINE IS STRONGEST*.
- **THE SECOND:** ΥΠΕΡΙΣΧΥΕΙ Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, that is, *THE KING IS STRONGEST*.
- **THE THIRD:** ΥΠΕΡΙΣΧΥΟΥΣΙΝ αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑπὲρ δὲ πάντα νικᾷ ἡ Ἀλήθεια, that is, *WOMEN PREVAIL OVER ALL; BUT ABOVE ALL THINGS TRUTH CONQUERS* — which [answer] Zorobabel, sprung of royal race among the Jews, had written.

When the king had read these before his wise men on the following day, it was acclaimed by all that the sentence of Zorobabel excelled the rest; which preferred Truth as the only thing, among all mortal things, immortal and perpetual, and obnoxious to no injuries of times nor mutations of fortune [8]. And to Zorobabel was delivered the power next to the royal, and at the same time the faculty of leading back the remnants of the Jewish captivity into Judaea, and of rebuilding the holy city and the temple. Read Esdras, book 3, chapter 3, and Josephus, book 5 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 3.

CYRUS, the first king of the Persians, is said to have written these [things] [9]: *Commentaries of daily actions* (in which Esdras testifies was found the decree spoken by king Darius concerning the leading-back of the Jews into Palestine). To all the cities of Asia, an edict for the liberation of the Jewish nation and the restoration of the holy city; to Sisenes and Sarabasanes, satraps of Syria, one epistle of the same argument — whose copy Josephus brings in the eleventh book of the *Antiquities*, chapter 1.

D.

DANIEL the Prophet's Dream-book [*Somnialia*], that is, *Writings*, in which is handed down a superstitious interpretation of dreams, such as that which Artemidorus, a Greek author, wrote. It is interdicted to Christians in the pontifical decrees, cause 26, question 7, chapter *NE OBSERVETIS* [Observe ye not] [10]. Saint Athanasius, in the *Synopsis*, reproves an Apocryphal book of the prophet Daniel, without a name; which some think to be this very art of interpreting dreams; but others [think it] a supplement of Daniel — that is, the Hymn of the three children, the history of Susanna, and the narration of Bel the dragon — Athanasius himself, however, gainsaying [this], who places that appendix among the canonical scriptures, and reviews

[it] by name.

DARIUS, son of Hystaspes, king of the Persians and Medes, wrote to Tatanai and Strabuzanes, concerning the restoring of the temple of the Jews, one epistle, which is had in 1 Esdras, chapter six; to Tangar and Sambabas, masters of the horse at Samaria, one epistle of the same argument — [so] Josephus, book eleven.

DARIUS — or, as Josephus reads, *Arius* — **king of the Lacedaemonians,** wrote to Onias, son of Simon the Great, high priest of Jerusalem, epistles for the entering-into of a fellowship with the Jews; concerning which, in the epistle of Jonathan to the SPARTANS, which is had in 1 Maccabees, chapter twelve [11], it is thus read: *ALREADY BEFORE, epistles had been sent to Onias, the high priest, from Arius, who reigned among you, [signifying] that ye are our brethren, as the writing which is subjoined contains,* &c. But of what kind this writing was, or the copy of the epistle, is not had out of the history of the Maccabees; yet it is extant in Josephus, book eleven of the *Antiquities,* chapter 5, in these words:

> ***Arius, king of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias, greeting.***
>
> *WE HAVE LIGHTED upon a certain ancient writing, in which we find that a kinship has intervened between our origins, and that our race also is not alien from the posterity of Abraham. It is fair, therefore, that, since ye are our brethren, ye ask of us whatsoever ye please. The same we also will do; and we shall esteem your affairs as our own, being about to hold our own likewise in common with you. Demoteles it is who renders these letters to you, written on a four-cornered page, and sealed with the seal of an eagle holding a dragon in its talons. Farewell. In the 144th Olympiad.*

DAVID, son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, king of Jerusalem, author of the psalms, put forth also other writings, concerning which the [things] written below are had among the divine letters.

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE TEMPLE, [12] in Hebrew תבנית ההיכל *Thaunith hecal* [*tabnith hekal*], but in Greek, according to the edition of the LXX interpreters, Τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ ναοῦ — that is, *The Exemplar* [13] [→ *of the temple*]

[*templi* →]

---

[1] Aquila, the first interpreter of divine scripture, why he was cast out of the church [2] An astrologer is not received into the church except after solemn penance [3] Books of nefarious doctrine are to be burned [4] Impious books burned by the Athenians [5] The books of Numa burned by the Romans [6] 3 Esdras 3 [7] The question proposed by Darius to the three guards of his body [8] Truth is subject to no injuries or changes of fortune [9] The writings of Cyrus [10] The superstitious interpretation of dreams is forbidden to Christians [11] 1 Macc. 12:7 [12] David described the temple — 1 Par. 28:11 [13] 3 Kings 8

---

*(printed p. 56 [PDF p. 69], verso — leaf stamps "54". **THE DESCRIPTION OF THE TEMPLE** concludes (David's plan given to Solomon), then **DAVID'S LAMENTATION** over Saul and Jonathan, **THE EPISTLE OF KING DAVID TO JOAB**, and **THE DESCRIPTION OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF THE HEBREWS** (David's census, with the discrepant totals of Samuel vs. Chronicles). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ of the] temple. In this work David, instructed by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, described the whole structure of the temple of Jerusalem — which he had vowed to God Most High — for Solomon his son, in a marvelous order and a wholly divine artifice. Witness of this is the author of the volume of sacred annals, writing thus in the 28th chapter of the former book: *AND DAVID GAVE to Solomon his son the description of the porch, and of the temple, and of the storehouses, and of the upper room, and of the inner chambers in the sanctuaries, and of the house of propitiation, and also of all the courts which he had thought upon,* &c. [1] And a little after: *ALL these things came to me written by the hand of the Lord, that I might understand all the works of the exemplar.* [2] The sum of this description is reported in 3 Kings, chapter six, and in 2 Paralipomenon, chapters three and four. [3]

DAVID'S LAMENTATION, or *Mournful song,* was over Saul, the first king of the Hebrews, and Jonathan his son; who, fighting fiercely in the war against the Philistines, most unhappily fell. The beginning of the song is, *CONSIDER, O ISRAEL, FOR THESE, WHO ARE DEAD,* &c. It is had also in 2 Samuel, chapter one. [4]

THE EPISTLE OF KING DAVID TO JOAB, concerning the slaying of Uriah the Hittite, a most valiant man, and renowned in war. [5] When the king had, by furtive coition, made his wife Bathsheba with child, fearing lest the husband should learn of the crime, he sent him with a diligently sealed letter to Joab, prefect of the whole army, who had then led out the royal forces against the Philistines. The sum of the epistle was that, an army being drawn up as soon as might be against the enemy, he should place Uriah in that part of the battle-line where he knew the sharper fight to press, and where each bravest of the enemy would contend from the opposite side; and that there, the [other] soldiers being recalled and at once withdrawn, they should abandon him to be cut down by the Philistine ranks. [6] Which Joab too, the letter being read through, forthwith executed — not without blood and slaughter of his own, who, valiantly fighting together with Uriah, fell. And thus David, a man otherwise most upright, by the guile of a single letter added treason and the slaying of a most innocent man — one who had deserved excellently, above all, of himself — upon a base adultery; [7] brought slaughter upon his own most faithful soldiers, who had never merited any such thing; lost his own firstborn by Bathsheba; and defiled all the glory of a well-lived life with the stain of treason, slaughter, and adultery.

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF THE HEBREWS, held by the command of David through Joab the leader. [8] This is that memorable description of the Israelite people, ennobled by a slaughter. For when God willed to avenge himself on the rebellious Israelites (who, having rejected David, the best of kings, had revolted to Seba, son of Bochri — a most abandoned man, who had stirred up sedition and arms against the king), [9] he permitted Satan to incite David's mind, by the goads of pride, to number the multitude of the people subject to him. David therefore sent, to discharge this office, Joab, the prince of the army; who, returning after nearly the tenth month, brought a book of the description of all the tribes, from Dan even to Beersheba; in which were described a thousand thousand and five hundred and seventy thousand heads of valiant men, most apt for war — [10] that is, out of the tribes of Israel a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand, and of the tribe of Judah four hundred and seventy thousand — although the second book of Samuel noted a far lesser sum than this which is gathered in the first volume of the annals, reporting the reckoning of this census to have been a thousand thousand and three hundred thousand heads of fighting men — namely eight hundred thousand out of Israel, and five hundred thousand out of Judah. The Rabbins of the Hebrews reckon that Joab the leader — because, unwilling, he was sent to this census by the King (as the second book of Kings testifies) [11] — most truly collected the greater sum, namely that which is written in the books of the annals; and that he offered to the king of set purpose the other, lesser sum which the book of Samuel commemorates, so as to afford to him — already lifted up into pride — a lesser occasion of swelling. After this description, therefore, God, moved with grave anger, took away by a sudden pestilence seventy thousand men out of those who had been described — all in one day, from the rising Sun even unto the evening; [12] [13] and by this kind of vengeance he avenged both the unjust defection of so seditious a people, and the proud arrogance of the king; who, for the ostentation of the amplitude of his kingdom and of the multitude of nations which by his counsel and by warlike valor he had subdued to himself, led by a certain foolish vanity commanded the heads of all who obeyed his empire to be numbered. In this place I know not what came into the mind of Lyra, a man most exercised in the sacred letters, [14] that he should assert God to have been angered at David not so much for the elation of his mind as because he commanded the census to be held by a rite and order plainly diverse from that which the divine law had sanctioned — [the law] bidding this review to be made not by an enumeration of heads and names, and a description of individual men (as Joab did), but by a public offering of money appointed for the use of the tabernacle; in which offering each — as well the rich as the poor — should offer to God a single half-shekel; which, when the Levites had

reduced into one [heap] and numbered, they perceived the number of the men to be double the number of the shekels which had been offered. Lyra seems to gather this his opinion out of the law of Moses concerning the reviewing of the people, written in the thirtieth chapter of Exodus; [15] whose words, as I judge, hold a sense diametrically fighting against the opinion of Lyra. For these are they: *WHEN thou shalt take the sum of the sons of Israel according to [their] number, each shall give a price for their souls to the Lord; and there shall be no plague among them. And this shall everyone give who passeth to the giving of his name.* By which words it is clear that Moses does not command the number of the sons of Israel to be gathered from the collected offering, their names and particular descriptions being omitted — which are wont to be made by heads, man by man, and by name. Nay rather he commands that, before the shekels be exacted, the censors gather the names of individuals, as well their own as of the family and of the country, and note these particularly — even as, at the beginning of Numbers, the same Moses commands in these words: [16] *TAKE the sum of the whole congregation of the sons of Israel by their kindreds and their houses, and the names of the individual valiant men, from twenty years old and upward.* And a little after: *THEY REVIEWED them by their kindreds, and houses, and fa-*

[*miliae* →]

[1] 1 Paral. 28:11-12 [2] 1 Paral. 28:19 [3] 3 Kings 8 [4] 2 Kings 1:18 [5] 2 Kings 11 [6] The sum of David's epistle to Joab [7] David joined to adultery the murder of a man who had deserved well of him [8] 2 Kings 24 [9] 2 Kings 20 [10] The number of Israelites described by Joab at David's command [11] 2 Kings 24:3; 1 Paral. 21:6 [12] In the space of one day seventy thousand men perished by pestilence [13] 2 Kings 24:15; 1 Paral. 21:14 [14] Lyra's opinion refuted by the author [15] Exod. 30:12-13 [16] Num. 1:2-3

(printed p. 57 [PDF p. 70], recto — leaf stamps "55". The census entry concludes (Athanasius: David wrote 3,000 psalms, only 150 preserved). New headwords: ***DEMETRIUS Soter****,* ***THE DEVOURED BOOK*** *(the little scroll of Apocalypse 10), and* ***GOD MOST HIGH*** *(the two tablets of the law and the three memorials in the ark). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ fami]lies, and heads, and the names of individuals, as Moses had commanded.

TO THESE [things] Athanasius, in the *Synopsis*, affirms that David wrote three thousand psalms; of which the friends of king Hezekiah collected only a hundred and fifty, the rest being hidden away, lest they should come to the knowledge of the common people. [1]

DEMETRIUS Soter, son of Seleucus, eleventh king of Syria and Asia, wrote five epistles inserted in the sacred volumes, to wit:

- **TO NICANOR,** prefect of his army in Palestine, one epistle. 2 Macc. 14.
- **TO JONATHAN,** high priest of the Jews, one epistle. 1 Macc. 10.
- **TO THE WHOLE commonwealth of the Jews,** one epistle. 1 Macc. 10.
- **TO JONATHAN,** high priest of the Jews, and to the senate of the Jews, one epistle. 1 Macc. 11.
- **TO LASTHENES,** his kinsman, one epistle. 1 Macc. 11.

He flourished in the hundred-and-forty-fourth year before the birth of Christ.

THE DEVOURED BOOK, or Τὸ βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεῳγμένον, that is, *The opened little book* — which certain Greek expositors [call] Τὸν βίβλον Κατεφαγόμενον, that is, they call *the Devoured book* — John, in the tenth chapter of the Apocalypse, describes in these words: [2] *AND I SAW another strong angel, coming down from heaven, clothed with a cloud; and a rainbow upon his head, and his face as the Sun; and he had in his hand a book, and cried with a great voice, and the seven thunders spoke. And the voice which I heard from heaven said to me, GO, and take the opened little book from the hand of the angel. And I went to the angel, and said to him that he should give me the little book. And he said to me, TAKE, and devour it, and it shall make thy belly bitter; but in thy mouth it shall be sweet, as honey. And I took the little book from the hand of the angel, and devoured it: and it was in my mouth sweet as honey; and when I had devoured it, my*

belly was made bitter, &c. Which [words] indeed, according to the opinion of Arethas, are thus expounded. [3] *The strong angel is Christ, the angel of great counsel, clothed with the cloud of our flesh; having a rainbow upon his head, a perpetual testimony of the divine appeasement; and a face like the Sun, because by the splendor of grace and the flashing of the evangelical light he has dispelled the darkness of the whole world, and illumined the minds of all mortals with the light of his glory. The book is the infallible and most exact knowledge, in the mind of God, of all the impious — beholding the several names, actions, crimes, punishments of the wicked, and the times appointed for [their] punishments. This John is bidden to seek and to receive from the hand of the angel, that he too may receive the knowledge of the miseries and griefs impending over the impious persecutors of the Church of Christ. Nor is he bidden simply to receive, but to devour — that is, to take a full knowledge of the matter, and to inscribe it in the bowels of the heart. And it is sweet in his mouth because of the attainment of the knowledge of future things: which, as it is affected and sought by all with great zeal, so, when first it is acquired, it brings in the beginning a great delight, but afterward grows bitter, when it is digested in the belly. For while he turns over in his mind the retribution of the crimes which is reserved for wicked men — especially of his own nation — he is affected with mercy toward those who are to perish by their own fault.* Thus Paul the Apostle, revolving in his mind the lamentable fall of the Jews, said: *SADNESS is great to me, and continual sorrow to my heart. For I myself wished to be made anathema for my brethren, only that they should not perish, and fall away from the divine grace.* [4] Otherwise, according to Bede, *the opened Book signifies the revelation of prophecy which John received.* [5] *This was sweet in his mouth, because while he perceived it he tasted the sweetness of the divine colloquy; but it was turned into bitterness while he began to preach the things which he had heard, and, for the preaching, to suffer tribulations. For although the preaching was to him sweet out of love, it was nevertheless bitter out of the endurance of persecution.* Otherwise, according to Ambrose, [6] *the opened Book is the volume of the divine scripture; which, when before it was sealed with seven seals, now, through the grace of Christ, is opened to the doctors of the church. This book, therefore, while it is devoured, is described as sweet as honey; because the divine scripture, while it is heard, read, and handled with attentive meditation, becomes in the thought sweeter than honey; but then first is its bitterness felt, when we begin to fulfill in work what we have learned. For the more we are given to the meditation of the divine scripture, and the sweeter its meditation is to our mind, the greater bitterness must we exhibit to our flesh, afflicting it with fastings, watchings, and abstinence from vices.*

GOD MOST HIGH, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the founder of the universe, after he had led the people of the Hebrews out of Egypt into the solitude of Arabia, summoned Moses to himself on the summit of Mount Sinai; in which place he gave him, by [the ministry of] Angels, a compendium and summary of all the laws, [7] pertaining as well to the divine worship as to human conversation — distinguished into ten heads [chapters], and inscribed, on two stone tablets fabricated by his own hand, with his own living finger, on each side, here and there, on the front and on the back. When Moses had received these, he descended from Mount Sinai; and when, now drawing near to the camp of the Hebrews, he had seen the people sacrificing to a golden calf, execrating the indignity of the thing, he dashed the tablets which he had in his hand upon the ground, out of exceeding indignation, and broke them. [8] Then, at the command of God, he fitted two other stone tablets, very like the former; which, when he had again ascended Mount Sinai and brought them to God, God wrote back upon them the same heads of the law [9] which had been in the former tablets, commanding Moses to lay them up in the ark of the covenant. [10] Which Moses also did, placing — as Paul says [11] — together with them, in the same ark, a golden urn filled with manna, and the rod of Aaron, which had once put forth leaves; that by these three he might preserve the chief monuments of Jewish ingratitude — namely, that by the manna he might transmit to posterity the insatiable gluttony of the Jews (who, when once they were fed with Manna in the desert, murmured against God and exasperated him); [12] but by the Rod of Aaron it might be made known to future ages with what insolence and contumacy of mind they had withstood the high priest divinely elected; [13] but by the Tablets of the law he might perpetually convict the

Jews of infidelity and inconstancy [14] — for whose execrable adoration of the calf the former tablets, very like these latter ones, had been ground to pieces by Moses in his anger. But after the death of Moses, the rod of Aaron and the urn of manna being removed from the ark, and [these] together with the same [being placed] in the tabernacle along with the [→ *volume*]

[*volumine* →]

[1] Athanasius thinks David wrote three thousand psalms, of which Hezekiah's friends collected only a hundred and fifty [2] Rev. 10:1-2 [3] What the devoured book is [4] Rom. 9:2-3 [5] What the opened book is, according to Bede [6] What St. Ambrose thinks of the opened book [7] God gave Moses on Mount Sinai a compendium of all the laws [8] Exod. 32 (printed "Esd. 32") [9] Exod. 34 [10] 2 Paral. 5:10 [11] Heb. 9:4 [12] The manna preserved in the ark was a testimony of the gluttony of the Jews [13] Aaron's rod was kept in the ark that posterity might understand with what insolence the Jews withstood the high priest [14] The tablets of the law were kept as witnesses of the infidelity and inconstancy of the Jews

---

*(printed p. 58 [PDF p. 71], verso — leaf stamps "56". **GOD MOST HIGH** continues: the tablets left in the ark, Jeremiah's hiding of the ark, the Titus-arch relief, and the differing numberings of the Decalogue across the two tables (Greek 4+6, Latin 3+7). New headword: **DEUTERONOMY inscribed on the altar** (Joshua 8). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ the] volume of the Mosaic law being laid up, the tablets alone remained in it [the ark]. [1] For when the ark was brought in by Solomon into the temple, the third book of Kings testifies that these alone were in it, in these words: [2] *BUT IN THE ARK there were nothing but the two stone tablets, which Moses put in it at Horeb, when he struck the covenant with the sons of Israel.* These tablets — nearly one thousand and four hundred years after they had been made — the prophet Jeremiah (as is reported in the second volume of the Maccabees) [3], divinely admonished at the devastation of the city of Jerusalem, took from the temple; and commanded them to be carried away, together with the ark itself, to Mount Nebo, over against the city of Jericho — on which Moses, about to die, had ascended — and there hid it in a deep cavern, known to no man; [4] foretelling that those tablets should again be brought into the light toward the end of the age, when the whole people of the Jews shall be converted to Christ. Some hand down that these tablets, at the time of the last destruction of Jerusalem under the Roman emperors, were in the temple of God, and thence were carried by Titus Augustus, among the other spoils of the captured city, into [his] triumph. With which agrees the image of the Jewish triumph, sculpted at Rome on the marble arch of the emperor Titus; where, among the other litters of those bearing [the spoils], the two tablets of the law are seen, together with the ark of the covenant and the golden candlestick. [5] Yet Josephus, who described the pomp of that triumph brilliantly, mentions only the golden candlestick, the golden table, and the volume of the Mosaic law; but of the tablets nothing at all. Philo and Josephus hand down that on each of these tablets five heads of the laws were inscribed.

ON THE FIRST were five weightier and nobler precepts: [6]

- **WHEREOF THE FIRST was:** Of the monarchy of one God, or of worshipping one God only — which begins, *I AM THE LORD THY GOD.*
- **THE SECOND:** Of utterly rejecting statues, images, and manufactured works of that kind.
- **THE THIRD:** Of not taking the name of God in vain.
- **THE FOURTH:** Of the religious observance of the seventh day.
- **THE FIFTH:** Of honoring parents.

But the SECOND tablet contained the other five, of things interdicted:

- **WHEREOF THE FIRST,** according to Philo, was, *THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT ADULTERY;* but according to Josephus and the Hebrew verity, the first was, *THOU SHALT NOT KILL.*

• **THE SECOND,** according to the Hebrew verity, was, *THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT ADULTERY;* according to Philo, *THOU SHALT NOT KILL.*

• **THE THIRD** restrains thieves.

• **THE FOURTH** forbids false witnesses.

• **THE FIFTH** represses concupiscence, the fountain of all evils.

But CHRISTIANS divide the precepts of these tablets in another order. For Origen, in the eighth homily on Exodus, and Athanasius, in the *Synopsis,* think that in the first tablet there were only four precepts, [7] pertaining to the divine worship — that is: the first, Of the adoration of one God; the second, Of not having images; the third, Of not misusing the name of God; the fourth, Of the Sabbath. But in the second tablet [they place] the remaining six precepts, necessary to the love of one's neighbor. Again, Augustine and some of the Latin fathers divide the precepts of each tablet into a triad and a septenary; and they affirm that in the first tablet there was, before all the precepts, prefixed a brief proem of the whole law — namely that, *I AM THE LORD THY GOD* [8] — which the Hebrews think to be the first precept of the law. To which proem they subjoin these three precepts, pertaining to the worship of God:

• **WHEREOF THE FIRST is:** Thou shalt not have strange gods.

• **THE SECOND:** Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.

• **THE THIRD:** Of the Sabbath.

But in the SECOND tablet they set in order these seven precepts:

• **WHEREOF THE FIRST is:** Of the honor of parents.

• **THE SECOND:** Of avoiding homicide.

• **THE THIRD** forbids adultery.

• **THE FOURTH** prohibits theft.

• **THE FIFTH,** false witnesses.

• **THE SIXTH,** which forbids all concupiscence — and which among the Hebrews is one only, and holds the tenth place in the decalogue — Augustine distinguishes into two: [9] that is, into an Interdict forbidding the concupiscence of riches (which is the sixth precept), and into an Interdict of the concupiscence of the flesh (which is numbered in the seventh and last place).

Now Moses called these tablets לחת העדת *Luchoth ha-edut,* that is, *the tablets of the testimony;* [10] [11] and Paul likewise, Τὰς πλάκας τῆς διαθήκης, that is, *The tablets of the testament or covenant* [12] — because God had written them for an everlasting testimony of that most celebrated covenant which the nation of the Hebrews had entered into with him on Mount Sinai, when, before the whole multitude of the Jews, [in answer] to God promising that out of all the nations of the earth he would have the people of Israel for his own peculiar [treasure], and for a priestly kingdom, and for a holy nation most highly commended to himself alone, if they would hear his voice and keep the covenants of the proposed law — all the people answered with unanimous cry: *ALL THINGS WHICH THE LORD HATH SPOKEN, WE WILL DO.* [13] Then, the consent of each part being given, and the covenants confirmed on both sides, God Most High engraved the conditions of the covenant entered into upon stone tablets, for a perpetual memorial of the deed, with his own living finger — in the year from the founding of the world two thousand four hundred and fifty-four, but before the advent of Christ 1507. [14]

DEUTERONOMY inscribed on the Altar, of which mention is in the eighth chapter of the book of Joshua, [15] was written on this occasion. When the people of the Jews were yet in the plains of Moab beyond the Jordan, Moses first commanded them that, when they had entered into the promised land, they should build on Mount Ebal an altar of great stones — whole, unformed, and unpolished, which iron had not touched — joined to one another with mortar; then that they should sculpt upon them, fairly and diligently, all the words

of the decalogue, with the eleven maledictions added which are read in the twenty-seventh chapter of Deuteronomy. When these were written, he commanded likewise that the Le-

[*Levitae* →]

[1] After the death of Moses only the tablets of the law were kept in the ark [2] 3 Kings 8:9 [3] 2 Macc. 2:5 [4] Jeremiah hid the tablets of the law in a cave [5] Whether the tablets of the law on which God wrote the Decalogue were in the temple of Jerusalem at the time of the last destruction is disputed [6] Exod. 20; Deut. 5 [7] In the judgment of Origen and Athanasius, in one tablet there were only four precepts, in the other the remaining six [8] Exod. 20:2 [9] Augustine divides the sixth precept, of those pertaining to the neighbor, into two others [10] Why the tablets of the law are called the tablets of testimony or covenant [11] Exod. 31:18 (printed "13:18") [12] Heb. 9:4 [13] Exod. 19:8 [14] God engraved the law on the tablets before the coming of Christ, in the year 1507 [15] Josh. 8:32

*(printed p. 59 [PDF p. 72], recto — leaf stamps "57". **DEUTERONOMY on the altar** concludes (Joshua at Ebal). The page then treats **THE DIARY of the kings of Media & Persia**, **DIONYSIUS the Areopagite** (his works and the authenticity debate), **THE BOOK OF THE LORD** (Isa 34:16), and **THE WRITING OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL**. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ the] Levites should intone those maledictions with a loud voice, and the whole people, answering to each, should acclaim, *AMEN*. When therefore Joshua, having crossed the Jordan, had occupied the land of the Canaanites in the fifth year after the death of Moses, [1] he built an altar to the Lord on Mount Ebal, and wrote upon the stones of the altar משנה תורה *Miscne Thora*, that is, that Summary of the law which the LXX interpreters rendered Δευτερονόμιον — that is, *the Second law*, or *repetition of the law;* and together with this summary he left those maledictions written, as Josephus testifies, in the year from the founding of the world two thousand four hundred and ninety-seven.

THE DIARY OF THE KINGS OF MEDIA AND PERSIA, or ספר דברי הימים למלכי מדי ופרס [2] *Sepher diver-haiamim lemalche Medai u-Phares*, that is, *The Book of the words of the days of the kings of the Medes and Persians*, signifies the annals in which the daily acts of the kings, the reckoning of times being kept, were briefly noted; and among the Babylonians they were preserved in the public library of the city of Ecbatana. In these Esdras testifies that, by the diligence of Darius, king of the Persians, was found a certain decree of Cyrus, king of the Persians, concerning the leading-back of the Jewish people into Judaea and the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem, at the cost and expenses furnished from the royal [treasury] of the kings of the Persians. In these also the author of the book of Esther reports that the deeds of Ahasuerus (or Artaxerxes), king of the Persians, were described — but especially his immortal benefit toward the Jewish nation; whereby he magnificently delivered the whole race of the Hebrews, [appointed] to be slaughtered in one day throughout all the cities of his kingdom, vengeance being taken upon their enemies.

DIONYSIUS, surnamed the Areopagite (whom Luke, in the 17th chapter of the Acts, writes to have believed, together with a woman [named] Damaris and very many others, when Paul preached in the Areopagus of Athens), [3] obtained the chief priesthood of the church of Athens, as Eusebius writes in the third book of the History; but, as Bede reports in the commentaries on the apostolic Acts, he was bishop of Corinth. He most learnedly composed, in Greek and sublime eloquence, admirable volumes of a divine wisdom, hidden in mysteries. Of which, those that are extant in Greek and Latin are these: [4]

- **OF THE Celestial, or angelic hierarchy,** to his fellow-presbyter Timothy, one book.
- **OF THE Ecclesiastical, or sacerdotal hierarchy,** to his fellow-presbyter Timothy, one book.
- **OF THE Divine names,** to his fellow-presbyter Timothy, one book.
- **OF Mystical theology,** to Timothy his fellow-presbyter, one book.
- **TO Caius the Monk,** four epistles.
- **TO Dorotheus the minister,** one epistle.
- **TO Sosipater the priest,** one epistle.

• **TO Polycarp the high priest,** one epistle.

• **TO Demophilus the Monk,** one epistle.

• **TO Titus the high priest,** one epistle; which Trithemius reviews under the title of the book *OF SYMBOLIC THEOLOGY.*

• **TO John the apostle and evangelist,** one epistle.

• **TO Apollophanes the philosopher,** one epistle.

But those which are now wanting — commemorated by Dionysius himself in the aforesaid lucubrations — are these works:

• **THE BOOK of Divine hymns,** alleged in chapter 7 of the *Celestial hierarchy.*

• **THE BOOK of Symbolic theology,** cited in chapter 15 of the *Celestial hierarchy,* and chapters 1 and 13 of the *Divine names,* and chapter 3 of the *Mystical theology,* and epistle 9, to Titus.

• **THE BOOK of intelligible and sensible [things],** cited in the first and second chapters of the *Ecclesiastical hierarchy.*

• **THE BOOK of the legal, or sacerdotal hierarchy,** cited in chapter 3 of the *Ecclesiastical hierarchy.*

• **THE BOOK of Theological hypotyposes,** cited in chapters 1 and 2 of the *Divine names,* and chapter 3 of the *Mystical Theology.*

• **THE BOOK of angelic properties,** cited in chapter 4 of the *Divine names.*

• **THE BOOK of the soul,** cited in the fourth chapter of the *Divine names.*

• **THE BOOK of the divine and just judgment,** cited in chapter 4 of the *Divine names.*

To these Trithemius adds one epistle *Of the death of Paul,* to Timothy; whose copy is recited by Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa, in the life of Paul.

THOMAS, presbyter cardinal of St. Xystus [San Sisto], in the commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles and on the third book of Kings, is of the opinion that Dionysius the Areopagite left nothing at all of the above-mentioned writings, being led (as he himself judges) by certain not-light conjectures; [5] to which — since Anastasius the Librarian, John Scotus, John the Saracen, Dionysius the Carthusian, Ambrose the Camaldolese, Marsilius Ficinus, and very many other most erudite men, long before him, most fully satisfied [the objections] alleged by others — it would be superfluous to weave over again the same web. The third Council of Constantinople, more than nine hundred years ago, acknowledged and venerated the aforesaid works as the true and proper offspring of Dionysius; [6] in whose acts the testimonies of these are several times brought in, under the name of the most holy Dionysius the Areopagite, for the confuting of heretics.

THE BOOK OF THE LORD, in Hebrew ספר יהוה *Sepher Iehova,* is cited by Isaiah, chapter 34, in these words: [7] *SEEK diligently in the Book of the Lord, and read: not one of them was wanting, one did not seek the other; for that which proceeds out of his mouth, he hath commanded; and his spirit itself shall gather them.* By this book some understand the book of Moses, some the book of nature; but the sounder sense is that Isaiah, by the *Book of the Lord,* understands the book of his own prophecies [8] — as if he said: *Let this book be commended to you; and when those things shall come to pass upon you which I foretell as future, seek, and all things shall meet you in this book, [written] by the command of the Lord, taken down from the spirit of [his] mouth.* Some gather out of those words the mystery of the Trinity. For the Son is signified by *[his] mouth;* but the Father, when *his* [own] is added — which in Hebrew is written הוא, and is reputed among the Rabbins a most excellent name of God; while the Holy Spirit is expressed by the very word *spirit.*

THE WRITING OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL designates the catalog and canon of the holy scriptures, [9] in which the vaticinations and writings of false prophets have no place — as God openly testifies through Ezekiel, chapter thirteen, saying: [10] *AND MY HAND SHALL BE upon the prophets who see vain things, and*

divine a li-

[*dacium* (= *lie*) →]

---

[1] Joshua in the fifth year after the death of Moses occupied the land of the Canaanites [2] 1 Esdras 6 [3] Acts 17:34 [4] The extant works of Dionysius the Areopagite [5] Cajetan's conjectures, led by which he denied that Dionysius wrote the works everywhere ascribed to him, are weak [6] The third Council of Constantinople acknowledged the works of blessed Dionysius [7] Isa. 34:16 [8] What the Book of the Lord is [9] What the Writing of the house of Israel is [10] Ezek. 13:9

---

*(printed p. 60 [PDF p. 73], verso — leaf stamps "58". **THE WRITING OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL** concludes. The letter **E** opens with a single long entry, **EPIMENIDES of Crete** — his book* Of Oracles *and Paul's use of his "Cretans always liars" verse (Titus 1:12), with the patristic debate over the Apostle's citing a pagan poet. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ a li]-e: they shall not be in the council of my people, and in the writing of the house of Israel they shall not be written. — Or in another manner: *The writing of the house of Israel* is the catalog of the elect with God, digested in the book of eternal predestination, in which no impious one, nor reprobate, is written.

E.

EPIMENIDES of Crete, by country a Gnossian, a most ancient philosopher and poet, priest of the temple of Mithra (or of the Sun) in Crete, [1] wrote a book entitled περὶ τῶν χρησμῶν, that is, *Of ORACLES;* in which he discoursed of oracles and responses foretelling future things. Out of this the Apostle Paul took a testimony against the false teachers of the Cretans, that he might convince them by the authority of their own teacher — thus writing to Titus, bishop of Crete: [2] *FOR THIS CAUSE I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst correct the things that are wanting… For there are many disobedient, vain-talkers, and seducers, especially they who are of the circumcision; whom it behooveth to be rebuked, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for the sake of filthy lucre. One of them, their own prophet, said:*

> ΚΡΗΤΕΣ ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί,
>
> *that is, CRETANS [are] always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.*

This testimony is true. For which cause rebuke them sharply. Thus Paul. Jerome, concerning this hexameter verse, in the commentaries on the epistle to Titus, speaks thus: [3] *THERE ARE THOSE who think this verse taken from Callimachus the Cyrenaean poet; and in some part they do not err — since he too, writing in praise of Jove against the Cretans (who gloried that they showed his sepulchre), says, CRETANS always liars, who have even fabricated thy sepulchre with a sacrilegious mind. But, as we said above, the whole verse is taken by the Apostle from the poet Epimenides; and Callimachus used it in the exordium of his own poem.* Thus Jerome; to whom Augustine, in the second book *Against the adversary of the law and the prophets,* subscribes, attributing the same verse to Epimenides. But Chrysostom, expounding more fully the occasion of this song, in the third sermon on the epistle to Titus, writes thus: [4] *WHO HE was, and whence he was who said this, must of necessity be told to you. Epimenides is he who uttered it, himself also a Cretan; and this is the occasion of the saying. The Cretans have a sepulchre of Jove, thus inscribed:*

> Ἐνθάδε Κεῖται ὃν Δία ἐπικαλοῦσι, *that is: Here lies he whom they call Jove.*

On account of this inscription, therefore, the poet, taxing them with lying, says:

> ΚΡΗΤΕΣ ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί,
>
> Τάφον ἄνα σεῖο Κρῆτες ἐτεκτήναντο·
>
> Σὺ δ′ οὐ θάνες, ἐστὶ γὰρ αἰεί.

that is, Cretans [are] always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. For indeed they fabricated thy sepulchre, O king; but thou didst by no means die: for thou ever livest.

CELSUS the Epicurean, in the books of *the true discourse* which he published against the Christians, said that those things which the Cretans relate concerning the sepulchre of Jove among them contain a mystery, and ought to be understood according to allegory. Contradicting whom, Origen, in the third volume against him — at the same time attributing these verses to Callimachus, with some [others] super-added — writes thus: *CALLIMACHUS the Cyrenaean, when he had read through infinite poems, and run over well-nigh the whole Greek history, and understood nothing at all said mystically concerning Jove and his sepulchre, accuses the Cretans in a certain distich which he wrote in praise of Jove, thus saying:*

O Jupiter, thee indeed men report to have been born on the Idaean mountains;

thee, I say, most also have said to have been born in Arcadia:

which of these, O father, do they lie?

The Cretans, always liars, built a sepulchre for thee, O king;

but thou hast not yet undergone death: for thou art to abide eternally.

The distich, of which Origen here makes mention, in Callimachus, in the hymn of Apollo [so; the Hymn to Zeus], has thus:

Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σεῖο

Κρῆτες ἐτεκτήναντο· σὺ δ' οὐ θάνες, ἐστὶ γὰρ αἰεί.

The Cretans, always vain, built a sepulchre — thy [sepulchre], O nourishing king; but to succumb to death thou never couldst, who livest through all ages.

EPIPHANIUS, in the first book of the *Panarion,* asserts that all these verses are of Epimenides, but that out of them Callimachus usurped for himself the last two, as an approved testimony against the Cretans. Jerome, meeting certain [persons] who, for the sake of this testimony, were calumniating Paul, in the place already cited adds these things: [5] *CERTAIN [persons] think the Apostle to be reprehended, because he imprudently slipped; and, while he rebukes the false teachers, he approved that verse — [saying] that on that account the Cretans are said to be deceivers, because they vainly built a sepulchre of Jove. For if (say they) Epimenides, or Callimachus, on that account argue the Cretans [to be] deceivers and evil beasts and slow bellies, because they perceive not divine things, and feign Jove — who reigns in heaven — to be buried in their island; and [if] this which they said is true, the Apostle's opinion is approved: it follows that Jove is not dead, but living. Unskillfully, therefore, [did] Paul, the destroyer of idolatry, while he acts against perverse teachers, assert the gods whom he was impugning.* To which it must be briefly answered, that just as, in that which he says, EVIL COMMUNICATIONS CORRUPT GOOD MANNERS, and in that, FOR WE ARE ALSO HIS OFFSPRING, he did not straightway approve the whole comedy of Menander and the book of Aratus, but used the opportunity of the verse: so also in the present place he did not, by a single verse, confirm the whole work of Callimachus or of Epimenides (whereof the one sings the praises of Jove, the other writes of oracles); but he rebuked only the Cretans as liars, for the vice of the nation — not on account of that opinion for which they are taxed by the poets, but for their inborn facility of lying, and he confuted them out of their nation's own author. And that we may know that the Apostle spoke, not by chance and in passing, but considerately and circumspectly, and protecting himself on every side against the Cretans, *THIS TESTIMONY,* he says,

[*HOC* →]

[1] Epimenides was a priest of the Sun in Crete [2] Titus 1:5,10-13 [3] St. Jerome's judgment on the hexameter verse, in the Epistle to Titus [4] St. Chrysostom explains the occasion of the hexameter verse in the epistle to Titus [5] St. Jerome refutes the calumniators of the Apostle

---

*(printed p. 61 [PDF p. 74], recto — leaf stamps "59". **EPIMENIDES** concludes (the "Liar" syllogism; his 57-year sleep and death). The page then treats **ISAIAH** (his works, and the apocryphal **Ascension of Isaiah**) and **ESDRAS** — the legend of the 204 dictated books (4 Esdras 14). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ THIS] IS TRUE — not the whole song from which the testimony is taken, not the entire work, but only this testimony, only this little verse, by which they are called liars. Thus Jerome.

This verse became celebrated in the schools of the dialecticians, from the syllogism which is called ψευδόμενος, that is, *The Liar*. [1] As an example of which this verse is brought forward by the sophists in this manner: *Either the song of Epimenides is true, or false: if true, then the Cretans are not liars, because Epimenides, the author of the song, was a Cretan: if false, then the Cretans are not liars.*

DIOGENES Laertius writes that Epimenides, when he was yet a youth, was once sent by his father to bring back a sheep from the country; and when, at the midday hour, he had turned aside from the journey into a cave, he there rested in a perpetual sleep fifty-seven years. [2] Then, being awakened — since he thought he had slept but little — he sought again for the sheep; which, when he had not found it, he returned to the field. And there, when he perceived the face of all things changed, astonished with stupor and hesitating, he went back into the town. There, when he wished to enter his own house, he was asked who he might be; and, scarcely recognized by a younger brother, now an old man, he learned from him the whole truth of the matter. Moreover, his fame flying through Greece, he was esteemed most dear to the gods, and always lived in the highest honor among the Athenians, even to the hundred-and-fifty-seventh year of his age; and he departed this life in the fiftieth Olympiad — that is, in the 750th year before the birth of Christ. [3]

ISAIAH, son of Amoz, the Prophet, wrote a book of the deeds of Uzziah, king of Jerusalem, of which there is mention in the twenty-sixth chapter of the latter book of Paralipomenon. In whose 32nd chapter also is commemorated a certain *Vision of Isaiah*, containing the discourses and the [acts of] mercy toward Hezekiah, king of Judah; which indeed there is no doubt is that same which, in the book of Isaiah, is described from the thirty-sixth chapter even to the fortieth, in a long discourse.

THE SAME Isaiah ALSO — as Rabbi Moses Kimchi, out of the opinion of the Jews, noted in the book *Of the Ways of the holy tongue* — is reported to have written the book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of canticles, which are had, under the name of Solomon, in the divine scriptures. [4]

HERETICS composed, under the name of Isaiah, a book which is inscribed ΑΝΑΒΑΣΙΣ, that is, *The Ascension;* of which Epiphanius makes mention in the second [book] of the *Panarion*, in these words: [5] *HIERAX, trifling much concerning Melchizedek — whom he says to be the Holy Spirit — strives to confirm this out of the Ascension of Isaiah; namely, as in the volume called the ASCENSION he said: THE ANGEL, walking about before me, SHOWED me, and said to me, Who is he at the right hand of God? And I said, Thou knowest, Lord. And he said, This is that only-begotten beloved [one]. And [he said], Who is the other, like to him, at the left? And I said, Thou knowest. This is the Holy Spirit, who speaks in thee and in the prophets. And he was like to the only-begotten.* And out of this testimony [Hierax] confirms Melchizedek to be the Holy Spirit — because, as Paul says, being likened to the Son of God, he remains a priest forever. That this same writing was in use among the Archontic heretics, the same Epiphanius testifies in the first book of the *Panarion.* [6] Jerome, on the 64th chapter of Isaiah, expounding that [verse] of Isaiah, *FROM THE AGE THEY HAVE NOT HEARD, NEITHER HAVE THEY [with their ears] RECEIVED,* &c., [7] says: *THE ASCENSION of Isaiah and the Apocalypse of Elias have this testimony; and by this occasion silly little women, laden with sins, were deceived. [the primary scan here prints an obscure word,* Lusitaniæ*, between "occasion" and "little women"; Jerome's text has no such word]* Origen, on the 13th chapter of Matthew, cites an Apocryphon of Isaiah, in which it is narrated that Isaiah perished, cruelly cut in pieces by his own

people.

THERE IS EXTANT a certain Vision, under the title of Isaiah, printed at Venice, whose inscription is this: *THE ADMIRABLE VISION of Isaiah the Prophet in a rapture of mind,* which contains the arcana of the divine Trinity and the redemption of fallen mankind.

ESDRAS, who in the first volume of the sacred annals is called Josedech the priest, [8] and by the Hebrews Malachi, is thought to be the last of the prophets. [9] He, when he was returned from the captivity of Babylon, by the afflatus of the Spirit of God dictated — concerning those [scriptures] which were contained in the most holy writings burned at the destruction of Jerusalem — two hundred and four books; [10] which five very swift scribes, taking down from his mouth through forty continuous days, wrote out on boxwood tablets. Of these, Esdras published a hundred and twenty-six abroad; but the rest, elaborated with a more secret wisdom and a more sublime science, he reserved to be read secretly by the wise alone, and by the teachers skilled in the law, with greater care and more diligent study. Esdras himself makes mention of these books in the fourth volume of his visions, chapter fourteen, in these words: [11] *BECAUSE, O LORD, thy law is burnt, and on this account no one knows the things which have been done by thee; if I have found grace with thee, send into me the Holy Spirit, that I may write all that has been done in the world from the beginning, [the things] which were written in thy law. And he answered me, and said, GO, and gather the people, and thou shalt say to them that they seek thee not for forty days. But do thou prepare thee many [tablets of] boxwood, and take with thee Saraias, Dabria, Salemia, Echanus, and Asiel — these five, who are ready to write swiftly; and come hither; and I will kindle in thy heart the lamp of understanding, which shall not be extinguished until the things be finished which thou shalt begin to write. And then, [these] being perfected, some thou shalt make public, some thou shalt deliver secretly to the wise…. And I took the five men, as the Lord had commanded me; and we set out into the field, and remained there. And it came to pass on the morrow; and behold, a voice called me, saying, ESDRAS, open thy mouth, and drink what I shall give thee to drink. And I opened my mouth; and behold, a full cup was reached to me. It was full, as it were of water; and the color as of fire. And I took it, and drank; and when I had drunk, my heart was tormented with understanding, and wisdom grew in my breast. For my spirit was preserved in memory. And my mouth was opened, and was shut no more. The Most High gave understanding to the five men, and they wrote the things that were dictated — the sublimities of the night, which they knew not. By night they ate bread; but I by day spoke, and by night was not silent. And there were written, in the forty days, two hundred and four books. And when the forty days were completed, the Most High said to me: THE FORMER [books], which thou hast written, set in public, that the worthy and the unworthy may read [them]; but the last seventy thou shalt preserve, to deliver them to the wise of thy people. For in these is the vein of understanding, and the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge. And I did so.*

[*PICVS* →]

---

[1] A sophistical argument [2] Epimenides slept fifty-seven continuous years in a cave [3] Epimenides, aged a hundred and fifty years, died 750 years before the birth of Christ [4] Some think Isaiah wrote the book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs [5] Epiphanius, against heresy 67 [6] Epiphanius, against heresy 40 [7] Isa. 64:14 [8] 1 Paral. 6:14-15 [9] Esdras is thought to be Malachi, the last of the prophets [10] Esdras dictated two hundred and four books [11] 4 Esdras 14:21

---

*(printed p. 62 [PDF p. 75], verso — leaf stamps "60". **ESDRAS** continues: Pico della Mirandola's claim that the 70 secret books = the **Kabbalah**, then the note distinguishing the true Kabbalah from the false, necromantic one condemned by the Roman Inquisition. The page also treats **ESDRAS's Pentateuch** and **Dream**, **ESTHER**, and **HEZEKIAH's writing**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

PICO, count of Mirandola, in the fifth question of his *Apologia,* asserts that in these seventy latter books is contained that whole more secret exposition of the divine law, which by the Jews is called קבלה KABBALAH, that is, *Reception.* [1] Now the Kabbalah is the more secret exposition of the divine law,

received from the mouth of God by Moses, and from the mouth of Moses by the fathers through continual successions — not indeed by writing, but taken up by living voice; which has a likeness to that exposition which we call Anagogical, and is on that account more sublime than the rest, because it leads us upward from earthly things to heavenly, from sensible to intelligible, from temporal to eternal, from corporeal to spiritual, from human to divine. The origin and occasion of these seventy volumes the same Pico reports, out of the opinion of Rabbi Moses the Egyptian [Maimonides], in well-nigh these words: [2] *WHEN MOSES had ascended Mount Sinai, he received from God a twofold law: the one literal, which he himself, engraven in letters, published to all the Jews by God's precept; the other spiritual, which — God so commanding — he wrote not, but communicated secretly to the seventy wise men only, whom he had chosen for himself for the custody of the law; and he likewise charged them not to publish it in writing, but to reveal it by living voice to their successors; and they in turn to their posterity, the same order being kept in perpetuity. And that God revealed to Moses, besides the written law, another spiritual law, or a mystical exposition of that same written law, separately — witnesses are Esdras, Paul, Origen, and Hilary. Of whom Esdras, in the fourth book, at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter, brings in God thus speaking to him: [margin: 4 Esdras 14:3-6] REVEALING, I was revealed to Moses upon the bush, when my people served in Egypt; and I brought him upon Mount Sinai, and detained him with me many days; and I narrated to him many marvels, and showed him the secrets of the times and the end; and I commanded him, saying, THESE words thou shalt make public, and these thou shalt hide. Subscribing to Esdras, Origen — when he expounded that [place] to the Romans, [margin: Rom. 3:2] BECAUSE TO THEM WERE COMMITTED THE ORACLES OF GOD — says that to the Jews were committed by God not only the letters, but also the oracles of God. From which saying of Origen it is indicated that, besides the literal law, something else was delivered to the Jews, which here Paul calls the Oracles of God. And Hilary too, in the exposition of the second psalm, testifies this same thing more openly, saying: IT WAS already instituted of old by Moses that in every synagogue there should be seventy doctors. For the same Moses, although he had composed the words of the Old Testament in letters, had nevertheless intimated separately certain more secret mysteries, out of the hidden [things] of the law, to the seventy elders, who should thenceforth remain doctors; of which doctrine the Lord also makes mention in the Gospel, saying, UPON the chair of Moses have sat the scribes and Pharisees: [margin: Matt. 23:2-3] all things therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, keep, and do; but according to their works do ye not. The doctrine, therefore, of these remained unto posterity; which, received from the very writing of the law, was preserved in this number and service of the elders.* Thus Hilary. *Since therefore, down to the time of the Babylonian captivity, nothing had been written concerning this more secret exposition, Esdras, after the rebuilding of the city and the law restored by him, willed that this Kabbalistic explanation should be committed to the monuments of letters, lest perchance it should be lost on account of the captivities and Jewish dispersions, in which the order and ancient custom of delivering the Kabbalah by hand [i.e., by succession] could not be kept. Having therefore called to him most faithful notaries, he reduced all the mysteries of the Kabbalah into 70 books, according to the number of the seventy elders of the synagogue, to be communicated thereafter to the wise alone. These books, therefore, bought up for me at great expense, when I had diligently read them through, I found in them many things — nay, well-nigh all — consonant with our faith, wherewith Christians may transfix the Jews with their own weapons: among whom the authority of the Kabbalists is in great honor and reverence. This, then, is the Kabbalah of which I believe I first made explicit mention among the Latins.* Thus far Pico. [3]

Moreover, because by decree of the holy Roman Inquisition all the books pertaining to the Kabbalah were lately condemned, it is to be known that there is a twofold Kabbalah — the one true, the other false. [4] True and pious is that which, as we already said, elucidates the arcane mysteries of the sacred law according to anagogy; which indeed, in the third volume of this work, we shall show to be necessary for the interpretation of the divine scripture, bringing forward some of the illustrious expositors, as well Greek as Latin, who use it in their explanations. This, therefore, the Church has never condemned. [5] False and impious is that Kabbalah

[which is] a certain counterfeit kind of Jewish tradition, which certain wicked Jews say has flowed down from Moses through the fathers even to themselves — stuffed with innumerable vanities and falsities, differing nothing, or little, from Necromancy. For it unfolds certain secret names of God, and their occult virtues; by which some Necromancers among the Jews use, for the binding of demons and the working of illusions, asserting that our Christ wrought all his miracles by the help of this art. This kind of superstition, therefore, improperly called Kabbalah, the Church in recent years has deservedly condemned. [6]

ESDRAS's Pentateuch — a single and oblong membrane [scroll] of his, written (as the Hebrews believe) by the hand of Esdras, without any vowel points — is preserved with the highest veneration in our monastery of the Preachers at Bologna.

ESDRAS's Dream and prophecy of the fates of the Roman monarchy is a book fabricated by the heretics of our times; which the Senate of the holy Roman Inquisition willed to be held, by name, among the condemned writings.

ESTHER, wife of Artaxerxes (or Ahasuerus), king of the Persians, wrote to the Jews living under her husband's empire two epistles concerning the solemnity of Purim — that is, of Lots — to be celebrated forever. These Lysimachus, son of Ptolemy, turned out of the Persian tongue into Greek. Esther, chapters 9 and 11.

THE WRITING OF HEZEKIAH, king of Judah, for which in the Hebrew is had מכתב *Michtav,* that is, *a writing;* among the Seventy interpreters προσευχὴ Ἐζεκίου, i.e., *the Prayer of Hezekiah;* but among others, *a Congratulation,* or *Thanksgiving in writing.* This king Hezekiah, when he was recovering after health divinely restored, wrote — a thing worthy of memory — transmitting to posterity the benefit of his prolonged life. He describes first the bitterness of the sickness, then the benefit of health restored by God. See Isaiah, chapter thirty-eight. The same [Hezekiah] wrote *Of the feast of the Passover kept outside the time appointed in the law* — that is,

[*est* →]

[1] What the Kabbalah may be [2] Pico della Mirandola's opinion of the Kabbalah [3] Pico thinks himself the first of the Latins to have openly discoursed of the Kabbalah [4] The Kabbalah is twofold [5] The Church has not condemned the true Kabbalah [6] The false Kabbalah has been condemned by the Church

---

*(printed p. 63 [PDF p. 76], recto — leaf stamps "61". **HEZEKIAH** concludes, then **EZEKIEL's apocryphon**. The letter **F** opens with **THE WRITING OF THE COVENANT** (Neh 9) and **THE BOOK OF THE COVENANT** (Exod 24). The letter **G** opens with **GAD the seer** (1 Chron 29:29). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ that] is, on the fourteenth day of the second month, in celebrating [the Passover] — one epistle, of which mention is made in 2 Paralipomenon, chapter 30. He wrote also, as some think, the history of the book of Judges. [1]

EZEKIEL the Prophet's Apocryphal book is cited by Athanasius in the *Synopsis;* which perhaps is one of the two books of prophecies and oracles which Josephus, in the fifth chapter of the tenth book of the *Antiquities,* reports to have been written by Ezekiel.

F.

THE WRITING OF THE COVENANT OF THE JEWS is had in the ninth chapter of Nehemiah; in which place it is narrated how the people of Israel, returned from the captivity of Babylon, struck a covenant with God, promising that they would thenceforth keep his law — a public writing being added, and an oath, for the confirmation of the covenant. And they sealed the writing; and to it, in the name of the whole people,

subscribed the princes, priests, and Levites, all of the Jews.

THE BOOK OF THE COVENANT, in Hebrew ספר הברית *Sepher ha-berith*, for which the Seventy interpreters rendered Τὸ βιβλίον διαθήκης, that is, *The Book of the testament*, is commemorated in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus in these words: [2] *AND MOSES wrote all the words of the Lord, and built an altar… and they offered holocausts, and immolated twelve calves. And Moses took half part of the blood, and put it into bowls; but the remaining part he poured upon the altar. And taking the book of the covenant, he read it, the people hearing; who said, ALL that the Lord hath spoken, we will do, and we will be obedient. But he took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people, and said, THIS is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath struck with you upon all these words.* Which covenant indeed Paul, some rites being super-added, in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews thus expressed: [3] *THE FIRST [testament] indeed was not dedicated without blood. For after Moses had read every commandment of the law to the whole people, taking the blood of calves and goats, with water and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book itself and the people, saying, THIS is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.* These things we have in the divine letters concerning the Book of the Covenant; which was so called [4] because it was as it were a handwriting [*chirographum*] of the covenant entered into between God and the people of Israel, containing in itself the promises of God to the people, and of the people to God. For such was the benignity of God, that, although he was free from all law and pact, he yet willed to bind himself as it were by an instrument and contract [5] — that even thus he might render the Hebrews the more certain that he would never fail his promises; and that they themselves might acknowledge themselves the more strictly bound to execute what they had of their own accord promised in this Book of the Covenant, as out of a bond [*syngrapha*]. He willed also that the promises of this covenant, made on both sides, should be confirmed by the effusion of blood and the slaying of animals, according to the common custom of all nations; which, sheep being slain and by the blood of victims, joined mutual covenants among themselves. That this custom flowed down, from a most ancient usage, even to the Alban and Roman kings, Virgil shows in these verses:

> *[Aeneid 8]*
>
> *Afterward the same kings, a combat being set between them,*
>
> *armed, before the altars of Jove, and holding bowls,*
>
> *stood, and joined covenants by a slain sow.*
>
> *[Aeneid 12]*
>
> *With such words they confirmed covenants among themselves,*
>
> *in the midst of the sight of the nobles: then they duly slaughter*
>
> *the consecrated beasts into the flame, and tear out the entrails*
>
> *from the living.*

But concerning the writing of this volume there is a threefold opinion. [6] The Jewish interpreters, among whom Rabbi Solomon [Rashi], say that the volume was the whole course of the Mosaic narration, from the beginning of Genesis even to the end of the 19th chapter of the book of Exodus; in which are had all the covenants and pacts which God sanctioned with their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, together with the other deeds of the Israelite people even to the delivery of the law; which [delivery] the twentieth chapter of Exodus relates [to have been made] after the writing of this volume was composed. Augustine judges that in this volume there were only the justifications — that is, the judicial and ceremonial mandates — which are recited from the twentieth even to the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus, the ten moral precepts of the decalogue excepted; which, although Moses reviewed them in the 20th chapter of Exodus (the rule of anticipation being kept, usual among the divine writers), he nevertheless shows afterward, in the 24th chapter, that the decalogue was written by God on stone tablets after the publication of that volume. Thomas

Cajetan reckons that in the present volume are comprehended, first and before all, the ten moral mandates, and then the other laws of judgments and ceremonies, promulgated by Moses before the promulgation of the law on the tablets; and this he urges from the very name of covenant which is attributed to the volume. For the sum and head of the whole covenant between God and the people consists in the obligation of the ten precepts. Whence also Moses named the tablets, in which those ten precepts are contained, the *Tablets of the covenant.* And since God had not yet revealed to him that he would at some time write the laws of the decalogue on tablets, it behooved him, at the beginning of this volume, to write down the ten precepts already brought forth from the mouth of God, that the writing of the pact — which was confirmed by the sprinkling of blood — might be whole and complete; and that the covenant also might be entire, whereby the people, especially through the obligation of the decalogue, were joined to God.

G.

GAD the Prophet, in Hebrew גד הנביא חזה דוד *Gad ha-navi, choze David,* that is, *Gad the Prophet, the Seer of David* [7] [8] (whom the Lord sent to king David, that he might offer him one of three punishments to be chosen, on account of the crime of the numbered people — that is, either seven years' famine, or a three-months' persecution by enemies, or a three-days' pestilence), composed a most copious universal history of the life of king David, [9] and of the deeds done everywhere on earth in his time; which is reviewed at the end of the former book of Paralipomenon in these words: [10] *NOW THE DEEDS of king David, the first and the last, are written in the volume of Samuel the Seer, and in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and of Gad the Seer, and [the deeds] of all his kingdom and might, and of the times which passed under him, whether in Israel or in all the kingdoms of the lands:*

[*GAIUS* →]

[1] Some think Hezekiah wrote the history of the book of Judges [2] Exod 24:4-8 [3] Heb 9:18-20 [4] What the Book of the Covenant is [5] Though God was free from all law, he willed to bind himself as it were by an instrument [6] There are three opinions of the authors concerning the Book of the Covenant [7] 1 Chron 29:29 [8] 1 Chron 21:10-12 [9] Gad wrote a history of the life of David [10] 1 Chron 29:29-30

(printed p. 64 [PDF p. 77], verso — leaf stamps "62". G-headwords: ***GAIUS*** *(Rom 16:23),* ***THE ENDLESS GENEALOGIES*** *(1 Tim 1:4; the Jewish* deuteroses*), and the long* ***THE GREAT BOOK*** *(Isa 8:1) — the* Maher-shalal-hash-baz *scroll, its historical setting and its allegorical reading (the prophetess = the Virgin Mary). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

GAIUS, the beloved host of the Apostles (concerning whom Paul, writing to the Romans, says: *GAIUS my host SALUTETH you*) [1] was — as Dorotheus of Tyre testifies in the *Synopsis* — bishop of the church of Ephesus after Titus, a disciple of Paul. [2] Athanasius, in the *Synopsis,* hands down that he wrote at Ephesus, from the mouth of John the Apostle, a Gospel, which is now inscribed *According to John.* But Simon Metaphrastes, in the life of John the Evangelist, has committed to memory that Prochorus, the apostolic deacon, put this same Gospel into writing on the island of Patmos, John dictating. [3]

THE ENDLESS GENEALOGIES. Concerning these Paul, in the former epistle to Timothy, says: [4] *ATTEND not to endless Genealogies, which afford questions rather than edification.* And in the epistle to Titus he says: [5] *Avoid Genealogies and contentions.* [6] Jerome, in the commentaries on the epistle to Titus, and in the third commentary on Isaiah, says that these are certain constitutions of the Jews, called by the Greeks δευτερώσεις [deuteroses], which the Hebrews Akiba, Meir, Johanan, and Eliezer first committed to writing. Augustine, in the second book against the adversary of the law, chapter one, reports that these *deuteroses* were not written among the Jews, but held by memory, and transfused from one to another by speaking; [7] in which the Jews hand down that God created for the first man two women, out of whom afterward they weave infinite genealogies.

THE GREAT BOOK, in Hebrew גליון גדול *Ghilaion gadol,* which the Seventy interpreters rendered [8] Τόμον καινὸν μέγαν, that is, *a New great volume,* [9] is a paper, or large page, rollable upon itself in the manner of a coil — commonly called by the notaries a *Roll* [*Rotulus*] — on which God commanded Isaiah to write, in larger letters, these four Hebrew words: מהר שלל חש בז *Maher shalal, chash baz,* [10] that is, *Hasten to the prey, make speed to the spoil.* For which our Vulgate edition reads, *Swiftly take away the spoils, speedily plunder.* But the Seventy interpreters have Τοῦ ἐξέως προνομὴν ποιῆσαι σκύλων, that is, *That he may swiftly make plundering of spoils.* But some have, *Call his name SWIFT-SPOILING, SPEEDY-PREY;* and others, *A swift plunderer, a hasty spoiler.* [11] Now this writing showed forth the name which Isaiah, by divine command, was to impose on his son — whom, as Chrysostom says, he was soon to have by his wife the prophetess. For God willed by this name to portend the imminent plundering of the Israelite kingdom, whereby, a little after — before that lately-born infant should begin to prattle — the king of the Assyrians plundered Damascus and Samaria, the metropolis of Israel; as Isaiah testifies in these words: [12] *AND THE LORD SAID to me, Take thee a great book, and write in it with a man's pen: SWIFTLY TAKE AWAY THE SPOILS, SPEEDILY PLUNDER. And I took to me faithful witnesses, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Barachiah: and I went to the prophetess; and she conceived, and bore a son. And the Lord said to me, Call his name, HASTEN, TAKE AWAY THE SPOILS, MAKE SPEED TO PLUNDER; for before he shall know to call his father and his mother, the strength of Damascus shall be taken away, and the spoils of Samaria, before the king of the Assyrians,* &c.

THERE ARE THOSE who think that these words are not to be understood of the son of Isaiah the Prophet; because it is not likely that the prophet, endowed with the highest modesty and honesty, would have brought in witnesses to observe him uniting with his wife — and those especially [as] witnesses whereof the one, namely Zechariah, son of Barachiah, was not yet born; but the other, namely Uriah the priest, was altogether unworthy in the authority and name of a witness, especially in divine mysteries, since he was unfaithful; and, as the fourth book of Kings reports, [13] had built an altar like to the altar of the city of Damascus, on which he offered victims and holocausts, together with the impious king Ahaz, to the gods of the gentiles. Whom Uriah, even if the prophet had brought him in with him, he would nevertheless not have called a faithful witness, saying, *I TOOK TO ME FAITHFUL WITNESSES.* Then, neither does the age of the infant seem to agree with the time of the Samaritan plundering, which the prophet had foretold as future before the boy should begin to speak. For that [plundering], as the fourth book of Kings is witness, [14] happened in the sixth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and the ninth year of Hosea, king of Israel; at which time the boy had already reached the eighteenth year of his age. For so many years flowed from the fourth year of Ahaz, in which the boy was born and the book was written, even to the sixth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and the ninth year of Hosea, reigning over Israel in Samaria — when Shalmaneser, king of the Assyrians, devastated Samaria, and carried the Israelites into the Assyrians, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river Gozan, in the cities of the Medes, as is narrated in the fourth book of Kings. [15] But we easily meet these [objections], saying that Isaiah brought those witnesses with him, not for the spectacle of a carnal coition, but for the beholding and hearing of the writing of the book. And he took with him Zechariah, son of Barachiah — not that one indeed who was not yet brought forth among the living, but another Zechariah, of the same name and surname, living at the same time. He summoned also Uriah the priest as a faithful witness; and he called him faithful, not by worship and religion toward God, whom [Uriah] himself worshipped not, but by fidelity and obsequiousness toward king Ahaz, with whom Uriah was held most faithful. And this [man] especially Isaiah willed to be present, that — an idolatrous man, and hostile to the prophets of God — having inspected the writing of the prophecy, he might straightway, in hatred of the prophecy, carry the whole matter to the idolatrous business [i.e., report it to Ahaz]. But the depopulation whereof the prophecy is here written is not that in which Shalmaneser carried Israel into Media, in the sixth year of Hezekiah and the ninth of Hosea; but another, which was made nearly fifteen years before, about the sixth, seventh, and eighth year of Ahaz, king of Judah, when Pekah, son of Remaliah, [and] Rezin, king of

Syria, and Tiglath-pileser, king of the Assyrians, laid waste Israel and Judah, and carried off an immense prey, together with all the vessels and ornaments of the temple; which king Ahaz delivered to Tiglath-pileser, king of the Assyrians, as is written in the second [book] of Paralipomenon.

There are likewise those who both acutely and piously interpret this place mystically, [16] asserting that this matter is narrated by the prophet as done not corporeally, but spiritually; and that accordingly the introduction of the witnesses, the coition of the prophet, and the nativity of the infant, are thus to be expounded according to allegory: so that by the prophetess [is meant] the Virgin, mother of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ,

[*per* →]

---

[1] Rom. 16 [2] Gaius was bishop of the church of Ephesus [3] Who wrote the Gospel of St. John at John's dictation [4] 1 Tim 1:3-4 [5] Titus 3:9 [6] What the foolish questions spoken of by St. Paul are [7] The Deuteroses were not written down among the Jews [8] Isaiah 8:1 [9] What the great book is [10] Isa 8:3 [11] Explanation of the words, "Accelera ad predam" etc. [12] Isa 8:1-4 [13] 2 Kings 16:10-11 [14] 2 Kings 18:10 [15] 2 Kings 18:11 [16] Mystical interpretation of the words of Isaiah, ch. 8

---

*(printed p. 65 [PDF p. 78], recto — leaf stamps "63". **THE GREAT BOOK** concludes (its allegorical reading; Epiphanius and Basil). The letter **H** opens with the long entry **THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS** and its three chief forms — the **Ebionite**, the **Encratite** (= Tatian's* Diatessaron*), and the **Nazarene**. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ by Uriah] let us understand — not that impious priest of king Ahaz, but Uriah the prophet, son of Shemaiah, a contemporary of Jeremiah the prophet, whom Jeremiah writes to have prophesied in the name of the Lord; [1] and by Zechariah, that one who is numbered eleventh among the twelve prophets. Finally, in the infant, whose name is *HASTEN TO THE PREY, MAKE SPEED TO THE SPOIL*, let us recognize that Lion of the tribe of Judah, to whom, many ages before, Jacob had said, [2] *THOU ART GONE UP TO THE PREY, my son; thy hands [shall be] on the necks of thine enemies* — that is, Christ Jesus our Savior, of the tribe of Judah according to the flesh; who, the world being overcome, the kingdom of sin destroyed, Satan cast down, hell despoiled, death slain, and all his enemies vanquished, routed, and prostrated, ascended into heaven, victor and triumphant, laden with the spoils of his enemies, leading captivity captive — bringing with him from the lower regions the ranks of the redeemed captive fathers, exulting before him, as victors exult when, the prey being taken, they divide the spoils. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in the first book against the heresies, tome 2, teaches that this [3] *Great Book* is the womb of the Virgin Mary, [4] deservedly called *great*, because it comprehended the incomprehensible [one], whom heaven and earth cannot contain. Basil, in the commentaries on Isaiah, [5] writes thus of this book according to allegory: *PERHAPS this Tome, or volume, or new and great book, is a certain adumbration and figure of the new and great testament, described with a man's pen — because the words of the gospel are set down in human speech, or character, that they may easily be heard by anyone. In which indeed it is written, that there should be a swift plundering of spoils. For the doctrine of the gospel, swifter than any lightning, reaches even to the utmost limits of the habitable earth, spoiling the prince of this world, and leading over to the rendering of obedience to Christ those whom that robber held captive.*

H.

THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS, which is inscribed *ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS,* or *[according to] the SYRIANS,* was — as appears from the monuments of the ancients — not one, but several: of which three chiefly are those which are called [the Gospels] of the Nazarenes, of the Ebionites, and of the Encratites.

Now the Gospel of the Ebionites, According to the Hebrews, [6] is the same as the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, but changed by the heretics of Ebion — followers of adulterous [doctrines] — and in many places

mutilated and cut short. Out of which Epiphanius, in the first book against the heresies, disputing against the heresy of the Ebionites, inserts a long fragment, writing thus: *THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPEL which is called Hebrew, among them has thus: It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, and of Caiaphas the pontiff, there came a certain one, John by name, baptizing a baptism of penance in the river Jordan; who was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, son of Zechariah and Elizabeth; and all went out to him. And there came a certain man, named JESUS, about thirty years old; and he was baptized by John. And as he came up from the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God in the likeness of a dove descending and entering into him. And a voice was made from heaven, saying, THOU ART MY BELOVED SON, IN WHOM I AM WELL PLEASED; THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE. And straightway a great light shone round about him. And when John had seen it, he says to him: Who art thou, Lord? And again a voice from heaven [came] to him, THIS IS MY BELOVED SON, IN WHOM I AM WELL PLEASED. And then John, falling down before him, said: I beseech thee, Lord, baptize thou me. But he forbade him, saying: Suffer it, for so it is fitting that all things be fulfilled. And Jesus, coming — who chose us — into Capernaum, entered into the house of Simon, called Peter; and opening his mouth, as he passed by the lake of Tiberias, he said: I chose John and James, sons of Zebedee, and Simon, and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Judas, and Thaddaeus, and Thomas, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot; and thee, Matthew, sitting at the toll-booth, I called, and thou followedst me. You, therefore, I will to be twelve Apostles for a testimony of Israel,* &c. These things concerning the gospel of the Ebionites.

The OTHER, the GOSPEL OF THE ENCRATITES, [7] once used by the Encratites themselves, the same Epiphanius, in the first book, heresy 46, hands down to have been collected by Tatian the Syrian, author of the Encratite sect, out of the four evangelists, and digested into one consonance of a continuous narration, which he called the *Diatessaron*, that is, *One out of four*. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus [*Cyrenensis*], in the first book of the *Heretical fables*, left thus written concerning this Gospel: *TATIAN also composed a Gospel, which is called the Diatessaron, that is, One out of four — the genealogies being cut off, and the other [things] whatsoever show the Lord to have been born of David according to the flesh. And this was used not only by those who are of his sect, but also by those who follow the apostolic dogmas, not perceiving the fraud of the composition, but using it more simply, as a compendious book. I myself also found more than two hundred books of this kind, which were held in honor in our churches; all of which, when I had gathered them together, I put away, and in their place I put back the gospels of the four Evangelists.* Thus Theodoret concerning Tatian's gospel; which now is extant, together with the genealogy of Christ itself, translated of old by Victor, bishop of Capua; and the beginning of it is, *FORASMUCH AS INDEED MANY HAVE TAKEN IN HAND.*

THE GOSPEL OF THE NAZARENES [8] was so called because it was in use among the Nazarenes, who, together with the evangelical doctrine of Christ, believed the Mosaic ceremonies also were to be kept. From this [source] certain places and opinions in the sacred four gospels which we now have are thought by the most ancient fathers to have been transfused: such as that opinion in Matthew, *THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF*, which Origen thinks taken out of this gospel. And in the eighth tractate on Matthew, adducing a certain place of this gospel whence this testimony was received, he writes thus: *AS TO THAT which he says, THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF, [margin: Matt 19:19] I can suspect [that it was] not placed by the Lord in this place, but added by some I-know-not-whom, not understanding [it]. And that this was added he proves by this, that when Mark and Luke expound this same place, neither of them added [it]. [margin: Mark 10; Luke 18] Ne-*

[*ver* (quam) →]

[1] Jer 26:20 [2] Gen. 46 (so printed; = Gen. 49) [3] Isaiah 9 [4] The great book is, in Epiphanius's judgment, the womb of the Blessed Virgin [5] St. Basil's opinion on the great book [6] What the Gospel of the Ebionites is [7] What the Gospel of the Encratites is [8] What the Gospel of the Nazarenes is

*(printed p. 66 [PDF p. 79], verso — leaf stamps "64". **THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS/NAZARENES** continues, quoting many of its famous fragments (the rich man; the woman taken in adultery; "handle me, I am no bodiless demon"; "my mother the Holy Spirit"). The page then treats **ELDAD AND MEDAD** (Num 11) and opens **ELIJAH the Prophet.** Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ for ne-]-ver would Mark and Luke have passed over this capital and greatest precept. But this is written in the Gospel which is called *ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS* — if it please anyone to receive it. *Another of the rich men said to him: Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live? He said to him, Man, do the laws and the prophets. He answered him, I have done [them]. He said to him, Go, sell all that thou possessest, and divide it among the poor; and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I have done the law and the prophets? — since it is written in the law, THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF; and behold, thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are clad with dung, dying of hunger; and thy house is full of goods, and nothing at all goeth out of it to them. And turning, he said to Simon his disciple, sitting by him, SIMON, SON OF JOHN, IT IS EASIER FOR A CAMEL TO ENTER THROUGH THE EYE OF A NEEDLE THAN A RICH MAN INTO THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.* Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, indicates that from this Gospel was taken that history which is now had in the Gospel of John, chapter eight, concerning the woman taken in adultery; which Euthymius Zigabenus denies to have been in the ancient copies. This very gospel was, among the ancient fathers, received among other venerable writings, for the edification of the Church. And although Eusebius writes that it was at some time contradicted in the church, Bede nevertheless, at the beginning of the commentaries on Luke, [1] speaks thus of it: *IT IS TO BE NOTED that he called the Gospel According to the Hebrews (which the Nazarenes use) to be numbered not among the Apocrypha, but among the Ecclesiastical histories. For it seemed good to Jerome himself, the interpreter of sacred scripture, to take from it very many testimonies, and to translate it into the Latin and Greek tongue.* That these words of Bede are true, divers places in the works of Jerome show; who, in the *Catalog of illustrious men,* [2] taking a testimony for James, the brother of the Lord, out of this gospel, says thus: *THE GOSPEL which is called ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS, lately translated by me into the Greek and Latin tongue (which Origen often uses), relates thus concerning James, after the resurrection of the Savior: BUT THE LORD, when he had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James, and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord, until he should see him rising from the dead.* And again, a little after: *BRING, said the Lord, a table and bread.* And straightway it is added: *He took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of man is risen from among them that sleep.* Thus Jerome; who, in the same book, speaking of Ignatius, says: *IGNATIUS wrote one epistle to the Smyrnaeans, in which, concerning the Gospel lately translated by me, he places a testimony upon the person of Christ, saying, But I, even after the resurrection, saw him in the flesh; and I believe that he is [so]. And when he came to Peter, and to those who were with Peter, he said to them, BEHOLD, handle [me], for I am not a bodiless demon. And straightway they touched him, and believed.* Again, in the third book against the Pelagians, [3] he says: *IN THE GOSPEL according to the Hebrews — which is written in the Chaldee and Syriac tongue, but with Hebrew letters (which the Nazarenes use even to this day, [the Gospel] according to the Apostles, or, as most suppose, According to Matthew), and which is had in the library of Caesarea — the history relates: AND BEHOLD, the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him, John the Baptist baptizeth unto the remission of sins; let us go, and be baptized by him. But he said to them, What have I sinned, that I should go and be baptized by him?* The authority of this scripture is received also by Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria; who, when in the second book of the *Stromata* he wished to establish that wonder is the first step toward the perfect knowledge of God, [4] took thence the confirmation of his saying, saying: *FOR THIS REASON it is written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, HE WHO SHALL HAVE WONDERED SHALL REIGN, and he who shall reign shall rest.* There is cited also out of this Gospel by

Origen, in the second Tome on John, another opinion, in these words: *CHRIST SAID, Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and carried me to the great mountain Tabor.* Which opinion, unless it be candidly considered, seems to contain the heresy of the Gnostics and Valentinians, asserting the Holy Spirit to be the mother of Christ. [5] Wherefore Origen, in the place already cited, says that this is to be so interpreted that we say the Holy Spirit is called the mother of Christ not by nature and generation, but by imitation of maternal piety [6] — that is, because the Holy Spirit always does the will of the Father; *AND EVERYONE,* says Christ, *WHO DOETH THE WILL OF MY FATHER, WHO IS IN HEAVEN, HE IS MY FATHER AND MY MOTHER.* That Hegesippus, who was near to the times of the Apostles, related many things out of this Gospel, Eusebius, in the fourth [book] of the Ecclesiastical History, is witness.

ELDAD AND MEDAD, prophets (upon whom, as is read in the fifth chapter of Numbers *[so printed; = Num. 11:26]*, the Spirit of the Lord rested), when they prophesied in the solitude of Arabia, in the camp of Israel — Joshua, fearing lest the estimation of them among the people should in any way diminish the authority of Moses, admonished Moses to inhibit their office of prophesying. To whom Moses, in no way offended at the honors of others, [7] placidly answered: *WHY art thou jealous for me? Who shall grant that all the people may prophesy, and the Lord give them his spirit?* [8] The vaticinations, therefore, of these were comprehended, by an uncertain author, in a single book; out of which Hermas, the disciple of Paul, in the first book of the *Pastor*, chapter two, took a testimony in these words: *THE LORD is near to those who convert themselves to him, as it is written in Eldad and Medad, who prophesied to the people in the solitude.* The author of the *Hebraic Traditions*, which are prefixed with the title of Jerome, [9] writes that Eldad and Medad are the same whom the former book of the annals, chapter 4, calls Epher and Jalon, of the tribe of Levi, sons of Ezra [10] — who is also called Amram, and was the father of Moses. For Moses, after receiving the law in the desert, enjoined his mother to put away his father Amram, because she was his [Amram's] aunt; for she was a daughter of Levi. After which separation, Amram took another wife, of whom he begat these two sons, Eldad and Medad. Athanasius, in the *Synopsis*, numbers this book among the Apocrypha.

ELIJAH the Prophet was of Thisbe, a town of the Arabians, a Levite of the tribe of Aaron [so], [11] dweller of the region of Gilead, a man of God, burning with zeal; who thrice brought down fire from heaven

[*dedit* →]

[1] Bede's opinion on the Gospel of the Hebrews [2] What St. Jerome thought of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which he himself translated into Greek and Latin [3] The Gospel according to the Hebrews, written in the Chaldee and Syriac tongue [4] Clement of Alexandria thinks that wonder is the first step toward the perfect knowledge of God [5] The Gnostics and Valentinians thought the Holy Spirit to be the mother of Christ [6] Origen thinks the Holy Spirit is called the mother of Christ by imitation of maternal piety [7] Moses was not offended at the honors of others [8] Num 11:29 [9] Who Eldad and Medad were [10] 1 Chron 4:17 [11] Elijah was a Levite; his miracles

---

*(printed p. 67 [PDF p. 80], recto — leaf stamps "65". **ELIJAH** continues (his letter to Joram; the apocryphal* Secrets of Elijah*; **STRATONICUS of Cumae** on the* Book of the Traditions of Elijah *and its Talmudic six-millennia prediction). The new headword **ENOCH** treats his prophetic booklets, quoted by Jude (Jude 14–15). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ he drew down] fire; he brought rain by his tongue [i.e., his prayer]; he raised the dead; and at last he was taken up into heaven in a whirlwind of fire. He, when Joram, king of Jerusalem, compelled the people to ascend the groves set on high mountains, and there to worship strange deities, wrote to him a letter, [1] in which he threatened him the inevitable vengeance of God for this cause — that, the example of his fathers being despised, he had betaken himself to following the impiety of the Israelite kings; and, not content with this, had also impelled the tribe of Judah and the citizens of Jerusalem, the native religion being forsaken, to revolt to foreign rites; and besides, that he had killed his brothers and other good and just men — for which crimes the punishment that hung over him. In the same letter he signified this also: that enemies should lay waste his people and his domestic family, sparing neither children nor wives; and that he himself, vexed by a slow flux of the belly, his intestines gradually flowing out, would late, out of these torments, recognize his

fault, and, imploring the help of God in vain, would breathe out his miserable soul. The argument of this letter one may see in the second [book] of Paralipomenon, chapter 21. [2]

THERE IS CARRIED [ABOUT] also a certain book under the name of Elijah, which is inscribed *The Ascension,* or *Assumption,* or *Apocalypse,* or *Secrets of Elijah;* concerning which Origen thinks that Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, received that testimony, [3] *WHICH THE EYE HATH NOT SEEN,* &c. For he writes thus, in the thirty-fifth tractate on Matthew: *THE APOSTLE brings forth certain secret scriptures; as when he says somewhere, WHICH THE EYE HATH NOT SEEN, NOR EAR HEARD. For in no canonical book is this found placed, except in the Secrets of Elijah the prophet.* Thus Origen. Jerome, on the 64th chapter of Isaiah, expounding those words out of the same chapter, *FROM THE AGE THEY HAVE NOT HEARD, NEITHER HAVE THEY RECEIVED,* &c., says: *THE APOCALYPSE of Elijah has this testimony; and by this occasion silly little women were deceived.* [The Apocalypse of Elijah] is cited in the *Synopsis* of Athanasius among the books rejected as of Apocryphal authorship, [namely] of Elijah the prophet.

STRATONICUS, bishop of Cumae, in his *Collections,* cites out of the *Book of the Traditions of Elijah the Prophet* a certain prediction concerning the consummation of the world — that it shall be future in the six-thousandth year from its creation. [4] I judge this to be that tradition which is read in the Talmudic volumes of the Hebrews, in the tractate Sanhedrin, chapter ■*elech* [■eleq], in these plain words: תרי אלפי ימות המשיח, תרי אלפי תורה, תרי אלפי תהו, וחד חרב, שית אלפי שני להוי עלמא *[the Hebrew is set confusingly in the primary scan; the reading follows the edition's own transliteration and Latin] — scitta alphe sene le heue alma, vechad thareb, be alaphim tohu, be alaphim tora, be alaphim iemot hamasciach —* which we may interpret in this manner: *The world shall be six thousand years, and again shall be destroyed; two thousand of emptiness [tohu], two thousand of the law, two thousand of the days of the Messiah.* Nor is this to be passed over in this place: I judge that Elijah is called by the Hebrews the *continuator of the seventh age of human [life].* [5] For they assert that seven men continued the whole human life, unbroken, from the beginning of the world even to its end. [6] The first man [was] Adam; him Methuselah saw, and stretched his life from the first man even to Methuselah; Methuselah saw Shem, son of Noah; Shem reached even to Jacob; Jacob even to Amram, father of Moses; Amram reached even to Ahijah the Shilonite; and Ahijah even to Elijah; but Elijah even to the end of the world.

ENOCH, or חנוך *Chenoc,* the seventh from Adam, son of Jared, grandson of Malaleel, great-grandson of Kenan, great-great-grandson of Enos, [who was] grandson of Adam — a man from that very age most just, and worshipping God with the highest religion — [7] wrote (as Origen testifies in the last homily on Numbers) several prophetic booklets; out of which Jude the Apostle, in his Catholic epistle against the impious seducers, received a formidable testimony concerning the last judgment, saying thus: [8] *AND ENOCH ALSO, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh in his holy thousands, to do judgment against all, and to reprove all the impious of all the works of their impiety, wherewith they have wickedly done, and of all the hard [things] which impious sinners have spoken against God.* Augustine, concerning this volume, in the 18th [book] *Of the City of God,* thus says: [9] *ENOCH, the seventh from Adam, is declared to have prophesied in the canonical [epistle] of the Apostle Jude; whose writings — that they should not be in authority, whether among the Jews or among us — their too-great antiquity brought about, on account of which they seemed suspect, lest false [things] be brought forth for true. For there are brought forth certain [writings] said to be his by those who, according to their own sense, believe promiscuously what they will; but the chastity of the canon has not received [them] — not that the authority of those men who pleased God is reproved, but that these are not believed to be theirs.* Thus Augustine. Jerome, in the catalog of Ecclesiastical writers, [10] teaches that the epistle of Jude was, on account of the testimony taken out of this Apocryphal book, of old rejected by very many of the ecclesiastical fathers. And in the commentaries on the epistle to Titus he adds that the Apostle Jude did not approve this whole book, but only this testimony concerning the judgment against the impious, whose authority he received into his epistle. But of what kind

the argument of this book was, is unknown; [11] it appears, however, from the monuments of the Fathers, that there were in it certain chapters: *Of the number and names of the stars, and their secret virtues; Of the descent of the sons of God to the daughters of men; Of the giants begotten of the coition of angels; Of the last judgment of God against the impious* — concerning which the present testimony of Jude is brought forth. Origen indeed, making words of these chapters, in the 28th homily of the book of Numbers [12] writes thus: *HE WHO made the multitude of the stars — as the prophet says — calls them all by names; of which names, indeed, very many are contained, as secret and arcane [things], in the booklets which are called ENOCH. But because these booklets themselves do not seem to be held in authority among the Hebrews, we shall defer for the present to bring forward as an example the [things] which are named in them.* Likewise, in the commentaries on John, tome six, speaking of the descent of souls into bodies, he says: *IN ENOCH it is written (if only anyone should be willing to approve it as a holy book), IN the days of the descent of the sons of God to the daughters of men.* Which descent some have thought to signify obscurely the descent of souls into bodies — that the *daughters of men* is obscurely and tropically said [to be] the earthly tabernacle. But Augustine, in the 15th book *Of the City of God,* chapter 23, speaking of the giants, says thus: *THAT indeed some divine [writings] were written by that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, we cannot deny, since the Apostle Jude says this in the canonical epistle; but they are not in the canon of the scriptures; whence those things which are put forth under his name*

[*forth* (runtur) →]

[1] Elijah's letter [2] 2 Chron 21:12 [3] 1 Cor 2:9 [4] Some prophesy the coming consummation of the world in the six-thousandth year from its creation [5] Elijah the continuator of the seventh age [6] The Hebrews assert that seven men continued human life from the beginning of the world even to its end [7] Enoch the seventh from Adam, most just in his own age [8] Jude 14 [9] Why Enoch's writings are not numbered among the canonical books [10] St. Jerome writes that the Epistle of Jude was rejected by many on account of the testimony taken from the apocryphal book of Enoch [11] The argument of the book of Enoch [12] Many of the names of the stars are found in the booklets called Enoch

---

*(printed p. 68 [PDF p. 81], verso — leaf stamps "66". **ENOCH** concludes (the* Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*; Annius on the twin-catastrophe prophecy; the exegesis of Gen 5:24). The new headword **HERMAS** treats the* Shepherd *(Rom 16:14) — its three books, its patristic use, and its rejection by Gelasius. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ are put] forth, and contain those fables about the giants [1] — that [certain] men had no [human] fathers — [and] are rightly judged by the prudent not to be believed his. Thus Augustine. But in a most ancient volume, whose title is *THE TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS* (which Origen and Procopius often cite), many vaticinations are inserted out of the book of Enoch — namely, *Of the things which were to befall the sons and grandsons of the twelve Patriarchs; [margin: Num. 11] Of the future crimes and punishments of the Hebrews; Of the Savior of the world to be slain by the Hebrews; Of the overthrow, captivity, and perpetual dispersion of the Hebrews among the nations.* John Annius, in the commentaries on Berosus, writes that in the same volume of Enoch there was a celebrated vaticination concerning the twin destructions of the whole earth [2] — the one to be by inundation, the other by burning; and he adds that this same vaticination was engraved by Enoch on two columns, the one of stone, the other of brick, for a perennial admonition of posterity: so that, if it should chance that the brick one were destroyed by the flood, the stone one, surviving, might preserve the writing committed to it. Josephus makes mention of both columns in the first [book] of the *Antiquities,* affirming also that the stone one existed in Syria in his own times. Tertullian, in the book *On the dress of women,* [3] meeting those who say that this book — if it had been written by Enoch before the flood — could not have come safe to posterity after the flood, shows that this is not incredible, either because Noah himself preserved it in the ark, or because — [it] having been abolished by the inundation of the flood — someone, illumined by the Holy Spirit, restored it, as by Esdras the sacred volumes were restored after the captivity. [4] Wherefore he reckons that the authority of this writing is not to be rejected.

ENOCH LIVED, [5] engaged in this exile of our mortality, three hundred and sixty-five years — that is, unto the one thousand and fifteenth year of the founded world. Which years being completed, *he walked* (as Moses says) *with God,* [6] *and was not, because God took him.* [7] But how, and into what place, God took him, is not equally certain among all the expositors of the sacred letters. [8] Aben Ezra [Ibn Ezra] and some of the Jews interpret that word, *GOD TOOK HIM,* [as] *He died* — and indeed before [his] time, lest malice should change his heart; because it is a custom of scriptural speech to say that he *is taken* who is taken from life, according to that [saying] of Elijah, *Take my soul;* [9] and of Job, *After a little he shall take me.* [10] Philo the Jew, in the book *Of the life of the wise man,* following the translation of the Seventy (who rendered this place ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, that is, *Because God translated him*), says that God translated Enoch not through death, but through a separation from the fellowship and frequency of wicked men, to a retreat of virtue unknown to the vulgar, and scarcely known to a few — and those the most excellent men. Procopius the Sophist, on Genesis, seems to hint that the translation of Enoch was not death, but a certain change from a mortal to an immortal body. Augustine, in the ninth book on Genesis, and in the book *On the merits of sinners,* denies that Enoch was changed into that spiritual quality of body which is promised in the resurrection; and thinks that he will again return to this life, and die, that the animal body may be changed into a spiritual [one]; but that meanwhile he is either sustained by God without food (as Elijah lived forty days without food), or, if he needs food, is perhaps fed in paradise, as Adam [was] of the tree of life, and thence receives, against the oldness [of age], a stability of life. Irenaeus, in the fifth book against the heresy of Valentinus, asserts that he lives, together with Elijah, in the same paradise in which the first man was placed by God. Jerome, in the first book against Jovinian — perhaps by a slip of memory — attributes this translation not to Enoch, but to Enos, of whom Enoch was the great-great-grandson, saying: *IF, HOWEVER, Enos is translated, I do not think Enos was translated on that account because he had a wife, but because he first invoked God.* Chrysostom and Theodoret say that it is not to be too curiously investigated whither he was translated, and whether he lives even to the present, and how he now fares; but that it is enough that we believe both that God translated him, and that he translated him living, and that he did not experience death — as Paul also testifies to the Hebrews, saying: [11] *BY FAITH Enoch was translated, that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him.* Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen], in the second book *Of Theology,* says: *ENOCH, although he was translated hence, yet it is not yet established whether he comprehended the nature of God, or is still to comprehend it.*

HERMAS, disciple of the Apostle Paul (of whom [Paul] himself, writing to the Romans, makes mention, saying: [12] *SALUTE Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren that are with them*), put forth a work in the Greek tongue, distinguished into three books: [13] whereof the first is inscribed *THE CHURCH,* because in it four visions of the Church are narrated; the second is entitled *THE PASTOR* [Shepherd], because in it an Angel — the shepherd, protector, and guardian of Hermas himself, who is also called the *angel-messenger of penance* — proposes twelve precepts of living well; the third, because it contains ten similitudes explained by the same Shepherd, is called *OF THE SIMILITUDES.* Custom, however, afterward prevailed that the whole work should be called by the title *OF THE PASTOR,* or *PASTORAL.* This was of old publicly read in certain churches of Greece, for the instruction of those who were being trained in the first elements toward the institution of faith; and many of the ancients used its testimonies for the confirmation of dogmas [14] — as Clement of Alexandria in the sixth book of the *Stromata,* Origen in the eighth homily on Numbers, homily 10 on Joshua, homily 35 on Luke, and books one, two, and four of the *Periarchon;* Athanasius in the book *On the Incarnation of Christ;* Irenaeus in the first book against the heresies; John Cassian in the 13th Conference, chapter twelve; and very many other most ancient authors. After whose times the authority of this book gradually failed, and at length was rejected by Gelasius among the writings of doubtful faith [15] — as I judge, for the subversion of the heretics, who thence took supports for their execrable dogmas. For (that I be silent of the rest) the Arians, Athanasius being witness, in the epistle to the bishops of Africa, maintained that the Son of God was created by the Father out of things not existing, or out

of nothing; because in the first precept of the second book of the *Pastoral* it was written: *FIRST OF ALL, believe that there is one God, who created all things, and completed [them], and made all things out of nothing.* Yet it is sometimes cited by Gratian in the *Collections* of the decrees, and by Peter Lombard in the *Collect-*

[*ions* (Collectaneis) →]

[1] The fables about the giants, that they had no fathers [2] Enoch's prophecy of the twin catastrophes of the whole earth [3] Tertullian, in the book on the dress of women, ch. 3, shows it is not incredible that the book of Enoch, written before the flood, came safe to posterity [4] Esdras restored the sacred volumes after the Babylonian captivity [5] Enoch lived in this world 365 years [6] Gen 5:22 [7] Gen 5:24 [8] How and to what place Enoch was translated is controverted among the interpreters of Scripture [9] 1 Kings 19 [10] Job 32:22 [11] Heb 11:5 [12] Rom 16:14 [13] The contents of the three books of Hermas [14] Very many of the ancients confirm the dogmas of the faith with the testimonies of the Pastor [15] Gelasius rejected the Pastor

*(printed p. 69 [PDF p. 82], recto — leaf stamps "67". **HERMAS** concludes (the patristic testimonies on the* Pastor*). The page also treats **HIRAM of Tyre** and **THE JERUSALEM SENATE**. The letter **I** opens with **THE LADDER OF JACOB**, **JAMES** (with the* Protevangelium *and Liturgy of St. James), and **JANNES & JAMBRES**. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ in the Collect-]anea of Sentences, for the confirmation of ecclesiastical sanctions [decrees]. Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 3, says: *THE LITTLE BOOK of Hermas, which is called* Ποιμήν*, that is, PASTOR [Shepherd], of which Paul makes mention in his epistles, is not received by very many; but by others it is judged necessary, on account of those who are being imbued with the first instructions toward the faith.* Whence also it is read in some churches, and many of the ancients used its testimonies. Rufinus, in the exposition of the Creed [Symbol], enumerates the volume of the *Pastor* among the ecclesiastical writings, together with the books of Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees. From the first narration of this book it appears that Hermas lived at Rome. [1] But Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, in the *Synopsis*, writes that he was bishop of Philippopolis. Damasus, in the *Catalog* of the pontiffs, hands down that this Hermas was brother of Pope Pius, the first of that name, and that he composed the work of the *Pastor* in the times of the Emperor Antoninus Pius, in the year of the Lord 129. But Origen, in the tenth book on the epistle to the Romans, reckons that he was contemporary with Paul, writing thus: *I THINK that this Hermas is the writer of that little book which is called PASTOR, which writing seems to me very useful, and, as I think, divinely inspired. But that Paul ascribed no praise to him, this is the cause: because he seems, as that writing declares, to have been converted to penance after many sins; and therefore he wrote no reproach to him either. For he had learned from the scripture NOT to reproach a man converting himself from sin. Nor did he attribute any praise [to him], because he was placed still under the angel of penance, by whom, at an opportune time, he should again be offered to Christ.*

HIRAM, king of the Tyrians (whom the third book of Kings testifies to have sent cedar wood for the building of the temple of Jerusalem), [2] wrote very many letters to Solomon, king of the Hebrews; in which he partly proposed diverse questions to be solved by Solomon, and partly solved [those] proposed to himself by Solomon. [3] Of these Dius makes mention in the Phoenician histories, and after him Josephus, in the first volume against Apion, in these words: *HIRAM, king of the Tyrians, was a friend of our king Solomon. And love of wisdom had won [conciliated] this friendship; for they directed problems to each other to be solved, and in these Solomon was the better, and appeared the wiser.* And even to now there are preserved among the Tyrians many letters, which they wrote to one another.

THE JERUSALEM SENATE wrote two letters — one to the dispersed Jews, the other to Aristobulus, preceptor of Ptolemy king of Egypt. Copies of both are had in 2 Maccabees, chapter 1.

I.

THE LADDER OF JACOB the patriarch [4] was a volume familiar to the Ebionite heretics; [5] in which Jacob was introduced [presented], as it were expounding the dream of the ladder, seen by him in his sleep, against the Jews, and the temple, and their sacrifices. Epiphanius, in the first [book] of the *Panarion,* in the confutation of the Ebionites, is a witness of this thing. There is also carried about, printed in type, *THE TESTAMENT OF JACOB the Patriarch,* [6] which Gelasius, in the fifteenth distinction, reckons among the books of Apocryphal authority. There is cited by Stratonicus, in the *Collectanea,* a *Title* [inscription] written by Jacob the patriarch in Bethel-Luz; [7] but whether that title was a writing cut in stone, or a stone erected without any writing for a perpetual memory of the vision seen, is not, in truth, sufficiently manifest. [8]

JAMES, brother of the Lord according to the flesh, author of that epistle which is numbered among the seven catholic [epistles], left very many writings of great sanctity; among which excels the Gospel, which by some is inscribed [the Gospel] *OF JAMES,* by some *ACCORDING TO the Hebrews* [9] — of which Origen often makes mention, and to which Jerome, who translated it from Hebrew into Greek, offers an excellent testimony in the *Catalog of illustrious writers;* concerning which we also have spoken abundantly under the title of the Gospel *According to the Hebrews.* Athanasius, in the *Synopsis,* writes that James was the first of all to apply an interpretation and exposition to the Gospel of Matthew, written in Hebrew. There is now extant a certain writing, printed in type by the heretics of our times, [10] which is inscribed *THE PROTEVANGELIUM OF JAMES,* or *A Historical Discourse on the Nativity of the Mother of God* [Deipara], containing the history of the nativity of Mary up to the coming of the Magi. In which, among other narrations of doubtful faith, this most absurd [thing] also is added: namely, that Joseph and Mary, accused of fornication and sacrilege, were by decree of the priests together compelled to drink the cup of conviction [i.e. the water of jealousy], by which Moses commanded the innocence of a woman suspected of adultery to be tested. There is carried about, and is in use among the Greeks, a *Liturgy,* or divine Mass, under the name of this Apostle, [11] whose beginning is, *DEFILED BY THE MULTITUDE OF SINS;* which, as a true and genuine writing of James, Proclus, Archbishop of Constantinople, acknowledges and receives — [he] who in the synod of Ephesus fought strongly against Nestorius. But the universal council also, surnamed *in Trullo,* celebrated under Justinian, refutes from this Mass the heretics who used only wine in the mysteries, pronouncing thus in the 32nd canon: *FOR both James, brother according to the flesh of Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom first the throne of the Church of Jerusalem was committed, and Basil, Archbishop of Caesarea, whose glory pervaded the whole world of lands, the mystical sacrifice having been handed down to us in writing, set forth [that] the sacred cup — to be performed in the sacred mystery — [be] of water and wine,* etc.

THE BOOK OF JANNES AND JAMBRES, Βίβλος Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς, or, as our edition reads, *Jamnes and Mambres.* From this, Paul in the latter epistle to Timothy took the names of the Magi who contended with Moses in Egypt, [12] saying: *FOR as Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses, so these also resist the truth.* Weighing which words, Origen, in the 35th tractate on Matthew, thus says: *THAT which Paul says — As Jannes and Mambres resisted Moses — is not found in the public scriptures, but in a secret book, which is entitled above, THE BOOK OF JANNES AND MAMBRES. Whence certain [persons] dared to reject the epistle to Timothy, as having in it the text of some secret [book]; but they could not. For that anyone refuted the first epistle to the Corinthians on this account, as [being] spurious [adulterine], has never come to my ears.* Thus Origen — alluding to the verse of Menander, which is read in chapter 15 of the former [epistle] to the Corinthians: [13]

[→ the Menander verse (1 Cor. 15:33)]

[1] Who Hermas was is controverted [2] 1 Kings 5 [3] Hiram in his letters set questions for Solomon to solve, and solved those set by Solomon [4] Gen 28:12 [5] The Ladder of Jacob was familiar to the Ebionites [6] The apocryphal Testament of the patriarch Jacob [7] Gen 28:18-19 [8] Whether the Title of Jacob was a writing is uncertain [9] The Apostle James is thought by some to have written the Gospel according to the Hebrews [10] The Protevangelium of James was printed by the heretics of our time [11] The Liturgy of James [12] 2 Tim 3:8 [13] 1 Cor 15:33

*(printed p. 70 [PDF p. 83], verso — leaf stamps "68". **JANNES & JAMBRES** concludes (Numenius of Apamea; Gelasius & Ambrose reject the book). The page then treats **JASON OF CYRENE** (epitomized as 2 Maccabees), **JASON OF THESSALONICA**, and **IDDO THE SEER**, and opens **JEREMIAH** with his non-canonical books. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ is read]: that is, *EVIL COMMUNICATIONS CORRUPT GOOD MANNERS.* [1] Numenius of Apamea, a Pythagorean by profession, attests to the authority of this volume, in the third book *On the good;* where he reports individually the names of the Magi who resisted Moses, in these words: [2] *JANNES and Jambres were Egyptians, men so pre-eminent in the magic arts that they were judged by all the Egyptians alone able to resist Musaeus [= Moses], leader of the Jews, a man most closely joined to God. For they seemed to loose [undo] many calamities which Musaeus brought upon Egypt.* These words of Numenius are transcribed by Eusebius out of the ninth [book] of the *Evangelical Preparation.* Gelasius — as is had in the decrees, distinction fifteen — rejects this book among the Apocrypha [3], following, no doubt, the judgment of St. Ambrose; who, in the exposition of these words of Paul, says: *THIS example is from the Apocrypha. For Jannes and Jambres were brothers, magicians or sorcerers of the Egyptians,* etc.

JASON OF CYRENE, a Jew by nation, a truthful and eloquent writer of histories, wrote in Greek — and with a copious abundance of speech — five books concerning the deeds of the Maccabean princes [4]; which, on account of the exceptional fidelity of the narration, the senate and people of Jerusalem ordered to be reduced into a small epitome, which now is numbered among the other books of divine scripture, and is received with equal veneration with them, and is inscribed *THE SECOND [book] OF THE MACCABEES.* [5] In the beginning of which these words are read: *THEREFORE we have attempted to abridge in one small volume [the things] comprehended by Jason of Cyrene in five books; and to ourselves indeed, who have undertaken this work for the sake of abridging, we have taken up no easy labor, but rather a business full of watchings and of sweat,* etc. Jason flourished under Ptolemy Philometor, the sixth king of Egypt, in the 151st Olympiad — that is, in the year 131 before the birth of Christ.

JASON of Thessalonica [6] (of whom Paul, to the Romans, makes mention, saying: *JASON saluteth you;* and of whom also it is written in the Acts of the Apostles, that, when the crowds at Thessalonica stirred up sedition against Paul and Silas, he gave himself up, that he might make for the Apostle the opportunity of fleeing) is said to be the author of that book which is inscribed *THE ALTERCATION OF JASON AND PAPISCUS;* whose authority, assailed by Celsus the Epicurean philosopher, Origen — defending [it] in the fourth book against the same Celsus — thus says: *IF anyone should read through, with a more equitable mind, the writings of Jason and Papiscus, he will assuredly find that this book is not to be derided — in which a Christian is described disputing with a Jew out of the Jewish scriptures, and plainly demonstrating that the prophecies which are extant concerning Christ agree with Jesus himself.* Jerome, in the beginning of the *Questions on Genesis,* says that it is wrongly affirmed in this book that in the exordium of Genesis it is written in Hebrew, *IN the Son God created heaven and earth* — whereas the Seventy interpreters, and Symmachus, and Theodotion translated *In the beginning,* and in the Hebrew it is written *Bereshith,* which all interpret *In the beginning,* and not *In the Son.* Dorotheus of Tyre, in the *Synopsis,* hands down that this Jason was the first bishop of Troas. [7]

IDDO HACHOZEH, עִדּוֹ הַחוֹזֶה — that is, Iddo the Seer, or a prophet full of the Spirit of God — composed *Chazoth,* that is, *Of visions,* or *divinations,* against Jeroboam, king of Israel, one volume; in which he mingled many [things] concerning the affairs done by king Solomon; likewise, concerning those [things] which were done by Rehoboam, king of Jerusalem, both in war and in peace, another volume. To these he also added a מדרש *Midrash* — that is, Commentaries on the memorable deeds and sayings of Abijah, king of Judah, digested with most accurate diligence. He lived from the times of Solomon even to the times of Asa, king of Judah. These volumes are cited in 2 Paralipomenon, chapters 9, 12, and 13.

JEREMIAH, prophet and priest, [8] besides those books which now are extant among the Sacred [scriptures] — that is, the book of the Prophecies, the book of Lamentations, and two Epistles to the Hebrews captive in Babylon (of which one is had in Jeremiah chapter 29, the other in Baruch chapter 6) — wrote also other books, cited in the sacred letters, whose inscriptions and arguments are these. [9]

כִּינוֹת *KINOTH*, or an *Epicedion* — that is, a Lamentation, or mournful song at the funeral of Josiah, king of Judah, who, fighting against Necho, king of Egypt, wounded by an arrow, perished. The second book of the Chronicles [Annals], chapter 35, makes mention of this song, in these words: [10] *AND Josiah died, and was buried in the mausoleum of his fathers; and all Judah and Jerusalem mourned him — Jeremiah most of all; whose lamentations all the singers, men and women, repeat over Josiah even to the present day; and it has prevailed as a law in Israel: Behold, it is written in the lamentations.* Jerome, and certain of the Jews — among whom Rabbi Solomon [Rashi] — reckon this lamentation to be the last part of the book of Threni [Lamentations], comprehended under the fourth and last alphabet [acrostic], thinking that what is there written is to be understood of the death of Josiah: *THE BREATH of our mouth, Christ the Lord [the Lord's anointed], is taken in our sins; to whom we said, Under thy shadow we shall live among the nations.* [11] Which, however, seems to agree rather with king Zedekiah, whom the Chaldeans, bound with chains and having his eyes put out, led into Babylon, immediately after the devastation of the holy city — which [devastation], in the whole meter of that same alphabet, is bewailed together with the captivity of the king and people; and therefore I would hardly believe that this lamentation survives [as one made] over Josiah — although Josephus, in the 11th book of the *Antiquities [so; = Antiq. 10]*, has testified that the Epicedion of Jeremiah upon Josiah existed in his own times.

JEREMIAH also wrote *Of the fury and indignation of the Lord against Judah and Jerusalem*, one book: in which — Baruch the notary taking [it] down — he foretold the overthrow of the temple, the destruction of the city, the devastation of the kingdom, the captivity of the king and of the whole people, and the other extreme calamities hanging over the Jews, unless they should repent. When the impious king Jehoiakim had begun to read this book, brought to him, execrating the horrible threatenings of the prophecy, he cut it up with a scribe's knife, and burned it in the little hearth of fire by which he sat through the winter, [12] commanding Jeremiah — [who was] lying hidden in his house — together with Baruch, to be thrust into prison. Hearing which, Jeremiah, God again commanding, rewrote the book by the hands of Baruch, adding besides even much heavier prophecies against the king and his kingdom. Jeremiah makes mention of this volume in chapter 36 of his Prophecy; which Rabbi Solomon thinks to be the book of Threni [Lamentations] — which, when Jeremiah rewrote it [after it had] already been burnt, he increased by a fourth alphabet [acrostic], which he had not placed in the former volume.

[*Conscrip-* (Conscripsit) →]

[1] 1 Cor. 15:33 [2] Jannes and Jambres were Egyptian magicians [3] The book entitled Jannes and Jambres is apocryphal [4] Jason wrote five books on the deeds of the Maccabees [5] 2 Macc. 2:24,27 [6] Rom. 16:21; Acts 17:7-9 [7] Jason was the first bishop of Troas [8] Jeremiah, prophet and priest [9] The inscriptions and arguments of Jeremiah's books [10] 2 Par. 35:24,25 [11] Lam. 4:20 — in the Chaldee paraphrase, they led Zedekiah bound with a chain and blinded into Babylon [12] Jehoiakim burned the books of Jeremiah

(printed p. 71 [PDF p. 84], recto — leaf stamps "69". JEREMIAH continued (his deed-books of purchase and sale, the book on Babylon's ruin sunk in the Euphrates, and other Jeremianic apocrypha), then JEHU king of Israel and JEHU the prophet son of Hanani; the entry on THE FINGER-WRITTEN SCRIPTURE OF JESUS CHRIST begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ There were also written], at Jeremiah's command, two books of *Purchase and Sale* [Buying and Selling], the one open, the other closed and sealed with seals. [1] For when the King of the Assyrians was now already approaching, about to seize the kingdom of Jerusalem, Hanameel, son of Jeremiah's uncle, came to him — [Jeremiah] being detained in the Royal prison — offering of his own accord the sale of his field, which he

possessed in the village of Anathoth; and although the Prophet recognized that this was being done by the command of God, and although he was a captive, and it might seem laughable in that region to buy fields which he himself believed would soon be laid waste, and constantly foretold [so] — nevertheless, the silver being counted out, he bought the field. And, that all the rights of the purchase and of the transferred possession might be preserved, he ordered the schedules of this contract — or instruments, which the Jews call *Books* — to be written up by public notaries, with witnesses and seals employed, by the authority of judges. Now in these contracts, as Rabbi Solomon [Rashi] hands down, there were made chiefly two schedules: one, fortified and closed with the seals of the witnesses, which was kept in a most safe place in the public archives of the notaries; the other, copied in good faith after the example of the former, and approved by the vote of the judges, which remained open with the buyer. Both, therefore, Jeremiah ordered to be laid up by Baruch, his scribe, in an earthen jar, that they might be for posterity a monument and testimony of the prophecy by which the Prophet had foretold that the Jews, after the seventieth year of the Babylonian captivity, would migrate back into their own seats, and there again would buy houses, fields, and vineyards. David Kimchi reckons these to have been three books: the first, of the purchase; the second, a copy of the same drawn out in full faith; the third, which contained the mystery and reason of this purchase, which seemed foolish in the eyes of the impious; and [that] these two latter were cast into the jar. Read Jeremiah chapter 32.

He likewise wrote *Of the devastation of Babylon* one book [2], which — bound to a stone — he commanded, by [the hand of] Seraiah the prince of the prophecy [Vulg. *princeps prophetiae;* the quartermaster], whom Zedekiah had sent to salute the king of Babylon, to be sunk in the river Euphrates before the Jews, as a presage of the perpetual submersion which hung over the city of Babylon. Concerning the book itself, these [things] are read in Jeremiah, chapter fifty-one: [3] *JEREMIAH wrote all the evil that was to come upon Babylon in one book; and he said to Seraiah, When thou shalt come into Babylon, and shalt see, and shalt read all these words, thou shalt say, O Lord, thou hast spoken against this place, that thou wouldst destroy it, so that there be none to dwell in it, from man even to beast, and that it be a perpetual solitude. And when thou shalt have finished reading this book, thou shalt bind to it a stone, and cast it into the midst of the Euphrates; and thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon be submerged, and shall not rise up from the face of the affliction which I bring upon her, and she shall be dissolved.* Thus far the words of Jeremiah, who wished to add this visible sign to his sayings, that the memory of the published prophecy might be more lasting; so that, if the words should fly past [be forgotten], the deed at least, done before [their] eyes, might endure, fixed deep in the minds of the beholders. There still survives a great part of this volume in the same Prophet, chapters 50 and 51, described [written out] by Jeremiah himself.

There are also cited, in 2 Maccabees chapter 2, the *Commentaries*, or *Descriptions*, of Jeremiah the Prophet: [4] in which he wrote those [things] which, immediately after the city was over-thrown, came to pass before the captive people was led into Babylon; that is, *Of the laws* which Jeremiah prescribed to the people who would sojourn in Babylon; *Of the perpetual fire*, which the priests, taking [it] up from the altar, hid in an unknown well [pit]; *Of the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the altar of incense*, hidden by God's command in the cave of Mount Nebo; and *of other matters* which happened at the beginning of the Babylonian transmigration. There are those who reject these commentaries — together with the beginning of the second book of the Maccabees, [which is] taken out of these commentaries — as Apocryphal and of doubtful faith; which [commentaries], nevertheless, Epiphanius, in the life of Jeremiah the Prophet, and very many ecclesiastical fathers, approve.

There is also carried about another volume under the name of Jeremiah, wholly Apocryphal; out of which Origen reckons that prophecy — *They weighed out my price at thirty pieces of silver* — was taken by Matthew. [5] That the Nazarenes formerly used this, Jerome relates on chapter 27 of Matthew.

JEHU, king of Israel, wrote to the senate of Samaria two letters; by which he commanded to be slain the seventy sons of king Ahab, [who had been] handed over to the education and instruction of the Samaritans. 4 Kings [2 Kings] 10.

JEHU the Prophet, son of Hanani the Prophet (who foretold to Baasha, king of Israel, from the command of God, his own and all his [family's] final destruction; [6] and after many years rebuked Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, for the alliance entered into with the impious Ahab, king of Israel) [7], wrote a most accurate history *of the deeds of the kings of Judah and Israel*, who reigned even down to Joram, son of Jehoshaphat king of Judah; of which the second book of Paralipomenon makes mention, in these words: [8] *NOW the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, the former and the latter, are written in the words of Jehu, son of Hanani, which he digested in the book of the Kings of Israel.* And lest to anyone it should perhaps seem impossible that Jehu wrote a history down to Joram, son of king Jehoshaphat — because in the third book of Kings it is read that this Jehu was cut down by Baasha, king of Israel, more than forty years before the death of Jehoshaphat — it must be known that those [things] which are reported concerning the slaying of Jehu in the sixteenth chapter of the third book of Kings in our Vulgate edition are not had in the Hebrew copies; [9] in which only these words are read: [10] *AND when the word of the Lord had come by the hand of Jehu, son of Hanani the Prophet, against Baasha, and against his house, and against all the evil which he had done before the Lord, to provoke him in the works of his hands, that [his house] might become like the house of Jeroboam: for this cause he slew him.* But that which in the Latin edition is straightway added — *THAT IS, Jehu, son of Hanani, the Prophet* — the Hebrew reading does not have; but it is, unless I am mistaken, a certain little annotation first added in the margin by some uncertain expositor, who wished to illustrate this place [which was] not understood by him; then, as often happens, transferred by the boldness of the copyists into the text.

THE FINGER-WRITTEN SCRIPTURE OF JESUS CHRIST. [11] Although Christ, our Master, committed nothing by himself to the monuments of letters — inasmuch as he had come to write the law of his love in a more excellent form of writing: not on pages, and dead parchments and books, but on the living and animate tablets of human hearts [12] — yet it is read that he once wrote certain [things] in

[→ *the ground* (in terra) — John 8]

[1] Two books of Purchase and Sale written at Jeremiah's command [2] Jeremiah wrote one book on the devastation of Babylon [3] Jer. 51:60-64 [4] The argument of the Description of Jeremiah the prophet [5] Matt. 27:9 [6] 3 Kings 16:1-3 [7] 2 Par. 19:2 [8] 2 Par. 20:30 — so printed; the quoted words are 2 Par. 20:34 [9] What is narrated concerning the slaying of Jehu in chapter 16 of the third book of Kings of the Vulgate edition is not found in the Hebrew copies [10] 3 Kings 16:7 [11] Christ the Lord committed nothing himself to the monuments of letters [12] 2 Cor. 3:3

(printed p. 72 [PDF p. 85], verso — leaf stamps "70". THE FINGER-WRITTEN SCRIPTURE OF JESUS CHRIST concluded (John 8 and the patristic guesses at what Christ wrote), then THE LIVING EPISTLE OF JESUS CHRIST (2 Cor 3); the entry on THE EPISTLE OF JESUS CHRIST to Abgar begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ in the ground] — on the stone pavement of the temple of Jerusalem — not with a reed [pen], nor with a stylus, but with that very finger with which he had once inscribed the divine precepts on tablets of stone. [1] [2] The occasion of this writing John reports in the eighth chapter of his Gospel, in these words: [3] *THE SCRIBES and Pharisees brought to Jesus a woman taken in adultery; and setting her in the midst, they said to him, Master, this woman was just now taken in adultery. Now in the law Moses commanded such to be stoned. But thou, what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might be able to accuse him. But Jesus, bowing himself down, wrote with his finger on the ground. And when they continued asking, he raised himself up, and said to them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her: and again bowing himself, he wrote on the ground.* Thus John. [4] But what Christ, bowing himself the first time to the ground, wrote — and what the second time — neither does the evangelist disclose, nor is it easy for anyone to determine. Ambrose, however, in the two epistles to Studius, surmises that Christ, bowing down the first

time, traced upon the pavement a certain sentence of Jeremiah — namely, [5] *O EARTH, WRITE THESE MEN [as] cast off:* that by these words he might show that those tempters were now cast away by God, and reckoned among the reprobate, whose names are written not in heaven, but in earth. But in the second bowing-down, he conjectures that Christ wrote that sentence elsewhere preached by him: [6] *THE MOTE WHICH IS IN THY BROTHER'S EYE, THOU SEEST; BUT THE BEAM WHICH IS IN THINE OWN EYE, THOU SEEST NOT.* Bede thinks that he, once and again, wrote that same sentence which he had then uttered with his mouth — namely, *HE WHO IS WITHOUT SIN, LET HIM FIRST CAST A STONE AT HER* — as if he should say: Let the sinful woman be punished, but not by the transgressors of the law. Haymo reckons that he traced certain marks in the ground, by which each of the accusers beheld with his own eyes his own crimes, and saw [them] set before his mind. Euthymius — who alone of the Greeks expounded the history of the adulterous woman — thinks that nothing was written by Christ, but only that the gesture and action of one writing was feigned by him: which they are wont frequently to do, who are unwilling to answer those who ask importunate and unworthy [things]. For, their machination being known, he pretended to write on the ground, and not to attend to what was being said; so that, while he did not look upon them, they, being more gently rebuked, might blush; and so that, [he being] occupied in writing, it might be permitted them to slip away gradually, before they should be more manifestly condemned. For by his supreme benignity he spared even them. Rabanus says that Christ, by this gesture of writing, wished to signify that those who were accusing the woman were worthy to be written in the earth, together with those of whom Jeremiah says, chapter 17: [7] *O LORD, all they that depart from thee shall be written in the earth.* For the impious are not written in heaven with everlasting writing, but in the dust of the pavement; so that quickly the engraving and memory of them, worn away by the feet of those passing by, may vanish.

THE LIVING [ANIMATE] EPISTLE OF JESUS CHRIST. Concerning this, Paul the Apostle thus addresses the Corinthians in the latter epistle to them: [8] *YE ARE the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, and written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tablets of stone, but in the fleshly tablets of the heart.* By which sentence Paul calls the Corinthians the epistle of Christ — [the same] whom, in the words immediately preceding, he had named his own epistle, saying: [9] *YE ARE our epistle, written in our hearts, which is known and read by all [men].* Now Paul calls them both his own and Christ's epistle, [10] because, just as commendatory letters — which are wont to be written for the commendation of someone — manifest in words the virtue and dignity of him for whose sake they are written: so the Corinthians, by the sincerity of [their] faith, and by a truly Evangelical and Christian life, illustrated the glory of Christ, and declared the mastership of Paul, who had instructed them in Christ. And just as, in commendatory letters, those who read them recognize the virtue of those who are commended in them: so those who looked upon the life of the Corinthians straightway recognized the sublime excellence of Christ, whom they professed, and the dignity of the Apostolate of Paul, who had led them to Christ. Now Paul used this metaphor of an epistle, to show that he had no need of commendatory letters — such as the false apostles carried about, whether obtained from others to the Corinthians, or from the Corinthians to others — which he also openly declared, saying: [11] *DO WE need, as some [do], commendatory letters to you, or from you?* — as if he should say: What need of the commendation of letters, where the thing itself commends the man? We care nothing for such letters. For ye are our living epistle and efficacious commendation, who, from the sublimity of your virtue, render the dignity of our ministry commendable to all men. Whatever that is which letters would have done — commending us, and winning reverence for us — this you do, while all both see you and hear of you: for this reason, that the virtue of disciples is wont to adorn the teacher, and to commend [him] more than any epistle could. Ye therefore, he says, are our epistle, written in our hearts; because we always have your piety and charity in [our] mind, bear [it] in [our] heart, everywhere carry [it] about with us, and celebrate your good deeds before all. Ye are likewise not only our epistle, but Christ's also, since through the holiness of your life ye exhibit Christ, the author of your salvation, to be received by all nations. For then are ye the true and living epistle of Christ — written indeed by him, but by our ministry: written, however, not with

deletable ink, such as are [those] which the false apostles bring to you, begged [from others]; nor again inscribed on stone tablets, as [was] that old law concerning which the Jews so greatly glory — but on the fleshly and soft tablets of the heart. For your hearts, on which we have impressed the doctrine of Christ, were to us in place of parchment. Our tongue [was] the pen, but Christ himself, through the Spirit, dictated what we should write in your hearts.

THE EPISTLE OF JESUS CHRIST [in reply] to Abgar, petty king of the Edessenes — [12] this Eusebius, in the first book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 15 *[so printed; the Abgar letters are HE 1.13]*, testifies that he found in the public Archives of the city of Edessa, together with the epistle of Abgar himself, written in Syriac: of which the copies are these:

> *Abgar, son of Uchania, Toparch, to JESUS the good Saviour, who has appeared in the regions of Jerusalem. Greeting.*

[→ *I HAVE HEARD* (Audivi)]

[1] Exod. 31:18 [2] Deut. 9:10 [3] John 8:3-8 [4] It is disputed what Christ the Lord wrote on the ground [5] Jer. 22 [6] Matt. 7:3 [7] Jer. 17:13 [8] 2 Cor. 3:3 [9] 2 Cor. 3:2 [10] The Corinthians were the epistle both of Christ the Lord and of St. Paul [11] 2 Cor. 3:1 [12] Eusebius writes that he found in the public archives of the city of Edessa the epistle of Christ the Lord to Abgar

---

(printed p. 73 [PDF p. 86], recto — leaf stamps "71". THE EPISTLE OF JESUS CHRIST to Abgar concluded (Abgar's letter and Christ's reply, rejected as apocryphal), then THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST (Matthew's genealogy), with brief entries on THE INFANCY and THE MAGIC OF JESUS CHRIST. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *IT HAS BEEN HEARD*] by me concerning thee, and concerning the healings which thou workest — that these are done by thee without medicines or herbs; and that by a word only thou makest the blind to see, and the lame to walk; and thou cleansest lepers; and unclean spirits and demons thou castest out; and those who are afflicted with long sicknesses, thou curest and healest; the dead also thou raisest up. All which having been heard concerning thee, I resolved in my mind that it is one of two things: either that thou art God, and hast descended from heaven, to do these things; or that thou art the Son of God, who doest these things. Therefore, writing, I would beg thee that thou wouldst deign to weary thyself [in journeying] even to me, and to cure my sickness, with which I have long labored. For I have also learned this, that the Jews murmur against thee, and wish to lay snares for thee. And I have a city, small indeed, but honorable, which may suffice for us both.

Jesus the Nazarene, to Abgar the Toparch.

> *BLESSED art thou, because thou hast believed in me, whom thou thyself hast not seen. For it is written of me, that those who see me shall not believe in me; and those who see me not, they shall believe and live. But concerning that which thou hast written to me, that I should come to thee: it behooves me to fulfill here all [the things] for which I was sent; and after I shall have fulfilled [them], to be received up to him who sent me. When therefore I shall have been taken up, I will send to thee one of my disciples, to cure thy sickness, and to give life to thee, and to those who are with thee.*

This epistle Pope Gelasius the First rejects among the Apocryphal scriptures. John of Damascus, in the fourth book *On the orthodox faith*, chapter 17, writes that our Lord Jesus sent to this Abgar — [who was] anxiously begging for it — an image of his own face. [1] Evagrius, in the fourth book of the Ecclesiastical History, narrates that the city of Edessa was, by the virtue of this sacred image, wonderfully delivered from the assault of the Persians, and from the burning of the flames stirred up by them. The same is also related in the fifth session of the second Council of Nicaea. Gelasius, in the fifteenth distinction, numbers both letters among the Apocrypha.

THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST, or *The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ* (which in the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew is called ספר תולדות ישוע המשיח *Sepher toldoth Yeshua ha-Mashiach* — that is, *The Book of the generations of Jesus the Messiah*), [2] gave occasion to the sacred interpreters of inquiring whether this title, *The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ*, signified the whole work of this gospel, or indicated only this genealogy of the Savior placed at the beginning of the Gospel — after the custom of Moses, who called the genealogy of our first parent *The Book of the generation of Adam.* [3] Chrysostom reckons that Matthew, by this title, did not wish to comprehend the sum of the whole Evangelical History — as many writers are accustomed to comprehend, in their titles, the entire arguments of [their] works — but only the beginning, and the fountain, from which the rest of the evangelical history arises, which takes its beginning from the carnal generation of Christ described in this genealogy. But certain [others] affirm that by this title is comprehended the sum and the universal argument of the whole gospel: that Matthew therefore called [it] *The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ* because, since he himself was a Hebrew, and wrote in Hebrew for Hebrews, it seemed [good] to him to inscribe his history from the generation of Christ, which he narrated at the beginning of the volume — the custom of the Hebrews being here preserved, who generally impose names on their books from those matters which are related in the openings; [4] imitating Moses, who (as Philo the Jew, in the book *On the world*, is witness) inscribed the first volume of the Pentateuch *The Book of Genesis*, that is, *of generation*, because its beginning contained the generation of the world.

But to me it seems that Matthew — not only after the manner of the Hebrews, but also according to the custom of other writers — comprehended by this title not only the carnal generation of Christ, but also his whole life, preaching, miracles, passion, death, resurrection, and all his other deeds and events; [5] since that word התולדות *ha-toldoth* — that is, *of generations* — which is placed in the title, among the Hebrews signifies two [things]: that is, *generations* and *events.* [6] Whence the Rabbis of the Hebrews, as often as they expound those places of the divine scriptures — *THIS IS THE BOOK OF THE GENERATION OF ADAM*, and *THESE ARE THE GENERATIONS OF ABRAHAM*, and places like these — say: *WHERESOEVER thou shalt find the word* תולדות *toldoth*, that is, *of generations*, that place teaches concerning the births, and the events, and the actions of him of whom mention is there made. *The Book of the generations of Jesus Christ*, therefore, will be a title comprehending all the operations and events of Christ, from his Incarnation even to the ascension, which are described in this whole gospel. Faustus, bishop of the Manichaeans — as Augustine relates in the books published against him — assailed this title with many and various cavils, [7] asserting that it pertained neither to the whole body of the gospel, nor to any part of it; but that by it was indicated only a certain carnal genealogy of Christ, which he thought ought to be cut off from the whole gospel entirely, as falsely fabricated, and rashly — and by an uncertain author — imposed on the Gospel of Matthew, like a horse's head set upon a human neck. The insane blasphemies of this [man], in the seventh book of this work, we have most strongly refuted, out of the opinions of Augustine.

THE INFANCY OF JESUS CHRIST, or the book *Of the infancy of the Savior.* See below, under the entry *Matthew.*

THE MAGIC OF JESUS CHRIST. [8] That many books were published by heretics and impostors under the title of our Saviour Jesus — not only is Jerome a witness, in the thirteenth [book of the] commentary on Ezekiel, but Augustine also affirms, in the first book *Of the consensus of the Evangelists*, that there were certain pagans in his own times who boasted that they had seen, and read, certain books of Christ [addressed] to Peter and Paul, [9] in which was written the sum of the whole art of Magic — out of the skill of which Christ, while he lived, had wrought so many and so great miracles. Whose madness Augustine, in the same place, briefly refutes by four arguments. First, that those who affirm that they have read such books could never — however anxiously they tried — perform such miracles as they say Christ performed out of such books. Secondly, that these [men] so err by divine judgment as to assert that these same books were inscribed [addressed] to Peter and Paul, as with an epistolary title — having perhaps fallen into such an error because

in many places they had seen them depicted together with Christ; whereas, however, it is known even to children that Paul, so long as Christ lived in mortal flesh, was neither a disciple nor an intimate of Christ. [10] Not, therefore, could [Christ have addressed to Paul] the books which, before [his] death, [they say he]

[→ *scripsisse* (wrote) — sig. G]

[1] That Christ the Lord sent the image of his own face to Abgar, who begged it [2] What the inscription of Matthew's Gospel signifies [3] The Book of the generation of Adam is the genealogy of the first parent [4] The Hebrews are accustomed to inscribe their books from those things which are referred to in the opening [5] Matthew in the inscription of his Gospel comprehended all the deeds of Christ the Lord [6] What the word "generation" signifies in the sacred letters [7] The madness of Faustus against the inscription of Matthew's Gospel [8] Many books were published by heretics and impostors under the name of Christ the Lord [9] Augustine refutes the pagans who boasted that they had read books of Christ addressed to Peter and Paul [10] Paul was not a disciple of Christ while he lived in mortal flesh

(printed p. 74 [PDF p. 87], verso — leaf stamps "72". THE MAGIC OF JESUS CHRIST concluded, then THE PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST and JEZEBEL (her letters against Naboth); the right column covers THE INSCRIPTION OF THE RIDER (Rev 19) and THE OTHER, INVISIBLE INSCRIPTION (the ineffable name). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ they say he] wrote — to write to Paul as [his] most intimate [friend], who only after the ascension of the Lord then first began to be his disciple. Thirdly, that those who think Christ could [do] such great [things] by magic arts, and turned the whole world unto himself alone, do not consider that it could by no means come about, through magic arts, that Christ — before he was born — should fill so many Prophets with the divine Spirit, [Prophets] who foretold that he would do such [things] as we now see present in the world. For even if he had brought [it] about by magic arts that he should be worshipped even [when] dead, yet he could not be a magician before he was born. Fourthly, because they foolishly believe that Christ composed books — [Christ] who never wrote anything, but only left to others [the things] to be written concerning himself, the most excellent sublimity of his own doctrine so requiring: which it did not befit to be written with deletable ink on the perishable leaves of papers, or on tablets void of sense, but rather to be engraved — destined to endure perpetually — on the living and everlasting minds of his disciples, with the pen of the divine Spirit. Whence also, among the pagans, the most noble philosophers Pythagoras and Socrates committed nothing to the monuments of letters, [1] thinking that they had found the most perfect manner of teaching, if they should leave the precepts of living well and blessedly not written on pages, but impressed on the minds of their hearers.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS CHRIST, or *A Book concerning the legal priesthood of Jesus Christ.* There is extant, in the Greek Lexicon of Suidas, under the entry *JESUS*, a certain little book inserted entire, *Of the legal priesthood of Jesus Christ*, found in the Archives of the city of Tiberias in the time of the Emperor Justinian, by Theodosius, a chief [prince] of the Jews, and by Philip Argentarius, a Christian: in which it is diffusely narrated that Christ — both on account of the sanctity of his life, and on account of the nobility of his race, deduced from the two tribes of Judah and Levi mutually intermingled — was judged by all the Levites worthy of the honor of the Mosaic priesthood, and thus at last received by the priests into the college of priests. [2] There is added, moreover, at the end of the book an *Apology*, which defends the authority of the same little book, and shows that Christ discharged the legal priesthood — both from the testimony of Josephus, and from various places of both Testaments. Hieronymus Hentenius wrote a refutation of this book — which in recent years had been printed three times, with great applause of readers, at Paris and Basel — and Pope Paul IV commanded [it] to be placed in the Index of condemned volumes.

JEZEBEL, [3] [4] wife of Ahab king of Israel, when she had noticed that her husband vehemently desired the estate of Naboth the Israelite, adjoining the royal grounds, and that it could not be obtained from Naboth either by price or by entreaties, wrote secret letters to the chief men of Israel; by which she commanded that, a fast being proclaimed, they should call an assembly, and in it should assign the first place to Naboth on account of [his] illustrious birth; then, three men being suborned [who would] dare anything, they should —

[Naboth] being convicted by the testimony of these of blasphemy against God and the king — cast him to the people to be stoned, and in this manner take him out of the way. Naboth, therefore, in this manner, against right and divine law, being overwhelmed with stones, Jezebel handed over the estate of the slain [man] to her husband to possess. For which so impious crime she herself, not long after, was slain, and devoured by dogs in that place where the dogs had consumed the corpse of Naboth. [5] See the third book of Kings, chapter 21.

Now thou shalt note, in these letters of Jezebel, that the word *HE BLESSED GOD AND THE KING* [6] is to be understood in a contrary sense for *He cursed* — just as also those execrable words of Job's wife, *BLESS GOD, AND DIE,* [7] that is, *Curse [him];* and likewise that [word] of Job himself, saying, *LEST perchance my sons have sinned, blessing God in their hearts;* [8] and that [word] of Satan to God concerning Job, *UNLESS he shall have blessed thee to [thy] face.* [9] For the word *Bless* among the Hebrews is of the number of those expressions which are taken as much in a good as in a bad sense [10] — just as, among the Greeks, *Anathema*, which signifies both a votive offering hung up to God in the temple, and utmost detestation. And among the Latins, *Sacer* and *Sacrum* are sometimes taken in a bad sense, [11] for [something] execrable and detestable: according to which signification Virgil said:

> *—To what dost thou not drive mortal breasts, O accursed hunger for gold?*

Juvenal: *Let him be intestable, and accursed [sacer].* There are also those who say that the name of cursing and blasphemy was so hateful to the Jews that, not daring to express it by its proper word, they signified it by the contrary word of *blessing.*

THE INSCRIPTION OF THE RIDER, sitting on a white horse, is twofold: the one visible, traced on the garment, upon the thigh of the one sitting; the other incomprehensible, which no one knows but the Rider himself. Of which John, in the Apocalypse, makes mention in these words: [12] *BEHOLD a white horse, and he that sat upon him [was] faithful and true, having a name written, which no one knoweth but himself: and he was clothed with a garment dipped in blood: and his name is called* ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, *that is, The Word of God: and he hath upon his garment, and upon his thigh, a name written,* Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, καὶ κύριος κυρίων, *that is, King of kings, and Lord of lords.* These [things] John [says] concerning the twin inscription of the Rider: of which, the [one] which is visible, imprinted on the thigh, is expounded thus, according to the interpretation of Arethas of Caesarea. [13] The garment indeed signifies the flesh of Christ; but the thigh, the nature of the flesh — that it is truly human, and not phantastic. For to signify this, *thigh* is taken in the divine scripture. The aim of the passage, therefore, is to signify by this, that although the Word is hypostatically united to the human nature, and truly took human flesh of the Virgin, nevertheless he is omnipotent — as being the king of things heavenly, and lord of things earthly and subterranean — which omnipotence of empire, communicated to the humanity of the Son of God, Paul, wishing to express in the epistle to the Philippians, said: [14] *WHEREFORE God hath exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that in the name of JESUS every knee should bow, of things heavenly, earthly, and infernal.*

THE OTHER, invisible inscription [15] — containing the name which no one knows except himself — signifies the incomprehensibility of the infinite, and therefore unknowable and ineffable, substance of the Son of God; concerning which Solomon says: [16] *WHAT is his name, and the name of his son, if thou knowest?* For although, from various likenesses of creatures, we beg [borrow] certain appellations, by which we may name God — inasmuch as we know him through a glass, and in an enigma [darkly] — whether by affirmative names, such as are *wise*,

[→ *good* (bonus)]

[1] The most noble philosophers committed nothing to the monuments of letters [2] The fable of Christ adopted into the college of the Jewish priests [3] The crime of Jezebel [4] 3 Kings 21:8-9 &c. [5] 4 Kings 9:33,36 [6] 3 Kings 21:10,13 [7] Job 2:9 [8] Job 1:5 [9] Job 1:11 [10] 'Bless' among the Hebrews is taken both in a good and in a bad sense [11] 'Sacer' and 'sacrum' are sometimes taken in a bad sense [12] Rev. 19:11 [13] The visible inscription of the Rider is explained [14] Phil. 2:9 [15] The invisible inscription of the Rider is explained [16] Prov. 30:4

(printed p. 75 [PDF p. 88], recto — leaf stamps "73". THE OTHER, INVISIBLE INSCRIPTION concluded (the Tetragrammaton and its meaning), then the entry on THE ROLLED-UP BOOK [SCROLL] begins (Rev 6; Isa 34; the form of Hebrew scrolls and the patristic readings of the heavens folded or unrolled). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *good*], Sun, light, life, king, lord; or by negatives, as are *invisible, immutable, incorporeal:* yet the essence itself, as it is in itself, can neither be explained by words, nor expressed by writings, nor comprehended by any thought. For he alone, who is infinite, and comprehends Himself alone, has reserved to himself the knowledge of this unknowable name of his — that is, of his essence, which is signified by the unknowable name — revealing to no one its incomprehensible immensity; as he himself testified to Moses, saying: [1] *I [am] the Lord, who appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in God Almighty, and my name* יהוה *JEHOVAH I did not make known to them.* Now this name is said to have been revealed to no one [2] — not because the word *Jehovah* itself is either unknown, or cannot be expressed by the tongue (since it is both written with definite letters, and was uttered by Pharaoh, a most impure man); but because the nature of God, especially [as] signified by that name, cannot be expressed by any creature, since it is infinite; and therefore can, by no one, distinctly, openly, and exactly, be known and named. There are those who think that in this place, by the *name which no one knows but himself,* is to be understood this name *Jehovah,* because of the likeness of signification which it has with the epithets that John attributes to him who sits upon the horse, calling him *faithful and true:* [3] for he is called faithful and true, who persists in [his] purpose, keeps [his] promises, and fulfills his pledges by deed. Which signification indeed the word *Jehovah* itself retains, deduced from the root היה *haia,* [4] which signifies *He was,* and *He made to be.* Whence *Jehovah* signifies him who is, and makes something to be. According to which sense God said to Moses: *MY name Jehovah I did not make known to them* — that is, I have not yet revealed myself through the fulfillment of those things which I promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but now I will reveal myself by the name *Jehovah* — that is, by the present and manifest fulfillment of my promises; and according to the signification of my name *Jehovah,* I will make to be what I promised. Now I promised that I would give the land of Canaan to the sons of Israel: soon presenting this, I will manifest the name *Jehovah,* now making those [things] to be which I, truthful and faithful, promised. Thou hast [more] on this matter below, in [the entry] *The inscription of the Pontifical vestment,* letter P; and in the third book, in the *Elementary Exposition.*

THE ROLLED-UP BOOK [SCROLL], in Greek βιβλίον είλισσόμενον — that is, *a book which is rolled,* or *that may be rolled together* — is mentioned in the Apocalypse, chapter six; where John, foretelling the final destruction of the whole world, says: [5] *THE SUN became black, as a sackcloth of hair; and the whole Moon became as blood; and the stars from heaven fell upon the earth, as a fig tree casteth its green figs when it is shaken by a great wind; and the heaven departed as a book rolled up.* And Isaiah, treating the same subject in almost the same words, thus writes concerning this book: [6] *ALL the host of the heavens shall waste away, and the heavens shall be folded together as a book, and all their host shall fall down, as the leaves fall from the vine and from the fig tree.* Obscure, indeed, is this Hebraic metaphor of the book, and unaccustomed and harsh to Greek as well as to Latin ears. Therefore it must be known that among the Hebrews, by ancient custom, the books — especially the sacred [ones] — are of another form than our books, which are compacted of many leaves. [7] For they have only one leaf, or an oblong membrane [parchment], which around a cylinder, or wooden axle, is turned about, in the manner of a warp of cloth rolled about a weaver's beam. Now books of this kind seem to bear a certain image of the heavens: [8] because, just as that wooden axle, which is in the middle of the volume, the several membranes of it — whether orbs, or spirals — surround and enclose, one above another: so this earth, which holds the axle [center] of the whole universe, several heavenly orbs, placed one above another, encircle in orbicular fashion, and enclose.

But in what manner, and for what cause, the heaven is — on the supreme day of the age — to be folded up like a book (according to Isaiah), or to depart like a book (according to John), there is a twofold opinion of

the fathers: [9] both, as I judge, arisen from the ambiguity of the Hebrew word גגול *nagol;* which, in this place of Isaiah, is doubtful, signifying as much *to roll around* as *to unroll* — or, as much *to fold up* as *to unfold.* Those, therefore, who take this word גגול *nagol* in the sense of *unrolling* and *unfolding,* read this place thus: *The heavens shall be unfolded like a book.* And they assert that the heaven, which is now wrapped up, is to be unrolled and opened at the end of the world, that all the rewards of that consummated glory may be manifested to us, which now are removed from our eyes. So also Arethas, bishop of Caesarea, expounded this place in [his] commentaries on the Apocalypse, saying: [10] *WE JUDGE that the Apostle used [the word] according to ancient custom.* For [being] a Hebrew, he used that thing which is rolled around, as is wont to be done in the books which are among us; whose unrolling is wont to effect not an obscuring, but a manifestation of the things which are written. Clement of Rome likewise, pontiff after Peter, in the second and third book of the *Recognitions,* narrating this place more fully, thus writes: [11] *THERE ARE two heavens: the one, the higher, encompassing the visible firmament — and that is perpetual and eternal, with those who dwell there; the other, this visible lower [heaven], which at the consummation of the age shall be dissolved, and shall pass away, that that heaven which is more ancient and more lofty may appear. For when the number of souls which are predestined shall be filled up, and the times of this world shall have come to an end, then this visible heaven shall be rolled up like a book, that that which is above may appear; and the souls of the blessed, restored to their bodies, may be brought into the light. For, for the sake of this present life of men, this visible heaven was made, that it might be a certain interposition and division, lest perchance anyone unworthy should see the habitation of the heavenly [ones], and the seat of God himself; which is prepared to be seen [only] by those alone who are clean of heart. For now — that is, in the time of the contest [agon] — it has pleased [God] that those [things] which are destined as a reward to the victors should be invisible. For just as the shell of eggs, although it seems beautifully made and diligently formed, must be broken and dissolved, that thence the chick may come forth, and that [thing] for the sake of which the whole form of the egg seems to be expressed may appear: so also the state of this world must pass away, that that state of the heavenly kingdom may shine forth.* Thus far Clement. To whom Justin, the philosopher and martyr, in the book of *Questions posed by the Gentiles,* subscribes in almost the same words. But those who attribute to this word גגול *nagol* the signification of *rolling together* and *folding up,* say that the heavens are to be folded up for various causes. Andreas, bishop of Caesarea, in [his] exposition of the Apocalypse, [12] thinks that by this rolling-up is to be understood, hyperbolically, the sadness of the

[→ *heavens* (coelorum) — sig. G 2]

[1] Exod. 3 (so printed; = Exod. 6:3) [2] Why the name Jehovah is said to have been revealed to no one [3] Who is called faithful and true [4] From what root Jehovah is derived [5] Rev. 6:12-14 [6] Isa. 34:4 [7] The sacred books among the Hebrews are of a different form than among the Latins [8] The sacred books among the Hebrews seem to bear some image of the heavens [9] In what manner and cause the heaven is to be folded up or to depart like a book is a twofold opinion of the Doctors [10] Arethas's opinion on the folding-up of the heaven [11] Clement's opinion on the folding-up of the heaven [12] The opinion of Andreas, bishop of Caesarea, on the rolling-up of the heaven

(printed p. 76 [PDF p. 89], verso — leaf stamps "74". THE ROLLED-UP BOOK concluded (further patristic readings of the folded heavens), then several entries under JOHN: the seven letters to the seven churches, the Epistle to the Parthians, the Acts of John, the Apocalypse, and the Commentary of John Maccabaeus. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ of the celestial] virtues, wherewith on that day they shall grieve together over those who have fallen away from the faith of Christ. For just as elsewhere we read [that] the heaven [is] stretched out like a tabernacle, [1] so now, by reason of bitterness, it is said [to be] rolled up like a book. Origen, in the *Tomes* on the book of Genesis — as Eusebius relates in the sixth book *Of the Evangelical Preparation* — said that the whole heaven is, as it were, a certain open book, containing the significations of all future things and of human events, [2] but without any compulsion of human liberty; Moses saying: [3] *GOD placed the stars in the firmament, that they may be for signs* — that is, that they may signify the reasons of future things, ordained by divine providence. When, therefore, all [those things] shall have been fulfilled and come to pass which the

stars, divinely ordained, announce to the human race, then the heavens shall be folded up like a book — that is, they shall cease from the announcing of future things, nor shall they any longer signify the events to come. Jerome, however, says [4] that the heavens are to be folded up on the day of judgment, so that after that day the sins of the wicked shall no longer be written in the heavens. Thomas Aquinas, treating the present place, says that this is the Prophet's meaning: that just as in a folded-up book nothing can be read, so neither in the heaven shall the astrologers and augurs of the Jews be able to foresee the calamities which the Jewish people is to receive from the Assyrians, and the Chaldeans, and other nations. Ambrose, in [his] commentaries on the Apocalypse, explaining according to allegory that [saying] of John — *THE HEAVEN DEPARTED AS A BOOK ROLLED UP* [5] — interprets by *Heaven* the Old Testament, which to the Jews is as a book rolled up: [6] because they will not understand the spiritual intelligence, which demonstrates Christ in the Old Testament. The Heaven, therefore, like a rolled-up book, departed: because the Old Testament forsook the Jews, and passed over to the Gentiles. Tyconius the African takes *heaven* allegorically for the Church: [7] since, just as a rolled-up book contains mysteries within, but not apparent without, so the Church, in that supreme persecution of Antichrist — known to her own only, and hidden from strangers — shall withdraw from the eyes of the impious, prudently and secretly avoiding the disaster of that persecution.

SEVEN LETTERS OF JOHN the Apostle to the Bishops of the seven Churches, written at the command of Christ — namely, to the bishops of the churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea: the contents of which are read in the second and third chapter of the Apocalypse, as Victorinus the martyr noted in [his] commentaries on that place. Origen, in the 20th homily on Numbers, and the 13th homily on Luke, [8] reckons that these seven bishops — whom John, in writing, calls *Angels* — were truly angels, not only in name and office, but also in nature.

THE EPISTLE OF JOHN the Apostle and Evangelist TO THE PARTHIANS. Making mention of this, Augustine, in the second book of the *Evangelical Questions,* question 39, says: *IT WAS SAID by John, in the epistle to the Parthians: DEARLY BELOVED, now are we the sons of God, and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is.* Whether Augustine cited this testimony out of the first Catholic [epistle] of John — where this very same [text] is read entire, to the letter — or whether he adduced it out of some other epistle written to the Parthians, I do not sufficiently perceive. See the first book, at [the entry] *the Epistle of John.*

THE ACTS OF JOHN. Philastrius mentions [these] in the *Catalog of heresies,* chapter fifty-four, saying: *THE MANICHAEANS have the Acts of Blessed John the Evangelist, and of Peter, and of Paul, likewise reproved by the Church: because in these they relate that the Apostles did great signs and prodigies — so that cattle, and beasts, and dogs spoke; and they say that the souls of men are, as it were, [the souls] of dogs and cattle.* James [Jacobus de Voragine], Archbishop of Genoa, in the book of the *Yearly Festivities* [the *Golden Legend*], brings forward a certain Apocryphal book of John the Evangelist, *Of the passing-over and assumption of the Virgin Mary:* out of which he also recites the history of that same solemnity, summarily collected. But Augustine convicts the vanity of that work, in sermon 35, *On the saints,* where, speaking of the bodily death of the Virgin Mary, he thus says: [9] *BUT neither is any of the treatise-writers found among the Latins to have said anything openly concerning the death of Mary. And what do I say of these, when not even he who received her before the cross of the Lord into his own [care] — that is, John the Evangelist — committed anything of this by writings to be retained by posterity? For no one could have narrated [it] more faithfully (had God willed to manifest it) than he, assuredly, who undertook to nourish [care for] her. It remains, therefore, that a man should not mendaciously feign as open [manifest] what God willed to remain hidden.* See below, under [the entry] *Mary.*

THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN — the Alogian heretics believed [it] to have been published not by John the Apostle, but by Cerinthus the heretic; and on this account they judged that it should be avoided, as the work of a most pestilent scoundrel. Epiphanius, in the second book against the heresies. See below, book six,

[under] *Heresy.*

THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN, according to Cerinthus. Concerning this work, Gaius, a disciple of Origen, in the dialogue of his disputations, thus writes: *CERINTHUS, by certain revelations — which he would pretend to have been written by the great Apostle, and revealed to him through Angels — introduces to us such portents as these: that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ shall be earthly in Jerusalem, and that men [shall be] in the flesh again, [and shall] have a manner of life subject to lusts and vices; and — against the faith also of the scriptures — he designates certain thousand years, in which [he says] many other works of corruption, and festivities of nuptials, shall be future, for the deceiving of those who are given to lust.*

THE COMMENTARY OF JOHN MACCABAEUS, high priest — or, *The Book of the days of the priesthood of John.* Out of this the author of the first book of Maccabees excerpted several deeds of John [Hyrcanus], son of Mattathias: of which the last chapter of the first [book] of Maccabees makes mention, in these words: [10] *THE REST of the words of John, and of his wars, and of the good deeds which he strongly did, and of the building of the walls which he raised up, and of his acts — behold, these are written in the book of the days of his principality and priesthood.* This work is extant in Greek at Lyons, in the Library which had been [that] of Santes Pagninus, a man most skilled in the three tongues, under the title *THE FOURTH BOOK OF THE MACCABEES* (*LIERI* [read *LIBRI*] *QVARTI MACCABAEORVM*). See above, in the first book, in the section of the Apocrypha.

[→ IONA-]

[1] Ps. 103:2 [2] Origen thought the heaven to be like an open book containing the significations of all future things [3] Gen. 1:14 [4] Jerome's opinion on the folding-up of the heavens [5] Rev. 6:14 [6] The Old Testament is to the Jews like a rolled-up book [7] Tyconius's opinion on the Church's hiding is not to be approved [8] Origen's opinion on the seven bishops to whom John wrote [9] Among the Latins before Augustine no treatise-writer said anything of the Blessed Virgin's death [10] 2 Macc. (so printed; the quotation is 1 Macc 16, "the last chapter of the first [book] of Maccabees")

(printed p. 77 [PDF p. 90], recto — leaf stamps "75". Entries on JONATHAN the high priest and THE PRAYER OF JOSEPH (the apocryphal Oratio Ioseph), then CICCUS OF ASCOLI on the "tablets of heaven" and the Notory Art with its condemnation, and IOTA & APEX (Matt 5:18). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

JONATHAN, high priest and leader of the Jews, wrote — for entering into an alliance with the Lacedaemonians — a letter to the Spartans, which is had in 1 Maccabees 12.

THE PRAYER OF JOSEPH [*Oratio Ioseph*], or *Sermon,* or *Narration,* or *Disputation of Joseph,* son of Jacob the Patriarch — a writing which among the ancients, both Hebrews and Christians, had no little authority, which Origen called *a not-to-be-despised writing* — perhaps because he had read certain [things] in it agreeing with his own opinions. For in the second tome of the exposition on John, he especially uses the testimonies of this [book] to confirm [his] assertion concerning the incarnation of certain angels, whom he himself believes to have assumed a human soul and body in imitation of our Saviour, [1] writing thus: *BUT IF anyone approve also that mystical Prayer of Joseph which is had among the Hebrews, he will receive thence a dogma like this — namely, that certain [beings], of the nature of angels, descended into the nature of men.* For Jacob says in this Prayer: *FOR I, who speak with you, Jacob and Israel, am an angel of God, and a chief spirit; and Abraham and Isaac were created before every work. But I, Jacob — called Jacob not by men, but Israel is my name; and I was called Israel by God, [that is,] the Man seeing God: for I am the firstborn of every living thing which receives from God the use of life. And when I came from Mesopotamia of Syria, Uriel, the angel of God, came forth; and he said that I had descended into the earth, and had dwelt among men, and was called by the name of Jacob. Moreover he rivaled me, and fought and wrestled with me, saying that his name would be set before my name, and before that [name] which precedes the whole Gospel; and I*

declared to him his name; and he holds a principality among the sons of God. For thou art Uriel, the eighth from me. I also am Israel, the archangel of the host of the Lord, and I am, among the sons of God, a commander of a thousand soldiers. Am I not that Israel, the first minister in the sight of God? And I invoked my God by [his] immortal name. But we have strayed too far from our purpose, having taken up the disputation about Jacob, and having produced for ourselves, as a witness, a not-to-be-despised writing. Thus Origen — who, in the *Tomes* of the expositions on Genesis, showing from this same narration that in the stars of heaven, as in books, all the foreknowledges of human events can be read by skilled inspectors of the stars, thus says: *THE WHOLE HEAVEN is, as it were, a certain open book, containing written in itself all future things: therefore, in the Prayer of Joseph, it may be understood in this way, [in] that [which] is said by Jacob to [his] sons: I have read in the tablets of heaven whatsoever shall befall you and your sons.* These same words, taken by name out of this very writing, Eusebius of Caesarea reports in the sixth book of the *Evangelical Preparation,* and Procopius of Gaza in the exposition of the first chapter of the book of Genesis. Athanasius, in his *Synopsis,* rejects this whole narration among the Apocryphal writings.

CICCUS [Cecco] OF ASCOLI, in [his] commentaries on the *Centiloquium* of Ptolemy, making mention of these tablets of heaven, left [it] thus written: *The common opinion of the wise astrologers is that not only the eighth sphere, but also the ninth and the tenth, are like tablets painted with various configurations, images, and marks: for in the sign of Aries is the image of a beautiful youth, and in the sign of Virgo, the image of a virgin carrying a boy; and in the other signs and parts of the heaven are diverse effigies, and characters, and letters, showing us the causes of these lower [things] — concerning which is to be understood that sentence of the Patriarch Jacob: I have read in the tablets of heaven whatsoever shall befall you. And these figures are not idle, but influence various effects into this world. And therefore Ptolemy says, in this part of the Centiloquium: THE FACES of this world are subject to the faces of the superior bodies — that is, to the figurations and aspects of the images which are in the celestial bodies. And although these figures cannot be seen by all indifferently, yet by those who have the sharpest sight and the most purified mind, at certain times and in the clearest serenity of night, they can be descried. Whence, from the observation of these, was gathered by the wise that art which is called the Notory [Art], by the virtue of which those same wise men performed many wonderful experiments for the use of men. For they engraved — either in metals, or in choice stones — or they imprinted, in gum, or in wax or clay, the marks of the celestial figures which they had seen in the tablets of heaven, and they added the names of the angels whom, by God's revealing, they had known to preside over those figures; and thus, from the engraving and impression of these, they worked many admirable effects, to the praise of God and the benefit of men. But afterward certain corrupters of this art added to it certain figures, and infernal marks, which they said were found in the region of the damned, and the names of demons — out of which, at the devil's persuasion, they formed images for inducing lusts, discords, homicides, thefts, sicknesses, bewitchings, poisonings, sorceries, etc. And therefore, on account of this corruption, it came about at last that the art — good in itself — was, on account of the superadded malice, condemned and prohibited.* Thus far Ciccus: intimating by these words that the former part of this art is not to be disapproved. Nor does Thomas Cajetan seem to be far from his opinion, who — upon the *Secunda Secundae* of St. Thomas, expounding Article 2, question 96 — contends with keen zeal that the images of the stars and of the celestial signs, imprinted on metals by astronomical artifice, are endowed with the powers of those same stars [2]: for example, that the figure of the Lion [Leo], engraved on gold while the constellation Leo holds the ascendant, would receive from the star of the Lion a certain profitable power, most salutary especially for those whom the influx of the Leonine constellation governs. But I, to declare frankly what is in my mind, judge that both parts are, by fullest right, to be hissed off and utterly rejected: the first indeed as an empty and superstitious fallacy, resting on no reason or authority; the latter as a certain and open impiety of detestable infidelity. Both are condemned by St. Thomas in the *Secunda Secundae,* question 96, and by the Ecumenical Synod of Trent, in the Index of rejected volumes.

IOTA and APEX — in the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew [they] are called יוד או עוקץ *Yod o* ■*oqets*, that is, *Yod, or Apex [tittle];* but in the Greek, ἰῶτα ἕν, ἢ μία κεραία — that is, *one Iota, or one apex.* Concerning these, Christ, speaking in passing in Matthew, says: [3] *AMEN I say to you, till heaven and earth pass, one iota, or one Apex, shall not pass from the law, till all be done* — wishing by these words vehemently to express the perfect observance of the whole law in himself [4], even to the least

[→ *things* (minima) — sig. G 3]

[1] Origen wrongly thought certain angels to be incarnate [2] Thomas Cajetan contends that the images of the stars, imprinted on metals by astronomical artifice, are endowed with the powers of those same stars — which opinion is by no means to be approved [3] Matt. 5:18 [4] The law is to be perfectly observed

(printed p. 78 [PDF p. 91], verso — leaf stamps "76". IOTA & APEX concluded (what "apex" means and the late invention of the vowel-points), then THE JUDICIAL BOOKS (Dan 7), THE GOSPEL OF JUDAS ISCARIOT, JUDAS MACCABAEUS's commentaries, and THE BOOK OF THE JUST (Josh 10). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ even to the least] and slightest precepts to be fulfilled. For these — the Iod and the apices [tittles] — signified the smallest particles of the law. For since there are two kinds of precepts in the law — the one Moral, the other Ceremonial — Christ fulfilled both. [1] For the ceremonial [precepts], which were nothing but shadows and figures of the Christ to come, Christ himself obscured [outshone] by the splendor of his coming. But the moral [precepts] he alone fulfilled most perfectly, in himself and by himself, according to the will of God the lawgiver, because he alone was innocent and without sin; and then he granted us also to fulfill these same [precepts] by the spirit of his grace. But, since by the name of *Apex,* both among the Greeks and among the Latins, two [things] are signified — namely, points, and the topmost tips of letters — this place gave occasion of inquiring what *Apex* here signifies: points, or the tips of letters. [2] Christian Druthmar, in [his] commentaries on Matthew, writes thus on this matter: *An APEX is called the mark [titulus] which among the ancients was placed over certain letters, whether for the sake of distinction, or to show that the letter was to be doubled. For example, when* Populus *[meant] a people, it was not placed: but when* Populus *meant a tree [poplar], then an apex was placed above, that it might warn the reader to depart from the usual meaning, and [that] the syllable was long. [It] was also placed for the sake of doubling — as in* Alleluia, *because there two L's ought to be, one L was written, and an apex above; from this it was understood that the letter L was to be doubled. In the syllable IA likewise, an apex was placed over the I, to show that that I was to be doubled. The Lord, therefore, shows that such distinctions are not to be passed over in the divine scripture: because, if they were neglected, the sense also would perish along [with them].* Thus he. Others of the Latins suppose that by *Apices* here ought to be understood those points which are everywhere written in the Hebrew codices, for forming the sounds of the vowel letters; and they assert that the marks of these points existed not only in the times of Christ, but even long before — many doctors of the Hebrews attesting this. Of whom some refer the invention of the vowel-points to the men of the Great Synagogue — in which were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, Ezra, and Nehemiah; but others judge this invention to be from God, who delivered the law to Moses on Mount Sinai together with the letters and the vowel-points. The greater part of the learned men opposes their opinion; of whose number Augustine, in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount,* expounds by *Apices* the little parts placed at the top of letters. Isidore says the *Apices* are little lines on the tips of letters; Euthymius, oblique lines; Thomas calls [them] little strokes drawn at the top of letters, which distinguish the like figures of the Hebrew letters. Which opinion indeed I judge most true — both because that Syriac or Chaldaic word עוקץ ■*Oqets* signifies rather the summit [point] of a thing than a point [dot]; and because it is sufficiently established that in the times of Christ, and long after, the Hebrew letters lacked the vowel-points — which (as Elias [Levita] writes in the preface of the book *Masoreth ha-Masoreth*) the Rabbis of the city of Tiberias, more practiced than the rest in the holy tongue, invented and added to the reading, in the 436th year from the last devastation of the temple — that is,

in the year of Christ 476. [3] Of which matter there are also these proofs: that neither Epiphanius nor Jerome made any mention at all of these points, although they often had occasion and necessity of speaking about them, if they had existed at that time; and the most ancient codices of the Hebrews, even if now they have the points, are perceived nevertheless once not to have had them — both from the dissimilarity of the ink, and from the position of the [points] themselves. Now the ancient Jews, in writing, used almost always consonants alone (as has been said elsewhere), which they pronounced according to the common usage of speaking, following the variety of the regions. Jerome attests this in the epistle to Evagrius; who, disputing whether — where in Genesis it is said, *MELCHIZEDEK, KING OF SALEM* — it should be read *Salem* or *Salim,* thus says: [4] *IT MATTERS not whether thou read Salem or Salim, since the Hebrews very rarely use vowels in the midst of the letters; and, according to the will of the readers and the diversity of the regions, they utter the same words with different sounds and accents.* See on this matter in the third book, in the *Elementary Exposition.*

THE JUDICIAL BOOKS, or *The Books opened in the judgment.* Concerning these Daniel says, in the seventh chapter: *THE JUDGMENT sat, and the books were opened.* [5] The opening of the books signifies [6] the opening of hearts, and of human minds — which now are inscrutable to us — [an opening] to be future on the day of judgment; when, before the tribunal of God, in the sight of all, the works of each one, whether good or evil, shall be laid open. And since God wishes the books to be kept closed with him until that supreme day, by this example he admonishes us not to judge rashly the hidden and unknown minds and thoughts of our brethren — which God willed to be hidden from mortals in this world — but to leave them to be judged by Him who alone knows the hearts of men, according to the precept of Paul, saying: *THEREFORE judge not before the time, until the Lord come, who will illuminate the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise from God.* [7]

THE GOSPEL OF JUDAS ISCARIOT — the Cainite heretics venerated [it] greatly. In it Judas is magnificently praised, in that he betrayed Christ, his master, to the Jews, according to the knowledge which he had of the divine determination [decree]. For Judas knew that through the death of Christ the world would be redeemed, and the kingdom of Satan overthrown; and on that account he hastened to betray Christ, that he might procure salvation for us through his cross. Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion* against the Cainites, and Theodoret, in the first book of the *Heretical fables,* are witnesses.

JUDAS MACCABAEUS collected the *commentaries of the holy war,* which Mattathias [his] father undertook against the kings of Asia for the liberty of [his] country and the divine laws, and which he himself, after [his] Father, gloriously accomplished. The author of the second book of Maccabees, chapter 2, obscurely intimates these, in these words: [8] *JUDAS gathered together all those [things] which he had learned through the war which had befallen us; and they are with us — which, if you desire to read, send [those] who may bring [them] to you.*

THE BOOK OF THE JUST [Upright] (which the sacred letters call ספר הישר *Sepher ha-yashar* [printed *chaiasciar*], and the LXX everywhere rendered βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθοῦς — that is, *The Book of the just* [the upright]) was of great authority among the divine writers. Out of it, in the book of Joshua, is brought forward the testimony concerning the miracle of the Sun standing in the midst of heaven, in these words:

[→ *NON-* (Josh 10)]

[1] Christ the Lord fulfilled both the moral and the ceremonial precepts of the Law [2] What is meant by the name "Apex" — the varied opinion of the Doctors [3] The points of the Hebrews devised in the year of the Lord 476 [4] Gen. 14 [5] Dan. 7:10 [6] What the opening of the books in Daniel signifies [7] 1 Cor. 4:5 [8] 2 Macc. 2:14

(printed p. 79 [PDF p. 92], recto — leaf stamps "77". THE BOOK OF THE JUST concluded (the various identifications of the book), then the letter L opens with LEMUEL (Prov 31), THE LAW INSCRIBED ON

THE HEART (Jer 31), and THE BOOK DESIRED BY JOB (Job 19 & 31). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ *IS* this not] written in the book of the just: *And the Sun and the Moon stood still, until the nation avenged itself of its enemies?* [1] And in the second book of Kings, chapter 1, it is had: *DAVID commanded that they should teach the sons of Judah the bow, as it is written in the book of the just.* [2] [3] Some think that this is the book of the eternal predestination, in which are written all the just, whom God in his eternal foreknowledge foreknew to be saved; psalm 63 [68] attesting this, in which is read: *LET THEM BE BLOTTED OUT of the book of the just, and let them not be written with the just.* [4] Jerome, in the *Questions on the books of Kings* (if however that work is Jerome's), hands down that this is the book of Samuel — that is, the first and second volume of Kings — because in it are written the deeds of the just: namely, of Samuel, David, Nathan, Gad, and other Just [men]. Certain of the Hebrews — to whom it does not seem likely that the same book should adduce itself in testimony of its own statement — think that this is the book of the twelve prophets; because the words cited in the book of Joshua are written in the prayer of Habakkuk in this manner: [5] *THE SUN and Moon stood still in their dwelling.* Which opinion indeed cannot be true, because the book of the twelve Prophets was written almost a thousand years after the times of Joshua. Accordingly Rabbi Solomon [Rashi] teaches that this is the volume of the whole law, in which are written the deeds of the just — Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses; but especially that admonition to the sons of Israel, that they should exercise themselves in the art of war (in which the bow and arrows then held the chief place), mindful of that precept, *THY HANDS [SHALL BE] ON THE NECKS OF THINE ENEMIES;* which is contained in the volume of Genesis. [6] There are also those who believe this to be the book of Exodus, because in it God said to Moses: *WRITE this for a memorial, and deliver [it] to the ears of Joshua; for I will blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven.* [7] Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, in the *Questions on Joshua,* supposes this to be a most ancient commentary, out of which the history of the book of Joshua was collected in compendium by an uncertain author.

L.

LEMUEL [Lamuel], a Hebrew king, wrote a certain two-part instruction, which is recited in the last chapter of Proverbs: [8] of which the former part has a brief instruction of a king; but the latter contains the instruction of a mother of a family, comprehended in twenty-two verses, namely according to the order and number of the Hebrew letters — so that the several verses begin with the several letters [an acrostic]. The Jews think [9] that this Lemuel was Solomon, called therefore למואל *Lamuel* — that is, *God [is] with us* — because in his days God was with the Israelites, all worship of idols being shut out, especially in the time of his youth, when with great zeal he raised a temple to God Most High, and propagated the divine worship.

THE LAW INSCRIBED ON THE HEART (which God, through Jeremiah, promised to his faithful, saying: [10] *AFTER those days, I will give my law in their bowels, and in their hearts I will write it*) is the law of Evangelical grace [11] — that is, the living and ardent experience of divine love — written not on tablets of stone, as [was] that old law, of which the Jews so greatly glory; nor on perishable pages with deletable ink, but on the fleshly and soft tablets of the heart; not with a pen, but with the finger of the living God — that is, with the Holy Spirit: who has so impressed the precepts of love on the hearts of the faithful, that he who holds this law fulfills all the commands of the law (as Paul says), [12] and has no need of long exhortations, by which he might be kindled to living well and blessedly. For charity, of itself burning, and perpetually boiling with the fire of love toward God and neighbor, knows not how to be idle, [13] but of its own accord bursts forth into holy works. Chrysostom, feeling almost this same [thing], says that this writing of the law, of which the Prophet speaks, is a restoration and a clearer expression of that most ancient and first law of all, which God, in the first age of the human race, delivered to his elect without any writing. For since those most blessed men — Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Job — were strong in a most upright life, they needed no

books or writings; but their hearts were to them in place of books; and in place of pages and parchments they had their minds and incorrupt intellects, in which God — not with ink, but by the grace of his illumination — wrote his laws, as in living and animate books, suggesting all [things] which would be necessary for a pious and holy life. But after that, in the progress of time, the human race had slipped down into the abyss of vices, it abolished from the heart every writing of the divine Spirit. Whence also tablets and books were afterward substituted in place of the abolished law [14], that through them men might be roused to the remembrance of the lost discipline. But, since these had profited little, our lawgiver Christ came at last, who — according to the prophecy of Jeremiah — would again engrave the law of God (delivered from the beginning of the world without writings) on human hearts, through the Holy Spirit.

THE BOOK DESIRED BY JOB. Job himself recalls this, in chapter 19, saying: [15] *WHO will grant me that my words may be written down in a book, or engraved with an iron pen, and on a plate of lead, or graven with a chisel in flint?* And again in the thirty-first chapter, repeating the same in other words, he adds: [16] *WHO will grant me that the Almighty may hear my desire, and that He who judges may Himself write a book; that I may carry it on my shoulder, and put it around me like a crown, and through each of my steps pronounce it, and offer it, as it were, to a prince?* This book, so greatly desired by blessed Job, signifies nothing else [17] than an open demonstration of his innocence, which he wishes to be laid open by God, the inspector of all things. For since he was striving to show that he was not tortured for committed crimes, but was exercised with tribulations for the proof of virtue and the trial of patience — and could not persuade of this [his] incredulous friends, who asserted that he, as a hypocrite, was being punished by the just judgment of God — he desires a book to be written by God: that is, he prays that an *Apology* and *Justification* of his integrity be committed to writing, God revealing [it], and be transmitted to the memory of posterity — not for the ostentation of glory, but for the consolation of the pious; that, these [things] being heard, they may recognize that God often sends adversities upon his elect for the exercise of piety. But it must be noted, as regards the phrasing, that the *plate of lead* is not so referred to the *stylus* that the meaning should be [that they were engraved] with a stylus of iron and of lead —

[→ *lead* (plumbi) — sig. G 4]

[1] Josh. 17 (so printed; = Josh. 10:13) [2] 2 Kings 1:18 [3] the book here called the Book of the Just [4] Ps. 68:29 [5] Hab. 3:11 [6] Gen. 49:8 [7] Exod. 17:14 [8] Prov. 31 [9] The Jews think Lemuel was Solomon [10] Jer. 31:33 [11] The law written on human hearts is the Evangelical law [12] Rom. 13:8-9 [13] Charity knows not how to be idle [14] Books were substituted in place of the abolished law [15] Job 19:23-24 [16] Job 31:35-37 [17] What the book desired by Job signifies

(printed p. 80 [PDF p. 93], verso — leaf stamps "78". THE BOOK DESIRED BY JOB concluded, then THE BOOK OF THE LAW FOUND BY HILKIAH (4 Kings 22), THE WRITING OF THE TWO STICKS (Ezek 37), LINUS the pope, and THE LETTER THAT KILLETH (2 Cor 3). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ with a stylus] of lead, or [engraved] with an iron and a leaden stylus, on flint: (since with a leaden stylus stones cannot be cut out) — but the meaning is that the letters are engraved with an iron stylus, [and] then are to be formed on the stone with a plate of lead. For he who inscribes letters on marble [1] first hollows them out with a chisel or an iron stylus; then he fills up the empty spaces of the letters with plates of lead or bronze, that he may render their marks more conspicuous — as at Rome may be seen in the inscription of Marcus Agrippa, consul for the third time, which is still viewed on the frontispiece [pediment] of the temple of the Pantheon.

THE BOOK OF THE LAW, found by Hilkiah, [2] of which it is written in the fourth book of Kings, chapter 22, and in the second [book] of Paralipomenon, chapter 34, was found on this occasion: When Manasseh, the impious king — who ruled the kingdom of Jerusalem fifty-five years — had utterly abolished the books of the law of the Lord, and had killed the Prophets and priests who taught it, and the other pious men who had

refused to follow his impiety; a certain man, kindled with zeal for the holy laws, hid a copy of the divine law in the inner recesses of the temple. But when Josiah, the most pious king, in the 26th year of his age and the 18th of his reign, had sent to Hilkiah the high priest — father of Jeremiah the Prophet — that he might bring forth the money which was in the hidden places of the temple, for repairing the ruins of the temple: he [Hilkiah], diligently searching for the gold, found also the book of the sacred law, and sent [it] to the king. Who, when he had heard the divine threatenings and the imminent calamities of the city which were described in it, having rent [his] garment, commanded Hilkiah the high priest and Shaphan the scribe to go to consult Huldah the prophetess, [to learn] whether by any counsel or aid that disaster could be escaped. There are those who think that this book was not the codex of the Mosaic law, but some other prophetic volume. For since Manasseh — after his penance and having obtained liberty, having returned from the Babylonian captivity into [his] kingdom — purged the temple, cast away the idols, and restored the worship of God (as we read in the second [book] of Paralipomenon), nor is it likely that he did not restore the law of the Lord, which is the head and fountain of the whole divine worship: it is also credible that Josiah, as a most religious man, had not only often heard and read the law (already restored by Manasseh), but also knew [it] well. Wherefore, if the recently-found book — read before that [time] — had contained the Mosaic law, to whose reading the king was already accustomed, it would not have been necessary for him to be so vehemently disturbed at the words of the book, as at an unexpected thing and one heard then for the first time, as to tear [his] garment, and to send to Huldah the prophetess to inquire concerning the meaning of that scripture. Chrysostom, in the ninth homily on Matthew, and Rabbi Solomon [Rashi], think that this was the book of Deuteronomy — which Manasseh, weighed down by old age and prevented by death, could not find; the narration of which Josiah then hearing for the first time, when he had come to the words of chapter 28 (which foretold to the Jews the utmost destruction and a long captivity, if ever they should forsake God), was seized with such grief of mind that, with weeping and tears, he rent [his] garment, and compelled all the people to give an oath that they would thenceforth keep entire all the precepts of that book. The book of Deuteronomy, therefore, was found — hidden for many years before — in the three thousand three hundred fifty-eighth year from the founding of the world; which, when they had again lost [it] through the injury of the times, the Christians at length found overwhelmed with mud, a little before the age of Chrysostom [3] — which he himself also noted in the 7th homily on the former [epistle] to the Corinthians.

THE WRITING OF THE TWO STICKS. Concerning this it is read in Ezekiel, chapter 37, in this manner: [4] *SON of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, [For] Judah, and [for] the sons of Israel his companions; and take another stick, and write upon it, [For] Joseph, [the stick of] Ephraim, and [of] all the house of Israel, and his companions; and join them, one to the other, for thee into one stick: and they shall be in a union in thy hand.* This writing was a symbol of the conjunction, under one king, the Messiah, of the whole Hebrew people — [now] discordant among themselves, and dispersed, and torn asunder. The history is well known: that under Rehoboam, son of Solomon, the ten tribes went over to Jeroboam, son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, son of Joseph, as it is written in the third book of Kings, chapter 12. And after these there were two peoples — namely, Judah, and his companion the tribe of Benjamin; and [the] ten tribes, which were called Joseph, or Ephraim: and these two nations, after king Josiah, were dispersed among the nations; and after Zedekiah both kingdoms were exterminated. From this image, therefore, of the two sticks, [5] the Prophet foretells that these two peoples are not only to be delivered, but to be again joined into the one kingdom of the Messiah, and to come together, by the highest consent, into one lawful king, so that it may seem — and be — utterly one scepter. For by the *stick* was made the symbol of the scepter of the kingdom: on the former stick is inscribed *Judah and [his] companions* — that is, Benjamin; the inscription of the other was *Ephraim.* Now the Prophet wished to join this sign to the word of God, that he might move the ears more effectively through the sight of the eyes. For things seen procure attention to the speech of the one speaking. Thus in the old law many ceremonies were employed, that, moved by these rites, the simple and children might ask what they meant and signified. [6] So also many ceremonies were instituted in the Church, that from

them the weakness of our understanding might come to know the inner and hidden will of God. Some hold that these two sticks coalesced into one by a miracle; which, if it be accepted, the parable will be more effective. This symbol of the union of the two sticks signified that — through the union of the two woods of the cross of Christ — the two peoples, Gentile and Jew, would come together into one Church, under one king, Christ, with the highest consent of minds. Whence Paul says: [7] *HE MADE both one, reconciling the enmities in himself, [preaching] peace to those who were near*, etc.

LINUS — one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, by whose name Paul salutes Timothy in the latter epistle to him [8] — the first Pontiff of the Roman Church after Peter, an Etruscan by nation, wrote in the Greek tongue two books *Of the contest [martyrdom] of Peter and Paul;* and likewise several letters. He dies at Rome under the emperor Galba, in the year of Christ seventy, after having completed eleven years, three months, [and] twelve days of his pontificate.

THE LETTER THAT KILLETH (concerning which Paul, writing in the latter epistle to the Corinthians, says: [9] *THE LETTER killeth, but the spirit quickeneth*) is the law of Moses; to which the Apostle everywhere ascribes not only that it kills the soul, but also that it excites the tinder [*fomes*] of concupiscence to

[→ *sin* (peccatum)]

[1] To be observed by those who inscribe letters on marble [2] What the Book of the Law found by Hilkiah was [3] The Christians found the book of Deuteronomy buried in mud a little before the age of St. Chrysostom [4] Ezek. 37:16-17 [5] The explanation of the prophecy of the two sticks [6] In the old law many ceremonies were employed, that the simple and children might ask what they signified [7] Eph. 2:14,16-17 [8] 2 Tim. 4:21 [9] 2 Cor. 3:6

(printed p. 81 [PDF p. 94], recto — leaf stamps "79". THE LETTER THAT KILLETH continued (the Pauline proof-texts and patristic readings of law vs. grace), then THE LETTER OF LYSIAS (2 Macc 11) and LUKE the Evangelist (the forged Acts of Paul and Thecla; Luke as painter of Christ and the Virgin). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ to] sin; that it begets an abundance of sins; that it induces wrath and indignation, and brings in death, and ministers damnation. For, writing thus to the Romans, he says: [1] *OCCASION being taken, sin, through the commandment, wrought in me all concupiscence.* And again: [2] *The law worketh wrath. For where there is no law, neither [is there] transgression.* And: [3] *The law entered in, that the offense might abound.* Likewise: [4] *Sin, occasion being taken through the commandment, seduced me, and by it slew [me]*. Likewise: [5] *The commandment wrought death for me, that sin might become exceedingly sinful.* And in the second [epistle] to the Corinthians, he calls it *the minister of death*, and *the ministration of damnation.* [6] And in the epistle to the Galatians he calls [it] *a writing of malediction* — not on this account, that the law is evil, and of its own nature noxious, or death-bringing by the malignity of its author (as of old the Manichaeans, destroyers of the law, said); but for other far different reasons, which the orthodox fathers learned from the doctrine of Paul. Origen says that by *the letter which killeth* is to be understood every tropical and figurative locution of the divine scripture, and every shadowy precept of the ancient ceremonies, understood according to the bare sense of the letter, just as its words sound. In which way indeed the letter kills those who, spurning the spiritual sense lying hidden in them, pursue only the external and carnal understanding. For, as Paul says in the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, [7] *to be wise according to the flesh is death; but to be wise according to the spirit, [is] life and peace* — as if anyone should take carnally all [things] which are written in the Song of Songs, according to the lustful concupiscence of carnal love, and not according to the affection of chaste and divine love: this one is killed by the perverse understanding of the letter. Or if anyone should believe that circumcision, sacrifices, and the other shadows of the law — which God commands to be kept by an everlasting covenant — are still to be done according to the letter, and not rather to be fulfilled according to the spirit: he slides down from the grace of Christ into Judaism, and it [the letter] slays him. But there is, as the same Origen says in the 7th homily on Leviticus, not only in the Old Testament, but also in

the New Testament, a letter of this kind that kills — which kills him who does not spiritually attend to the [things] which are said. For if, according to the letter, you follow this very [saying] which was spoken: [8] *He who has not a sword, let him sell his tunic, and buy a sword* — behold, this too is a letter of the gospel; but it kills. But if you receive it spiritually, it does not kill; but in it is the quickening spirit. Chrysostom says that by the word *the letter that killeth* is signified the Mosaic law, but by the name *the quickening spirit,* the grace which is conferred through baptism. Because the law damns and punishes offenders; but grace absolves and justifies sinners. The law, if it catch a murderer, takes him from among the living; grace, if it receive a murderer, illuminates and quickens [him]. The killing letter of the law stones [him who is] gathering wood on the Sabbath. [9] Grace of the quickening spirit receives innumerable murderers and robbers, and saves [them when] baptized. The law makes the living [man] dead: [him] whom grace catches, it makes from dead alive — saying, [10] *COME TO ME ALL YOU WHO LABOR AND ARE BURDENED, AND I WILL REFRESH YOU.* He said not, *I will punish you,* but *I will refresh you.* For in baptism sins are blotted out, the former [sins] are blotted out, the man is quickened; and in his heart, as on a tablet, all grace is written. Augustine, in the book *Of the spirit and the letter* — in which he most copiously treats this sentence of Paul — by *the law* understands especially the law of the Decalogue itself: which, although it is just and best, is nevertheless said to kill, and to work wrath, and sin, and malediction: because, while it points out and prohibits sin, it gives occasion of spiritual destruction in two chief ways — that is, by increasing the desire of sinning, and by aggravating the transgression of sin. For first, when the law forbids sin, from this prohibition it increases concupiscence, the fountain of all evils; which by its own nature always strives after the forbidden, and desires the [things] denied. For just as the rush of water, if it does not cease to flow into that part to which it is carried by its own violence, becomes more vehement when a barrier is set against it — and when it has overcome the mass of it, hurled down in a greater heap, is rolled forward down the slopes: so this very thing which is coveted is more ardently desired while it is forbidden; torments more sharply while it is not had; and becomes more pleasant when it is obtained. And this is what Paul wished to indicate, when he said: [11] *OCCASION being taken, sin wrought in me all concupiscence.* And again: [12] *Sin, occasion being taken through the commandment, seduced me, and slew [me].* Then the law heaps up and aggravates the gravity of the crime committed, because it is much more grievous to have fallen into sin where the law has pointed out and prohibited sin, than before: because *where there is no law, there neither is transgression,* as the Apostle says. [13] But when through the law the knowledge of sin has been laid open, [14] then he who knowingly and willingly sins is reckoned [guilty of] a greater and graver crime. And for this cause Paul said: [15] *THE LAW entered in, that the offense might abound.* [16] *And through the commandment sin becomes exceedingly sinful.* For these causes, therefore, the law is not undeservedly called *a killing letter;* but the spirit of grace is deservedly called *quickening:* because it lessens the concupiscence which the law increases, extinguishes the desire of sinning, and inspires the contrary desire of doing good through faith, and — through charity, poured out in our hearts — fulfills the good desire with good works.

THE LETTER OF LYSIAS — intimate and companion of Antiochus, king of Syria — to the people of the Jews, is had in the second [book] of Maccabees, chapter 11.

LUKE the Evangelist, writer of the gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, was believed by very many of the ancients [to be] the author of the epistle which is inscribed, under the name of Paul the Apostle, to the Hebrews [17]; among whom [that] the chief was Tertullian, Jerome attests in the *Catalog of ecclesiastical writers.* Which opinion — utterly false — we shall show [to be so] in the seventh volume of this work. Tertullian has handed down to memory [18] that a certain Asian presbyter, a devotee of Paul, out of a pious but lying zeal, feigned certain *Acts of Paul and Thecla,* falsely inscribed with the title of Luke; and that he, when they [i.e. these Acts] were convicted of falsity in judgment, confessed that he had done this, led by love of Paul. It is also said that Luke, after he had written the life of Christ the Saviour, also painted with brush and colors an image of him and of his mother [19], and left the icons of both to the Church of Antioch. Making mention of which thing, Simon Metaphrastes, in the life of St. Luke, [20] thus writes: *THIS, moreover, among*

other [things], is most pleasing — that he also [portrayed] the very assumed type of the humanity of Christ, and the image of him

[→ *of him* (eius)]

[1] Rom. 7:8 [2] Rom. 4:15 [3] Rom. 5:20 [4] Rom. 7:11 [5] Rom. 7:13 [6] 2 Cor. 5 (so in base; margin-rich ed.: 2 Cor. 3:7,9); Gal. 3:10 [7] Rom. 8:6 [8] Luke 22:36 [9] Num. 15:35-36 [10] Matt. 12 (so printed; = Matt. 11:28) [11] Rom. 7:8 [12] Rom. 7:11 [13] Rom. 5 [14] Rom. 3:20 [15] Rom. 5:20 [16] Rom. 7:13 [17] Some think St. Luke was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. See volume 7 [18] A fraud of a certain devotee of St. Paul [19] St. Luke painted images of Christ the Lord and of his mother [20] Simon Metaphrastes in the life of St. Luke

---

(printed p. 82 [PDF p. 95], verso — leaf stamps "80". LUKE concluded (his icons of Christ and the Virgin, and Mary's physical description), then the letter M opens with MARK the Evangelist and THE WRITING OF THE HAND on the wall (Belshazzar's feast, Dan 5), with a note on the Rabbis' kabbalistic exposition. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[→ and the image] of her who bore him — Luke, first of all, painting [them] in wax and outline, handed [them] down, so that even to these times they might be honored in the image; as though he thought it not enough to be, in mind and spirit, with those whom he loved, unless he might also be conversant with them through image and figure: which is a token of most fervent love. Thus far he [Metaphrastes]. Nicephorus Callistus, in the 14th and 15th books of the Ecclesiastical History, speaks in this manner concerning the image of the Virgin Mother of God painted by Luke: [1] *PULCHERIA Augusta built a temple in the city of Constantinople, called* τῶν ὁδηγῶν, *that is, [the temple] Of the Guides of the Way [Hodegon]: where she dedicated the image of the Mother of God sent from Antioch — which the holy Apostle Luke himself painted with his own hands, while she [Mary] was yet living and seeing the very panel, and imparting so great a grace to that likeness of her. This image was first in that place which is called the Tribunal; where those miracles were performed which even now also are done.* [2] Thus Nicephorus. We once saw at Venice, in the house of Titian, the most celebrated painter of our times, a copy of this sacred picture, taken (as was believed) from the archetype of St. Luke: in which were seen all those features which the same Nicephorus expressed in the second volume of the same history; where, describing the stature and form of the most holy Virgin from the opinion of Epiphanius, [3] he brings these [things]: *MARY the virgin was of middling stature, although there are those who say that she somewhat exceeded the middling stature. She was of a color resembling wheat, with fair [blond] hair, keen eyes, having in them somewhat-yellow pupils, and, as it were, of the color of the olive: her eyebrows were arched, and becomingly black: [her] nose rather long, [her] lips blooming, and full of the sweetness of words: [her] face not round or sharp, but somewhat longer: [her] hands and fingers longer. Finally, she was devoid of all pride, simple, and in no way affecting her countenance. She was content with garments of natural color — which also the holy veil of her head shows.*

M.

MARK, bishop of Alexandria, and Evangelist (whom Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter twelve, names *John*, son of Mary) [4] — after the gospel gathered by him from the mouth of Peter the Apostle, whose companion and interpreter he was [5] — wrote, in a brief volume, the life of Barnabas the Apostle, and his cousin — [a life] which Bede the presbyter is believed to have translated from the Greek tongue into the Latin speech. James, Archbishop of Genoa [Jacobus de Voragine], makes mention of this work in the book of the *Yearly Festivities.* There are also those who report that he committed other [things] to the monuments of letters; of which neither do they themselves recount the titles, nor have we found [them] noted anywhere.

THE WRITING OF THE HAND appearing on the wall of the Babylonian palace had only three Chaldaic words, and those messengers of a most inauspicious omen — namely: [6]

מנא *MENE*, that is, *He hath numbered;* or, as the Greeks read, ἐμέτρησε, *He hath measured.*

תקל *THEKEL*, which is, *He hath weighed.*

פרס *PHERES*, that is, *He hath divided.*

The occasion of the writing of these, and at the same time the interpretation, Daniel — in the fifth chapter of his volume — relates to have been such: When Belshazzar, king of the Assyrians, was besieged within Babylon by Cyrus, king of the Persians, and Darius [king] of the Medes — he, the enemy being utterly neglected, feasting in a certain spacious hall, reclined with great magnificence, [his] concubines reclining with [him], and the chief of [his] nobles. And when he had now grown hot with wine, he commanded the sacred vessels to be brought — which Nebuchadnezzar had placed from the temple of Jerusalem into his own temple; and when he was drinking in them together with his concubines, and hurling many contumelious words against God: suddenly, from the wall opposite, a hand was seen to project, whose fingers left the aforesaid words, gradually written thereon. By which portent the king, most greatly terrified, when he had long and much sought the meaning of the writing from his magi and diviners, and had not been able to find [it]; at last, Daniel being summoned, obtained from him the mournful interpretation of the words, in this manner: [7] *SINCE, O king,* said Daniel, *thou hast proudly despised the greatest God of all, who raised thee to the summit of so great a kingdom, and hast poured forth impious words against him with a sacrilegious mouth, and hast not feared to drink from his sacred vessels together with thy concubines; on account of these [things] God, being angry, announces to thee by this writing what [kind of] end thou shalt have of [thy] kingdom and life. For thus are the several words of it to be interpreted. MENE, that is, He hath numbered, signifies that God has numbered the days both of thy life and of thy kingdom, and that the end of both is soon at hand. THEKEL, that is, He hath weighed, signifies that God has weighed thy works in the balance of his justice; and in the one scale of the balance, which was lower [heavier], there appeared an enormous weight of pride, luxury, blasphemy, and thy tyranny; but in the other, which was very light, there appeared that thou hast less piety toward God and justice toward men than would be fitting for a king — and above all for that king whom God had set over so many kingdoms and peoples. PHERES, which is He hath divided, signifies that God has divided all the riches of thy most opulent kingdom, and has now distributed them in portions among the Medes and Persians.* And this was the occasion of this writing, and its right interpretation. Which indeed to have been most true, the event of the prediction itself confirmed immediately the very next night; for while Belshazzar was lying [there], partly struck with the horror of the portent, partly overcome with sleep and wine, he was slain by his chamberlains, who had already before conspired against his life; and the city, by treachery, was handed over to the Medes and Persians.

I judge that it is not to be passed over in this place, that the Rabbis of the Hebrews took, from the interpretation of this writing, occasion of devising a certain new kind of exposition upon the sacred letters [8] — called by them *kabbalistic:* [9] in that they not only explain the sentences and entire clauses of the divine scripture, but also, weighing separately the syllables and each single letter, examine [them], and expound [them] with various senses, both historical and mystical — the argument being taken from hence, that just as it was permitted to Daniel to explicate single words by single whole clauses, so it is lawful for the other Rabbis of the synagogue, by a like example, to interpret the syllables — and even the letters of words themselves, one separated from another — by certain words which those letters signify. But concerning this manner of interpre-

[→ *-ting* (interpretandi)]

[1] The image of the Blessed Virgin painted by Luke, brought from Antioch to Constantinople [2] Miracles at the image of the Blessed Virgin [3] The stature and form of the most holy Virgin [4] Acts 12:12 [5] Mark the companion and interpreter of St. Peter; the life of Barnabas written by Mark [6] Dan. 5:25 [7] A history diligently to be observed, against the despisers of God and of divine worship [8] The occasion of finding the kabbalistic art [9] A kabbalistic species of exposition

*(printed p. 83 [PDF p. 96], recto — leaf stamps "81". The kabbalistic-method note closes; then new headword **MARY** the Blessed Virgin (the apocryphal Ignatius–Mary correspondence) and **THE QUESTIONS OF MARY** (the Gnostic/Stratiotic forgeries, with Epiphanius's account of the Borborite rite). NOTE: this page carries Epiphanius's explicit account of a heretical rite, translated as a historical source. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ this manner of interpret]-ing we have written enough and more than enough below, in the book *On the modes of expounding the sacred scriptures*, when we treated the Method of the elementary exposition: to which place we refer the reader who is curious of these matters.

MARY, the most blessed Virgin, Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, is said to have written a certain very brief letter to Ignatius the martyr [1] — disciple of John the Apostle [2], and the third bishop of the Church of Antioch after Peter. For he [Ignatius], since he was held by an incredible ardor of seeing, and of speaking face to face with, the mother of the Lord, wrote to her a rather brief letter in this manner: [3]

> *To Christ-bearing Mary, her own Ignatius.*
>
> *ME — a neophyte, and a disciple of thy John — thou oughtest to have comforted and consoled. For concerning thy Jesus I have received innumerable [things] to tell, and I was astounded at the hearing. But from thee — who wast always familiar and joined to him, and privy to his secrets — I desire in [my] mind to be made more certain concerning the [things] heard. I have written to thee also at other times, and asked. Farewell: and let the neophytes who are with me be comforted from thee, and through thee, and in thee. Amen.*

To which letter the Mother of God satisfied [replied] with this response: [4]

> *To Ignatius, [her] beloved disciple, the humble handmaid of Christ Jesus.*
>
> *THE [things] concerning JESUS which thou hast heard and learned from John are true. Believe them, cleave to them, and firmly hold the vow of Christianity, and conform [thy] morals and life to the vow. And I will come, together with John, to see thee, and those who are with thee. Stand, and act manfully in the faith. Nor let the austerity of persecution move thee; but let thy spirit be strong, and exult in God thy salvation. Amen.*

St. Bernard makes mention of Ignatius's letter, [5] on the ninetieth psalm, in the seventh sermon, in these words: *THAT GREAT Ignatius — a hearer of the disciple whom Jesus loved, our martyr, with whose precious relics our poverty is enriched [6] — salutes Mary, in several letters which he wrote to her, as* CHRIST-BEARING. *An excellent title of dignity indeed — that is, a commendation of immense honor.* Dionysius the Carthusian, in the commentaries which he published on the book of Dionysius the Areopagite *On the divine names*, thus writes concerning the letter of Ignatius: [7] *SAINT Ignatius, in one of his letters to the most sacred Virgin, fervently asks her that, for the consolation and comforting of himself and of many neophytes, she would deign to come to him.* But of both letters Marcus Michael, a presbyter of Cortona, in the book *Of illustrious men*, makes record in this manner: [8] *IGNATIUS wrote four letters to various [recipients]: the first to the Ephesians, the second to the Magnesians, the third to the Colossians* [so; the genuine third is to the Trallians], *the fourth to the Romans. There are also extant his letters to John the Evangelist, his teacher, and to Mary, the most blessed Virgin, and the most humble mother of our Lord the Saviour; to whom she herself did not humbly disdain to render a brief letter in response.*

THE GREAT QUESTIONS OF MARY, and the *Small Questions* of the same, are books filled with execrable impieties and blasphemies by the Gnostic and Stratiotic heretics [9]; in which, among other mysteries of detestable foulness, is handed down a rite of the Lord's Supper, celebrated among those same heretics with such abomination that the mind shudders to speak [it], and the hand recoils from writing [it]. But, that it may appear from this into how great a deep of prodigious blindness, and abyss of diabolical madness, they rush who imitate the Gnostics (so called from the *knowledge* of all things which they professed) [10] — that is, who, relying on their own wit and wisdom, depart from ecclesiastical discipline and the traditions of the holy fathers — I shall not be reluctant briefly to report what Epiphanius writes concerning this in the first [book]

of the *Panarion* against the Gnostics. [11] These, then, in the aforesaid volume of the *Great Questions,* have [it] that the Lord Jesus Christ revealed to the Virgin Mary a rite of the *synaxis* and of the Lord's communion, afterward observed by the Gnostics in this manner: All — men and women — assembled together into the same dining-room; there, when they had dined largely and sumptuously, the husbands, all shame cast aside, exposed their wives to the public, and invited one another into the embrace of his [own] wife with these words: *Rise, brother, and make love with thy brother.* And when the invited [man] mingled with the offered woman, each with his own hands received the flux of the male seed. Then, with palms spread and hands stretched out after the manner of suppliants, he offered this very [thing] to God, with this little prayer added: *We offer to thee this gift, namely the body of Christ;* [12] and immediately, taking the seed itself with the mouth, and eating [it], they added: *For this is the body of Christ, and this is the Pascha, that is, the passion: therefore our bodies suffer, and in this manner confess the passion of Christ.* In the same manner also, when it happened that a woman was in the flux of blood, they offered to God the menstruum collected from her; and immediately, eating [it], they said: *And this is the blood of Christ.* Now for the confirmation of this most base foulness they used not only the aforesaid volumes of the *Questions,* but — what can scarcely be believed — also the testimonies of the divine scriptures [13]; God so permitting, lest we should lightly believe those who strive to build up their dogmas (contrary to the traditions of the Church) from the divine letters, wrested in some way [to their purpose] — after the example of the Gnostics, who interpreted of this prodigious turpitude that which was said by Christ: [14] *WHEN you shall see the Son of man returning where he was before* — that is, the flux of the human seed returning thither whence it had gone out. And likewise that [saying]: [15] *UNLESS you shall have eaten the flesh of the Son of man, and drunk his blood* — that is, [they said, this means] in the human seed and the menstrual blood. To the same [purpose] they referred what Solomon said: [16] *DRINK water from thy cisterns.* And that which is had in the first psalm: [17] *LIKE a tree planted beside the courses of waters, it shall give fruit in its season* — and they expounded [it] of the genital member, which in the flux of the seed gives the fruit of pleasure. And that [phrase], [18] *ITS leaf shall not fall,* they said was added for this [reason]: that one should not let the drops of the seed fall to the ground, but should eat [it when] collected. Similarly, what is read in the Apocalypse concerning the tree bearing twelve fruits in the year, through the several months — which is the tree of life — they figuratively interpreted of the menstrual blood of a woman, flowing in the several months. [19] Thus Epiphanius. Augu-

[→ *Augustine* (Augustinus)]

[1] St. Mary wrote a letter to St. Ignatius [2] St. Ignatius a disciple of St. John [3] St. Ignatius desires to be made more certain by the Blessed Virgin concerning the things he had heard of Christ the Lord [4] The Blessed Virgin Mary approves St. John's teachings concerning Christ the Lord [5] Bernard, on Psalm 90, sermon 7 [6] The precious relics of Ignatius in the monastery of St. Bernard [7] Dionysius the Carthusian mentions Ignatius's letter to the Blessed Virgin [8] Marcus Michael reviews Ignatius's letters [9] The impiety of the Gnostics and Stratiotics [10] The Gnostics named from the knowledge of all things [11] Epiphanius, Against Heresies bk. 1, tome 2, against heresy 26 [12] The horrible blasphemy of the Gnostics [13] The Gnostics abused the testimonies of Scripture to confirm their crimes — what wonder, then, if the Calvinists abuse the Scriptures [14] John 6:62 [15] John 6:53 [16] Prov. 5:15 [17] Ps. 1:3 [18] Ps. 1:3 [19] Rev. 22:2

(printed p. 84 [PDF p. 97], verso — leaf stamps "82". The Gnostic-rite account closes; then ***THE STOCK / LINEAGE OF MARY*** *(a Gnostic book, and the origin of the pagan "ass-worship" calumny against Jews and Christians) and* ***THE PASSING OF MARY*** *[*Transitus*] — the Dormition/Assumption narrative rejected by Gelasius, with testimonies of Augustine and Bede. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ Thus Epiphanius.] But Augustine, in the book *On heresies, to Quodvultdeus,* writes that the Manichaeans in his own time, at Carthage, addicted to this execrable superstition, [1] were accustomed to take a Eucharist sprinkled [mixed] with flour and the human seed of those coupling.

THE STOCK, or LINEAGE, OF MARY — as, in the place cited above, Epiphanius reports [2] — is a book famous among the Gnostics, containing a horrible and pernicious doctrine; in which, among other portents, it is narrated that the priest Zechariah, having entered into the inner parts of the temple to burn incense before God, saw a certain form endowed with an ass's head [3]; and when he wished to reveal this vision, and to

admonish the people not to worship an ass, he who had appeared took away from him the use of voice and tongue, but a few days after restored [what had been] taken away. Which [faculty] being received back, Zechariah disclosed the vision to the Jews; [and] they, indignant, cut him down. Moved by this cause, the lawgiver of the Hebrews commanded the priest that, entering to perform the sacred [rites], he should wear little bells hung on [his] garment: so that, warned by the sound, that ass-headed God might hide himself, lest his form, unseasonably beheld, should bring destruction on the beholder. Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in the book against the Manichaeans, affirms that from the occasion of this book the Christians were once accused by the pagans [4], that — mingled with the Jews — they worshipped an ass as the deity of the Jews. Tertullian, however, in the *Apologeticus,* supposes that the Gentiles came into this suspicion from the writings of Cornelius Tacitus; who, in the fifth book of the *Histories,* relating the origin of the Hebrew religion, says that the Jews, driven out of Egypt — when in the vast solitude of Arabia they were wasting away with thirst — learned [the location of] the springs of water from wild asses, which by chance were making for drink from [their] pasture; and, mindful of the benefit, they honored the beast with divine honors, and afterward consecrated its image in the temple; and thence [it was] presumed by the Gentiles that the Christians, as [being] near to the Jewish religion, venerated an ass for [their] god. Whence also a certain hirer-out of beasts of burden dared, in the times of Tertullian, at Carthage — before the stable of the beasts, as it were the emblem of his trade — to hang up a placard, in which was painted a man wearing a toga, holding a book in [his] right hand: from whose head asinine ears projected; and on [his] feet the hoofs of an ass were seen; with this inscription: *THE GOD OF THE CHRISTIANS, ONONYCHITES* — that is, [having] ass's hoofs.

THE PASSING OF MARY [*Transitus*], or the *Book of the passing of St. Mary,* is rejected by Gelasius among the Apocryphal writings. James, Archbishop of Genoa [Jacobus de Voragine], in the *Book of the Yearly Festivities,* reports that he lit upon a certain Apocryphal volume of the same subject and title, ascribed to St. John the Evangelist [5]: in which it was written that the Virgin Mary, in the twenty-fourth year from the ascension of her Son, departed from this life; and that all the Apostles, snatched through the air in a moment of time, were present at [her] dying; and that they bore out her body with a public funeral and solemn obsequies, and laid [it] in a stone monument; and that she, after the third day, revived; and, with body entire, the Angels leading [her], flew up into heaven. But that Thomas — since he had been absent, and returning refused to believe — received, as a proof of the resurrection and of the bodily assumption into heaven, the girdle with which the body of the Virgin had been girded, let down from on high. Augustine, in sermon 35 *On the saints,* refutes the inscription, narration, and authority of this work in these words: *[In] what order the Virgin Mary passed hence to the highest [places], no Catholic history narrates.* [6] *Not only, moreover, is this Church said to spit out the Apocrypha, but even to be ignorant [of these things]: since there are some [writings] composed, without the name of an author, concerning her assumption; which, as I said, are so guarded against that they are by no means permitted to be read for confirming the truth of the matter. Hence indeed some are troubled, because neither is her body found on earth, nor is her assumption with the flesh — as is read in the Apocrypha — found in Catholic history. But it is not worthy that anyone should be anxious about the knowledge of her body — [she] whom he doubts not to reign with Christ, exalted above the heavens.* [7] *But neither is any of the treatise-writers found to have said anything openly concerning her death. And what do I say of these, when not even he who received her before the cross of the Lord into his own [care] — that is, John the Evangelist — committed anything of this in writings to be retained by posterity? For no one could have narrated this more faithfully, had God willed it to be manifested. It remains, therefore, that a man should not mendaciously feign as manifest what God willed to remain hidden. But the true opinion concerning her assumption* [8] *is that — according to the Apostle, [whether] assumed in the body or out of the body, [we] not knowing — we should believe her to be above the angels.* Thus Augustine concerning the passing and assumption of Mary: who seems openly to dissent from this opinion in the little book *On the assumption of Mary,* which, under his name, is reckoned among the writings of the ninth tome. [9] Jerome — or Jerome's companion Sophronius — in the sermon *On the assumption of the Virgin,* making

mention of this book, thus writes: [10] *IF that Apocryphon Of the passing of the Virgin Mary should come into your hands, receive not doubtful [things] for certain; which many of the Latins, out of love of piety and zeal for reading, embrace [too] fondly. And her sepulchre is shown, even to the present, in the midst of the valley of Josaphat. These [things] I would say for this reason, because many of our [people] doubt whether she was assumed together with the body, or departed [her] body being left [behind]; but how, or at what time, or by what persons her most holy body was taken away from thence, or where it was transferred, [and] whether she has risen again, is unknown. Although some wish to affirm that she is already raised up, and clothed with blessed immortality with Christ in the heavenly [places]. Nevertheless, which of these is to be reckoned the truer, we are in doubt. Better, however, [that] we commit the whole to God, to whom nothing is impossible, than that we should wish to define anything rashly by our own authority. But also, whether she has returned into the dust of the earth, we hold [it] not certain.* Trithemius, in [his] catalog, reckons the book *Of the passing of St. Mary* among the works of Melito, bishop of Sardis — whose beginning is, *MELITO, THE SERVANT OF CHRIST* — which, however, Jerome, enumerating the writings of Melito, passed over. BEDE the presbyter, concerning this book, in the *Retractations on the Acts of the Apostles,* expounding that [verse], [11] *All were dispersed through the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the Apostles,* left [it] thus written: *IF, the Church being dispersed, the Apostles remained in Jerusalem, as Luke says, it is evident that he wrote a falsehood who — composing a book, in the person of Melito, bishop of Asia, concerning the death of the blessed Mother of God — says that in the second year after the ascension of the Lord all the Apostles were*

[→ *all* (omnes)]

[1] The execrable impiety of the Manichaeans [2] Epiphanius, Against Heresies, book 1, tome 2, heresy 26 [3] A plainly ridiculous fable about a man having an ass's head [4] Christians once accused of worshipping an ass as a deity, and the cause of this matter; Tertullian in the Apologeticus writes that Tacitus gave the pagans the occasion of that fable about the worship of the ass's head [5] An apocryphal book ascribed to St. John [6] No Catholic history narrates in what order the Blessed Virgin passed hence to the highest [7] The Blessed Virgin Mary, exalted above the heavens, reigns with Christ [8] The true opinion concerning the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary [9] See in tome 9 of the works of St. Augustine, the book On the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin [10] The opinion of St. Jerome or Sophronius on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary [11] Acts 8:2

---

*(printed p. 85 [PDF p. 98], recto — leaf stamps "83". **THE PASSING OF MARY** concluded (Bede's refutation); then **MATTHEW the Evangelist**, falsely made author of two apocryphal infancy gospels, **THE GOSPEL OF MATTHIAS**, and shorter entries (the Book of Remembrance, Menander, the Great Harlot of Rev 17), before **THE BOOK OF DEATH** begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ all] divided over the whole world for preaching, each into his own province: who all, as the death of blessed Mary drew near, were lifted up on clouds from the places in which they were preaching the word of God, [and] snatched to Jerusalem, and set down before the door of her house; among whom also Paul, lately converted from a persecutor to the faith of Christ, who was taken up with Barnabas into the ministry of the Gentiles. Which writing also relates specially concerning John the Apostle, that at that time he was preaching at Ephesus — [things] which all contradict the words of blessed Luke; by which [words] he narrates that the Apostles, the other faithful being driven from Jerusalem, remained in that same place [1], and preached throughout all [things], until the Church had peace through all Judaea, and Samaria, and Galilee — which [peace] could have been achieved in one year, [of which] there is no doubt to anyone. [Luke] also manifestly insinuates that Paul was ordained into the ministry of the Gentiles with Barnabas [2], not in the second year after the ascension of the Lord, but a long time afterward. But far be it that we should believe [that] blessed John the Apostle — to whom the Lord on the cross commended his virgin mother, [entrusting the] virgin to [the] virgin — departed after one year, and left her alone, and so long cast down that she even feared that her body, [when] dead, would be burned by the enemies; and that she, on whose account he was snatched up on the clouds, anxiously begged that he — as if forgetful or careless of her — would return to her, saying: *I BEG thee, son John, that thou be mindful of the word of thy master, my Lord Jesus Christ, who commended me to thee. For behold, [being] called, I shall enter the way of all the earth. And I have heard the counsels of*

the Jews, saying, Let us await the day when she dies who carried Jesus the Nazarene, and let us burn her body. Now therefore, son, take care of my obsequies. These [things] I have taken care to relate for this reason, because I have known some to give assent, by incautious rashness, to the aforesaid volume, against the authority of blessed Luke. Thus far Bede.

MATTHEW the Evangelist [3] is falsely made the author of two books, of which the one is inscribed *Of the birth, or lineage, of Mary,* the other *Of the infancy of the Saviour:* which are figments of the Valentinians and Gnostics. To these books certain foolish [persons], desiring to claim authority [for them], added prefaces feigned under the name of the bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus, to Jerome, and of Jerome to them; which [prefaces] would testify that both works were translated by Jerome, for the favor of those same bishops, from the Hebrew volume of Matthew, and purged from the falsifications of the heretics. But since in these books there now stand the same old-wives' fables which Irenaeus, in the first [book] against the heresies of the Valentinians, and Epiphanius, in the first [book] of the *Panarion,* section three, refute out of those same volumes, the deception of the impostors plainly appears. Gelasius, in the 15th distinction, casts out both among the books condemned by the Church.

THE GOSPEL OF THE APOSTLE MATTHIAS [4] — among other non-canonical gospels, Origen enumerates [it] in the first homily on Luke. The *Traditions* of the same [Matthias] Clement cites in the second book of the *Stromata;* and in the seventh book of the same work he writes that Marcion and Basilides confirmed their heresies from the authority of these. Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter twenty-five, reckons the Gospel of Matthias among the books forged by the heretics.

THE BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE [Memorial], or *Of the Monument,* in Hebrew ספר זכרון *Sepher zikkaron.* The Prophet Malachi, in the third chapter, recalls this, saying: [5] *THE LORD attended, and heard, and wrote a book before [him], for those fearing the Lord, and thinking upon his name.* This book signifies the particular memory and consideration which God has of his elect. The impious, seeing them afflicted, think that they are in forgetfulness with God. But the prophet says that God bears so great a care of them, and attends, and hears, that he numbers and writes all the groans of his own, lest they come into forgetfulness; and he always has the book before [his] eyes: so that, when the opportune time shall have come, there be no need of anyone suggesting [reminding him] — just as, in Isaiah also, he says that he has written [it] on [his] hands [6]. Therefore no one is to despair in afflictions. For the devil tempts us — like the friends of Job — saying that God has forgotten us, and does not consider our [affairs]. Whence they say: *How long wilt thou forget [us] unto the end?* To whom God answers that he has a memorial book of everlasting remembrance, which no forgetfulness shall ever blot out.

MENANDER, among the ancient comic poets of Greece a most celebrated poet (some of whose plays — especially the *Andria* and the *Perinthia* — Terence confesses he made Latin) [7], wrote, as Athenaeus in the *Deipnosophists* is witness, forty-nine comedies [8]: out of one of which Paul the Apostle (as Jerome, writing to Magnus the Orator, attests) — when, in the former epistle which he wrote to the Corinthians, he dissuaded them from the conversations of seducers — took an iambic senarius [verse] of this kind: [9]

> Φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί. *— that is, Evil communications corrupt good manners.*

He flourished in the 115th Olympiad — in the first year of which he publicly exhibited his first play, surnamed *Orge* [*Anger*] — and died in the first year of the 122nd Olympiad.

THE INSCRIPTION OF THE GREAT HARLOT (concerning which John in the Apocalypse says: [10] *I SAW a woman sitting upon a beast, and upon her forehead a name written, BABYLON, THE GREAT MOTHER OF THE FORNICATIONS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH*) signifies ancient Rome [11] — [showing] that, while she still served the uncleannesses and abominations of idols, she most impudently and without any blush perpetrated execrable crimes; and, among other [things], that she cruelly shed also the blood of the martyrs, who were rebuking her, that she might more freely enjoy the fornications of her gods.

Thus Arethas, bishop of Caesarea, in the commentaries on the Apocalypse. For the same cause Papias, [Jerome], Oecumenius, and Bede think that Peter, at the end of [his] former epistle, called Rome by the name of Babylon [12], when he said: *The church which is gathered in Babylon saluteth you.*

THE BOOK OF DEATH is the most certain and immovable knowledge of God, recognizing them, and holding [them] reckoned in [his] count, whom the divine justice — by a hidden but nevertheless most just judgment — from eternity and unto eternity reprobated, and condemned to eternal punishment not without preceding demerit [13]; in which volume indeed are written all the evil and reprobate, whom God foreknew [would] die outside charity and grace, without penance — which book, however, although the divine

[→ *scripture* (scriptura) — sig. H]

[1] Acts 8:1–2 [2] Acts 13:2–3 [3] Two books falsely ascribed to St. Matthew [4] The Gospel of Matthias, apocryphal [5] Malac. 3:16 [6] Isa. 44:5 — for so it is written: "This one shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call [himself] by the name of Jacob; and this one shall write with his hand, To the Lord" [7] Terence in the prologue of the Andria [8] Menander wrote 49 comedies [9] 2 Cor. 15 (so printed; = 1 Cor. 15:33, "the former epistle") [10] Rev. 17:3,5 [11] Ancient Rome is understood by the name of Babylon [12] St. Peter wrote his latter epistle at Rome. 1 Pet. 5:13 [13] The reprobate are damned not without preceding demerit

*(printed p. 86 [PDF p. 99], verso — leaf stamps "84". **THE BOOK OF DEATH** concluded (the roll of the reprobate as counterpart to the book of life, with the scholastic problem of deletion resolved by the* within/without *distinction). Then **THE ASCENSION OF MOSES** — quoted in Jude, the dispute of Michael and the devil over Moses's body. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ although the divine] scriptures have not expressed [it] in bare and open words, and some schools of the theologians do not receive [it]; yet from many places they have latently indicated its necessity. For since the sacred letters everywhere teach that there is with God — to whose eyes all things are naked and open — a book of life, that is, a clear and infallible knowledge and record of predestination and of the predestined; [1] it is necessary also — since the knowledge of opposites is one and the same — that there be in God, from whom nothing can be hidden, a clear knowledge and certain record of reprobation and of all the reprobate; and this is called the *Book of Death*, in which are described, one by one, the names, and the evil merits, and the sins of all the reprobate, whom God — [they] having so deserved — has consigned to perpetual damnation. Concerning whom Augustine, in the 28th chapter of the *Soliloquies*, thus addresses God: *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 (ever just), thou didst foreknow 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.* JOHN also, in his Revelation, attests that the names of the reprobate are numbered in the divine foreknowledge, when, speaking of the impious, he said: [2] *AND there were slain in the earthquake names of men, seven thousand.* Whence also St. Jerome, in the commentaries on Isaiah, explaining that [text], [3] *THE HEAVENS SHALL BE FOLDED UP LIKE A BOOK*, said that the heavens, on the day of judgment, are to be folded up like a book, so that the sins of the wicked be no longer written in them. And just as our Saviour — saying, [4] *REJOICE, BECAUSE YOUR NAMES ARE WRITTEN IN THE HEAVENS* — wished to signify those whose names are written in the book of life: so Jeremiah wished to signify those who are written in the book of death by those whom he asserted to be written in the earth, when he said: [5] *O LORD, all they that depart from thee shall be written in the earth.* But whether some can be deleted from this book of death, that they may be saved, and again rewritten, that they may be damned [6]: there is no slight difficulty among the Theologians, especially the scholastics — which is easily resolved if, just as we said elsewhere [that] in the book of life some are written *within*, some *without:* so now also we say that the book of death is written within and without [7]; and that some are written in it within and without [8], but some only externally. Those are written within and without whom God, according to [his] eternal and firm wisdom, foreknew either [as] about to persevere in evil unto the end, or at least [as] about to depart from this life in [their] iniquities; whom, according to the foreknowledge of everlasting damnation, and according to

the purpose of perpetual misery, he irrevocably rejected from eternity, and proscribed with an indelible proscription — as Cain, Judas, Esau, Pharaoh, Antiochus, and other reprobates; who indeed can by no means be deleted from the inner writing of this book. For although sometimes they are deleted, or seem to be deleted, from the external circumscription of the book — while they exercise in some way a certain temporal grace of present righteousness (with Cain, offering sacrifices; with Judas, following Christ in a state of the highest perfection; with Esau and Antiochus, doing penance, and imploring mercy with many tears): yet within they remain indelibly written. But those are written in this book only on the outside [9] whom God foreknew [as] about to remain in [their] crimes for a while and for a time, but afterward to be saved through penance — as Paul, Peter, and Augustine; who, although they were in the book of death, and for a time circumscribed [written on the edge], and externally deleted from the book of life, on account of the lethal and death-bringing crime of infidelity; nevertheless were not written within, in the book of death, eternally and indelibly, and deleted from the inmost pages of the book of life; but were inscribed in the inner part of that same book of life, and numbered among those who — as Augustine says — can by no means perish; to whom all things cooperate unto good [10], even [their] very sins: [11] who, when they fall, are not dashed to pieces, because God puts under his hand, guarding their bones, that not one of these be crushed. Not that their sins are not sins, and worthy of death and eternal damnation; but that they themselves, after [their] fall, recognizing the gravity of the crime and the weakness of their own strength, rose again more easily, repented more sharply, walked more cautiously, and — with more ardent zeal and stronger effort — strove, as it were, violently to seize the kingdom of God. The Jews make mention of this Book of Death [12], of which we have now spoken, in the second order of the Talmudic volumes, tractate eight: [13] where they fable that God, in each year, in the first ten days of the September moon [Tishri], writes the good in the book of life, but the evil in the book of death.

THE ASCENSION OF MOSES, in Greek ἀνάβασις τοῦ Μωσέως, is a book; concerning which it is said that Jude the Apostle, in his Catholic epistle, took the testimony [14] of the Archangel Michael contending with Satan concerning the body of Moses. Origen [15] recalls this writing in the 3rd book of the *Periarchon*, chapter 2, in these words: *FIRST indeed, in Genesis, the serpent is described to have seduced Eve: concerning whom, in the Ascension of Moses (which little book the Apostle Jude mentions in his epistle), Michael the Archangel, disputing with the devil concerning the body of Moses, says to the devil that the instigated serpent was the cause of the transgression of Adam and Eve.* Thus he. Now this book is inscribed, as I judge, the *ASCENSION of Moses,* [16] because it contains the ascent of Moses from the plains of Moab up to Mount Nebo, on the top of Phasga [Pisgah], over against Jericho; likewise the conversations of Moses — now on the very point of dying — held with God, and his sepulchre dug out in a hidden place by the hands of the Angels; also the dispute of Michael and the devil, concerning which Oecumenius [17], in the commentaries on the epistle of Jude, thus writes: *IT IS SAID that Michael the Archangel furnished [his] ministry in burying Moses. This the devil did not endure, but brought an accusation on account of the slaying of the Egyptian, as if Moses were his [own]; and therefore he did not permit that [Moses] should obtain honorable burial. But when Michael, in this controversy, had occasion to assail the devil with a curse on account of his impudence, he did not do this, but only brought this against him:* [18] *THE LORD REBUKE THEE, O DEVIL.* Thus far the words of Oecumenius. Jerome [19], in the commentaries on the epistle to Titus, being in doubt about the book whence the Apostle received this, says: *FROM WHAT scriptures Jude took this testimony, is not easily evident. But nevertheless it must be known that we find something like these [things] in the prophet Zechariah. For he himself says:* [20]

[→ *BECAUSE* (Quia)]

[1] The Book of Life is the clear and infallible knowledge and record of the predestined and of predestination. The Book of Death is the clear knowledge and certain record of reprobation, etc., of the reprobate [2] Rev. 11:3 [3] Isa. 34 [4] Luke 10:20 [5] Jer. 27 — margin-rich ed. reads Jer. 17:13 [6] A scholastic controversy, whether some can be deleted from the book of death and afterward rewritten so that they be damned [7] The book of death is written within and without [8] Within and without in the Book of Death are written the reprobate [9] Who are

written only on the outside in the book of death [10] Rom. 8:28 [11] Ps. 32 — margin-rich ed. reads Ps. 36:24 [12] The Jews make mention of the book of death [13] A ridiculous tablet of the Jews [14] Jude 1:9 [15] Origen [16] Why this book is entitled the Ascension of Moses [17] Oecumenius [18] Jude 1:9 [19] Jerome [20] Zech. 3

---

*(printed p. 87 [PDF p. 100], recto — leaf stamps "85". **THE ASCENSION OF MOSES** concluded (with the* Book of Jubilees, *condemned by Trent). The letter **N** opens: **NATHAN the Prophet** and **NEHEMIAH**, then shorter entries (Nicodemus, the Nicolaitans, the Name of God on the foreheads) before **THE NAME & NUMBER of the beast** begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ *BECAUSE* the Lord] showed me Jesus [Joshua] the high priest, standing before the Angel of the Lord: and Satan stood at his right hand, to oppose him. And the Lord said, THE LORD REBUKE THEE, O SATAN. *Thus he [Jerome]. Origen, in the 35th homily on Luke, cites a certain more secret book of almost the same argument, in which are introduced the angels of justice and of iniquity, disputing over the death and salvation of Abraham* [1] *— while both troops wish to claim him for their own company. Clement, in the sixth [book] of the* Stromata, *alleges out of the* Assumption of Moses *a certain vision of Joshua and Caleb, who saw Moses — while he was being assumed [taken up] — illustrated with glory among the Angels. Athanasius, in the* Synopsis, *rejects this Ascension of Moses — together with another writing akin to it, whose title is* THE TESTAMENT OF MOSES *— among the Apocrypha. That other books also, under the name of MOSES, were forged by the heretics who are called Sethians, Epiphanius is witness* [2]*, in the first [book] of the* Panarion, *confuting the heresy of the Sethians; where also, against them, he brings in the authority of a certain very ancient volume, which is inscribed* JUBILEES, *or* GENESIS MORE EXACTLY EXPLAINED, *setting forth, in a long discourse, the lineage and genealogies of the sons of Adam. There is also carried about a certain book under the name of Moses, cited by George Cedrenus, whose title is* λεπτιγένεσις *[= λεπτὴ γένεσις] — that is,* Little Genesis. *That this is that Apocryphon which the Synod of Trent lately condemned under the name of the* little flowers of the Bible, several narrations sufficiently indicate — which the same Cedrenus seems to have transfused out of this work into his histories.

N.

NATHAN the Prophet, inspired by the Holy Spirit of God, was of the tribe and stock of Tock, sprung from the city of Gabath of Galilee. [3] This [Nathan], as Epiphanius in the *Lives of the Prophets* hands down, the day before David sinned with Bathsheba, wife of Uriah [4], foreknew that crime, and straightway set out on a journey toward Jerusalem, [intending] to draw the king away from that foulness: but when on the way he had come upon a man lately deprived of life, and could not endure to leave the unburied corpse to be torn by beasts, he buried it, the earth being dug out [5]; in which pious office, when the now-darkening day had overtaken him, that same night David fulfilled the ardor of the lust he had conceived. But the Prophet, the matter being known, grieving and sorrowing, returned whence he had come. But when David killed Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, by evil guile [6], [Nathan] again, by God's command, hastened to Jerusalem; and there, an elegant apologue [parable] being composed — concerning the rich man seizing the ewe-lamb of [his] poor neighbor [7] — led the king to the recognition of the guilt committed, gravely rebuked [him], and converted [him] to penance [8]. And not long after, having returned into his own country, he lived there a long time; and there at last, worn out by long old age, he died, having left to posterity two volumes of history [9]; in the former of which he had written the deeds of David, king of Jerusalem, and in the latter the acts of Solomon, king of Jerusalem. The first book of Paralipomenon, in the last chapter, and the second [book] of Paralipomenon, chapter nine, make mention of these volumes. [10]

NEHEMIAH HACHALIAH, נחמיה חכליה, or Nehemiah, son of Hachaliah, a Jew by race [11], cupbearer of Artaxerxes, king of the Persians and Medes — besides that book which is reckoned among the divine writings under the title of *SECOND ESDRAS*, wrote one book of *commentaries and descriptions:* in which he most diligently comprehended all those [things] which befell the Jews returning from the Chaldaic

captivity; but especially the finding of the sacred fire, which the priests, when the holy city was destroyed, had buried in a very deep well [12]; and the furnishing of the Library built by him, and the most abundant supply of all books — both sacred and profane — gathered together in it. The second book of Maccabees, chapter 2, makes mention of these commentaries. [13]

NICODEMUS the Pharisee, and a master in Israel, who came by night to hear Christ [14], is said to have written a gospel *Of the passion and resurrection of the Lord;* [15] which is reproved by the holy Church. Its beginning is, *ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS.*

THE NICOLAITANS, followers of Nicolas of Antioch, an Apostolic deacon — whose most wicked deeds John in the Apocalypse detests [16] — wrote certain books of pernicious superstition under the name *IALDABAOTH,* fashioning in them infinite and barbarous nomenclatures of the princes and powers dwelling in each heaven. Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion,* heresy 25, and Gelasius, distinction 15, number the writings of this Nicolas among the condemned scriptures. [17]

THE NAME OF GOD, inscribed on the foreheads of the saints, is mentioned by John in the Apocalypse in these words: [18] *HE WHO shall have overcome, I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, and my new name.* And again, in another place: [19] *AND I saw, and behold a lamb stood on Mount Sion, and with him the number of a hundred forty-four thousand, having his name, and the name of his father, written on their foreheads.* And again, in the same volume: [20] *THE THRONE of God and of the Lamb shall be in it: and his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face, and his name [shall be] on their foreheads.* The Name of God, inscribed on the foreheads of the elect, according to the exposition of Arethas of Caesarea, is twofold [21]: one, which is impressed on the hearts of the saints in the present life, signifying the knowledge and imitation of those [things] which are signified by the name of God — that is, the knowledge of the divine goodness and justice, and also the meditation of those [things] which God has prepared, in the heavenly Jerusalem, for those who love him. Those, therefore, who in this world retain, with indelible memory, the immortal goods of God and of the heavenly Jerusalem, bear the name of God and of Jerusalem engraved on heart and mind, and possess the pledge of future glory. The other name is that which is also called *new,* superadded to the foreheads of the saints in the other life — that is, the reward of the divine vision, and the light of the divine splendor, diffused from the blessed and glorious essence of the three Persons into the souls, and from the souls into the bodies of the saints, bringing with it incorruptible felicity, overflowing with an abundance of all delights. Those, therefore, bear the name of the Lamb, and the name of his Father, described on [their] foreheads, who are sealed with the blessed light of the divine countenance itself in the heavenly fatherland.

THE NAME, and the Number of the name, of the beast: concerning this John [says] in the Apocalypse, chapter thirteen *[so printed: "capite tertio" = ch. 3; the passage is Rev 13:16–17],* [22] *AND HE MAKETH,* he says, *that no one may be able to buy or sell, unless he have the character [mark], or the name of the beast, or the number*

[→ *of the name* (nominis) — sig. H 2]

[1] Good and evil angels contend over the salvation and destruction of Abraham [2] Books forged by the heretics under the name of Moses. Epiphanius, Against Heresies, book 1, tome 3, heresy 39 [3] From what tribe Nathan sprang [4] 2 Reg. 11:4 [5] The piety of the prophet Nathan [6] 2 Reg. 11:17 [7] 2 Reg. 12:1-4 [8] David, admonished by Nathan, was converted to penance [9] Nathan wrote two volumes [10] 1 Paral. 29:29; 2 Par. 9:29 [11] Nehemiah the Jew [12] 2 Macc. 1:19,20 [13] 2 Macc. 2 [14] John 3:2 [15] The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus [16] Rev. 2:15 [17] The writings of Nicolas condemned [18] Rev. 3:12 [19] Rev. 14:1 [20] Rev. 22:3 [21] The name of God inscribed on the foreheads of the elect is twofold [22] Rev. 13:17,18

*(printed p. 88 [PDF p. 101], verso — leaf stamps "86". **THE NAME & NUMBER of the beast** concluded (the four proposed 666-names). The letter **O** opens with **OCTAVIUS AUGUSTUS** (the census-edict, his lost works, the Altar-of-the-Firstborn legend), then the Book of Og and Onias; the letter **P** opens with **THE CHOROGRAPHY OF PALESTINE**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ the number] of his name. Here is wisdom: he who has understanding, let him compute the number of the beast. For it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred sixty-six. The character [mark] of the beast, the Name of the beast, and the Number of his name, are one and the same. [1] And whosoever communicates in the works of the beast — that is, of the devil, or of Antichrist — bears impressed in himself the character, mark, name, and number of his name. But that thou mayest know what the Number of the name of the beast (which denotes Antichrist in this place) signifies, it must be observed that the Greeks make their number out of the letters of the alphabet — whence any Greek word consists of as many numbers as letters. The numbers of a Greek word being known, therefore, the letters also, out of which the word itself is composed, are easily known. Since, therefore, the Number of the name of Antichrist is 666, the letters comprising this number will contain in themselves the number of Antichrist. But what these letters are, and what names result from them, cannot be held for certain. [2] Yet the ancient authors, for the sake of exercise, gathered various names out of these; which to write down here will not be unseasonable.

The NAME of Antichrist, according to Irenaeus and Hippolytus [3], is **TEITAN** (ΤΕΙΤΑΝ), that is, *Giant:* [4] whose letters render this number — Τ 300, Ε 5, Ι 10, Τ 300, Α 1, Ν 50; and the sum will be 666.

According to Tyconius [5], the Name of Antichrist is ΛΑΜΠΕΤΙΣ [LAMPETIS], that is, *Illustrious [Shining]*. And the numeral letters which make up the name are these: Λ 30, Α 1, Μ 40, Π 80, Ε 5, Τ 300, Ι 10, Σ 200; sum 666.

According to Arethas [6], his Name is ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ [LATEINOS], that is, *Latin:* whose letters have these numbers — Λ 30, Α 1, Τ 300, Ε 5, Ι 10, Ν 50, Ο 70, Σ 200; sum 666.

According to the opinion of Primasius [7], the Name of the same Antichrist is ΑΝΤΕΜΟΣ [ANTEMOS]. And the elements of the numbers [are] these: Α 1, Ν 50, Τ 300, Ε 5, Μ 40, Ο 70, Σ 200; sum 666.

[Later-edition addition — not present in our 1586 primary edition; the expanded later edition (the margin-rich copy) appends here an editorial cross-reference. It cannot be Sixtus's own, since all four authors cited published after his death in 1569:] SEE William Lindanus, in the third [book] of the *Dubitantius;* Nicholas Sander, in the eighth book *On the Visible Monarchy of the Church,* chapter 48; Gilbert Génebrard, in the last book of the *Chronography;* and Robert Bellarmine, *On the Roman Pontiff,* book 3, chapter 10.

O.

OCTAVIUS AUGUSTUS — from whom, as Luke the Evangelist hands down in chapter 2, an edict went out that the whole world should be enrolled [8] — composed many little works of various kinds [9]: among which are: the *Replies to Brutus, concerning Cato; Exhortations to philosophy; Of his own life,* or *Of the deeds done by him in war up to the Cantabrian [campaign],* thirteen books; *Of an heroic poem,* whose subject and title is *SICILY; Of Epigrams,* extemporaneous, one book; a *TRAGEDY,* whose title is *AJAX* — which, when he had begun [it] with great impetus, he afterward, the style not succeeding, abolished; and to friends asking what Ajax was doing, he answered that his Ajax had fallen upon the sponge [had been sponged out]. He also left a volume of *familiar letters.* But also of the books which pertained to the Roman religion he was so diligent an investigator and preserver, that of the prophetic books of the Greek and Latin kind — which were commonly circulated under no, or scarcely fit, authors — he burned more than two thousand, gathered from every side [10]; only the books of the Sibyls being reserved from the fire, and out of these too a selection being made: and those which seemed spurious being burned, he laid up the remaining ones in two gilded cases under the base of the Palatine Apollo. Thus Suetonius, in [the life of] Augustus.

There is also celebrated, among Christian authors, an Inscription and title engraved by the same Augustus on the Capitoline altar [11]; which he himself, first of all, erected to our Saviour Christ — although not knowing him. Of which thing Nicephorus makes mention, in the first book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter

seventeen, in these words: *CAESAR AUGUSTUS — illustrious for very many affairs gloriously and happily done, and himself first proclaimed Monarch — [when] now of more advanced age, came to the oracle of Pythian Apollo; and, a sacrifice greatest of all (which is called a Hecatomb) having been offered to the demon, he inquired who was to administer the Roman empire after him. But when no answer was returned, he added a second sacrifice also, and asked again, why the oracle — accustomed to use many words — had now at last fallen silent. Then it, a little delay being interposed, answered in this manner:*

> Παῖς Ἑβραῖος κέλεταί με, θεὸς μακάρεσσιν ἀνάσσων,
>
> τὸν δὲ δόμον προλιπεῖν, καὶ αὖθις Ἄϊδος ἱκέσθαι·
>
> λοιπὸν ἄπιθι σιγῶν ἐκ βωμῶν ἡμετέρων.
>
> *A Hebrew boy — God himself, governing the gods —*
>
> *bids me yield [my] seat, and return, sorrowful, beneath Orcus.*
>
> *Depart, therefore, henceforth silent from our altars.*

Such an answer having been received, Caesar returned to Rome, and there in the Capitol built a great altar with a Latin inscription of this kind: THE ALTAR OF THE FIRSTBORN OF GOD. Suidas relates this same [thing], under [the entry] *Augustus.*

THE BOOK OF OG, king of Bashan — of which Moses makes mention in the books of Numbers, chapter 11, and Deuteronomy, chapter 3 [12] — is numbered by Gelasius, distinction 15, among the condemned scriptures.

ONIAS [so; the Spartan king was Areus, Onias being the Jewish high priest — the roles are here conflated], king of the Lacedaemonians, wrote two letters concerning friendship and alliance to be entered into with the Jews [13]: one to Jonathan, high priest of the Jews (a copy of which is extant in the first [book] of Maccabees, chapter 11); the other to Simon, high priest of the Jews, which is had in 1 Maccabees 14.

P.

THE CHOROGRAPHY OF PALESTINE, or the *Description of the Holy Land on this side of the Jordan* — of which the history of Joshua, chapter eighteen, makes mention — twenty-one Jewish men wrote [14]; whom Joshua, in the fourteenth year after the entry of the sons of Israel into the land of promise, sent (three out of each of the seven tribes which had remained without possession) to traverse and describe all the regions of the Canaanites which are on this side of the Jordan, from Mount Lebanon even to the borders of Egypt, which had not yet been divided. (For up to that time only five tribes had received their possessions — namely, the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad, and the half-tri-

[→ *half-tribe* [of Manasseh] (tribus)]

[1] Who is said to bear the mark, name, note, and number of the name of the beast [2] From what letters the name of Antichrist consists is not certain to us [3] Concerning the name of Antichrist [4] The opinion of Irenaeus, book 5, chapter 30, and Hippolytus's book in the oration on the Consummation of the World [5] The opinion of Tyconius on the same matter [6] The opinion of Arethas [7] The opinion of Primasius [8] Luke 2:1 [9] Various books composed by Augustus Caesar [10] Augustus Caesar burned the prophetic books [11] An altar in the Capitol erected to Christ the Lord by Augustus Caesar [12] This book is not found in the place cited by the author [13] The letters of Onias [14] Those who wrote the chorography of the Holy Land

*(printed p. 89 [PDF p. 102], recto — leaf stamps "87". **THE CHOROGRAPHY OF PALESTINE** concluded; then **THE TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS** (translated by Grosseteste), **PAUL THE APOSTLE** (the non-canonical works ascribed to him), and **THE GOSPEL OF PAUL**, before **THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS** begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ the half-]tribe of Manasseh beyond the Jordan; but Judah and Ephraim, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, on this side of the Jordan). Those twenty-one men, therefore — since they were surveyors of the fields and most skilled estimators of lands — described the whole province, with its cities, towns, mountains, valleys, and the other level places, in a Geographic volume large enough; which, according to the number of the seven tribes, they divided into seven tables [maps], or portions — unequal indeed in size, but equal in the total of fruits and produce and in estimation of value. Whence also the tribe of Benjamin, which obtained the narrowest region of all [1], had [it] nevertheless — in beauty, and in fertility of soil, and in the nobility of [its] cities — superior, [and] equal to the rest, as Josephus is witness. The estimators of the land, therefore, returning after the seventh month, brought the book of the description to Joshua: who, having diligently inspected it, distributed that whole province among those seven tribes by lot, in the two thousand eight hundred thirty-fourth year from the founding of the world.

THE TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS, sons of Jacob, is a very ancient book [2]; which — translated from Hebrew into Greek — Robert, bishop of Lincoln [Grosseteste], rendered into Latin. In it are narrated very many things — both prophetic oracles, and exhortations to virtue and the worship of God, which each of the Patriarchs, on the last day of [his] life, having called to himself his sons and grandsons, uttered. Many prophecies also are inserted in it out of the book of Enoch, concerning those [things] which were to befall the sons and grandsons of the twelve patriarchs; *Of the future crimes and punishments of the Hebrews; Of the Saviour of the world to be slain by the Hebrews; Of the overthrow, captivity, and perpetual dispersion of the Hebrews among the nations.* Origen makes mention of this work in the fifteenth homily on Joshua, and Procopius of Gaza in the commentaries on the thirty-eighth chapter of Genesis.

PAUL THE APOSTLE, besides the fourteen epistles received in the sacred canon, and enumerated by us in the volume above, is said also to have left the writings noted below [3], namely:

- A *GOSPEL.*
- To the Laodiceans, one epistle.
- To the Corinthians, a third epistle.
- To the Thessalonians, a third epistle.
- To Lucius Annaeus Seneca, six epistles.
- *Of an Apocalypse,* that is, *of a Revelation,* or *Anabaseos,* that is, *of an Ascension,* or *Of his own rapture,* one book.
- *Of his own acts,* one book.
- *The Acts of Paul and Thecla,* one book.

Concerning which writings, those [things] which I have found among the ancient authors are these.

THE GOSPEL OF PAUL. Concerning this, Paul himself writes in the latter epistle to Timothy: [4] *BE MINDFUL that the Lord Jesus rose from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my Gospel, in which I labor.* Which words very many of the ancients so expound as to think that Paul, as often as in his epistles he said, *According to my gospel,* signifies the Gospel of Luke [5] — because Luke learned it, Paul teaching. Others think that Paul called the Gospel *his own,* in order to distinguish it from the many false gospels of the pseudo-apostles, which were carried about without any certain authority: from which he not undeservedly distinguishes his own — true, undoubted, and approved by the Apostles in the Council of Jerusalem. Nor are there lacking those who say that the Apostle, by *his Gospel,* understood nothing else than the Evangelical doctrine preached by him with the oracle of the living voice. [6]

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE LAODICEANS. This the Apostle commends to the Colossians, writing thus at the end of the epistle which he gave to them: [7] *SALUTE the brethren who are at Laodicea: and when this epistle shall have been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the*

Laodiceans; and that [the one] which is of the Laodiceans be read to you. [8] St. Thomas affirms that the author of this epistle was Paul [9], who sent it to the Laodiceans; and that it was not received by the Church into the canon of the divine scriptures — whether because its authority was not plainly established, or because it was corrupted by the heretics, or because it had perished by the injury of time, or because it contained the very same [things] which are had in the other epistles of Paul. Chrysostom [10] reckons that this is not an epistle which Paul sent to the Laodiceans, but [one] which the Laodiceans sent to Paul; because the Apostle did not say, *That [epistle] which [is] to the Laodiceans, let it be read to you,* but καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας — that is, *And let that which was written from Laodicea be read.* Theophylact [11] thinks that this is the former epistle of Paul to Timothy — which, as the Greek copies attest, was sent by Tychicus the Deacon, from Laodicea, the metropolis of Phrygia Pacatiana. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis [12], in the first book against the heresies, asserts that this epistle is not Paul's, and produces a testimony cited by the heretic Marcion out of the *epistle to the Laodiceans,* in these words: [13] *ONE God, one faith, one baptism: one God and Father of all; who is above all, and through all, and in all* — which testimony indeed is had among us, in the same and just so many words, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter four. Tertullian [14], in the fifth book against Marcion, indicates that Marcion himself was of this opinion — that he believed the epistle which among us is inscribed *TO THE EPHESIANS* to have been written and inscribed by Paul not to the Ephesians, but to the Laodiceans. Philastrius [15], in the catalog of heresies, chapter eighty-nine, hands down that the epistle was received by some as Paul's, but that there was not the custom in the churches that it should be read publicly before the people, on account of certain ambiguous sentences rashly inserted by some. Jerome [16], in the catalog of ecclesiastical writers, says: *SOME read also an epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is hissed off by all.* This epistle is extant, as we have heard, at Paris, in a very ancient codex of the Sorbonne Library. [17] I myself also saw it at Padua, in the Library of St. John of Verdara [Viridarium]; from which also I have copied the appended copy:

> *PAUL, an Apostle not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, to the brethren who are at Laodicea: grace to you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. I GIVE thanks to Christ through all my prayer, that you are abiding and persevering in good works, awaiting the promise in the day of judgment. Nor let the empty talk of certain [persons] disturb you, who insinuate [falsehood against] the truth, to turn you away from the truth of the Gospel which is preached by me. And now God will make*

[→ *that those* (vt qui) — sig. H 3]

[1] The tribe of Benjamin obtained the narrowest region [2] The Testament of the Patriarchs [3] The works which St. Paul is thought to have written are enumerated [4] 2 Tim. 2:8 [5] The Gospel of Luke, St. Paul calls his own, as some hold [6] The Gospel of St. Paul is the evangelical doctrine delivered by him [7] Col. 4:15,16 [8] Whether St. Paul wrote a special epistle to the Laodiceans — opinions vary [9] The first opinion, of St. Thomas [10] Another [opinion], of St. Chrysostom [11] The third [opinion], of Theophylact [12] The fourth [opinion], of Epiphanius [13] Eph. 4:5 [14] The fifth [opinion], of Tertullian [15] The sixth [opinion], of Philastrius [16] The seventh opinion, of St. Jerome [17] The epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans is extant at Paris and Padua

---

*(printed p. 90 [PDF p. 103], verso — leaf stamps "88". The text of **THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS** concluded with Sixtus's verdict; then **THE THIRD EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS** and **TO THE THESSALONIANS**, before **THE EPISTLES OF PAUL AND SENECA** begin. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ ...God will make it] so that those who are from me may be serving unto the perfect [truth] of the Gospel, and doing kindness of works which are of the salvation of eternal life. And now my chains are manifest, which I suffer in Christ; in which I rejoice and am glad. And this is to me unto perpetual salvation — which is brought about by your prayers, the Holy Spirit administering, whether through life or through death. For to me to live is [life] in Christ, and to die is joy [gain]: and he himself will work in us his mercy, that you may have the same love, and be of one mind. Therefore, dearly beloved, as you have heard of the presence of the Lord, so think, and do in fear: and it shall be to you life for eternity (for it is God who works in you); and do without sin whatsoever you do: and — what is best, dearly beloved — rejoice in the Lord Jesus Christ, and

beware of all filthiness in all gain [lucre]. Let all your petitions be openly before God. Be firm in the mind of Christ; and whatsoever things are sound [integra], and true, and modest, and chaste, and just, and lovely, do; and what things you have heard and received, retain in [your] heart: and peace shall be to you. All the saints salute you. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen. Cause this to be read to the Colossians, and that which is of the Colossians, [to be read] to you.

This, therefore, is the copy of the epistle to the Laodiceans: whether it be Paul's own makes me doubt [1] — both [on account of] the aforesaid testimony, cited by Epiphanius out of the book of Marcion, which is not had in this epistle; and also because whatever is in this Laodicean epistle, the same is had in the epistle to the Colossians, and more copiously: wherefore it was not fitting for Paul to enjoin the Colossians that this too should be read among them. I suspect this copy to be that same one [2] concerning which Theodoret, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Colossians, thus wrote: *SOME think that Paul also wrote an epistle to the Laodiceans; and so they even produce a forged epistle. But the divine Apostle did not say, "That [epistle] which is TO the Laodiceans," but "That [epistle] which is FROM Laodicea." For they had written to him concerning certain matters. Now it is likely that they [the Laodiceans] either had made accusation of those [things] which were being done at Colossae, or had themselves also labored with the same disease: and therefore he said that this epistle too was to be read by them [the Colossians].*

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS. [3] There are those who think that Paul, besides the two epistles to the Corinthians which are had in the canon, wrote also another epistle to the same — not enumerated among the canonical [ones] [4] — the argument being taken from this, that Paul in the fifth chapter of the former [epistle] to the Corinthians says: [5] *I WROTE to you in an epistle, not to keep company with fornicators. Not indeed with the fornicators of this world, or the covetous, or the rapacious, or those serving idols; otherwise you must have gone out of this world. But now I have written to you not to keep company &c.* Chrysostom judges that Paul here named not some other epistle different from this, but this very epistle [6] — wishing by these words to correct what he had a little before written in it, when he had said: [7] *IT IS ABSOLUTELY heard [reported] that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as [is] not even among the Gentiles: so that one should have his father's wife. And you are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he who has done this deed might be taken away from among you.* And then: [8] *DO YOU NOT KNOW that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, &c.*

It was credible, therefore, that the Corinthians suspected that all fornicators were to be shunned [9] — not only those who are defiled with the foulness of bodily lust, but also those who follow spiritual fornication; which happens as often as the soul departs from God through any sin whatsoever, whether it be infidelity, or avarice, or drunkenness. Excluding therefore this vain suspicion of theirs, Paul says: *I WROTE to you in an epistle, Not to keep company with fornicators, &c.* — as if he should say: Lest you err in this, that I enjoined a little above that you flee the custom of those defiled with infamous lust: I do not mean this, that I demanded you shun all the fornicators of this world, both bodily and spiritual, nor that you keep no dealing at all with anyone fornicating spiritually — that is, with idolatry, or avarice, which is the worship of idols. For, if you strove [after that], all Greece — nay, the whole world — would have to be abandoned by you, since fornicators of this kind occur everywhere; however much I too might wish it, if it were lawful. Now what cannot be done, I do not exact. But this I have now written, and in this epistle write to you: that, if any Christian be openly infected with vices of this kind — which for the most part are far removed from the Christian profession, such as fornication, avarice, the worship of images, evil-speaking, drunkenness, rapacity — you deem the familiarity of such a man so [utterly] to be shunned, that you should not think it worthy even to take food with him, until he come to his senses.

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS. [10] Origen, in an epistle which (Rufinus being witness) he wrote to his friends at Alexandria, thus speaks: *NOTHING seems wonderful to me, if my doctrine is adulterated by my enemies, and corrupted with such adultery as that with which the epistle of*

Paul the Apostle was corrupted. For certain [persons] wrote a false epistle under the name of Paul the Apostle, to trouble the Thessalonians, as though the day of the Lord were at hand, and to seduce them. On account of this epistle, in the second epistle which he wrote to the Thessalonians, he said this: [11] *NOW WE BESEECH you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that you be not quickly moved from your mind, nor be terrified, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by epistle as sent by us, as if the day of the Lord were at hand. Let no man seduce you by any means.* Thus far Origen.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO SENECA, AND OF SENECA TO PAUL. [12] Concerning these I have found it written, among various authors of approved faith, that Lucius Annaeus Seneca of Cordova — a philosopher of the Stoic sect, a disciple of Photinus the Stoic, paternal uncle of Lucan the poet, a man of most continent life, whom Jerome numbers in the catalog of the saints [13] — wrote eight epistles to Paul the Apostle [14], most friendly to him; before whose martyrdom, by nearly two years, he himself also was slain by Nero, his most cruel disciple. To him Paul wrote back — in the Latin tongue, as is believed [15] — six small and familiar epistles, writing to him not as to one regenerated and plainly faithful, but as to a friend, and one who pursued the Christians not with hatred but with benevolence, and who approved their discipline. Now Seneca seems to have somewhat obscured his own style in these epistles on purpose [16], and to have dissembled [it], so that, if perchance the epistles came into other hands, although they were inscribed with the name of Sene-

[→ *Senecae* — sig. H 4]

[1] The reason for doubting whether the epistle to the Laodiceans is Paul's [2] Theodoret denies the epistle to the Laodiceans to be Paul's [3] Paul's third epistle to the Corinthians [4] The argument of those who think Paul wrote a third epistle to the Corinthians [5] 1 Cor. 5:9-11 [6] Chrysostom denies that a third epistle to the Corinthians was written by the Apostle [7] 1 Cor. 5:1 [8] 1 Cor. 5:6 [9] The Corinthians supposed all sinners were to be shunned [10] Paul's third epistle to the Thessalonians [11] 2 Thess. 2:1-2 [12] The epistles of Paul to Seneca, and of Seneca to Paul [13] Sap. 18 — so printed; the reference is obscure here (the "catalog of saints" is Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, where Seneca appears as ch. 12) [14] Seneca wrote eight epistles to Paul [15] Paul wrote back to Seneca in the Latin tongue [16] Why Seneca obscured his own style in the epistles to Paul

---

(printed p. 91 [PDF p. 104], recto — leaf stamps "89". The apocryphal EPISTLES OF PAUL AND SENECA, given in full: Sixtus's introduction (with testimonies from Linus, Jerome, and Augustine), then the fourteen short letters alternating between Seneca and Paul. The exchange continues on the next page. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)

[→ …although inscribed with the name of Sene-]ca, they could nevertheless not, [amid such] danger, appear to be Seneca's. For there was danger — and [it was] against the Emperor's edict then [in force] — for a Christian or a Jew to enjoy [such] familiarity. Some of the most ancient fathers bear witness to these epistles; but first of all Linus, the second Pontiff after Peter [1], who at the beginning of the book *On the Passion of Paul*, speaking of the friendship of Paul and Seneca, thus says: *CONCOURSES [of people] from the house of Caesar were made unto him [Paul]. But the emperor's tutor also was so knit to him in friendship — seeing in him divine knowledge — that he could scarcely restrain himself from converse with him; so that, when he could not address him mouth to mouth, by frequent letters given and received he enjoyed his sweetness, and friendly converse, and counsel.* And St. Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, numbering Seneca among the ecclesiastical writers [2], says: *I WOULD NOT put Seneca in the catalog of saints, did not those epistles invite me — which are read by very many — of Paul to Seneca, and of Seneca to Paul; in which, though he was Nero's master and the most powerful [man] of that age, he says that he desires to be of that rank among his own people which Paul is among the Christians.* And Augustine, in the fifty-third epistle to Macedonius, making mention of these epistles, says: *DESERVEDLY does Seneca say (he who was in the times of the Apostles, some of whose epistles to Paul the Apostle are also read): HE HATES ALL, WHO HATES THE WICKED.* These [things] they [say] concerning Seneca and Paul's epistles; which, since they are exceedingly brief and known to few, I judge it will not be amiss if I set them down here in this place.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

I BELIEVE it has been reported to you, Paul, [the discourse] which yesterday we held with our Lucilius concerning the apocrisis [so printed; the common text reads apocryphis, "apocrypha"] and other matters. For there were with me certain companions of your teachings; for I had withdrawn into the gardens of Sallust, in which place these [companions] of whom I have spoken, bending their course elsewhere as we chanced [to be there], joined themselves to us. Assuredly we longed for your presence. And this I wish you to know: that, your little book being read — that is, [some] out of the many letters, certain epistles which you directed to some city or capital of a province, containing with wonderful exhortation the moral life — we were thoroughly refreshed. Which thoughts I judge to have been uttered not [merely] by you, but through you; certainly at times [both] by you and through you. For so great is the majesty of those matters, and they shine with such nobility [3], that I scarcely think the ages of men would suffice by which [men] might be instructed and perfected. I wish you well, brother. Farewell.

Paul, to Seneca, greeting.

YOUR letter I received yesterday with gladness; to which I could straightway have written back, had I had at hand the presence of the young man whom I was about to send to you. For you know when, and by whom, and at what time, and to whom, anything ought to be given and entrusted. I ask, therefore, that you not think yourself neglected, while I have regard to the quality of the person. But whereas you write that you are refreshed by my letters, I count myself happy in the judgment of so great a man. [4] For you would not be called Censor, Sophist, and master of so great a prince — nay, of all — were it not that you speak the truth. May you long fare well.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

CERTAIN volumes I have set in order, and given them their finished form by their own divisions. These, too, I am resolved to read to Caesar. And if only chance shall favorably assent, perhaps you also will be present; but if otherwise, I will appoint you a day, that we may examine this work together. I had resolved not to publish this writing to him before I had first conferred with you — if only this could be done with impunity — that you might know that you also are not passed over. Farewell, dearest Paul.

Paul, to Seneca, greeting.

AS OFTEN as I hear your letters, I think upon your presence; nor do I reckon otherwise than that at all times you are with us. As soon, therefore, as you begin to come, we shall see one another, and that at close hand. I wish you well.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

WE ARE distressed by your too-long withdrawal. What is it, or what matters, that make you tarry? If [it be] the master's [Nero's] indignation — because you have departed from the ancient rite and sect, and are again converting others — there will be place for pleading, that he may esteem this [as done] by reason, not by levity. Farewell.

Paul, to Seneca and Lucilius, greeting.

CONCERNING those [matters], or those [things], which you have written to me, it is not permitted to speak out with reed [pen] and ink: whereof the one marks and designates something, the other plainly shows [it] — especially since I know that there are among you, as among us, and in our [company], those who understand me. Honor is to be rendered to all, and so much the more to these who catch at occasion for taking offense; to whom, if we show patience, we shall in every way overcome them on whatsoever side — provided only they be such as bear repentance for themselves. Fare you well.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

I DECLARE myself well pleased in the reading of your letters, which you sent to the Galatians, the Corinthians, and the Achaeans. For the Holy Spirit, [being] in you and above you, expresses exalted, more sublime, and exceedingly venerable meanings. I could wish, therefore — since you bring forth surpassing matters — that a cultivation of speech [elegance of style] be not wanting to their majesty. And, that I may not filch anything from you, brother, or owe [it] to my own conscience, I confess that Augustus [the Emperor] was moved by your sentiments [5]: to whom, when the exordium of your letters had been read, this utterance was [made] — that he

could marvel that one not lawfully imbued [instructed] should think in such wise. To whom I answered, that the gods are wont to speak by the mouth of the guileless — after the example of the rustic little man of Vaticanum, to whom, when two men had appeared in the Reatine field (who are named Castor and Pollux), he was divinely instructed. Farewell.

Paul, to Seneca, greeting.

THOUGH I am not ignorant that Caesar is an admirer and lover of our affairs, you will nevertheless permit that you be not harmed, but admonished. For I think you have acted gravely, in that you wished to bring to [his] notice what is contrary to his rite and discipline; since he indeed worships the gods of the nations. What has seemed [good] to you, that you would have him know this, I do not see: but I judge you do this out of your excessive love for me. I ask you, for the future, that you do it not. For heed must be taken, lest — while you love me — you cause offense to the master [lord]: whose offense indeed will neither hurt, if he persevere [in it], nor, if it be not [taken], profit. If she be a queen, she will not be indignant; if she be [merely] a woman, she will be offended. [the closing sentence is corrupt in the printed copy] Farewell.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

KNOW that you have been moved by [my] letters not so much for my sake

[→ *as* (quas) — sig. H 4]

---

[1] Linus testifies that Seneca sent letters to Paul [2] Seneca is numbered among the ecclesiastical writers by Jerome [3] Notable praise of Paul's epistles [4] Paul highly values Seneca's judgment [5] Nero moved by the reading of Paul's epistles

---

*(printed p. 92 [PDF p. 105], verso — leaf stamps "90". The **EPISTLES OF PAUL AND SENECA** concluded (the remaining letters with their apocryphal datings, and Sixtus's closing note); then **THE RAPTURE OF PAUL, OR APOCALYPSE** (the Gnostic* Ascension of Paul*), before **THE ACTS OF PAUL** begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …not so much for my sake] as [for] that which I made [wrote] to you concerning the publication of your epistles to Caesar — as [I am moved] by the nature of things: which so recalls the minds of men from all arts and manners, that I do not wonder [at it] today. Indeed, [I am moved] as one who by many proofs hold this now for a most certain thing. Therefore let us act anew: you, if anything in [regard to] the past has been lightly done, will grant [me] pardon. I have sent you a book *On the Abundance of Words.* Farewell, dearest Paul.

Paul, to Seneca, greeting.

AS OFTEN as I write to you, and set my own name before yours, I do a grave thing, and one incongruous with my sect [profession]. For I ought, as I have often professed, to be all things to all men; and to observe toward your person the same [rule] which the Roman law has granted to the honor of the senate — namely, in a letter to choose the last place [for myself]; lest, with perplexity, I should out of [regard for] decorum wish to effect what would be [a matter] of my own choosing. Farewell, most devoted Master. Given on the fifth [day] before the Kalends of July, Nero for the fourth [time] and Messala being Consuls.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

HAIL, my dearest Paul. If to me and to my name a man so great and beloved in every way — I say not, be joined, but of necessity be mingled [united] — it will fitly have been done concerning your Seneca. Since, then, you are the summit and the peak of all the loftiest mountains, deem not yourself unworthy to be named at the head of the letters, lest you seem not so much to try me as to make sport [of me]; for you know that you are a Roman citizen. For what place is mine with you, [let it be] yours; what is yours, I would have [to be] mine. Farewell, dearest Paul. Given on the tenth [day] before the Kalends of April, Aprianus and Capito being Consuls.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

HAIL, my dearest Paul. Do you think that I am not saddened, and not full of grief, that again and again punishment is exacted upon your innocence [upon you, [though] innocent]? And, further, that all the people

judge you so liable to guilt, thinking that whatever contrary thing happens in the city is wrought by you? But let us bear it with equanimity, and make use of the [public] tribunal which chance has granted, until unconquered good fortune set an end to [these] evils. The age of the ancients bore also Philip's son the Macedonian [Alexander], and Dionysius; our own [age bore] also Caius Caesar [Caligula]: to whom whatever pleased was lawful. Whence the city of Rome so often suffers conflagration is manifestly clear. But if human lowliness could speak out, and it were permitted to speak with impunity in this darkness, all [men] — Christians — would now see all things. And the Jews are wont to be visited with punishment as [though they were] contrivers of the fire. That cutthroat, whoever he be — whose delight is the butchery, and whose covering [cloak] is falsehood — is destined to his own time; and just as the head [life] of each best man is given [in ransom] for one head, so one head shall be given for many, and this [man], devoted [as a victim], shall be burned with fire for all. A hundred thirty-two houses [and] four blocks [insulae] burned in six days: the seventh gave a pause [respite]. I wish you well. Given on the fifth [day] before the Kalends of April, Frigius and Bassus being Consuls.

Annaeus Seneca, to Paul, greeting.

HAIL, my dearest Paul. Allegorically and enigmatically are many works everywhere composed by you; and therefore so great a force of matters and of [your] office, bestowed upon you, is to be adorned not with ornament of words, but with a certain [inner] cultivation. I very often retain [in memory] that you have said [that] many who affect such things [only] corrupt the meanings, and shun the [true] virtues of things. But this I would have you grant me: comply with [good] Latinity, put a fair appearance [upon it] with honorable words, that the bestowal of [your] noble gift may worthily be set forth by you. Farewell. Given on the fifth [day before] the Nones of July, Leo and Savinus being Consuls.

Paul, to Seneca, greeting.

TO YOU, [being] one who weighs [these things], are revealed those [things] which the Divinity has granted to few. I therefore, assured, now sow in a fertile field the strongest seed — not indeed matter, which seems [liable] to corruption, but the stable word of God, the derivative [outflow] of [Him who is] ever growing and abiding unto eternity. Which [word], since your prudence has attained it, must needs be unfailing. Reckon that the observances both of the Gentiles and of the Israelites are to be shunned. Those [truths] which you have nearly attained, you will instill into the temporal king [Nero], and into his household, and into [his] faithful friends. To whom, although your persuasion will be harsh and hard to grasp — since the most of them are by no means bent by your insinuations — yet the word of God instilled into them will bring forth in them a new man, hastening hence toward God. Farewell, O Seneca, most dear to us. Given on the Kalends of August, Leo and Savinus being Consuls.

James Faber [Lefèvre], bishop of Vienne *[so identified by Sixtus]*, wrote brief little commentaries upon these epistles.

THE RAPTURE OF PAUL, OR APOCALYPSE. [1] Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion*, refuting the heresy of the Caians [Cainites], says: [2] *AGAIN, the Caians forged another little book under the name of Paul, stuffed with nefarious deeds — which those also called Gnostics use — which they call the ASCENSION OF PAUL, the occasion being taken from that which the Apostle says: that he ascended even to the third heaven, and heard secret words which it is not lawful for a man to speak. And these, they say, are [those] secret words.* Augustine, in the ninety-eighth tractate on John, confuting the madness of these [men], adds this: *CERTAIN of the spiritual [men] attained to those [things] which it is not lawful for a man to speak. On which occasion sundry [persons], with most foolish presumption, forged an Apocalypse of Paul — which the sound Church does not receive —* [3] *full of I know not what fables, saying this to be that whence he had said he was caught up into the third heaven, and there heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. However tolerable the audacity of these [men] might be, had he said that he heard [things] WHICH IT IS NOT YET lawful for a man to speak; but since he said [things] WHICH IT IS NOT lawful for a man to speak — who then are these who dare to speak these things impudently and unhappily?* Nicephorus, in the twelfth book of the *Ecclesiastical History*, introduced mention of this Apocalypse in this manner: *AGAIN, that [book] which is called the Apocalypse of Paul the Apostle — which none of the men of old ever saw — many monks admire with veneration. A report indeed grew rife, in this very time of the reigning*

Theodosius, that by divine revelation a book had been found — laid up in the fatherland and paternal house of Paul at Tarsus of Cilicia, in a marble chest, and buried in the earth; which [report] that it was plainly false, a certain very aged presbyter of the church of Tarsus (for his hoary hairs bore witness to that [age]) confessed; for he affirmed that nothing of this kind had happened in his time. And when he asserted this, he wondered whether that report had not been fabricated by heretics — which thing we have said before was done in many other [cases] also.

THE ACTS OF PAUL. [4] Eusebius makes mention of the Acts of Paul in the third [book] of the *Histo-*

[→ *History* (Historiae)]

[1] The Apocalypse of Paul [2] The Cainites forged a book under the name of Paul [3] The sound Church does not receive the Apocalypse of Paul [4] The apocryphal Acts of Paul

---

*(printed p. 93 [PDF p. 106], recto — leaf stamps "91". **THE ACTS OF PAUL** concluded; then **THE ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA** (the "baptized lion" fable) and **THE APOSTLE PETER** — the five spurious books ascribed to him, with the long* Preaching of Peter *fragment, the* Judgment, *and the* Gospel of Peter. *Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …in the third [book] of the] *Ecclesiastical History,* chapter twenty-five: *AFTER these,* he says, *is the scripture which is called the ACTS OF PAUL; and the little book which is called [THE BOOK] OF THE SHEPHERD [Pastor]: concerning which there is the very greatest doubt.* Clement of Alexandria, in the sixth volume of the *Stromata,* out of a certain unknown scripture of Paul brings forth such a testimony: *THIS Paul the Apostle declares, saying: Take also the Greek books; recognize the Sibyls, how they signify one God, and those [things] which are to come; and take Hystaspes, and read, and you shall find the Son of God written much more clearly and openly, and how against Christ many kings shall array [their] battle-line — those who hold [him] in hatred, &c.*

THE ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA. [1] Gelasius, distinction 15, reckons the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* among the reprobate scriptures. I suspect this to be the writing concerning which Jerome, in the catalog of writers, under the title of LUKE, has these [words]: *THEREFORE the "periods" [journeyings] of Paul and Thecla, and the whole fable of the baptized lion, we number among the apocryphal scriptures. For what likelihood is it, that Luke, the inseparable companion of the Apostle, among the other affairs of his should have been ignorant of this one alone? But Tertullian too, near to the times of the Apostles, relates that a certain presbyter in Asia — a* σπουδαστήν *[a zealous devotee] of the Apostle Paul — was convicted before John, because he was the author of the book; and that he confessed he had done this out of love for Paul, and on that account was deposed.* The argument [content] of this book was [2] — as is gathered from the third book of Epiphanius *Against the Heresies,* from the second book of Ambrose *On Virgins,* and from the eighth book of the *Histories* of Vincent, bishop of Beauvais — of this kind: While Paul was preaching at Iconium, the virgin Thecla, having heard his sermon on Virginity, suddenly loosed herself from [her intended] nuptials; and left her betrothed — a young man, a leading citizen of the city, renowned for beauty and riches — and, cleaving to Paul, gave herself to him as a companion of [his] pilgrimage: in which, when she was compelled by persecutors to undergo grave perils of death — now plunged in the waters, now cast into the fires, now exposed to wild beasts — at last, freed from all these (Paul protecting her), she came safe to Rome together with him.

THE APOSTLE PETER, besides the two Catholic epistles received into the sacred canon, is said to have written five books of Christian doctrine — [which] Sophronius, as [taken] from Jerome, reports:

- The FIRST is entitled Κήρυγμα, that is, PREACHING.
- The SECOND, Εὐαγγέλιον, GOSPEL.
- The THIRD, Πρᾶξις, that is, ACTS.

- The FOURTH, Ἀποκάλυψις, that is, REVELATION.
- The FIFTH, Κρίσις, that is, JUDGMENT.

Of these, I have found that only the first and the fifth were in authority among the ancients — since the most ancient fathers used their testimonies [3], especially Clement of Alexandria and Origen; of whom the former, in the sixth [book] of the *Stromata,* cites a fragment, from which you may have some specimen of this book, in these words: *PETER, IN THE PREACHING, says: Know that there is one God, who made the beginning of all things, and holds power over [their] end; and who falls not under sight [is invisible]; who sees all things; who, though he cannot be grasped, grasps all things; needing nothing, [while] all things need him, and through whom are all things; who cannot be comprehended, eternal, free from corruption, unmade — who made all things by the word of his power, that is, by [his] Son. Worship this God, not as the Greeks [do] —* inasmuch as they too worship the same God whom we [worship] (those of them who are honest men among the Greeks), but not with a perfect and absolute knowledge, as [men] who have not so learned [what was] handed down by the Son; *for while they are carried along in ignorance, and know not God as we [do] with perfect knowledge — with the means which he gave them for [their] use — they fashion wood, and stones, and iron, and gold, and silver, and worship gods made out of their own material; and — the [creatures] which he gave them for food, the birds of the air, and the swimming things of the sea, and the serpents of the earth, and wild beasts, with the cattle of the field and the four-footed beasts — they sacrifice [these] to [idols in the form of] men, and, offering dead things to the dead as to gods, are ungrateful toward God. Neither worship [him] as the Jews [do]: for they, thinking that they alone know God, know not that they worship Angels and Archangels, the months and the Moon; and unless the Moon appear, they keep not the sabbath which is called the first, nor the new-moon, nor the unleavened bread, nor the great day. Wherefore do you also — learning the [things] which we hand down to you — keep [them] holily and justly, worshipping God anew through Christ. For we find in the scriptures, as the Lord says: Behold, I make for you a new testament [covenant], not as I made for your fathers on Mount Horeb. For he has given us a new testament: for the [things] of the Jews and of the Greeks are old; but we, who worship him anew in a third kind, are Christians.* Thus far the words of Peter: which indeed Origen, in the thirteenth tome on John, resuming [them] in an epilogue, expounds more openly. Yet he says that it must be inquired concerning this book, whether it be true, or supposititious [spurious], or mixed.

THE JUDGMENT OF PETER. But concerning the work whose title is *THE JUDGMENT OF PETER,* Rufinus, in the explanation of the Creed to Laurentius, thus writes: *But in the New Testament, the little book which is called [THE BOOK] OF THE SHEPHERD, or OF HERMAS, and THE JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO PETER — the fathers indeed willed [these] all to be read in the churches, yet not to be brought forward for confirming authority of faith out of them.* [4]

THE GOSPEL OF PETER. Concerning the *Gospel of Peter,* Serapion — who in the two-hundredth year of the Lord was bishop of Antioch — composed a particular book to the brethren of Rhossus in Cilicia, [who] on occasion of this scripture were declining into heresy; in which, reproving certain false [things] contained in it, he thus speaks: *FOR WE receive both Peter and the other Apostles as [we receive] Christ; but the false [writings] which under their name have been composed by others, we decline [reject], as [men] aware of their [true] meaning and mind, knowing that such [things] were not handed down to us. For I, when I was among you, supposed that all were of the right faith among you; and, the little book not yet perused which was offered to me — in which a gospel written under the name of Peter was current — I said: If this is the only [thing] which seems to bring in enmity and dissension among you, let the book be read.* [5] *But now, having learned that these who assert that book ought to be read demanded that this be done with a view to a certain hidden heresy (as has been told me), I will hasten to come to you again. For [I know] of whose heresy these [were]: Marcianus, who also stood contrary to his very self, not understanding what he was saying — which [things] you also will understand — [and I learned it] from those who had learned this same gospel*

according to his tradition, and became successors of his opinion, whom we call Δοκητάς *[Docetae], that is, "Opiners."* These words of Serapion [are] gathered out of Eusebius.

[→ *DE*]

[1] The Acts of Paul and Thecla rejected by the Church [2] The argument of the apocryphal book of the Acts of Paul and Thecla [3] The ancients used the testimonies of the apocryphal books [4] It is not permitted to bring forward, out of all the books once read in the church, authority for confirming the faith, says Rufinus [5] The cunning of the heretics

---

(printed p. 94 [PDF p. 107], verso — leaf stamps "92". The several spurious Petrine books treated (the ***Acts, Gospel, Preaching, Apocalypse,*** *and* ***Doctrine of Peter,*** *the* Itinerary, *and the* Martyrdom of Peter and Paul*); then* ***THE PHYLACTERIES OF THE ANGELS*** *(magical amulets) and* ***THE PHYLACTERIES OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES*** *(the Hebrew* Tephilin, *Matt 23). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

THE ACTS OF PETER. [1] Concerning the Acts of Peter, and his other books, Eusebius, in the third [book] of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter three, has thus: *But that little book which is called the ACTS OF PETER, and [that] which is named a GOSPEL of his name, and also that which is called his PREACHING, and his APOCALYPSE, are not had among the canonical scriptures; nor indeed is any of the ancients found to use their testimonies.* And in the third book, chapter twenty-five: *AFTER these*, he says, *is the scripture which is called the Acts of Paul, and the little book which is called [that] of the Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter: concerning which there is the greatest doubt.* Nicephorus likewise, in book 12, relating that the Apocalypse of Peter was accustomed to be read in the churches of Palestine, [says]: *That [book] which is called the Apocalypse of Peter — as [being] supposititious and illegitimate, judged [so] by the ancients — we find to have been accustomed to be read for a [certain] time among the Palestinians, in certain churches, once every year on the day of the Parasceve [Good Friday];* [2] *on which day the people fast, with great devotion and contrition, for the memory of Christ's saving passion.*

Moreover, Origen — by whom a testimony is cited out of the *Acts of Peter* in the twentieth tome on John — likewise, in the first book of the *Periarchon*, makes mention of another book, which is inscribed the *DOCTRINE OF PETER,* [3] in this manner: *If anyone should wish to bring forward to us, out of that little book which is called the Doctrine of Peter, [the saying] which the Saviour seems to say to the disciples — A DEMON IS NOT INCORPOREAL: it must be answered him that that book is not had among the ecclesiastical [books]; and it must be shown that that scripture is neither Peter's, nor of any other who was inspired by the Spirit of God.*

THE ITINERARY OF PETER, published under the name of Clement, Gelasius, distinction 15, places among the books of suspect faith.

THE MARTYRDOM OF PETER AND PAUL, Pope Linus wrote in two volumes.

THE PHYLACTERIES OF THE ANGELS are numbered among the condemned scriptures by Gelasius, distinction fifteen, in these words: *ALL PHYLACTERIES, which are composed not by Angels (as the heretics feign) but rather by a demon, are Apocryphal.* Which words indeed can be understood of magical amulets — which, against enchantments, incursions of enemies, falls of thunderbolts, and other perils of this kind, certain superstitious [persons] wear hung about the neck. [4] For that the ancients sometimes called these *Phylacteries*, Epiphanius is witness, in the first book *Against the Heresies.* Concerning these there is extant a decree of Pope Gregory in Burchard, bishop of Worms, book ten, chapter 23, in these words: *IF ANYONE SHALL HAVE OBSERVED [consulted] SOOTHSAYERS, DIVINERS, OR ENCHANTERS, OR SHALL HAVE USED PHYLACTERIES, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.*

THE PHYLACTERIES OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES — which in the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew [5] are called טוטפות *Totaphot,* [and which] the Rabbis of the Hebrews call תפילין *thephilin* [tefillin],

the Greeks φυλακτήρια, that is, *Preservatories,* so called ἀπὸ τοῦ φυλάττω [from *phylatt*■, "I guard"], because they preserved the memory from oblivion; but Jerome names [them] *Pictatiola,* that is, little white tablets, fitted for inscribing very brief little sentences. Now these Phylacteries — concerning which Christ censures the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Scribes [who] enlarge [their] Phylacteries out of ambition — were little papers, or [strips of] parchment, or certain very tiny little scrolls, written with the words of the divine law, which the Pharisees and scribes wore upon the forehead. [6] For since (as Chrysostom says) the Jews easily forgot the commandments of God, God ordered these to be written on tablets and hung upon the forehead and the hands, saying: [7] [8] *Bind these for a sign upon your hand; and let them be as frontlets before your eyes.* For just as mothers, tying a thread about the finger of forgetful boys, bring them back to remembrance of the [things] which have been enjoined them, [9] so God commanded the Jews — as [if they were] little children — to bind these upon the hands and forehead; wishing in this way to admonish [them] that they should meditate on the law of the Lord day and night, and fulfill his commandments in deed. But the Pharisees, wrongly interpreting this, [10] thought (as they also now think) that it was enough for the assiduous observance of the law if they bound these *Thephilin* upon head and arms. For thus Rabbi David Kimchi writes, concerning the continual observance of the whole law, on the first Psalm, expounding that sentence — *AND IN THE LAW OF THE LORD SHALL HE MEDITATE DAY AND NIGHT* — saying: *He shall meditate day and night,* that is, he shall always be occupied in the study of the law. But if you object: How can it be that a man should be wholly [taken up] day and night in meditating on the law — which, when it is done, leaves no room [time] for when a man may attend to [his] remaining works, which are of domestic care? — the sages of the Hebrews answer in this manner: [11] *Whosoever keeps the precept concerning the putting-on of the Thephilin, to him the scripture attributes as much as if he studied day and night.* Jerome, in the commentaries on Matthew, writes that this custom of wearing *Thephilin* flourished even in his own times among the Babylonians, Persians, and Indians. In whose place Chrysostom, in the seventy-third homily on Matthew, relates that many Christian women in his own age were accustomed to carry the Gospel, hanging from the neck, [12] that they might the more easily recall the evangelical precepts to memory. Further, as to what was wont to be written in these phylacteries, the opinion of the Christians and of the Hebrews differs: [13] Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theophylact assert that the Decalogue of the law — that is, the ten precepts of the two tables — was wont to be written in them. Lyra [Nicholas of Lyra], according to the opinion of the Rabbis, testifies that it is by the ordinance of the Jews that in the *Thephilin* there be inscribed twelve *Pasuch* — that is, verses or sentences out of the book of Deuteronomy: namely five out of the sixth chapter, and seven out of the eleventh chapter of the same volume — which are these:

From Deuteronomy, chapter six.

1. [14] *HEAR, O Israel: the Lord our God is one God. And you shall love the Lord your God with your whole heart, and with your whole soul, and with your whole strength.*

2. [15] *AND these words, which I command you this day, shall be in your heart.*

3. [16] *AND you shall repeat them to your sons, and shall speak of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk on the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise up.*

4. [17] *AND you shall bind them as a sign in your hand; and they shall be as frontlets before your eyes.*

5. [18] *AND you shall write them on the doorposts of your house, and on your gates.*

From Deuteronomy, chapter eleven.

1. [19] *AND it shall be, if obeying you shall obey my precepts which*

[→ *which* (quae)]

---

[1] Eusebius's judgment concerning the apocryphal books ascribed to St. Peter [2] The fast of the day of Parasceve [3] The book entitled the Doctrine of Peter is apocryphal [4] Magical amulets devised by a demon [5] Matt. 23 [6] What the phylacteries of the Scribes and Pharisees were [7] Deut. 11 [8] CONFLICT — the margin-rich edition prints this reference as Deut. 6:8 (the wording "Bind these for a sign upon your

hand" matches Deut 6:8); base edition has Deut. 11 [9] A notable simile [10] The Pharisees wrongly interpreted the commandment of the Lord [11] The sages of the Hebrews play the fool [12] In antiquity a Christian woman carried the Gospel hanging from the neck [13] What was once written in the Jews' Thephilin is disputed [14] Deut. 6:4-5 [15] Deut. 6:6 [16] Deut. 6:7 [17] Deut. 6:8 [18] Deut. 6:9 [19] Deut. 11:13

(printed p. 95 [PDF p. 108], recto — leaf stamps "93". The ***PHYLACTERIES OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES*** *concluded (the Rabbinic rules for writing the* Thephilin*). Then* ***PHILIP THE APOSTLE*** *(the Gnostic* Gospel *and* Acts of Philip*) and* ***THE WRITING OF THE PEOPLES*** *(Ps 87), before* ***THE INSCRIPTION OF THE PONTIFICAL VESTMENT*** *begins. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …my precepts] which I command you, that you love the Lord your God with your whole heart, and your whole soul.

2. [1] *I WILL GIVE your rain in its season, the early and the latter [rain]: and you shall gather in your grain, and your wine, and your oil.*

3. [2] *AND I will give grass in your field for your cattle: and you shall eat, and be filled.*

4. [3] *TAKE HEED to yourselves, lest perhaps your heart be seduced, and you depart, and worship strange gods, and bow yourselves down to them.*

5. [4] *AND the fury of the Lord be angry against you, and he shut up the heavens, and there be no rain, and the earth give not its fruit, and you perish quickly from the good land which the Lord gives you.*

6. [5] *AND put these my words in your heart, and bind them as a sign in your hand: and let them be as frontlets before your eyes.*

7. [6] *AND teach them to your sons, that they may speak of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk on the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise up: and you shall write them on the doorposts of your house, and on your gates.*

These [things] concerning the writing of the *Thephilin.* But concerning the manner and rite in which these ought to be written, the Rabbis prescribe many things; [7] of which, that nothing be wanting to the curiosity of readers, I will adduce a few — which I once read, in the order [Seder] of the Talmudic volumes, in the tractate ראש השנה *Rosh haShanah;* from which, if the reader draw nothing else of good, he will at least learn utterly to despise the ridiculous fooleries of the Jews. They are these: The *Tutaphoth,* or *Thephilin* — that is, *Phylacteries,* or *Preservatories* — are little parchments in which certain Biblical sentences are written; and it is necessary that they be made from a domestic beast, or a clean wild animal, as the scripture says, *that the law of the Lord may be in your mouth.* One must also write with one's own right hand, even if one can use both hands. But if one can use only the left hand, that will be to him in place of the right. And [for] one who cannot make a straight line without a drawn line, it is permitted that he draw a line over which he may write. Now the little parchment ought to be whole, without a hole, lest the ink flow through it. And if one of the letters be effaced, and an untaught boy who is not stupid can [still] read it, it will be fit; if not, it will be unfit. Nor is it needful that a space be left above, except what suffices for the [upstroke] of the ל *lamed;* but below, let it be made according to the measure of the length of the ק *kof* [qof] and the ן *nun.* Further, they write the writing itself only from that side of the parchment where it touched the flesh. One must also enclose the writings with four lines around the circuit of the leaf; but it is not needful that lines be made between the written lines. And a man ought not to go through a cemetery when he has the *Thephilim* on his head, nor to approach it within a space of four cubits. In the place where the *Thephilin* — or also the book of the law — are, it is forbidden therein to give attention to Venus [conjugal intercourse], unless first he has carried them out, or laid them up within some vessel, and again laid up that vessel within another vessel; and when he has thus laid the vessel within a vessel, it will be permitted also to place them under the pillow, between the bed-covering and the bolster. These [things] the Jews, interpreting according to the dead letter, observe the commandment of the Lord with such superstition — whereas the better and truer sense of it is, that they keep the law of God with heart and mind, and fulfill it with hands and in deed. [8] Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion,* heresy 15, asserts that the Phylacteries of the Pharisees — concerning which Christ speaks in

the Gospel — were no kind of scripture, but certain broad marks [bands] of purple, bordering the conspicuous places of [their] cloaks; [9] which the very phrase of the Gospel also indicates, saying: [10] *FOR they broaden [their] phylacteries, and magnify the fringes of [their] cloaks* — understanding by *fringes* the edges and margins of the cloaks, but by *phylacteries* their purple marks, such as are set both on the breast and on the back of the Dalmatics [dalmatic vestments].

PHILIP THE APOSTLE [11] was allotted a Gospel by the Gnostic heretics — forged under his name — concerning which Epiphanius, in the first [book] of the *Panarion*, has this: *NOW the Gnostics bring forth, in the name of Philip the holy Apostle, a forged Gospel, in which it is written: "Since the Lord revealed to me what the soul must say, in that [moment] when it ascends to heaven, and how it must answer to each of the powers above — [saying:] For I have known myself, and have gathered myself together from every side, and have not sown children to the prince [archon], but have rooted out his roots, and have gathered the scattered members, and I know thee, who thou art. For I am of the [powers] above," &c.* Gelasius, distinction 15, lists the *Acts of Philip* in the catalog of the Apocrypha. [12]

THE WRITING OF THE PEOPLES. [13] Concerning this, according to the edition of the Seventy, in Psalm 86 [87] it is read: *THE LORD shall narrate* ἐν γραφῇ — that is, *in the writing of the peoples, and of these princes, who were born in her.* Euthymius, expounding this place, says: *Out of the writings OF THE PROPHETS, Christ shall teach [the things] which pertain to himself.* For Luke says: [14] *And the book of Isaiah the Prophet was delivered to him; and, the book being unrolled, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord [is] upon me,* and the rest. This kind of writing of the prophets, therefore, he [the Psalmist] calls *the writing of the peoples,* and *the writing of their princes* — as [being that] which was given both to the peoples of the Jews and to their princes, and was the proper possession of those who were born in her, that is, born in Sion. Thus he. According to the Hebrew verity it is thus read: *THE LORD numbered [them], writing down the peoples: this one was born in her forever.* Which the Jews thus expound: So great will be the future multitude of the peoples in Jerusalem, that the Messiah alone — in whose knowledge is written the number of all the Jews — will be able to number it: inasmuch as he was born in that city to reign in it always, and without end.

THE INSCRIPTION OF THE PONTIFICAL VESTMENT [15] was threefold: namely, on the head, on the shoulders, and on the breast. The first was displayed on a golden plate, fixed above the forehead of the Pontiff's mitre or diadem; on which was inscribed the name of God in four Hebrew letters — [16] י *Iod*, ה *he*, ו *vau*, ה *he* — which is reckoned ineffable by the Hebrews. The second writing two huge emeralds contained, which the Pontiff wore one on each shoulder, enclosed and bound in gold: on the right of which were engraved the six names of the elder Patriarchs — that is, Judah, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Naphtali, Dan; but on the left, the other six names of the later Patriarchs — namely, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun, Manasseh, Ephraim, Benjamin. The third writing the Pontiff bore before him upon [his] breast, in a certain square jewel [breastplate], of gold and four-

[→ *four [colors] interwoven* (qua-[tuor coloribus])]

[1] Deut. 11:14 [2] Deut. 11:15 [3] Deut. 11:16 [4] Deut. 11:17 [5] Deut. 11:18 [6] Deut. 11:19-20 [7] The superstitious rite which the Jews observed in writing their Thephilim [8] The true sense of the commandment, which the Jews wrongly understood [9] What the phylacteries of the Pharisees were, on the evidence of Epiphanius [10] Matt. 23 [11] The Gnostics forged a Gospel of Philip [12] The Acts of Philip are apocryphal [13] Ps. 86:6 [14] Luke 4:17; Isa. 61:1 [15] The threefold inscription of the pontifical vestment [16] Exod. 28

*(PDF p. 109 — the **source-transition page,** bridging the base edition and the margin-rich edition (rich PDF p. 115–116, printed folio 92). It concludes the cosmic allegory of the pontifical vesture, treats **THE NAME OF GOD** (the ineffable Tetragrammaton), and opens **PONTIUS PILATE** (the title INRI set over the cross). From here forward the translation is made directly from the margin-rich edition, one of its pages per file. Running heads: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE / LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …of gold and four] colors interwoven, which was called the *Rational* [breastplate]: into which were inserted twelve stones of diverse color, of marvelous size and price, in four rows; so that in each little row three stones were set, and on each of the stones one of the twelve names of the patriarchs, according to their ages [order of birth], was written. The causes of these inscriptions, and their mystical significations, the author of the book of Wisdom — touching [them] in very few words — [1] states thus: [2] *UPON the vesture, [namely] the* poderis *[long robe] which Aaron had, was the whole world; and the great deeds of the fathers were graven in the four rows of stones; and the magnificence of God was written in the diadem of his head.* Philo, in the third book *On the Life of Moses*, and in the second book *On Monarchy;* Josephus, in the third book of the *Antiquities;* and Jerome, in the epistle to Fabiola — beginning somewhat further back, and unfolding the matter more amply — hand down the occasions of these inscriptions, and their significations, to be of this kind.

The whole vesture of the Pontiff [3] consisted of six ornaments — that is, of two tunics, the thorax [breastpiece], the necklace, the girdle, and the diadem. Now of the two Tunics, [4] the inner was a linen [garment] of the whitest byssus [fine linen]; the outer wholly of hyacinth [blue], with little bells and golden pomegranates hung about its lowest hem. The Thorax, [5] or *superhumeral* [ephod], was interwoven of four colors — namely hyacinth, byssus, scarlet, and purple — and of gold. The Necklace, [6] which was also called the *Rational,* distinguished with twelve gems, hung from the neck of the Pontiff before [his] breast. The Diadem, [7] or *Thiara,* adorned with a golden plate and inscribed with the name of God, was placed upon the head of the Pontiff: whose thorax the Girdle, [8] let down about the breast even to the ankles, bound fast. This was the vesture of the Pontiff.

But what it signifies — both as a whole and by [its] parts — is this. [9] The whole garment carries back the likeness of the whole world: so that the Pontiff, wearing upon [his] vestments the image of the whole universe, may know himself to be the mediator of the whole world before God; and may perform the divine service not only for [his] familiar friends and fellow-citizens, but for the whole human race, and for all the parts of nature — [both] heaven and the elements — either rendering acts of thanksgiving, or offering supplications to God the creator of all. Moreover, [that he may know] that he ought to study to express, by [his] life, doctrine, and virtues, the order, adornment, and harmony of the whole world, lacking in no respect; and to become, in a manner, a *microcosm* — that is, a little world — thus representing the likeness of the greater world in [his] manners, even as he bears it upon [his] vestments. But the several parts of the vestment represent the several parts of the universe. The Byssine Tunic, [10] because byssus is engendered from the earth, shows the earth. The Hyacinthine Tunic [11] demonstrates the air — stretched out from the lunar orb even to the lands — on account of the likeness of [its] color. The sound of the little bells hanging from it, and their golden gleam, indicate [12] the lightnings and thunders begotten in the air. The ornament of the Thorax, [13] resplendent with gems, figures the beauty of the starry heaven: for the two round emeralds on each shoulder bear the type of the Sun and the Moon — the [luminary] of the one being of the day, of the other of the night. In the Rational, the twelve gems of divers color, distributed three by three into four rows, hint to us the zodiac [sign-bearing] circle, divided into four parts, each consisting of three signs. The Girdle has the pattern of the equinoctial circle, which the astronomers call the girdle of the world.

But the Diadem, [14] which is a royal ensign, set upon the highest summit of the whole body, and containing the name of God on a golden plate, hints at the empyrean heaven and the seat of God — [a seat] loftier than the whole compass of created things — from which the King of kings, presiding over all, most wisely governs all the [things] that are below. The Diadem also signifies, [15] overtopping every ornament of the Pontiff, that the power and honor of the high priesthood is more eminent not only than [that] of private men, but even than [that] of all kings and emperors of the world. These are the enigmas which lie hidden beneath the Pontifical vesture: now let us see what his inscriptions mean.

THE NAME OF GOD, [16] graven upon the golden plate — which the Greeks call τετραγράμματον, that is, *Quadriliteral* [four-lettered], because it is written with these four letters, יהוה — is reckoned ineffable among the Hebrews: either because the letters which compose the name are voiceless, and can of themselves express no articulate utterance; or on account of reverence for the divine majesty, whose most proper name they think it not lawful either to hear or to name. Whence, as often as it falls [to them] to read it in the sacred letters, they pronounce [it] by another name — that is, *Adonai*, which is interpreted *Lord.* Clemens of Alexandria, in the fifth book of the *Stromata,* says that the Hebrew utterance of this name יהוה is [17] *IEHOVA;* which, according to him also, is expounded, *He who is, and who shall be.* Theodoret, in the fifteenth question on Exodus, says that the expression of the same name is, among the Samaritans, *Iaue;* but among the Jews, *Ia.* Jerome, in the exposition of the eighth Psalm, explains this same name by the word *Iaho.* But Philo asserts that this very name *Iehova* — which signifies *Being,* or *He who is* — is most justly attributed to God; because no word agrees with God more reasonably and more truly than *To Be.* For thus He named Himself, when, to Moses asking, *What is thy name?* He answered: [18] *I am, who am;* or, as the Hebrew has it, אני אהיה אשר אהיה *Ani eheieh, ascer eheieh,* that is, *I will be, who will be* — which is the same [thing] among the Hebrews, to whom it is proper to use futures for presents. And from this place Augustine, bishop of Chisamus [Chisamensis], judges [19] the name *Tetragrammaton* to have been derived — [the name] whereby the Divinity named itself from *being*: because, in the first utterance of the substantive verb *Is,* the Hebrews thus write היה *haia,* that is, *He was;* to which, in the future of the third person, *iod* is added, and it becomes יהיה *iheieh,* that is, *He shall be.* And this very [word] is the quadriliteral name — only [with] the *iod* drawn out, so that it becomes *vau* [vav]; and the same bishop thinks that in the place of that which is now *vau,* there was [formerly] *iod,* because the passage from *iod* to *vau* is easy, on account of the very great affinity of the like letters. The name of Being, therefore, graven on the golden plate, indicates that supreme and greatest Being of all to be the principle and the bond of all the things whose images the Pontiff puts on — containing and constraining all the parts of the universe, and not suffering them to be dissolved or to slip away, nor anything to be in the world which could be without His aid; who is the fullness of all essence and of all life, from whom all things live, are moved, and have proceeded; and who embraces the whole of being in Himself, as it were a certain infinite and immense sea of essence; which indeed always was, and is, and always shall be — nay rather, always *is.* For *Was,* or *Shall be,* are divisions of fluxile [ever-flowing] nature and of time; but God transcends the reckoning both of nature and of time. Which [truth] those ancient Egyptians also — heathen though they were — acknowledging, [20] described God in their temples (as Eusebius, in the eleventh book of the *Preparation for the Gospel,* is witness) with these words: *I AM THAT WHICH WAS, WHICH IS, AND WHICH SHALL BE. MY VEIL NO ONE HAS EVER UNCOVERED.* This, then, is what the name of God impressed upon the plate signified.

Moreover, the names of the twelve sons of Israel were graven on twelve gems before the breast in the Rational, and again on two emeralds upon the shoulders of the Pontiff — [21] as Moses says, *for a memorial;* that is, that the high priest, entering the holy of holies, might remember that he bears upon [his] shoulders the sins especially of his own people, and might make expiations and sacrifices first for it, then for the other nations. Again, these same names, written on the front part of the Thorax — which designates heaven — mystically show that the names alone of the sons of Israel, and of those who descend from them not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit, the promise, and the inheritance of faith, are written in the heavens; and that to them alone pertains that most welcome announcement of the Savior: [22] *REJOICE THAT YOUR NAMES ARE WRITTEN IN HEAVEN.* And this is what Solomon said, [23] that the *great deeds* of the fathers were described in the Rational — that is, that the magnificent and illustrious deeds of the patriarchs, and of their spiritual posterity, were written in the heavens (whereof the Rational was the exemplar), not with ink, nor as men are wont to write, but in the everlasting memory of God: in that manner in which God is wont to write in the book of Life those whom He willed to be enrolled citizens of the eternal city. And the six names of the patriarchs engraved on the emeralds of each shoulder — [the emeralds] signifying the Sun and

the Moon — indicate the eternity of the seed of Israel, [a seed] destined to endure as long as the everlasting stars of the Sun and Moon shall remain. See what we have noted concerning the Pontifical vesture in the third book, in the *Sciographic [Shadow-drawn] Method of divine Scripture,* where we have also set a picture of the several parts of the pontifical adornment.

PONTIUS PILATE, governor of Judaea, when he had condemned our Savior — the cause unpleaded — to gratify the Jews, and, wishing to show that he had done it for a weighty cause and, beyond the ordinary order of law, most justly, set upon His neck the title and cause of Christ's condemnation, expressed most briefly in four words, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, in this manner: [24]

> ישוע הנצרי מלך היהודים
>
> ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ.
>
> *JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS.*

This title Pilate — in his own judgment most ignominious, but in very truth most glorious —

[→ *in-*]

[1] The reason for the threefold inscription of the pontifical vestment [2] Wisd. 18:24 [3] Description of the pontifical vesture [4] The two tunics [5] The thorax [6] The necklace [7] The diadem [8] The girdle [9] The whole vestment of the Pontiff signified the whole world [10] The byssine tunic signified the earth [11] The hyacinthine tunic, the air [12] The little bells signified the lightnings [13] The ornament of the thorax figured the starry heaven [14] The diadem signified the empyrean heaven [15] The dignity of the high priesthood is more excellent than every imperial and royal dignity [16] Why the Name of God (the Tetragrammaton) is called ineffable [17] In what manner the name Jehovah ought to be pronounced [18] Exod. 3:14 [19] Whence the name Tetragrammaton is derived [20] The Egyptians acknowledged that God transcends the reckoning of nature and time [21] A notable doctrine [22] Luke 10:20 [23] Wisd. 18:24 [24] John 19:19

---

*(Rich PDF p. 117 — printed folio 100, recto. **PONTIUS PILATE** concluded: the meaning of the title on the cross (*Quod scripsi, scripsi*), Helena's finding of the cross, the fabricated **Acts of Pilate** (Maximinus) refuted by chronology, and Pilate's genuine letter to Tiberius — found in the Vatican archive — reporting Christ's miracles and resurrection; Tertullian on Tiberius; Pilate banished to Lyons. Then **PROCHORUS**, the deacon said to have written John's Gospel on Patmos. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …but in very truth most glorious —] devised as an excuse and defense of the detestable sentence pronounced by him against Jesus: as it were, an apology for his own injustice, [1] written to all the nations of the whole world in three tongues, confident that he could defend himself before all, as though he had put to death a seditious [man], an aspirant to kingship, and an enemy of the Roman empire. But the Holy Spirit, who had impelled Pilate to this writing, intended [2] something far otherwise — namely, to signify by this title the name and title of the kingdom which Christ, through His cross, was soon to receive over all the Jews; that is, according to the interpretation of the Jewish name, over all who confess [Him] — [all] who throughout the whole world confess and worship the true God — and [to signify] that those nations especially would pass under the empire of Christ whose tongues were included in the title of His kingdom. Whence also, when the Jews strove to change the title, Pilate, saying [3] *WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN, I HAVE WRITTEN,* firmly resisted — God so willing it, [God] who had decreed that the title of Christ's kingdom should remain unchangeable and uncorrupted forever. This title, still whole after three hundred and thirty years, [4] found together with the Lord's cross by Helena, mother of Constantine, among the ruins of the city of Jerusalem, Rufinus records in the tenth book of the *Ecclesiastical History,* chapter eight.

THERE ARE CARRIED ABOUT also certain other [writings] under the name of Pilate, among which the first place is held by the ACTS OF PILATE — [5] which, as Eusebius relates in the ninth book of the *Ecclesiastical History,* chapter 4, were forged by the enemies of the Christian name, by the zeal and effort of the emperor Maximinus; who, when he wished to seem to persecute the Christians for just causes, ordered certain Acts to be published abroad — as though composed before Pilate concerning our Savior — in which every kind of blasphemy against Christ was heaped up. These acts he commanded, by a public edict, to be

sent through all the provinces of his realm, and to be set up in every city, in the villages, and even in the fields; he also ordered them to be handed to the schoolmasters of boys, so that — in place of the [lessons] they are wont to dictate for meditating or learning by heart — they should deliver these to the boys to be committed to memory, and recited all day long in the schools, and chanted at the crossroads. This so impudent forgery Eusebius, in the first [book] of the same history, chapter 9, easily refutes from the reckoning of the times. For [these] false Acts of Pilate record the time of the crime committed against the Savior as the fourth consulate of Tiberius — which was the seventh year of his reign — at which time [Eusebius] evidently shows that Pilate had not even yet been sent to the procuratorship of Judaea, on the testimony of Josephus, [6] a most approved historian, who most plainly indicates that Pilate took up the procuratorship of Judaea [7] in the twelfth year of Tiberius Caesar — which also agrees with the Gospel of Luke. [8]

Epiphanius, in the second [book] of the *Panarion,* teaches that there were also certain Acts of Pilate, which the Quartadeciman heretics used, building on them [the claim] that Pascha must always be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the moon of the month of March, because in those same Acts it is written that our Savior suffered on the twenty-fourth day of March. Eusebius, in the second book of the ecclesiastical history, hands down [9] that Pilate, after the Lord's resurrection, wrote to Tiberius the emperor [a letter] which spread a happy report throughout all Syria concerning the resurrection of Christ, and His miracles, and the opinion of His divinity; the copy of which letter — omitted by Eusebius, but found by us among the ancient monuments of the Vatican Library — is this:

Pontius Pilate to Claudius Tiberius Nero, emperor, greeting.

> *LATELY it has come to pass — of which thing I myself can be a witness — that the Jews, through envy, have by a cruel condemnation destroyed themselves and all their posterity. For whereas, out of the promises of the oracles received on the authority of their forefathers, they were expecting this — that their God would send [one] by a young virgin, who should by right be called their king — [God] sent Him, I being present, into Judaea. [10] He (as is known to all) restored sight to the blind, cleansed lepers, healed the palsied [those slack in [their] sinews]. They saw also that He drove out demons, and freed those beset by unclean spirits, and likewise raised the dead out of the very sepulchres; the whirlwinds of the winds obeyed Him; He walked upon the sea with dry feet; and He did very many other miracles besides — so that even commonly, among the Jews and the people, He was called the Son of God. But the chief priests, stirred by rivalry and spite, opposed Him; and having seized Him, delivered Him to me, making Him out guilty by feigned crimes, calling Him a magician and a deserter and gainsayer of their law. [11] Led astray by these persuasions, I gave credit to their complaints, and delivered Him, scourged, to them, that they might deal with Him according to their pleasure. They crucified Him, therefore, and set guards over the sepulchre in which He was laid — among whom also were some of my [own] soldiers — who on the third day saw Him rising from the dead. But the wickedness of the Jews blazed up the more at this deed: and they counted out a great sum of money to the soldiers themselves, that they should give out that His disciples had stolen the body by night; and these [soldiers] indeed took the money, yet nonetheless everywhere publicly professed, and bear witness, that they had seen visions of Angels, and that that Jesus had truly risen from the dead. These things I have written for this cause: that no one should give credit to the trifles and lies of the Jews, if they should speak otherwise of the matter [as] done. Farewell.*

TERTULLIAN, in the *Apologeticus,* writes [12] that the emperor Tiberius, when he had heard these [things] concerning Christ's miracles out of Syria, referred [them] to the senate with the prerogative of his own vote, that Christ might be received among the gods of the Romans; and when the Senate would not approve it, Caesar remained in his opinion, threatening peril to the accusers of the Christians.

PETER COMESTOR, in the *Scholastic History,* relates [13] that Pilate, accused before Caesar concerning the unjust slaughter of the Jews and [the plundering] of the sacred treasury of Jerusalem (which is called *Corban*), was by him banished to Lyons — which city was his birthplace [14] — that there, in the hatred and ignominy of his own race, he might die inglorious.

PROCHORUS, one of the seven deacons whom Luke in the Acts reports to have been chosen by the Apostles, is said to have written [15] the Gospel of John on the island of Patmos. Simon Metaphrastes attests this, in the life of John, in these words: *JOHN bids a certain one of the seven deacons to follow him — this was Prochorus. And he takes the summit of the mountain, and is raised upright after the manner of Samuel, and is figured like Moses with hands uplifted, and withdraws [his] mind from the senses: then dreadful thunders, ter-*

[→ *-rors* (terrores)]

---

[1] An apology for Pilate's injustice [2] What the title of the cross signified [3] John 19:22 [4] When the cross of Christ was found by Helena, mother of Constantine [5] The Acts of Pilate, fabricated by the emperor Maximinus [6] Josephus, Antiquities, bk. 18 [7] In what year of Tiberius Pilate took up the procuratorship of Judaea [8] Luke 3:1 [9] Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. 2.2) asserts that Pilate wrote to the emperor Tiberius concerning Christ [10] Pilate recounts the various miracles of Christ [11] Pilate's testimony against the Jews, on behalf of Christ the Lord [12] The benevolence of the emperor Tiberius toward Christ and the Christians [13] Pilate, for the slaying of Christ the Lord, banished by the Emperor to Lyons [14] The common opinion is that Pilate was born in the Dauphiné, on the Rhône, not far from Saint-Vallier [15] Where and by whom the Gospel of John was written

---

(Rich PDF p. 118 — printed folio 101, verso. ***PROCHORUS*** *concluded (writing John's Gospel at Patmos);* ***PTOLEMY PHILOPATOR****'s two letters (3 Macc.);* ***THE WRITING-TABLET of Zacharias*** *(Luke 1:63 — the* Pugillar*, Prudentius's verses on Cassian, the public register, Herod's burning of the Jewish annals). Then letter* ***R****:* ***THE BOOK OF KINGS*** *(*Sepher hammelachim*, the lost source-book) and* ***THE BILL OF DIVORCE*** *(God's repudiation of the Synagogue, Isa 50). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …then dreadful thunders,] terrors, and lightnings like to those which had before befallen Moses when he received the law, took place; at last the thunders are expressed into a [human] voice, and clearly resound: *In the beginning was the Word*, and so forth. At which [voice] Prochorus — who at first had fallen, as it were lifeless with fear — his dread a little repressed, began with trembling hand to write his [John's] words from the mouth and voice of John the Theologian (a voice which was to him [as] thunder), thus continuing until he had completed the whole gospel. But Athanasius, in the Synopsis, thinks [1] the Gospel of John was written at Ephesus by Gaius.

PTOLEMY PHILOPATOR, fourth king of Egypt, wrote to the governors of his kingdom two letters — one against the Jews, the other for the Jews — the copy of which is extant in the third [book] of Maccabees, chapters 3 and 7.

THE WRITING-TABLET OF ZACHARIAS. Luke, making mention of this, [2] said: *AND asking for a writing-tablet, he wrote, saying, John is his name.* Now the *Pugillar* [writing-tablet] — which the Greeks call πινακίδιον — is a little tablet smeared with wax, on which one writes with a stylus. Prudentius, in the *Peristephanon*, describing the martyrdom of Cassian (who, cut to pieces little by little by the writing-tablets and styli of his own pupils, perished), expressed the form and use [3] of the writing-tablet and of the stylus (with which the tablets were written upon) in these verses:

> *Countless boys around [him] — a piteous sight —*
>
> *transfixed [his] pierced limbs with [their] little styli.*
>
> *Hence the tablets, wont to outrun the wax;*
>
> *noting the school's murmur, they had written [their lessons].*
>
> *Some hurl stones, and break the tablets upon [his] face;*
>
> *the wood, its surface struck back, flies asunder.*
>
> *The waxed box-wood [tablets] crackle, dashed on [his] bleeding cheeks,*
>
> *and the short swelling page grows red from the blow.*
>
> *Then others brandish goads and iron points —*

[there] where the wax is written with ploughed furrows,

and where the cut letter-strokes are erased; and the field of the rough surface,

shining anew, is made fresh again.

There are those who think [4] that this Writing-tablet asked for by Zacharias was a public register, diligently kept by the scribes and priests in the synagogue, in which the names, tribes, and parents of circumcised infants — together with the year, month, and day of the circumcision — were noted, for the retaining of certainty and assurance both of the origin and of the age of each. This custom is still observed [5] in many cities of Italy: [namely] that the names and times of baptized infants are written down by the parish priests who baptized them, in the authentic volume of the parish. Nor is [the opinion] of these far from what Eusebius, out of Julius Africanus, relates in the first [book] of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 7 — namely, that the Hebrews were accustomed to keep publicly, in the more secret archives of the temple, certain books in which were contained the origins of whatsoever Jews (even of those descended from foreigners) and the lineages and genealogies of all the families: which [books] Herod, thinking himself convicted by them of the ignobility of his own race, burned with flames; [6] yet he could not utterly abolish them, since many — and especially those whom a nobility handed down from [their] forefathers put in mind [of it] — kept books of this kind copied out at home. Among which the genealogy of our Savior Jesus was found closely similar to those [things] which are had in the Gospel.

R.

THE BOOK OF KINGS, in Hebrew ספר המלכים *Sepher hammelachim,* is cited in 2 Paralipomenon, chapter 24. [7] That this is not that work which is contained under the name of the Four Books of Kings in the sacred Bible, the last period [sentence] of that same chapter shows clearly enough, [8] running thus: *NOW [concerning] the sons of Joash, and the great sum of money which had been gathered under him, and the repairing of the house of God — these are written more diligently in the book of Kings.* Which words certainly cannot be referred to the [canonical] history of Kings; wherein it is so far [otherwise] — that the [things] narrated in the present chapter of Paralipomenon should be related more fully and more exactly — that some [things] are even omitted in it out of those which are here either recorded or at least indicated. This book, therefore, is (as I judge) plainly diverse from the canonical Books of Kings. And the author of the third volume of Esdras seems to feel the same, who, distinguishing this [book] from those by a manifest difference, writes thus in the first chapter of his work: [9] *AND these [things] were prescribed [written down before] in the book of the histories of the kings of Judah; and the several deeds and acts of Josiah, and his glory, and his understanding in the law of the Lord; both the [things] done by him, and those which are not written in the book of the Kings of Israel,* &c. Now this book is cited both in the two latter volumes of Kings, and in the latter book of Paralipomenon, in almost every chapter, once and again, and with the words of the title a little varied: sometimes it is called *the Book of the words, or of the discourses, or of the days of the kings of Judah;* sometimes *the Book of the discourses of the days of the Kings of Israel;* and at times, too, by the joined title of both together, it is called *the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel* — in which, by an ampler narration, all and singular the deeds of the Kings of Judah and Israel had been more brilliantly set in order by a most diligent author, whose name no less than [his] work devouring time has consumed, [10] leaving only, for the memory of posterity, those [things] which — in the second [book] of Paralipomenon, and in the second and third books of Kings — were gathered into a short compendium by an uncertain abridger, whom some think to be Jeremiah, others Esdras.

THE BILL OF DIVORCE, a book delivered by God to the mother of the Jews, is the execution of the divine reprobation against the Jewish synagogue. Concerning which, of old — when the Jews, on account of [their] nefarious crimes, had been repudiated by God and given into the servitude of barbarous nations — they were wont, by a certain popular kind of complaint, under the parable of a book of divorce, to accuse [11]

God as fickle, changeable, and least of all consistent with Himself: [complaining] that He had suddenly, with changed purpose of mind, repudiated and cast off the mother and Jewish synagogue joined to Himself in matrimony and most ardently beloved for a long time — and that provoked or challenged by no fault of hers, but out of the sole and mere choice of a new will; after the manner of a carnal man who of his own accord dismisses a wife sought with ardent desire and long kept, for no other cause than that her long and continual companionship and abundance has brought upon him satiety and loathing of the conjugal life. [12]

[→ *From [which]* (A quibus)]

---

[1] The opinion of Athanasius concerning the scribe of St. John [2] Luke 1:63 [3] What the form and use of the writing-tablet and stylus were [4] The writing-tablet which Zacharias asked for was a public register [5] The custom of keeping written registers is to be commended [6] The annals of the Jews burned by Herod, and by what means this loss was remedied [7] What the Book of Kings cited in 2 Paralipomenon is [8] 2 Paral. 24:27 [9] 3 Esdras 1:33 [10] The Book of Kings cited in the Scriptures perished through the injury of time [11] The unjust complaint of the Jews concerning God [12] Isa. 50:1-2

(Rich PDF p. 119 — printed folio 102, recto. ***THE BILL OF DIVORCE*** *continued: the prophets (Isa 50; Jer 3; Hos 2; Isa 57) refer the Synagogue's rejection to her own ingratitude, not to God's mere will; Paul (Rom 11) and Jeremiah/Hosea seem to deny any repudiation at all; Sixtus resolves it by distinguishing* ***eternal*** *from* ***temporal*** *reprobation. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …From] which so iniquitous accusations God, clearing Himself through Isaiah, says: *WHO is (says He) the book of divorce of your mother, whereby I put her away? For behold, you are sold in your iniquities, and in your crimes have I put away your mother; because I came, and there was no man; I called, and there was none to answer* — showing forsooth by these words [1] that the occasions and causes of the Hebrew reprobation and repudiation are not to be referred to His own good pleasure of the divine will, but rather to the perfidious ingratitude of the adulterous synagogue, which — the fidelity of the marriage-bed being violated, and the worship of God her spouse cast off — had prostituted herself to the adulterous gods of all nations, and had drawn God, well-nigh unwilling, to the book of divorce by the foulness of her fornications. Which God also, confirming through Jeremiah, says: [2] *BECAUSE the rebel Israel had committed adultery, I had put her away, and had given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.* And again, repeating the same through Hosea, He says: [3] *JUDGE your mother, judge; for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband.* And again in Isaiah, upbraiding the children of Israel with the adulteries of [their] shameless mother, He says: [4] *COME hither, you sons of the sorceress, the seed of the adulterer and of the harlot.* And a little after, in the same chapter, turning His speech to their mother, He subjoins: [5] *UPON a lofty and high mountain you have set your bed, and thither you went up to offer victims; and behind the door and behind the post you have set up your memorial; and beside me you uncovered yourself, and received adulterers; you enlarged your bed, and made a covenant with them; you loved their bed with open hand; and you adorned yourself with royal ointment, and multiplied your perfumes; you sent your messengers far off, and were debased even to hell.* By which words God plainly demonstrates [6] that not without cause, nor out of the mere sentence of His own mind, but out of the ignominy of the Jewish baseness, did He cast off the Synagogue, [which had] deserved ill of Him. For God reprobates no one at all [7] unless a fault has first gone before in him; nor is He an avenger before someone is a sinner.

BUT to these [things], which are drawn from those prophets concerning the occasion and cause of the Jewish repudiation and reprobation, the Apostle Paul seems not a little to be at variance — [8] who, in the Epistle to the Romans, discoursing of this very reprobation of the Jewish nation, refers the cause of this rejection not to the crimes and evil deserts of the Jews, but to the very good pleasure of the divine will so willing it: [a will] which, with no inspection made of human [merits], apart from any inspection of [their] vices or virtues, receives into favor whom it wills and as it wills, and hates, rejects, and repudiates whom it wills and as it wills — even the undeserving. Which sentence indeed fights diametrically with the sayings of the Prophets set down above.

AGAIN, the same Paul, in another place of the same epistle, seems to have utterly taken away not only the [aforesaid] cause of the Jewish reprobation, but even the reprobation itself of the Jewish nation, when he thus spoke: [9] *I SAY then, has God cast off his people? God forbid: for I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God has not cast off his people, whom he foreknew* — as if he should say: He is unchangeable, nor does He any more retract what He once decreed.

SINCE, therefore, according to His eternal prescience He has chosen for Himself the nation of the Hebrews as a peculiar [people], it cannot come to pass that God should repudiate and cast it off — which God Himself also, in Jeremiah, taking an argument from impossibilities, most constantly confirms, in these words: [10] *THUS says the Lord: If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth beneath be searched out, then also will I cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done.* [11] *Thus says the Lord, who gives the Sun for the light of the day, the order of the Moon and of the stars for the light of the night: If these laws shall fail before me, then also shall the seed of Israel fail, so as not to be a nation before me all the days.* And, what is even much more admirable, God Himself, through Hosea, affirms that He is so far from the repudiation of the Jewish nation that He even promises to take her to Himself as a perpetual spouse, saying: [12] *I WILL espouse you to myself forever: and I will espouse you to me in justice, and in judgment, and in mercy, and in compassions; and I will espouse you to me in faith.* Which words indeed seem most firmly to establish that the Hebrew nation was neither at any time repudiated, nor thereafter to be repudiated.

FOR the solution of this controversy it is needful to know that the divine reprobation, or divorce, is twofold — [13] namely, eternal and temporal. Eternal divorce [14] is the order and disposition of the divine providence concerning those whom God has foreknown [as] to be excluded forever from the nuptials of the celestial Lamb, and from the fellowship and everlasting fruition of the divine Spouse. Temporal divorce [15] is the rejection whereby God, for a time, repudiates certain [persons] — as much of the number of those to be saved as of the number of those to be damned — and temporally excludes and rejects [them] from the participation of His goods, whether spiritual or corporal. Of the temporal casting-off of spiritual goods Jonas complained, when he said: [16] *I AM cast away from the sight of your eyes;* and David, dreading the same casting-off, was saying: [17] *CAST me not away from your face, and take not your holy Spirit from me.* And in another psalm: [18] *I said in the excess of my mind, I am cast away from the face of your eyes.* Of the divorce from temporal goods the same David says: [19] *WHY have you repelled me? and why do I go sorrowful, while the enemy afflicts me?* And Jeremiah, in the Lamentations, embracing both divorces — the eternal as well as the temporal — in one sentence, says: [20] *THE Lord will not cast off forever; for if he has cast off, he will also have mercy.*

SINCE, therefore, the divorce is twofold, of each

[→ *of each* (de unoquo[que])]

---

[1] The cause of the Hebrew repudiation is to be referred to the ingratitude of the synagogue [2] Jer. 3:8 [3] Hosea 2:2 [4] Isa. 57:3 [5] Isa. 57:7-9 [6] Why the Synagogue was rejected by God [7] Reprobation happens on account of a preceding fault [8] An argument from the Epistle to the Romans against the [aforesaid] cause [9] Rom. 11:1 [10] Jer. 31:37 [11] Jer. 31:35-36 [12] Hosea 2:19-20 [13] The divine reprobation is twofold [14] What eternal reprobation is [15] What temporal reprobation is [16] Jonah 2:4 [17] Ps. 50:13 [18] Ps. 30:23 [19] Ps. 42:2 [20] Lam. 3:31-32

(Rich PDF p. 120 — printed folio 103, verso. ***THE BILL OF DIVORCE*** *(of the Synagogue) concluded: eternal versus temporal reprobation applied to the Jews; the temporal cause = their own incredulity and ingratitude (Rom 9; Hos 13; the Bridegroom's wooing of the adulterous synagogue). Then* ***THE BILL OF HUMAN DIVORCE*** *(*Sepher cherithuth */ the* get, *Deut 24) with the Rabbinic formula of Moses of Coucy. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …Of each] of them two [things] can be particularly investigated — namely, whether the penalty of each divorce reaches to the whole race of the Jews, and what were the causes of each divorce.

IN THE FIRST place, if we ask whether the whole Jewish nation has been cast off by eternal divorce, [1] Paul answers: *God forbid.* As if he should say: although out of the Jews an innumerable multitude (as the Prophets everywhere testify) has been repudiated by God with eternal reprobation, yet God forbid that I should believe the whole seed of Israel condemned to the penalty of eternal divorce: for I also am an Israelite, [2] of the tribe of Benjamin; for God has not cast off his people, whom he foreknew. But if anyone should ask whether temporal divorce [3] excludes the whole Jewish multitude from God utterly, or has at some time excluded [it], it must be answered that temporal divorce — as regards the casting-off from the temporal goods which God had granted to the Synagogue as it were a dowry — does comprehend the whole Jewish nation. For God has temporally cast off all — the good as well as the bad, the elect as well as the reprobate [4] — and has cast [them] out of the synagogue, out of the temple, out of the kingdom, and out of the possession of the promised land, into captivity and servitude. But as regards spiritual goods, and the grace of present justice, not all have been repudiated.

IN THE SECOND place, if we desire to know what was the cause why the greater part of the Jews has been cast off by perpetual divorce, [5] we ought to consider that, in the whole progress of the Jewish repudiation, certain degrees are prior and eternal, but certain [are] later and temporal — or (what is the same) that in the whole work of that divorce the beginning and the completion are to be regarded. If we consider the beginning, or the prior and eternal degrees — which are hatred, rejection, and repudiation, opposed in a privative manner to love, election, and predestination — Paul answers that the cause why the Jews are cast off eternally is none, save the good pleasure of the divine will; and he proves it by the example of the reprobation of Esau, concerning whom, before he was born or had done anything of evil — not out of foreseen evil works, but out of the choice of His own will — God said: [6] *ESAU I have hated; and the elder shall serve the younger.* But if we look to the later, temporal degrees, and to the last completion of the eternal repudiation [7] (which is concluded in eternal damnation), the cause of this final outcome is in the Jews — namely, their incredulity, arrogance, ingratitude, and obstinacy: out of which they have fallen into the damnation of perpetual perdition, God saying to them through Hosea the Prophet: [8] *THY perdition [is] from thyself, O Israel; only from me [is] thy help.* Which Paul likewise demonstrated when, proposing that question — Why Israel did not deserve to be justified — he said: [9] *WHAT then shall we say? that Israel, following the law of justice, is not come unto the law of justice.* Wherefore? And answering, he added: [10] *Because [it was] not by faith, but as it were by works: for they stumbled at the stumbling-stone, and the rock of scandal* — because they did not believe that they could be justified through Christ, who is the rock of offense, against which they, by their own incredulity, dashed themselves: and for that cause they have been repudiated forever.

FINALLY, if it be asked whence [comes] the cause of the temporal divorce of the Jews — [11] that is, why God has dismissed from Himself the Jewish race, and cast off in His fury the whole seed of Israel, and given it for a prey and for a plundering to all the nations — God Himself answers through Jeremiah: [12] *Because the rebel Israel has committed adultery, I had dismissed her, and had given her a bill of divorce.* And again through Isaiah: [13] *In your iniquities are you sold, and in your crimes have I dismissed your mother; because I came, and there was no man; I called, and there was none to hear.* The Bridegroom Himself came; He called the adulterous synagogue; He provoked [her] with benefits, invited [her] with blandishments, entreated [her] with prayers, deterred [her] with threats, goaded [her] with scourges, that — the adulterer forsaken — she might return to Him. He sent prayers before, when, speaking out of the mouth of Jeremiah and Hosea, He said: [14] *IT IS commonly said: If a man dismiss his wife, and she, departing from him, marry another man, shall he return to her any more? but you have fornicated with many lovers: yet return to me, says the Lord, and I will espouse you* [15] *to me forever, and in mercy, and in compassions.* Threats He added, when He spoke to her — through Hosea, to [her] sons — saying: [16] *Judge your mother, judge; for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband: let her put away her fornications from her face, and her adultery from between her breasts; lest perhaps I strip her naked, and set her as in the day of her nativity, and make her as a*

wilderness, and set her as a trackless land, and slay her with thirst; and I will not have mercy on her children, for they are the children of fornication: for their mother has committed fornication. Scourges, finally, He applied, when He afflicted her with various captivities; but when she could by no means be brought — neither by sweet nor by bitter [things] — to forsake the adulterers utterly and to cleave perseveringly to God her Spouse, at length, by the desert of her ingratitude, [17] she was cast off by her Spouse with a temporal divorce, for perpetual time.

THE BILL OF HUMAN DIVORCE, in Hebrew ספר כריתות *Sepher cherithuth*, but in Greek according to the Seventy interpreters βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, is the book which a husband was bound by law to hand to a wife soon to be dismissed — [the law] which Moses promulgated [18] in the twenty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy in these words: [19] *IF a man take a wife, and have her, and she find not favor before his eyes on account of some foulness, he shall write a bill of divorce, and shall give it into her hand, and shall send her away out of his house. And when, having departed, she has married another husband, and he also hates her, and has given her a bill of divorce, and has sent her away out of his house, or is indeed dead, the former husband cannot take her again to wife: because she is polluted, and is become abominable before the Lord.* Thus Moses. This bill the Rabbis of the Hebrews call גט *ghet*, because it is, as it were, a witness of the divorce, in which the husband resigns all the right which he had over the wife. Now the Hebrews of our times use, in composing bills of this kind, a certain formula taken out of the book of the precepts of Rabbi Moses of Coucy [de Cozi], in well-nigh these words:

ON THE SIXTH [day] of the week, on the twelfth of the month Adar, in the year from the creation of the world five thousand three hun-

[→ *-dred[th]* (tercen[tesimo])]

[1] Whether the whole Jewish nation is cast off by eternal repudiation [2] Rom. 11:1 [3] Whether temporal repudiation excludes the whole Jewish nation from God [4] All the Jews cast out of the land of promise into servitude [5] The cause why the greater part of the Jews is cast off by perpetual repudiation [6] Rom. 9:13 [7] What the cause of the Jews' damnation is [8] Hosea 13:9 [9] Rom. 9 [10] Rom. 9:32 [11] What the cause of the temporal repudiation of the Jews is [12] Jer. 3:8 [13] Isa. 50:1-2 [14] Jer. 3:1 [15] Hosea 2:19 [16] Hosea 2:2-5 [17] The Jewish nation cast off by God on account of ingratitude [18] Moses promulgated the bill of divorce [19] Deut. 24:1-4

(Rich PDF p. 121 — printed folio 104, recto. ***THE BILL OF DIVORCE*** *concluded: a sample Jewish* get *(the Cremona formula); Christ's correction (Matt 19 — Moses's* permission *vs.* command*); why the bill was required (a curb, a remedy against a greater evil); Christian indissolubility (1 Cor 7; Augustine against Pollentius, renewed by the Calvinists); the Roman divorce custom (Paulus Aemilius; the imperial curbs; the Roman formula). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …five thousand three hun]dred and six, in the city of Cremona beside the river Po, in Italy. I, Samuel Carmina, son of Rabbi Daniel Sapharadi, of my own accord, and from [my] heart, and without any compulsion, dismiss from me Rachel, daughter of Rabbi Ezra Tarizol, and grant her license and power to depart at her own discretion, whithersoever it shall seem [good] to her, and that she may be married by any man; nor let anyone presume to hinder her. In testimony whereof I have given her this book of divorce, and the schedule of dismissal, and the seal of divorce, according to the constitution of Moses and of Israel, in the presence of the witnesses subscribed below: *Mardochai Gabirol; Helia Chaphet; Manuel Pandin.* [1]

THUS, therefore, the Jews believe that they rightly understand and piously observe the law concerning the bill of divorce, thinking that Moses commanded husbands to dismiss hateful wives for whatsoever cause, and to marry another. But Christ showed [2] that this law was not so to be understood, when — the Pharisees asking, in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, whether it was lawful for a man to dismiss his wife for whatsoever cause — He answered that it was not lawful for a man to separate those whom God had joined into one flesh. And again, when the Pharisees objected that Moses had commanded to give a bill and to dismiss the wife, He straightway added: [3] *MOSES, for the hardness of your heart, permitted you to dismiss*

your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, that whosoever shall dismiss his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, commits adultery; and he that shall marry her that is dismissed, commits adultery — willing (as Augustine says) to declare by these words that not the whole of this law is a precept, but that one part of it (namely, that which pertains to the divorce) is a permission; but the other, which speaks of the bill of divorce, is a command and a mandate. [4] For Moses did not say, *Whosoever will, let him dismiss [his] wife* — which was contrary to the law of God — but he said, *If any man dismiss [her], let him not dismiss [her] except a bill of divorce being first given:* so that, forsooth, a delay being interposed, the mind — [otherwise] headlong into discord and separation — being checked by the writing of the bill, might desist, and might consider what an evil it was to dismiss a wife; especially because (as they report) among the Hebrews it was lawful for none [5] to write the sacred letters — that is, the Hebrew [letters] — except for the scribes alone, since they professed a more excellent wisdom. To these scribes and judges, therefore — endowed with wisdom and justice — the law sent [the parties], that by their persuasions the husband might be recalled to conjugal concord. But if only such hatred should intervene that it could not be extinguished or amended, then He permitted a divorce to be made, and another to be married — not as something lawful, but [6] as a remedy prepared for avoiding a greater evil, lest the husband, from weariness and the despair of an inseparable marriage, should turn to the murder of the wife. For it was always an evil to repudiate a wife for whatsoever cause, and to take another — nay, [it is] against the very inseparable nature of matrimony, founded from the beginning of the human race, whose law is: [7] *Wherefore a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.* Not, therefore, was it a precept for the Jews to dismiss a wife and to marry another, but only a permission. To us Christians it is neither a precept, nor in any part permitted — Paul saying: [8] *TO THOSE who are joined in matrimony I give commandment, not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from the husband; but if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband.* [9] Albeit a bill of repudiation and of divorce — from the bed and cohabitation only, and in the sole cause of fornication, and to those alone who are free from fornication — is permitted to be given, and is even sometimes just (namely, when the adulteress is incorrigible), lest we fall into that sentence of the proverbs: [10] *HE WHO holds [retains] an adulteress is foolish and senseless.* Augustine treats this argument [11] in the first book *On the Lord's sermon on the mount;* in the first book of the *Retractations,* chapter nineteen; and in the nineteenth book against Faustus, chapter twenty-six; but most copiously in the two books *On adulterous marriages,* to Pollentius — a most religious man, who, moved rather by a certain human commiseration of husbands than by solid reasons, thought it not unlawful for a Christian man, in the cause of fornication, to give a bill of divorce to an adulterous wife and to marry another; lest the unhappy husband, who cannot live continently, should — by the necessity of satisfying human frailty and of having offspring — be compelled to lie with the adulteress, or be driven to slay the adulteress without any mercy, if, she living, it were not lawful for him, according to the laws of the Romans, to marry another wife. Now the ancient Romans permitted [12] the divorces of wives with such liberty that, while the republic yet flourished, it was lawful for anyone, and for whatsoever cause (even a hidden one), to cast out a wife by a bill sent [to her]. Whence, when Paulus Aemilius had repudiated his wife Papyria [13] — daughter of Musonius, a man of consular rank, with whom he had lived a long time, and out of whom he had raised a most noble offspring, that renowned and greatest Scipio Aemilianus — he would indicate no cause of the divorce, but thought that he abundantly satisfied those inquiring [of him] if, holding out his foot, he answered: *This shoe is new, and fair: but none of you knows where it pinches my foot.* This so unbridled license of divorces the later Roman Emperors [14] (as appears in the fifth book of the Code, title seventeen) restrained with some curbs, laws being published that it should not be lawful for anyone, without open and designated causes, to repudiate his own spouse, nor in any way to expel [her], unless [she were] an adulteress, or a murderess, or a kidnapper, or a poisoner, or a violater of sepulchres, or sacrilegious, or guilty of treason, or liable to some other crime like to these. Now the formula of the bill of divorce, which the Romans concluded in exceedingly brief words, [15] was this: *PAPYRIA, DAUGHTER OF MUSONIUS, ATTEND TO YOUR OWN AFFAIRS; KEEP YOUR OWN THINGS FOR YOURSELF.*

IN OUR times Thomas, Bishop of Gaeta [Cajetan] — the same [being] a presbyter Cardinal — in [his] commentaries on Matthew, and Ambrose, Archbishop of Compsa, in a book separately published on this matter, [16] have tried to establish by many [arguments]

[→ *to establish* (astruere)]

---

[1] The formula which the Jews use in writing bills of divorce [2] The law of the bill of divorce rightly explained by Christ the Lord [3] Matt. 19:8 [4] Deut. 24 — why the Jews were commanded not to dismiss wives except with a bill of divorce first given [5] To whom it was permitted among the Hebrews to write the sacred letters [6] Divorce permitted to the Jews for avoiding a greater evil [7] Gen. 2:24 [8] 1 Cor. 7:10-11 [9] Let the Calvinists read the sentence here, who dissolve marriages against the precept of the Lord [10] Prov. 18:22 [11] The error of Pollentius, which the Calvinists renewed, refuted by St. Augustine in various places [12] Divorces of wives permitted by the ancient Romans [13] Paulus Aemilius would give no cause why he repudiated his wife [14] The Roman emperors decreed that it should not be lawful to divorce a wife without a just cause [15] The formula of the bill of divorce among the ancient Romans [16] The error of Cajetan and of Ambrose, bishop of Compsa

---

*(Rich PDF p. 122 — printed folio 105, verso. The divorce entry closes (Cajetan; Ambrose of Compsa); **RHEUM BEELTHEB**'s letter (Ezra 4); the **Roman Senate's documents** favoring the Jews (Maccabees). Then letter **S**: **SOLOMON** — his lost writings: the 3000 Parables, the 5000 Songs (only the Song of Songs survived Jerusalem's burning), the* Disputations on nature *(1 Kgs 4:33; Hezekiah's suppression of the book of remedies), and the* Description of the Temple. *Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …have tried to establish] by many arguments that it is lawful for a husband to cast out a wife guilty of adultery, and to take another wife to himself. Whose opinion I leave to be discussed in the sixth book of this work.

RHEUM BEELTHEB [Rehum Beeltheem], whom Josephus calls Rathymus, wrote to Cambyses, king of the Persians, one letter, by which he petitioned that the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem be prohibited. See the first book of Esdras, chapter 4.

THE SENATE AND PEOPLE OF THE ROMANS sent forth various writings in favor of the Jews, [1] concerning which these [things] are had in the sacred letters:

A DECREE OF THE SENATE concerning the friendship and alliance entered into with Judas Maccabaeus and the Jews, inscribed on brazen tablets in the Capitol; a copy whereof, sent into Judaea, is had in the first [book] of Maccabees, chapter eight, and in Josephus, in the twelfth book of the Antiquities, chapter seventeen.

A LETTER to Demetrius, king of Syria, that he should not harass the Jews with war. 1 Maccabees 8.

A LETTER written by T. Manlius and Q. Memmius to the senate of the Jews, whereby it is granted to them to live freely according to their ancestral laws. Second [book] of Maccabees, 11.

COMMENDATORY LETTERS to the kings of Europe and Asia, that they should grant a safe return into their homeland to the ambassadors of the Jews sent from Rome by Jonathan. 1 Maccabees, twelve.

A DECREE OF THE SENATE concerning the league and alliance renewed with Simon Maccabaeus, leader of the Jews, engraved on brazen tablets, and kept among the monuments of the Romans; a copy of which Simon set up on brazen tablets in the vestibule of the temple, and laid up the autograph [original] of it in the treasury of Jerusalem. 1 Maccabees 14.

COMMENDATORY LETTERS to the kings and free peoples, that they should permit the ambassadors of Simon Maccabaeus to return safely from Rome into Palestine. 1 Maccabees, fourteen.

S.

SOLOMON, king of Jerusalem — besides those three books which are placed in the first order of the sacred canon (namely Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, [and] the book of Canticles), and two psalms (that is, the seventy-second and the hundred twenty-seventh), and besides the book of Wisdom (which is numbered among the canonical volumes of the second order) — published a well-nigh infinite number of books, [2] of which the [ones] written below are cited in the sacred letters:

משלי *Mishle,* that is, three thousand books of Parables — concerning which, at the close of the book of Ecclesiastes, Solomon himself speaks thus: [3] *AND whereas Ecclesiastes was most wise, he taught the people, and declared the [things] he had done; and, searching out, he composed many parables: he sought profitable words, and wrote most upright discourses, and full of truth.* Which is more amply explained in the third volume of Kings, in these words: [4] *GOD gave to Solomon wisdom, and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart as the sand that is on the sea shore: and the wisdom of Solomon surpassed the wisdom of all the men of the East, and of the Egyptians; and he was wiser than all men,* &c.; *and he spoke three thousand parables,* &c. Which words the author of the book of Hebrew Questions (whether that were Jerome, or some other) explains, saying that this work of three thousand parables is the book of Proverbs, [5] in which there are *pesuchim* [verses] — namely, nine hundred and fifteen verses — wherein three thousand parables are contained. But Josephus, in the eighth [book] of the Antiquities, expounding this place otherwise, [6] writes that Solomon made three thousand books of parables and similitudes; which the Rabbis of the Jews hand down to have been burned, in the devastation of the holy city, together with the books of the law, by Nabuzardan, prefect of the soldiery of the Chaldaeans, and afterward could not be repaired by Esdras.

Solomon likewise wrote [7] שירים *Hashirim* — that is, five thousand Canticles, or Songs, [8] as the same third [book] of Kings testifies — or (as Josephus expounds) five thousand books of Songs; of which one book only, which is inscribed שיר השירים *Shir hashirim,* that is, THE SONG OF SONGS, remained, the rest being consumed in the burning of Jerusalem.

He published also [9] דברי הטבע *Dibre hatteva,* that is, [the discourses] of the words of nature — or a huge work of Natural disputations, filled with an admirable wisdom of all things — which the third book of Kings recalls, at the place already cited, in this manner: [10] *SOLOMON disputed concerning trees, from the cedar which is in Lebanon unto the hyssop which comes out of the wall; and he discoursed of beasts, and of fowls, and of creeping things, and of fishes* — that is (as Jerome says) of their force, natures, and habits, and at what time they are born, and why not all [things] are born in every land. Which work was burned up in the same fire with the rest of the books. Georgius Cedrenus, in the compendium of histories, relates [11] that the Greek iatrosophists [physician-sages] filched the matter and the arguments of the art of Medicine out of this work — which indeed Hezekiah, king of Jerusalem, took away out of the midst [suppressed], offended (as the same author writes) by the negligence of the Jewish people, who, seeking the remedies of diseases from these writings, neglected to demand the healing of them from God.

He wrote also [12] מכתב היכל *Michtav hechal,* that is, the Writing of the temple, or a Description of the temple of Jerusalem — in which, after the imitation of his father David, he most copiously set forth an exemplar of the temple to be built, showing the form, the site, the measure, and the price of the several parts of the temple; and likewise explaining the dispositions, and the several offices of the Priests, Levites, Doorkeepers, Singers, and the other ministers, which were to be performed in the temple. Of this work the second book of the sacred Annals makes mention. [13] Rabanus judges this book to be the same as that which the first [book] of the Annals records David to have written on the same subject; [14] but the second book of the Annals gainsays [it], distinguishing the one from the other in these words: [15] *PREPARE yourselves by [your] houses and kindred*

[→ *kindreds* (cognatio[nes])]

[1] Writings of the Roman Senate and People in favor of the Jews [2] Solomon published many books which perished through the injury of time [3] Eccles. 12:9-10 [4] 3 Kings 4:29-32 [5] Solomon wrote 3000 parables [6] Josephus thinks Solomon wrote 3000 books of parables [7] 5000 songs of Solomon [8] 3 Kings 4:32 [9] Solomon's Disputations on natural things [10] 3 Kings 4:33 [11] The Greek iatrosophists stole the arguments of the art of Medicine from the books of Solomon [12] The description of the temple published by Solomon [13] 2 Paral. 35:4 [14] 1 Paral. 28:11 [15] 2 Paral. 35:4

(Rich PDF p. 123 — printed folio 106, recto. ***SOLOMON*** *concluded: the temple-dedication prayer; the lost* Book of the Words of Solomon; *his books of Incantations and Exorcisms (Josephus's Eleazar; Origen); the riddle-letters with Hiram of Tyre; the apocryphal* Wisdom *(Pico),* Little Key, Contradiction, *and* Shadows of the Ideas. *Then* ***THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH****, and* ***SAMUEL the Ephraite*** *begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …prepare yourselves by your houses and] your kindreds in the divisions of each, as it is [written] בכתב *bi-chethav*, that is, in the writing of David, king of Israel, and במכתב *be-michtav*, that is, in the writing of Solomon, his son — but both perished in the destruction of the city.

There was also published by him a Prayer to God for the dedication of the temple, which he himself — on bended knees before the altar, and with hands lifted up to heaven — offered to God, saying: *O LORD God of Israel*, &c. — which [things] are written in the whole sixth chapter of the second [book] of Paralipomenon.

There is also cited, in the third book of Kings, chapter eleven, [1] ספר דברי שלמה *Sepher divre Shelomo*, that is, the book of the words of Solomon: in which he himself — or, as others think, the Prophet Ozai [Iddo] — wrote the life and all the deeds of Solomon; which book the Chaldaeans burned together with the other sacred scriptures.

AND these are the writings of Solomon of which mention is made in the sacred letters; beyond which he is reported to have written also certain others, concerning which [these things are noted]:

Of PRAYERS, or Incantations, for soothing sicknesses, one book — of which Josephus makes mention in the eighth book of the Antiquities.

Of EXORCISMS, or Conjurations, for driving away evil demons, one book. Concerning these Josephus, in the eighth book of the Antiquities, writes thus: *GOD granted also to Solomon that he should learn thoroughly the art against demons, for the utility of men, and the cures of these [diseases]; whence also he instituted incantations by which sicknesses are wont to be mitigated: he found out also the manner of the bindings by which the demons, [once] bound, do not return again after they have been driven off. And this cure is discerned to prevail much among us even to this day. For I saw a certain Eleazar, of our nation, in the presence of Vespasian and his sons, and the Tribunes, and the rest of the army, curing those who were vexed by demons. Now the manner of the medicine was of this kind. He put to the nostrils of him who was vexed by the demon a ring having under [its] seal a root shown by Solomon: then he drew out the demon through the nostrils of the [man] smelling [it]; and suddenly the man fell down. Afterward he adjured him [the demon], casting against [it] the adjurations of Solomon, that it should not return again unto him — that is, the Songs which he composed, [now] to be said over him. But, wishing to satisfy and to prove to the bystanders that he had this virtue [power], Eleazar would place before them either a cup or a basin full of water, and would command the demon that, going out from the man, it should overturn these, and give to the beholders a sign that it had left the man.* Which being done, the wisdom of Solomon became known to all. Thus Josephus. Origen, in the 35th tractate on Matthew, indicating that in his own age there were not lacking [those] who out of these books adjured demons, writes thus: *TO ADJURE demons is a Jewish [practice]; and if at any time such a thing is done by our [people], it is like to that whereby the demons are wont to be adjured by the adjurations written by Solomon. But those very [persons] who use those adjurations sometimes use books not even fitly composed; and with certain [adjurations] taken even from the Hebrew, they adjure demons.*

THERE ARE COMMEMORATED also, among the ancient authors of approved credit, the riddling Letters of Solomon to Hiram, king of the Tyrians, [2] and of Hiram to Solomon: concerning which Josephus, in the first volume against Apion, writes in this manner: *HIRAM, king of the Tyrians, was a friend to our king Solomon; but it was chiefly the love of wisdom that had procured [their] friendship. For they used to send to each other problems to be solved; and in these Solomon was the better, and appeared the wiser. Even to this day there are kept among the Tyrians many letters, which they wrote to one another. And that I may not [seem to] feign concerning the letters of the Tyrians, I will bring forward as witness Dius, who is approved as most trustworthy in the histories of the Phoenicians. He, then, in the histories of the Phoenicians, writes thus: THEY say that king Solomon sent to king Hiram riddles, and demanded [some] from him — it being added that whosoever could not solve [them] should pay a sum of money to the one who did solve [them]: and that Hiram, having confessed that he could not solve the proposed questions,* [3] *was fined in much money; then, that a certain Abdemon, a Tyrian man, solved the proposed questions, and himself proposed others, which, if Solomon did not solve them, he should in turn confer much money on king Hiram.* Thus Josephus; to whom Theophilus, sixth bishop of Antioch, in the third book to Autolycus, subscribes in well-nigh the same words.

THERE IS reported also another book of Solomon, inscribed WISDOM, [4] diverse from that which we have in the Canon: concerning which John Pico [della Mirandola], in the preface of his *Heptaplus,* left [it] thus written: *THERE IS extant among the Hebrews a book of that Solomon surnamed the most wise, whose title is WISDOM — not that which is now in [our] hands, the work of Philo, but another, composed in the more secret tongue which they call the Jerusalem [tongue]; in which the man [Solomon], the interpreter of the nature of things (as is thought), confesses that he received all the doctrine of that book out of the inner recesses of the Mosaic law.*

THERE IS also numbered, in the Decree of Gelasius the Pontiff, among the condemned writings, a certain book most falsely ascribed to Solomon, which is entitled THE LITTLE KEY of Solomon — [5] which we once saw carried about by certain impostors, containing a kind of prodigious and maleficent superstition.

LIKEWISE also another book, called THE CONTRADICTION OF SOLOMON, [6] is enumerated in the same Decree of Gelasius, which it has not yet befallen me to see.

Cecco d'Ascoli [Ciccus Asculanus] often alleges, in [his] commentaries on the Sphere, a certain book of Solomon *On the Shadows of the Ideas,* [7] in which, under [that] name, the appellations, significations, and definitions of the axes of the poles, of the circles, and of the other parts of the Astronomical Sphere, are transferred to the explaining of the mysteries of magical impiety.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH, which of old was in use among the Samaritans, contained the five books of Moses written in the Hebrew tongue, but with letter-shapes and points plainly diverse [8] from these characters which the Jews now use — [characters] found out by Esdras after the taking of Jerusalem; although, before its destruction, the characters of the Samaritans and of the Hebrews (as Jerome testifies in the preface of Kings) were the same. Jerome frequently makes mention of this Pentateuch, [9] admonishing that some [things] out of it have crept into our Vulgate edition: such as that [reading] in the book of Genesis, [10] *LET US GO FORTH ABROAD* — which is not had in the Hebrew.

SAMUEL the Ephraite, the Prophet, wrote ספר משפט המלוכה *Sepher Mishpat ha-Meluchah;* for which the Seventy translated βιβλίον τῆς

[→ δικαιώματος (*of the ordinance*)]

[1] 3 Kings 11:41 [2] The riddling letter of Solomon to Hiram, and of Hiram to Solomon [3] Hiram was unable to solve Solomon's riddles [4] A book of the Wisdom of Solomon found among the Jews [5] The Little Key of Solomon [6] The Contradiction of Solomon [7] The Shadows of the Ideas of Solomon [8] The Samaritans used other characters than the Jews now do [9] From the Samaritan Pentateuch some [readings] crept into the Vulgate edition [10] Gen. 4:8

(Rich PDF p. 124 — printed folio 107, verso. ***SAMUEL*** *(the* Book of the Ordinance of the Kingdom, *1 Sam 10:25; David's early deeds; Judges and Ruth);* ***SHEMAIAH the Nehelamite*** *(the false prophet, Jer 29);* ***SHEMAIAH the prophet*** *(Rehoboam's life);* ***THE SCRIBES*** *(guardians and fourfold interpreters of Scripture);* ***SENNACHERIB****'s blasphemous letter and Hezekiah's prudence (a lesson against reading heretics' books); then* ***SETH****'s seven Gnostic books. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …the Seventy translated it βιβλίον] δικαιώματος τῆς βασιλείας, that is, the Book of the justification, or of the Jewish kingdom, or of the Law of the kingdom: [1] in which the Prophet, after he had appointed Saul the first king of the Hebrews, wrote the institution of the royal polity, and certain laws by which the helm of the kingdom should be handled with such moderation that neither should the King exercise tyranny over the people, nor the people, out of their own caprice, despise the commands of the King. And he laid up the volume, [placing] it in the Ark of the covenant, for the perpetual instruction of the kingdom. Mention is made of this book in the first volume of Kings, chapter ten, in these words: [2] *AND Samuel spoke to the people the law of the Kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord.* He wrote also [3] concerning the earlier deeds of David of Jerusalem one book, of which, at the end of the former book of Paralipomenon, it is thus read: [4] *NOW the acts of David the king, the first and the last, are written in the book of Samuel the Seer, and in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the volume of Gad the Seer.* This book Rabbi Moses Kimhi says to be the former part of the volume which by us is [reckoned] under the name of the First [book] of Kings, but by the Hebrews is reckoned, under the title of Samuel, among the scriptures of the old testament; and he asserts the same Samuel to have been the writer of the book of Judges and of Ruth.

SHEMAIAH THE NEHELAMITE — שמעיה הנחלמי *Shemaiah ha-Nehelami,* or Semeias the Nehelamite — a false prophet, [5] and sent by his own [authority], unbidden of God (being of the number of those who were led away into Babylon together with the impious king Joakim), wrote — as though in the name of God — to Sophonias [Zephaniah] the Pontiff, and to the whole senate and people of Jerusalem, an accusatory book against Jeremiah the Prophet, [6] charging him that (seized by a raving and malignant spirit) he had filled the whole multitude of the transmigrants [exiles] with despair, by a letter sent to them, in which he had foretold, as [it were] out of the words of God, that their captivity in Babylon would be long. And accordingly he urgently demanded that [Jeremiah] be cast into prison, and be punished after the manner of the forefathers. But this lying Shemaiah died not long after, a captive in Babylon together with his whole family — God so willing it, who had announced this very punishment to him, for the office of prophecy rashly usurped, through the mouth of Jeremiah the Prophet.

SHEMAIAH — שמעיה *Shemaiah,* or Semeias — a most holy prophet of the Lord, a Jew by race, [7] who, going to Rehoboam king of Judah at Jerusalem in the fifth year of his reign, foretold to him by the command of God the plundering of the temple and of the city — soon to be done — by Shishak [Sesac], king of Egypt; [and] published concerning the life and deeds of Rehoboam king of Judah one book, of which, in the second volume of the sacred annals, chapter 12, it is thus written: [8] *NOW the works of Rehoboam, the first and the last, are written in the books of Shemaiah the Prophet, and of Addo [Iddo] the Seer, and diligently expounded.*

Under the name of **THE SCRIBES,** which is so often inculcated in the Gospel, [9] some think there is signified a kind of men to whom alone, among the Jews, there was the power of writing out the sacred books of the divine law, lest they should be depraved by being written according to the caprice and pleasure of anyone. For Augustine also, in the first book On the Lord's sermon on the mount, relates [10] that it was lawful for none among the Hebrews to write the sacred letters, except for the Scribes alone, because they professed a wisdom more excellent than the rest. There are [those] who hand down that the Scribes were the chief men, and of the highest authority, and most wise, whose office it was that — as of old among the Romans, in doubtful matters, answers were sought out of the volumes of the Sibyls through the haruspices — so these, [being] consulted concerning hard and perplexed matters, should answer out of the sacred books and the

oracles of the prophets: [11] whom Matthew reports that Herod also consulted, at the coming of the Magi, concerning the birth of the Messiah. [12] Epiphanius, in the first book of the Panarion, relates that they were expositors of the divine scripture, [13] and thence obtained the name of Scribes; and that they were wont to interpret the scriptures according to four expositions: [14] of which the first was called [that] of Moses the Prophet; the second, of Achiba [Akiba]; the third, of Ammani, or Ida; the fourth, of the sons of Asamonaeus [the Hasmonaeans].

SENNACHERIB, or Sancherib, king of the Assyrians, [15] when he had besieged Hezekiah, king of the Jews, within the walls of the city of Jerusalem with a most powerful army, sent to him a letter, in which he called him a fool, because — relying on the empty hope of his God — he thought that he could escape the servitude of him [Sennacherib] who had utterly subdued so many nations; and he threatened destruction to all, unless of their own accord, the gates being thrown open, they should receive the army into the city. This letter, having read [it] secretly, Hezekiah went up into the temple, and, spreading it out before the Lord, commended his own safety and that of the City to Him with many supplications. To be observed [16] in this place is the prudence of the king, who read the blasphemies of the letters to no one, lest he should diminish the faith in the divine promises among his [people], dismayed by fear; but laid [them] open to God alone, whom he knew to be the protector of the people. With the same counsel the same King asked, through his ambassadors, Rabshakeh, the leader of the Syrian army, that he would not speak in the Jewish [tongue], fearing lest he should stir up a tumult of the people by his speech: for the people, hearing Rabshakeh purposely upbraiding the King (because he had destroyed the high places and altars which the forefathers had erected in honor of God), might in a little moment waver. But when Rabshakeh, understanding well enough what Hezekiah feared, went on to speak in Hebrew with an even greater voice and much more vehemently, it was commanded that no one should answer. By which example we are admonished [17] that the books, writings, sermons, and colloquies of heretics are not to be heard; [18] and that if we be compelled to hear their blasphemies even with unwilling ears, we ought not to give them an answer, nor to dispute with them. For they are swine and dogs, before whom pearls ought not to be cast; and this is against those who say that all books are to be read indiscriminately, boasting that [saying] of Paul, [19] *PROVE all things: hold fast that which is good;* and likewise that saying of Dionysius of Alexandria, out of the sixth [book] of the ecclesiastical history, and of Jerome in the epistle to Minervius and Alexander: to whom we have abundantly answered in the sixth book, in the censures on the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter fifteen.

SETH, the son of Adam — seven books. These (as Epiphanius attests in the first [book] of the Panarion) the Gnostic heretics — [those] who were called Sethians, and [those] Archontici — fashioned under the name of that Seth, [20] adding to them also seven other books, which they call [21] AL-

[→ *ALIENS* (Alienigenas / Allogeneis)]

[1] The royal constitution of government written by Samuel [2] 1 Kings 10:25 [3] Samuel wrote the deeds of David [4] 1 Paral. 29:29 [5] Shemaiah a false prophet [6] Jer. 29:24, 32 [7] Shemaiah, the prophet of the Lord, wrote the life of Rehoboam [8] 2 Paral. 12:15 [9] Who the Scribes were whom the Gospel names [10] To the Scribes alone was it permitted to write the sacred letters, in St. Augustine's judgment [11] The Scribes were wont to answer questions put concerning the sacred doctrines of God [12] Matt. 2:4 [13] The Scribes were expositors of the divine Scripture [14] The four expositions of the Scriptures [15] The arrogance of Sennacherib [16] The prudence of Hezekiah [17] By the example of Hezekiah we ought to flee the company of the impious [18] The books of heretics are not to be read [19] 1 Thess. 5:21 [20] The Gnostics published certain books under the name of Seth [21] The Allogeneis [Aliens], books of the Gnostics

*(Rich PDF p. 125 — printed folio 108, recto. **SETH** concluded (the sons of Seth, the sidereal science, the two pillars; the* Opus imperfectum*'s star-prophecy of Seth, Matt 2). Then the long **SIBYLLINE ORACLES** entry begins: Paul/Clement's exhortation; the etymology and the ten Sibyls (Varro, Lactantius, Jerome); and **THE CUMAEAN SIBYL** in detail — Justin Martyr's account, the basilica at Cumae, Plato's testimony (*Phaedo, Meno*). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …which they call AL]IENS [*Alienigenae*], from the name of the seven sons of Seth, who among them were called Aliens [Allogeneis]. But they took, as I judge, the occasion of this fabrication from that which Josephus relates in the first book of the Antiquities — namely, that the sons of Seth devised [1] the sidereal science for the knowledge of celestial things; and, since they knew that Adam had foretold two universal destructions of things (the one by fire, the other by flood), fearing lest their inventions should perish before they were thoroughly known, they raised up two pillars, and inscribed their inventions on each; that, if it should befall the brick [pillar] to be destroyed by the flood, the stone one, surviving, [2] might afford to men the means of learning [them]. And that [pillar] which had been built of stone, Josephus relates to have existed, in his own times, still in Asia.

The author of the *Unfinished Work* on Matthew, expounding that [saying] of Matthew, chapter 2, [3] *WE HAVE SEEN his star in the East*, makes mention of a certain writing of Seth concerning the star to appear at the rising [birth] of the Messiah, in these words: *I HAVE HEARD certain [men] relating concerning a certain writing — though not certain, yet not destroying faith, but rather delighting [it] — [namely] that there was a certain nation situated in the very beginning of the East, beside the Ocean, among whom there was carried about a certain writing, inscribed with the name of Seth, concerning this star that was to appear, and the gifts of this kind to be offered to Christ; which [writing] was held handed down through the generations of studious men, the fathers relating [it] to their sons,* &c.

THE ORACLES OF THE SIBYLS. Paul the Apostle (as Clement, in the sixth book of the Stromata, is witness) exhorts his [people] to the reading of the Sibylline volumes, [4] saying thus in a certain recondite writing: *TAKE the Greek books, and acknowledge the Sibyls, how they signify one God, and the [things] that are to come; and you shall find in them the Son of God more clearly and more openly written.* Incited by this exhortation of Paul (whatever it be), I have received certain [things] concerning the names, the fatherland, and the writings of the Sibyls from various authors, especially Christian, which I shall here insert. The Sibyls were all women, prophetesses full of God, [5] flourishing in perpetual virginity, foreknowers and interpreters of future things — so named by the ancients because they announced the counsels of the gods: for βίος [signifies] god [θεόν], and βουλήν [signifies] counsel, in the Aeolic kind of speech. And whereas they brought forth oracles of future [things] in diverse kinds of verse, they foretold also many [things] concerning our Savior Christ, and the redemption of the human race, and committed [them] also to letters with such certainty and clarity of foreknowledge, [6] that they seem to have written past [events] rather than future. These — according to the opinion of M. Varro, who in the books of divine matters, to C. Caesar the Pontifex Maximus, discoursed copiously concerning the Sibyls — Lactantius (in the first book against the gentiles) and Jerome (in the first [book] against Jovinian) report to have been ten [7] in number; whose surnames from [their] fatherland are these: [8] the Cumaean, the Cumanan, the Persian, the Hellespontic, the Libyan, the Samian, the Delphic, the Phrygian, the Tiburtine, the Erythraean. But the [things] which I have gathered concerning each separately, according to the order of the mysteries of human salvation foretold by them, here follow.

THE CUMAEAN SIBYL took [her] surname from Cumae, a city in Campania of Italy, [9] in which she published oracles. Of her, among the heathen, Naevius (in the books of the Punic War) and Piso (in the annals) make mention; among ours, Lactantius (in the book cited a little before), and Justin Martyr in the *Hortatory Address to the Gentiles* — in which [work], speaking of this Sibyl's race, fatherland, and oracles, he thus addresses the nations: *THAT you may in part learn the worship of God, it will easily be furnished to you from the ancient Cumaean Sibyl,* [10] *teaching you by some inspiration through oracles, which forsooth seem very near to the doctrine of the prophets. And they assert that she set out from Babylon, and was the daughter of that Berosus who wrote the Chaldaic history: who, when she had withdrawn into a certain part of Campania, there prophesied in the city named Cumae, which is six thousand paces distant from Baiae — in which place warm baths are frequented. We ourselves saw, when we had been in the city, the place where*

a very great basilica had been built, [11] *a work of one polished stone, exceedingly great and worthy of all admiration: there they affirm that she poured forth oracles — [they] who received these [things] from their forefathers as [it were their] native tradition. And they showed us, in the midst of the basilica, three vessels made of the same stone, in which, [being] filled with water, she was washed; and, having received [her] robe, she would proceed into the innermost part of the same Basilica, built of the same polished stone: in the middle whereof she would ascend a lofty tribunal and throne, and thence render oracles. And of this Sibyl, as a soothsayer, both many others, and especially Plato, make mention in the Phaedo:* [12] *who seems to me, when he had lighted upon her oracles, to have esteemed soothsayers [to be] divine — inasmuch as he had seen those [things] fulfilled which she had long before foretold. Wherefore, in the dialogue which is entitled MENO, admiring the singers of the oracles, he praised them in these words: RIGHTLY, then, may we call those, whom we now name soothsayers, divine.* [13] *For not in vain do we call these divine, and inspired by a divine power, and possessed by God — since they truly foretell both great and many [things], [while yet] ignorant of the [things] which they utter.* Clearly and manifestly he looked to the oracles of the Sibyl: for she had not, as poets do, the power of correcting and polishing, with metrical diligence, what she had written; but she published [them] at the time of the afflatus, in which they looked to the prediction; and this [afflatus] ceasing, the memory of them likewise ceased. And this was the cause why the measure of the Sibylline verses was not kept. For we ourselves, while we were at Cumae, learned this very thing from those who had recounted these [things], and who also showed [us] where she had prophesied, and a little vessel likewise made of bronze, where her relics were kept. [14] And among many other [things] they related this — which they had heard from their forefathers — that those who received the oracles, being for the most part unlearned, deviated in many places from the reckoning of the meter; and this cause they assign, why many of her verses lack the due measure: [15] namely, both because the Sibyl, [once] destitute of the afflatus itself, did not remember what she had before poured forth, and because the notaries, through unskillfulness and rudeness, fell away from the reckoning of the meter. Therefore, O gentile men, assent to this old and most ancient Sibyl, whose volumes it befalls to be kept in the whole world, [and] who, inspired from on high, will instruct you by oracles that those who are called [gods] are not gods. And concerning the coming of our Savior Jesus Christ, and concerning all those [things] which He was to do, she manifestly declares — the knowledge of which, [being] in some sort necessary for you, she fore-exer-

[→ *fore-exercises* (praexer[cet])]

---

[1] The sons of Seth devised the sidereal science [2] A stone pillar built by the sons of Seth survived in Asia in Josephus's times [3] Matt. 2:2 [4] The Sibyls prophesied concerning the Son of God [5] The Sibyls were prophetesses, flourishing in perpetual virginity [6] So clear were the Sibyls' prophecies of Christ the Lord that they seem to have written the past rather than the future [7] The Sibyls were ten in number [8] The surnames of the Sibyls, from their birthplaces [9] The Cumaean Sibyl prophesied at Cumae in Italy [10] The Cumaean Sibyl was the daughter of the historian Berosus [11] A very great basilica made of one polished stone [12] Plato mentions the Cumaean Sibyl [13] Soothsayers are rightly called divine, in Plato's judgment [14] The relics of the Cumaean Sibyl were kept at Cumae in Justin's time [15] Why the Sibyls did not keep the poetic measure in their verses

---

(Rich PDF p. 126 — printed folio 109, verso. The ***SIBYLS*** *continued: Augustine and Virgil's* Eclogue 4 *("Now is come the last age of the Cumaean song"); the Cumaean Sibyl's peaceful-kingdom oracle (Greek + Latin verse, echoing Isaiah 11); Julian's burning of the verses. Then* ***THE CUMANA SIBYL*** *(the Tarquin books-story) with the famous* ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *acrostic and its numerology (888, per Bede); and* ***THE PERSIAN SIBYL*** *(an oracle of John the Baptist). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …a] fore-exercising for the prophecies of holy men. Thus far Justin, concerning the Cumaean Sibyl. Of whom Augustine makes mention, oracle by oracle, in the begun exposition of the epistle to the Romans, in these words: [1] *THERE WERE prophets also among the gentiles, in whom likewise some things are found which they sang concerning Christ — as is also said concerning the Sibyl; which I would not easily believe, but that a certain [poet], the most noble in the Roman tongue, before he uttered those [things] concerning the renewal of the age which seem well enough to accord and agree with the kingdom of our Lord, set before*

[them] the verse, saying: NOW is come the last age of the Cumaean song. And that the Cumaean song is Sibylline, no one will doubt. Thus Augustine. Before whom Eusebius, in the fourth book *On the life of Constantine*, [2] expounded that same verse of Virgil in the same manner. There is extant, in the collectanea of Stratonicus, bishop of Cumae [3] (out of which we have gathered well-nigh all the oracles subjoined), the Greek verses of this Sibyl concerning the highest tranquillity of the times [that was to be] at the coming of Christ — not wholly unlike those which Maro [Virgil] translated out of the Cumaean oracles, but most like to those which Isaiah prophesied concerning the peace-bringing coming of the Messiah. And they are these:

ὅταν ἀπ′ οὐρανοῦ θεὸς πέμψῃ βασιλῆα,
τῷ γὰρ παγγενέτειρα βροτοῖς δώσει τὸν ἄριστον
καρπὸν ἀπόδρεψιν, σῖτον, οἶνον, ἐλαίου·
αὐτὰρ ἀπ′ οὐρανόθεν μέλιτος γλυκεροῦ πότον ἡδὺν
νάματα, καὶ ῥήξει γλυκερὰ λευκοῖο γάλακτος.
πλήρεις δ′ ἔσονται πόλεις ἀγαθῶν, καὶ πίονες ἀγροί·
ἔσσοντ′ οὐδὲ μάχαιρα κατὰ χθονὸς, οὐδὲ κυδοιμός·
ἀλλ′ ἅμιν εἰράνη μεγάλη κατὰ γαῖαν ἅπασαν.
ἐν δὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ἐν οὔρεσιν ἄμμιξ ἔδονται
χόρτον, παρδάλεις τ′ ἐρίφοις ἅμα βοσκήσονται·
ἄρκτοι σὺν μόσχοις νομάδες ἀλισθήσονται,
σαρκοβόρος τε λέων ἄχυρον φάγετ′ ὡς βοῦς·
καὶ βρετέεσσι δράκοντες ἅμα σφίσι κοιμήσονται·
καὶ οὐκ ἀδικήσουσιν, χεὶρ γὰρ κυρίου ἔσετ′ ἐπ′ αὐτούς.

which may be rendered thus:

When God shall send down a king from high Olympus,
Then shall the all-bearing earth render to sick mortals
Inexhaustible fruits of corn, of wine, and of oil;
Then shall the sweet cups of heaven pour forth honey,
And streams pleasant with snowy milk shall burst forth;
The towns shall be full of good things, and the rich fields shall flourish:
Nor shall the earth fear swords, nor the tumults of war:
But high peace shall flower in all lands:
And the lambs with the wolves shall crop the grass upon the mountains;
And the leopards, mingled together, shall feed with the kids;
The bears shall dwell with the calves, following the herds;
And the carnivorous lion shall eat at the manger, like the ox;
With children shall the serpents take [their] sleep by night,
Nor shall they harm [them]: for the hand of the Lord shall cover them.

AMMIANUS Marcellinus, in his history, relates that the Sibylline verses were given to the flames [4] by the Emperor Julian the Apostate, at the city of Aenus.

THE CUMANA SIBYL — born and brought up at Cumae, which is a city of the province of Ionia — is named Amalthea, and Erophile, and Demophile. [5] She is said to have written many books of divinations; concerning which Lactantius, on the testimony of Varro, relates that she brought nine [books] to king Tarquinius Priscus, and demanded for them three hundred Philippei [gold pieces]; and that the king, scorning the greatness of the price, mocked the madness of the woman; but she, in the king's sight, burned three, and demanded the same price for the rest — [so that] Tarquin thought the woman much more mad. She, three others being again burned, when she persisted in the same price, [it is said] that the king was moved, and bought the remaining [three] for three hundred gold pieces. Solinus said that her sepulchre is to be seen in Sicily. There is reported [to be] a Greek prophecy of hers concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, and His most holy name, in these words:

Δὴ τότε καὶ μεγάλοιο θεοῦ παῖς ἀνθρώποισι
ἥξει σαρκοφόρος θνητοῖς ὁμοιούμενος ἐν γῇ.
τέσσαρα φωνήεντα φέρει, τὰ δ' ἄφωνα ἐν αὐτῷ
δισσῶν ἀγγέλων· ἀριθμοῦ δ' ὅλον ἐξονομήνω·
ὀκτὼ γὰρ μονάδας, τόσας δεκάδας ἐπὶ τούτοις,
ἠδὲ ἑκατοντάδας ὀκτὼ, ἀπιστοτέροις ἀνθρώποις
οὔνομα δηλώσει· σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇ συννόησον.

that is,

Then shall come to mortals, upon the very mortals
On earth, [one] born like [them], of the almighty Father,
Clothed in a body: four vowels
He bears, and two consonants of double kind;
But I will teach what is the whole sum of the number.
For eight units, and as many tens upon these,
And eight hundreds, shall the name declare
To faithless men: but do thou hold [it] in mind. [6] [7]

The reckoning of the letters of the name of Jesus, gathered by the Sibyl in these verses, Bede more clearly explains in the first book of the commentaries on Luke — the number seventy being added, which is lacking in the Sibylline verse. Now he speaks in this manner: *OF THIS most sacred name IESUS, not only the etymology, but the very number also which is comprehended in [its] letters, breathes forth the perpetual mysteries of our salvation. For with six letters, among the Greeks, it was written* ΙΗΣΟΥΣ *— namely* Ι, *and* Η, *and* Σ, *and* Ο, *and* Υ, *and* Σ *— whose numbers are 10, and 8, and 200, and 70, and 400, and 200, which together make 888; which number indeed rejoices in the figure of the resurrection. For the eighth number, in the sacred letters, befits the glory of the resurrection: because the Lord rose on the eighth day (that is, after the seventh, [the day] of the Sabbath); and we ourselves, after the six ages of this world, and the seventh — the sabbath of souls, which now meanwhile is passed in another life — shall rise, as it were, at the eighth time.*

THE PERSIAN SIBYL was from Persia: [8] of whom (on the testimony of Lactantius) Nicanor, who wrote the deeds of Alexander the Great, made mention. There is had of hers, concerning the preaching and baptism of the forerunner of Christ [John the Baptist], an oracle of this kind:

ἀλλ' ὁπόταν φωνή τ' ἐρημαίης διὰ χώρης
ἥξει, ἀπαγγέλλουσα βροτοῖς, καὶ πᾶσι βοήσει

εὐθείας ἀτραποὺς ποιήσειν, ἠδ′ ἀπορῖψαι

ἐκ κραδίης κακίας, καὶ ὕδασι φωτίζεσθε.

that is,

Then also a certain voice shall come through the deserts of the places,

A messenger, whereby it may cry to all wretched mortals

That they make straight the paths, and purge [their] souls

From vices, and cleanse [their] bodies with pure waters.

[→ *SIBYLLA* (the next Sibyl follows)]

---

[1] Among the gentiles there were prophets, says St. Augustine [2] See the Emperor Constantine's Oration to the assembly of the saints, ch. 20, in Eusebius of Caesarea [3] Stratonicus, bishop of Cumae, collected the Sibylline verses [4] Julian the Apostate burned the Sibylline verses [5] The Cumana Sibyl, born at Cumae; of her nine books she burned six [6] The sum of the name of Jesus: Ι 10, Η 8, Σ 200, Ο 70, Υ 400, Σ 200 (= 888) [7] The two [letters] together, ΣΣ, are the two elements from which begin the names of the two chief angels — the good, whom most of the ancients called Sathael, and the evil, who is called Satan [8] The Persian Sibyl was from Persia

---

*(Rich PDF p. 127 — printed folio 110, verso. The **SIBYLS** continued, each with a Greek oracle + Latin verse: **Hellespontic** (Christ fulfilling the Law), **Libyan** (the healings), **Samian** (the entry into Jerusalem on the ass), **Delphic** (the buffets and gall of the Passion), **Phrygian** (the darkness and rent veil), **Tiburtine** (the resurrection and ascension). Then the **Erythraean Sibyl** — Clement, Apollodorus, the ~1000 verses brought to Rome, and the famous acrostic* ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ *(the Last-Judgment poem cited by Constantine and Augustine), which begins here. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

THE HELLESPONTIC SIBYL, born in the Trojan territory, [1] in the village of Marmissa near the town Gergitium — whom Heraclides Ponticus writes to have been in the times of Cyrus — among many other oracles left this divination concerning the doctrine of Christ:

αὐτὸς πληρώσει δὲ θεοῦ νόμον, οὐ καταλύσει

ἀντίτυπον μίμημα φέρων, καὶ πάντα διδάξει.

that is,

He shall fulfill the Law of God, [and] not violate [it],

Bearing a most-like image [of the Father], and shall teach all things.

THE LIBYAN SIBYL, [2] whom Euripides recalls in the prologue of the *Lamia*, brought forth this prophecy of the miracles of Christ:

καὶ τότε δὴ νοσεροὺς ἰήσεται, ἠδ′ ἐπιμώμους

πάντας, ὅσοι τούτῳ πίστιν ἐνὶ ποιήσονται·

βλέψουσιν δὲ τυφλοί, ἀτὰρ βαδίσουσί τε χωλοί,

κωφοί τ′ εἰσαΐσουσι, λαλήσουσ′ οὐ λαλέοντες·

δαίμονας ἐξελάσει, νεκρῶν δ′ ἐπανάστασιν ἔξει.

that is,

He indeed shall heal those pressed by diseases, and all

The hurt, as many as put their trust in him; and the blind shall see:

The lame shall walk: to the deaf it shall be granted to hear:

To the dumb it shall be given to form unwonted speech:

He shall drive out demons: those oppressed by death shall rise again.

THE SAMIAN SIBYL — of whom Eratosthenes writes that he found the memory in the ancient annals of the Samians — was called by the name Pitho; [3] in whose verses there is had this oracle concerning Christ entering into Jerusalem, mounted on an ass:

χαῖρε ἁγνὴ θύγατερ Σιών, καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα·
αὐτός σου βασιλεὺς ἐπιβὰς ἐπὶ πῶλον εἰσάγει,
πρᾷος πᾶσι φανείς, ἵνα ζυγὸν ὅνπερ ὑπῆμεν,
ξύλον δυσβάστακτον ἐπ' αὐχένι κάμνον, ἄρῃ.

that is,

Hail, chaste daughter Sion, and maiden that hast suffered much:
Behold, thy own King enters to thee, mounted on an ass,
Gentle in the sight of all, that he may take from thee the yokes,
Insufferable to thee, which thou bearest with subdued neck.

THE DELPHIC SIBYL — of whom Chrysippus speaks in the book which he composed *On Divination* — is thought to have been born at Delphi, by name Anthemis, [4] and lived before the destruction of Troy; several of whose verses some have believed Homer to have inserted into his own work. There is extant her prophecy concerning the Passion of Christ, in this manner:

καὶ τότε δὴ κολάφους καὶ πτύσματα φαρμακόεντα,
Ἰσραὴλ δώσει μυσαροῖς ἐνὶ χείλεσι τούτῳ·
εἰς δὲ τὸ βρῶμα χολήν, καὶ εἰς πότον ὄξος ἄκρατον.

that is,

Israel shall dash upon him buffets, and wicked spittings
With [their] defiled lips; and shall set before [him]
Food of gall, and for drink harsh vinegar.

THE PHRYGIAN SIBYL, who prophesied at Ancyra, [5] sang the death of Christ in these verses:

ναοῦ σχισθῇ τὸ καταπέτασμα, καὶ ἤματι μέσῳ
νὺξ ἔσται σκοτόεσσα πελώριος ἐν τρισὶν ὥραις·
καὶ θανάτου μοῖραν τελέσει τρίτον ἦμαρ ὑπνώσας.

that is,

The veil of the temple shall be rent, and in the midst of the day
A dark, wondrous night shall press [the world] for three hours;
and, having slept a three-day sleep, he shall accomplish the lot of death.

THE TIBURTINE SIBYL, from Tibur, an Italian city, by name Albunea [6] — whom the Tiburtines of old worshipped as a goddess by the banks of the river Anio, in whose eddies they had found her image, holding a book in [her] hand — foretold the resurrection and assumption of Christ in this manner:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἔλθῃ τρισὶν ἤμασιν ἐς φάος αὖθις,
καὶ δείξει θνητοῖσιν ὕπνον, καὶ πάντα διδάξει,
ἐν νεφέλαις ἐπιβὰς, εἰς οὐρανοῦ οἶκον ὁδεύσῃ.

that is,

But after he shall have come again to the light on the third day,

and shown to mortals [the meaning of his] sleep, and taught all things,

mounted upon the clouds he shall journey to the house of heaven.

THE ERYTHRAEAN SIBYL, whom blessed Clement, the first Pope, recalls in the epistle to the Corinthians, [7] was from Erythrae, a city of Ionia. Apollodorus the Erythraean affirms that she was his fellow-citizen, and that she prophesied to the Greeks, [as they were] making for Ilium, that Troy would be [besieged and] would perish, and that Homer would write lies. Fenestella, a most diligent author, writes that C. Curio the Consul, when the Capitol was restored, referred [a motion] to the senate, that legates should be sent to seek out and carry to Rome the verses of this Sibyl; and that accordingly P. Gabinius, M. Octacilius, [and] L. Valerius were sent, who carried to Rome about a thousand [8] verses copied out from private persons. Constantine the Great Augustus, in the oration which Eusebius appended to the books *On the life of Constantine* published by him, recites an oracle of this Sibyl concerning the coming of Christ to the Judgment, [9] composed in acrostic verses in such wise that in the initial letters of the verses these words may be read: ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ — that is, JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, THE SAVIOR. [10] And the same Emperor asserts that M. T. Cicero, when he had lighted upon this Sibylline acrostic, moved by the artifice of the poem, [11] rendered it into Latin for Latin ears, and reckoned it among his other lucubrations. Augustine, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God,* chapter 23, affirms [12] that he himself read the same acrostic in a Greek codex of the Erythraean Sibyl, which Flaccianus, proconsul of Africa, showed to him. Now the Greek verses are twenty-seven, namely:

ΙΔΡΩΣΕΙ δὲ χθὼν κρίσεως σημεῖον ὅτ′ ἔσται,

Ηξει δ′ οὐρανόθεν βασιλεὺς αἰῶσιν ὁ μέλλων,

Σάρκα παρὼν πᾶσαν κρῖναι καὶ κόσμον ἅπαντα,

Ὄψονται δὲ θεὸν μέροπες πιστοὶ καὶ ἄπιστοι,

Ὕψιστον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπὶ τέρμα χρόνοιο,

Σαρκοφόρων ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰς βήματι κρίνων.

ΧΕΡΣΟΣ ὅταν ποτὲ κόσμος ὅλος, καὶ ἄκανθα γενῆται,

Ῥίψουσιν δ′ εἴδωλα βροτοὶ, καὶ πάντα*:*

Ἐκκαύσει δὲ τὸ πῦρ γῆν, οὐρανὸν, ἠδὲ θάλασσαν

Ἰχνεῦον· φλέξει δὲ πύλας εἱρκτῆς ἀΐδαο·

Σάρξ τότε πᾶσα βροτῶν ἐπελευθέριον φάος ἥξει

Τῶν ἁγίων· ἀνόμους δὲ τὸ πῦρ αἰῶσιν ἐλέγξει.

Ὁππόσα τις πράξας ἔλαθεν, τότε πάντα λαλήσει

which may be rendered (the initials of the verses spelling *Jesus Christ [Son] of God, Savior*):

The earth shall sweat, when the sign of judgment shall be;

A king shall come from heaven, [he] who is to be unto the ages,

Present to judge all flesh and the whole world.

And mortals shall see God — the faithful and the faithless —

The Most High, with the saints, at the end of time,

Judging at [his] tribunal the souls of flesh-bearing men.

When at length the whole world shall [lie] waste and [full of] thorns,

Mortals shall cast away [their] idols and all [their wealth]:

The fire, searching [them] out, shall burn up earth, heaven, and sea,

and shall burn the gates of the prison of Hades:

Then shall all the flesh of [holy] mortals come to the free light

Of the saints; but the fire shall convict the lawless unto the ages.

Whatsoever anyone has done in secret, then shall he tell it all —

[→ *breasts* (στήθεα)]

[1] The Hellespontic Sibyl, born in the Trojan territory [2] The Libyan Sibyl [3] The Samian Sibyl was called Pitho [4] The Delphic Sibyl, born at Delphi [5] The Phrygian Sibyl prophesied at Ancyra [6] The Tiburtine Sibyl, Italian [7] The Erythraean Sibyl prophesied concerning the destruction of Troy and the lies of Homer [8] About a thousand verses of the Erythraean Sibyl were carried to Rome [9] Constantine the Emperor, in the Oration to the assembly of the saints, ch. 18 [10] In Eusebius there is besides [the word] CROSS (ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ) [11] Constantine, ibid., ch. 19 [12] Augustine read the Sibylline Acrostic in a book

---

*(Rich PDF p. 128 — printed folio 111, recto. The **Sibylline acrostic** completed (Greek), then Sixtus's Latin verse rendering — the* IESVS CHRISTVS DEI FILIVS SERVATOR *Judgment poem; the Erythraean's epistle to the Greeks; other Sibyls (Aristotle's black-bile theory); Tacitus and Stilicho on the Sibylline books; the eight printed books; Theophilus's "one God" verse. Then a new entry: **THE BOOK OF THE SEVEN SEALS** (Rev 5) — John's vision quoted, and the six points of its exposition begun. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

στήθεα γὰρ ζοφόεντα θεὸς φωστῆρσιν ἀνοίξει.

ΘΡΗΝΟΣ δ′ ἐκ πάντων ἥξει, καὶ βρυγμὸς ὀδόντων.

ἐκλάμψει δὲ φάος, σέλας ἠελίοιο καὶ ἄστρων,

οὐρανὸν εἰλίξει, μήνης δέ τε φέγγος ὀλεῖται.

ὑψώσει δὲ φάραγγας, ὀλεῖ δ′ ὑψώματα βουνῶν.

ΥΨΟΣ δ′ οὐκέτι λυγρὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι φανεῖται.

ἴσά τ′ ὄρη πεδίοις ἔσται, καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα

οὐκέτι πλοῦν ἕξει· γῆ γὰρ φρυχθεῖσα κεραυνῷ

σὺν πηγαῖς ποταμοὶ δεινὰ καχλάζοντες λείψουσιν.

ΣΑΛΠΙΓΞ δ′ οὐρανόθεν φωνὴν πολύθρηνον ἀφήσει.

ὠρύουσα μύσος μελέων, καὶ πήματα κόσμου,

ταρτάρεον δὲ χάος τότε δείξει γαῖα χανοῦσα·

ἥξουσιν δ′ ἐπὶ βῆμα θεοῦ βασιλῆες ἅπαντες·

Ῥεύσει δ′ οὐρανόθεν ποταμὸς πυρὸς ἠδέ τε θεῖον.

Which [verses], ill rendered in Augustine, may — the capital letters being again restored — be translated thus (the initials of the verses spelling *IESVS CHRISTVS, DEI FILIVS, SERVATOR* — Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior):

In sign of Judgment the earth shall grow moist with sweat,

And the eternal King shall descend from the highest heaven,

Namely, that he may judge all flesh and the whole world:

Whence both the faithful and the faithless shall see God,

The Most High, sitting with the saints at the end of the age,

In bodily [form], to judge the souls of men. Then, of old,

The world shall bristle all over with dense thickets [of thorns];

Men shall cast away [their] idols and their stored-up treasures;

And fire shall burn up the lands, and heaven, and sea,

And shall burn the gates of the narrow prison of Orcus [Hell].

And all the flesh of the saints, restored to freedom, shall then

Seek again the light: [but] the flame shall ever torment the wicked;

And whatever anyone has sinned in secret, he shall tell it all,

And God shall lay open to the light the closed breasts [of hearts].

Teeth shall gnash, laments shall thicken on every side,

And the light shall fail; and darkness shall enwrap the sun

And the shining stars; then the Moon's splendor shall pass away.

The valleys shall be raised up, the steep ridges brought low;

And nothing lofty shall any more hinder mortals.

The long keel shall not cleave the deep; the very fields

Shall be leveled with the mountains; for the earth, scorched by lightning,

And the dry fountains and rivers together, shall gape [be dried];

And the trumpet shall sound with a mournful blast from the starry regions.

Mourning the crime of fools, and the sorrows of the world,

The earth, yawning open, shall disclose chaos and Tartarus;

And all kings shall be set before the throne of the deity;

And a wave, flowing from heaven, fiery, mingled with sulphur,

Shall mark all men with a most-notable sign. At that time

The wood [the Cross] — through the lovely token of faith,

[Christ's] fall set against the world, yet the life of the pious —

Shall cleanse, by [re]sprinkling, the slain from the twelvefold fountain.

There is reported, besides, a divinatory Epistle of hers to the Greeks [as they were] making for Ilium, translated into Latin, whose beginning is: *YOU INQUIRE of me, O most illustrious throng of the Danaï.*

Besides these, there are named many other Sibyls also — the Sardian, the Rhodian, the Sicilian, and very many more — whom Ambrose, in the commentaries on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, judges to have been seized by an evil and wicked spirit. [1] But Aristotle, in the thirtieth section of the Problems, [2] declares that these same [women] — driven by the heat of black bile, kindled about the seat of the mind — were agitated. Cornelius Tacitus writes that Augustus, since in his times many vain [verses] were displayed under the name of the Sibyls, commanded that the verses be sought out at Samos, Erythrae, Ilium, [and] Africa, and through the Italian colonies, and brought within a set day to the prefect of the city; and that the judgment and censure of the fifteen men [*quindecimviri*] be applied; and that it should not be lawful to keep [them] privately [3] — which had already been provided for by the forefathers. These verses, after four hundred years, Stilicho, father-in-law of the emperor Honorius — being about to stir up a sedition against his son-in-law on such an occasion — took care [4] utterly to abolish. Which deed Rutilius Claudius did not pass over in silence, saying:

Not only did the traitor, ranging with Getic arms,

ravage [Italy]; before [that], he burned the Sibylline oracles of aid.

Nevertheless, in recent years there have come forth out of Germany eight books of Sibylline verses, printed [5] in Greek and Latin, in which well-nigh all the oracles set down above are had. The beginning of the work is:

εἷς θεὸς μόνος, ὃς ἀρχὴ ὑπερμεγέθης ἀγένητος.

One God alone, who reigns, greatest, unbegotten.

Theophilus, sixth bishop of Antioch, in the second book to Autolycus, recites from an unnamed Sibyl [6] about eighty verses, some of which are extant in these books somewhat diverse, but others are not extant.

THE BOOK OF THE SEVEN SEALS John, in the Revelations, mystically described [7] in this manner: *AND I saw in the right hand of him that sat upon the throne a book written within and without, sealed with seven seals; and I saw a strong angel, proclaiming with a loud voice: Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no one was able, neither in heaven, nor on earth, nor under the earth, to open the book; and I wept much, because no one was found worthy to open the book, nor to look on it. And one of the elders said to me: Weep not: behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, has prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I saw, and behold, in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing as it were slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent into all the earth. And he came, and took the book from the right hand of him that sat on the throne; and when he had opened the book, the four living creatures and the four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, saying: Worthy art thou, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof,* &c. And this is John's vision Of the Book of the seven seals; in which — lest I detain the reader too long over its several words — I will briefly note six points only, [8] whereof the whole series of the vision consists: namely, What is the [one] sitting on the throne; what the four living creatures; what the four-and-twenty Elders; what the Lion, the same being the Lamb that opens the book; what the Book sealed with seals; [and] what the seven Seals.

1. THE [ONE] SITTING ON THE THRONE is God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, sitting on the throne of his kingdom, which is [9] the Church.

2. THE FOUR LIVING CREATURES not all authors expound in the same way. Origen and Gregory Nazianzen think [them] to be the four powers, or affections, of the rational soul: [10] namely, [that] Man is the power of reason, the Lion the irascible power, the Calf the concupiscible power, [and] the Eagle the conscience set over the rest — which by Paul [is called] the spirit [11] of man—

[→ *of man* (homi[nis])]

[1] Many Sibyls seized by an evil spirit [2] Aristotle's opinion concerning the Sibyls, by no means to be approved [3] It was not lawful for any private person to possess the verses of the Sibyls [4] Stilicho caused the verses of the Sibyls to be abolished [5] Eight books of Sibylline verses printed in Germany [6] The unnamed Sibyl [7] Apoc. 5:1-3, etc. [8] Six chief points are noted in the vision of St. John [9] The Church is the kingdom of God [10] The four powers of the rational soul [11] 1 Cor. 2:11

(Rich PDF p. 129 — printed folio 112, verso. The seven-seals vision (Rev 5) expounded: ***the four living creatures*** *— the many interpretations (Ambrose, Arethas, Theodoret, Jerome vs. Augustine, Andreas, Rupert, Lyra, the Rabbis; and Justin's single fourfold creature = Nebuchadnezzar, Dan 4);* ***the 24 elders****;* ***the Lion/Lamb*** *(= Christ); and* ***the Book written within and without****. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …which by Paul is called the spirit] of man. AMBROSE, in the third book *On virgins*, says that the four [creatures] signify the moral virtues: [1] namely the Lion, Fortitude; the Calf, Justice; the Eagle, Temperance; the Man, Prudence. ARETHAS, bishop of Caesarea, [understands] four excellent divine virtues (whatever they are) which designate the power of God about the world, [that world being] constituted of four elements. THEODORET, four created virtues which God set over the four elements — out of which the universe

subsists, and which preserve it. POLYCHRONIUS, four Angels set over the four parts of the world. JEROME, the four evangelists — of whom Matthew is designated by the Man, Mark by the Lion, Luke by the Calf, John by the Eagle. AUGUSTINE, [likewise] the four Evangelists, but by another reckoning [2] — that is, Matthew in the Lion, Mark in the Man, Luke in the Calf, John in the Eagle. ANDREAS, likewise bishop of Caesarea, [understands] the four Evangelists, but otherwise: the Lion, on account of [his] eminent fortitude above the rest, signifies John; the Calf, Luke; the Eagle, Mark; the Man, Matthew. CATINA the Syrian, in the exposition of the first vision of Ezekiel (where these four living creatures are placed), refers the Man to all Israel, the Lion to the royal scepter of the Jews, the Calf to the sacerdotal and levitical tribe, the Eagle to the vengeance and retribution of God upon Israel. RUPERT, Abbot of Deutz [Tuitiensis], expounds, by the four living creatures, the four chief mysteries of Christ [3] which a Christian may not be ignorant of — that is, the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, [and] Ascension. GALERIDUS understands all the prelates of the Church; for a prelate shows himself a Lion [4] in terribly correcting faults, an Ox in strenuously handling earthly [matters], a Man in kindly compassionating men, an Eagle in loftily soaring aloft and subtly contemplating divine [things]. LYRA [Nicholas of Lyra] adapts the four living creatures to the four patriarchal churches: [5] namely the Lion to Jerusalem, the Ox to Antioch, the Man to Alexandria, the Eagle to Constantinople. RABBI DAVID [Kimhi] thinks that the four Monarchies — of the Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans — are adumbrated [6] by the four living creatures seen by Ezekiel. RABBI SOLOMON [Rashi] hands down that four angels, set over the four monarchies, are signified by the four living creatures of Ezekiel. JUSTIN Martyr, in the book of *Questions against the Gentiles*, question 44, relates that the four living creatures shown to Ezekiel were but one living creature [7] endowed with a fourfold face — namely of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle — and that it designated the future change of the power of king Nebuchadnezzar: [8] whom Daniel narrates to have been thus, after the elation of his pride, humbled by God and in a manner transformed into a beast — so that his hairs grew like a lion's mane, his nails were curved like an eagle's talons, and he himself ate grass like an ox; and then, after [his] penance, a mild human heart and mind was restored to him by God. God also willed (as it seems to the same Martyr), by this vision, to raise up the captive people into the hope of recovering [their] liberty, showing to it the change of the Babylonian kingdom by the conjunction of a tame and a wild animal, and likewise of a heavy and a light [one] in one and the same creature. For a tame creature is the Man, a wild [one] the Lion; heavy, [yet] light and winged, is the Eagle. By these [figures], therefore, he showed that the kingdom was to be changed from the wild empire of Nebuchadnezzar into the mild empire of Cyrus; but by these [others], that the heaviness of captivity was to be turned into a light and unencumbered liberty. For the Ox bears the yoke, but the Eagle is free of the yoke. This same thing the wheel within the wheel announced: for of these [wheels], the one adumbrated the leading-away of the Jews into captivity, the other [their] leading-back into [their] homeland.

3. THE FOUR-AND-TWENTY ELDERS, according to Ambrose, are the twenty-four books of the old testament; [9] according to Augustine, the whole body [and] number of the prophets; according to Rupert, twelve earlier and [twelve] later Judges of the Church of God. The earlier [10] are they who, before the kingdom of the Hebrews, presided over the people of God — namely from Othniel to Samuel. But the later Judges, who presided after Christ, [11] are the twelve Apostles. According to Galeridus they are the twenty-four patriarchs of the church — namely twelve of the old church (that is, the twelve sons of Jacob), [12] and the twelve Apostles, patriarchs of the new Church of Christ. [13] According to Lyra, [they are] all bishops and Pastors of particular churches; according to Ambrose, all the Doctors of the Church.

4. THE LION, THE SAME BEING ALSO THE LAMB (as it were slain, having seven horns and seven eyes), is Christ: [14] who, as in his Passion he was a lamb dumb before the shearer, and opened not his mouth, so — that same Passion being consummated — soon, like a lion's whelp (which Jacob foreshowed in his son [Judah]), ascending to the prey, he spoiled hell; and, resting and reclining in the sepulchre like a Lion, he ground down even death itself with a great roar. Now he has seven eyes and seven horns — that is, all the fullness of the illuminating and strengthening Spirit; for the eyes signify light, the horn strength; [15] and he is

as it were slain, because — although after his resurrection from the dead he lives forever, no more to die — yet he keeps the signs of his death [16] (that is, the places of the nails in [his] hands and feet, and the place of the lance in [his] side) for the everlasting memory of our redemption.

5. THE BOOK WRITTEN WITHIN AND WITHOUT is (as Arethas says) the incomprehensible memory of God, which both the prophet David and Moses foresignified — the one, when he said, [17] *In your book all shall be written;* the other, when he says, [18] *Either forgive them this trespass, or, if you do not, blot me out of your book which you have written.* Moreover, that it is written within and without [means] this: that those, forsooth, are said to be written within, who are of Jerusalem, as it were worshippers of God; but without — that is, on the back and on the worse [inferior] side — those who are of the gentiles. THOMAS [Aquinas] says: the book is the divine knowledge, or the knowledge of God concerning the [things] which God has disposed to do; whence also it is placed in the right hand, because by the right hand we work. It is written within, as regards the knowledge of God, to whom the whole book is fully known; without, inasmuch as the disposition of the divine order, to be fulfilled at the appointed time, is revealed to men. AUGUSTINE [says]: the Book is all the divine—

[→ *divine* (divina)]

---

[1] The four moral virtues [2] A disagreement between St. Jerome and St. Augustine [3] The four chief mysteries of Christ [4] The office of a good prelate [5] The four patriarchal Churches [6] The four Monarchies [7] One living creature endowed with a fourfold face [8] Dan. 4 [9] The books of the Old Testament are 24 [10] The twelve Judges of the Synagogue [11] The twelve Judges of the Church of Christ [12] The twelve Patriarchs of the old Church [13] The twelve Patriarchs of the new Church [14] Why Christ is called a Lamb, and why also a Lion [15] The eyes signify light, the horns strength [16] Christ keeps the signs of his death in his body [17] Ps. 138:16 [18] Exod. 32:32

(Rich PDF p. 130 — printed folio 113, recto. ***The seven seals*** *expounded through many authors: Augustine (the 7 gifts of the Spirit, Isa 11), Thomas (the seven horsemen of Rev 6 — preachers, tyrants, heretics, false brethren, martyrs, Antichrist, the final peace), Primasius (the seven grammatical* moods *of Scripture, with examples), Theodorus, Gregory, Isidore, Rupert, Lyra (the seven ages of the Church, Caius→Constantine). Then* ***the Sealed Book*** *(Isa 29; 2 Cor 3 — the veil on the Jews; only the Lamb opens it), and why God made Scripture difficult (Augustine's three causes). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …the Book is all the] divine scripture, digested into two Testaments. Written *within,* in the old testament, in which the obscure mysteries of our redemption are contained; [1] *without,* in the new, openly explained — or, *Without,* according to the historical understanding, [and] *Within,* according to the mystical and spiritual sense.

6. THE SEVEN SEALS, as Augustine attests, signify the most obscure fullness of the mysteries lying hidden in the divine scripture; for the number seven, in the scriptures, denotes the last completion [2] of that thing whereof we speak. Arethas says the seven Seals demonstrate the varieties of days and successions of times which befall in this transitory world, whose articles and moments no one, save God alone, can exactly know. Or, as Augustine again — writing to Maximinus — says, the seven seals are the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, of which it is read in Isaiah, chapter 11: [3] *THE spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and of piety; and shall fill him with the spirit of fear.* THOMAS [Aquinas] says the septenary number of the seals is the enclosure of the divine knowledge, shutting up in itself seven secrets pertaining to the state of the Church, which are opened to John; and they are these. The first is of the white horse, which signifies the company of preachers [4] coursing about in the primitive church. The second is of the red horse, which portends the persecution of tyrants. [5] The third, of the black horse, which is a type of the heretics. [6] The fourth, of the pale horse, in which is shown the multitude of false brethren [7] and hypocrites. The fifth, of the souls of the martyrs resting under the altar of God — which designates the consolation to be present to the elect in tribulation. The sixth, of the darkening of the Moon, which figures the persecution of Antichrist. The seventh, of the silence of half an hour, which hints at the peace of the church after the death of Antichrist —

but [a peace] to last a little while. PRIMASIUS says the seven seals are the seven wholesome modes [8] of the sacred utterances of the divine scripture — that is: the Indicative, as in Micah, [9] *I will show you what is good;* the Pronunciative, as in Isaiah, [10] *I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God;* the Imperative, as in the same prophet, [11] *Cry, cease not;* the Optative, as again in Isaiah, [12] *Would that you had attended to my commandments;* the Conjunctive, as in Jeremiah, [13] *If you will not hear my voice;* the Infinitive, as in the same [prophet], [14] *To know and understand me, that I am the Lord;* the Impersonal, as in the Psalm, [15] *Who shall declare the powers of the Lord?* THEODORUS says the seven seals signify the seven regular forms of sacred understanding. [16] The first is the text of the history. The second, allegory. The third, the commixture of both, of history as well as of allegory. The fourth is of the immutable essence of the divine Trinity — [showing] when it is insinuated into the sacred oracles properly, [and] when tropically. The fifth is of parables, in which, while one thing is said, another is spiritually signified. The sixth is of the twofold coming of the Savior — lest the first be understood for the second, or the second for the first. The seventh is of the twin precepts, both of the life to be led and of [the life] to be signified. GREGORY says the seven seals are the seven mysteries of human redemption — [17] namely the Incarnation, the Nativity, the Passion, the Descent to hell, the Resurrection, the Ascension, [and] the Coming to judgment. ISIDORE says the seven seals are the seven modes of speaking in the scriptures: [18] that is, the Historical, Tropical, Allegorical, Anagogical, Figurative, Absolute, [and] Parabolic. RUPERT asserts that they are the seven spirits by which the divine scripture was inspired. LYRA says the seven seals are the seven states of the Church [19] from the ascension of Christ to the judgment. The first state, shown by the white horse, signifies the time under the Emperor Caius. The second, by the red horse, the persecution of Nero. The third, by the black horse, the times of Vespasian and Titus. The fourth, in the pale horse, the persecution of Domitian. The fifth, the persecution under Trajan even to Diocletian. The sixth, the state of the church under Diocletian. The seventh, the battles of the Church against heretics — which times follow [those] of Constantine.

THE SEALED BOOK, in Hebrew ספר החתום *Sepher hachatum*, signifies the volume of the whole divine scripture, whose understanding is sealed up to the unbelieving and to those lacking the spirit of God, and altogether hidden — the prophet saying, [20] *UNLESS YOU BELIEVE, YOU SHALL NOT UNDERSTAND.* Of which book Isaiah, speaking to the Jews (to be blinded in future ages), says: [21] *THE Lord has mingled for you a spirit of deep sleep; he shall shut your eyes — the prophets and your princes, who see visions, shall he cover. And the vision of all shall be to you as the words of a sealed Book, which, when they shall give it to one that knows letters, he shall say, Read this; and he shall answer, I cannot, for it is sealed. And the book shall be given to one that knows not letters, and it shall be said to him, Read; and he shall answer, I know not letters.* By which words Isaiah foretold that the prophetic visions, and the whole divine scripture, would be closed to the Jews [22] on account of their perfidy and ingratitude, and that they would be utterly blinded, so that reading they should not understand what they read. Whence Paul rightly says of them, to the Corinthians: [23] *EVEN unto this present day the selfsame veil, in the reading of the old Testament, remains unrevealed (which is made void in Christ); but even to this present day, when Moses is read, the veil is laid upon their heart: but when they shall be converted to God, the veil shall be taken away.* For no one is able — as John says — neither in heaven, nor on earth, nor under the earth, [24] by the powers of his own wit, to cut away the veil of this book, which by its own nature is sealed, and shut up with the seals of inaccessible mysteries; nor can anyone open the book except that seven-horned and seven-eyed Lamb [25] — to whom the four living creatures and the four-and-twenty elders, falling down, acclaim: *WORTHY art thou, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God in thy blood.* This Lamb is Christ, who, after his resurrection (as Luke says), [26] opened to his disciples the sense, that they might understand the scriptures, and through them unlocked the understanding of them to the holy and catholic Doctors. Now God willed his scriptures (as Augustine says) to be sealed and closed chiefly for three causes: [27] first, to avoid loathing [contempt]. For such is the condition of men, that things by their own nature open, and everywhere obvious, or easily investigated, they loathe and despise; [28] but things covered

and hidden, they more desire; and, [being] desired, [they] more ardently seek out; and, [being] found, the more sweetly

[→ *taste* (gustent)]

[1] In the Old Testament the mysteries of our redemption are obscure [2] The number seven denotes the last completion of a thing [3] Isa. 11:2-3 [4] The white horse signifies the Doctors of the Gospel [5] The red horse portends the persecution of Tyrants [6] The black horse is a type of the heretics [7] The pale horse designates false brethren [8] The seven wholesome modes of the utterances of divine Scripture [9] Micah 6:8 [10] Isa. 44:6 [11] Isa. 58:1 [12] Isa. 48:18 [13] Baruch 1 (so printed 1:29) [14] Jer. 9:24 [15] Ps. 105:2 [16] The seven regular forms of sacred understanding [17] The seven mysteries of human redemption [18] The seven modes of speaking in the Scriptures [19] The seven states of the Church [20] Isa. 7:9 [21] Isa. 29:10-12 [22] The Scripture closed to the Jews on account of their perfidy [23] 2 Cor. 3:14-16 [24] Apoc. 5:3 [25] Apoc. 5:9 [26] Luke 24:45 [27] God willed the divine scriptures to be difficult for three causes [28] Let the Calvinists read this

---

(Rich PDF p. 131 — printed folio 114, verso. End of Augustine's three reasons for Scripture's obscurity (utility, elucidation, taming pride — the Ethiopian eunuch, Acts 8). Then heretical/disputed writings: ***SILVANUS*** *(Silas; the Thessalonian epistles; 1 Pet 5:12);* ***SIMON MAGUS*** *(the Samaritan — his statue at Rome, his blasphemies, his fall by Peter's prayer); the* ***Assumption of Zephaniah****;* ***SOSTHENES*** *(co-signer of 1 Cor; bishop of Colophon); the* ***Writing of the Spartans*** *(1 Macc 12); and the* ***Manichaean writings*** *under the name of "the Paraclete." Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …the more sweetly] taste [them]. As, therefore, God has set many [things] in the divine books in the most open light, that from them we might be fed and drive away hunger, so he has wrapped many [things] in most useful obscurities, [1] that in these — without any loathing or satiety — we may exercise the acuteness of [our] wit. Secondly, that obscurity may conduce to a greater elucidation of the truth, while the explanations of many hidden meanings are drawn forth into the light — and one [expositor] thus, and another again thus most truly, veraciously explains what had been obscure; and, on occasion of inquiring into the proposed difficulty, he attains also the truth of other matters which he was not seeking. Thirdly, to repress the temerity of human wit, and to tame its pride by labor; [2] so that, while the swelling and puffed-up mind of man presumes that it can penetrate the abstruse recesses of the divine letters, at length, despairing, it may be forced to cry out, together with that Ethiopian Eunuch: [3] *How can I understand these things, unless someone show me?*

SILVANUS — whom some hand down to be called Silas by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles [4] — is thought to have been, together with Paul, the author of the two epistles to the Thessalonians, [5] because in their prefaces the name of Silvanus is joined with the name of Paul. But Photius, bishop of Constantinople, asserts that each [epistle] was elaborated by Paul alone, [6] but communicated and ascribed to Silvanus, as to a fellow-minister, out of apostolic modesty. Peter the apostle makes mention of this Silvanus at the close of [his] former epistle, saying: [7] *By Silvanus, a faithful brother, I have written to you in few [words].* The Synopsis of Dorotheus the Martyr relates that he was bishop of Thessalonica.

SIMON Magus the Samaritan [8] — [his] father Antonius, [his] mother Rachel, from a village which was called Triton — [was] baptized by Philip the deacon (as is read in the Acts of the Apostles), [9] [and] wished to buy with money from the holy Apostles [the power] that by the imposition of his hand also the Holy Spirit might be given. This [man], when he had come to Rome under Claudius Caesar — using the help of a demon assisting him — so bewitched the Romans by magic arts [10] that he was decreed a god by them, and honored with a statue on the island of Aesculapius (set between the two bridges of the Tiber), having also a title written in Latin letters: TO SIMON THE HOLY GOD. Now he wrote volumes of prodigious impiety, seedbeds of all heresies, [11] in which he taught that he himself was the great power of God, whom the Greeks called Jove; but that his consort was that ancient Helen, on account of whom the Trojans and Greeks came to battle; and that Homer wrote allegorically about her whatsoever things are had in the Iliad. He also handed down the practice of a detestable filthiness — of using women indifferently; he denied that God made the world, and likewise [denied] the resurrection of the flesh; he said also that he himself was Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit, and that in the person of the Father he had appeared in the time of Tiberius, and had suffered in appearance [putatively]; then that afterward he had descended in fiery tongues upon the apostles, in the person of the Holy Spirit; but that Christ had neither come, nor suffered anything from the Jews. He died at Rome, cast down from a great height by the prayer of Peter, [12] when he had challenged that same Peter into a contest of miracles. His writings are condemned by Gelasius, in the fifteenth distinction, enumerated in the first place among the works of the heretics.

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE PROPHET SOPHONIAS [Zephaniah] the Synopsis of Athanasius reviews among the impious writings.

SOSTHENES — one of the seventy disciples of our Savior, a Jew by nation, ruler of the synagogue of the Corinthians — suffered many [things] for the cause of the gospel before the proconsul Gallio, [13] as Luke relates in the Acts. This [man] is reported to have composed, together with Paul, that epistle which is the former one, to the Corinthians, [14] because the Apostle, in the salutation of the same epistle, joins him to himself no otherwise than as [one] writing and greeting [with him]. But Photius, bishop of Constantinople, thinks that it proceeded and was dictated from the very spirit and wit of Paul alone; [15] but that the Apostle easily attributed what was his own to Sosthenes, that he might make his epistle firmer and more acceptable to the Corinthians, among whom the name of Sosthenes the ruler of the synagogue was celebrated, and [his] authority greatly venerable. The Synopsis of Dorotheus shows that he was bishop of Colophon. [16]

THE WRITING OF THE SPARTANS — in which it was written that the Jews and the Spartans are brethren, and that both descended from the race of Abraham [17] — is cited in 1 Maccabees 12. Darius, king of the Lacedaemonians, makes mention of this writing in a certain epistle to Onias, pontiff of the Jews; a copy of which, taken from the twelfth book of the Antiquities of the Jews of Josephus, chapter 5, is had above, in [the entry] *Darius.*

Under the name of **THE SPIRIT, THE PARACLETE,** all the works of Manes the Persian (or Manichaeus) are inscribed by the Manichaeans — [18] whom his disciples believed to be [that Paraclete], and taught that he was that Paraclete Spirit promised by Christ in the Gospel. Now among the Manichaeans, under the title of the Paraclete Spirit, [these] more notable volumes, which follow, were had:

Of GOSPELS, one book.

Of MYSTERIES, two-and-twenty books, published in the Syriac tongue according to the number and order of the Syriac letters.

Of the GREAT TREASURE, one book.

Of the LITTLE TREASURE, one book.

Of SUMMARIES, one book.

ON FAITH, a book, whose beginning is: *There was God, and Matter, light and darkness, good and evil,* &c.

TO THE CHURCH of the faithful, one Epistle, which is called [the Epistle] Of the Foundation, whose beginning is: *Manichaeus, Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God the Father. These are wholesome words, from a perennial and living fountain,* &c. And it is had in Augustine, together with its confutation, in the sixth Tome.

TO MARCELLUS, [his] beloved son, one Epistle, whose beginning is: *Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ — and all the saints and virgins who are with me — to Marcellus, [his] beloved son: grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ,* &c. And it is had in Epiphanius, book 2 against the heresies, whence we have taken these [things].

VICTOR, Bishop of Vita [Vtitensis], in the second book of the *African persecution*, has committed to memory that the Manichaeans, out of reverence for their teacher, were wont to carry this writing on the skin of [their] thigh: [19] MANICHAEUS, DISCIPLE OF CHRIST JESUS.

STEPHA-

[→ *STEPHEN* (Stepha[nus])]

---

[1] The obscurity of the Scriptures is useful [2] The obscurity of the Scriptures tames the pride of man [3] Acts 8:31 [4] Acts 15:22 & 16:19 [5] 1 Thess. 1 & 2 Thess. 1 [6] The notable modesty of St. Paul [7] 1 Pet. 5:12 [8] Simon Magus the Samaritan [9] Acts 8:13 [10] Simon by magic arts made the Romans mad [11] The blasphemy of Simon Magus [12] Simon perished miserably at Rome, St. Peter praying [13] Acts 18:17 [14] 1 Cor. 1:1 [15] The Epistle to the Corinthians written by St. Paul alone [16] Sosthenes, bishop of Colophon [17] The Spartans descended from Abraham [18] The madness of the Manichaeans [19] The writing which the Manichaeans were wont to carry on the skin of the thigh

---

(Rich PDF p. 132 — printed folio 115, recto. Letter ***T*** *begins. The Apocalypse of* ***Stephen*** *(a Manichaean forgery); the* ***Lying Stylus of the Scribes*** *(Jer 8:8; the* Tikkun Sopherim *— the scribes' "corrections"); **TERTIUS** (Paul's amanuensis for Romans, blamed — wrongly — for its obscurity); **THADDAEUS/Jude** (the reprobated Gospel); and **THAV** — the letter Tau as the saving mark on the forehead (Ezek 9), the last Hebrew letter, and the origin of the Greek* Τ/Θ *marks for the living and the dead (Persius). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ …STEPH]EN. The Apocalypse of **STEPHEN the Protomartyr** (who was one of the seven deacons of the apostles) — [in truth that] of Manichaeus the heretic, as Serapion is witness — [certain heretics] held in esteem. [1] This Pope Gelasius forbade to Christians under the interdict of anathema, Distinction 15.

THE LYING STYLUS OF THE SCRIBES [2] is cited in Jeremiah in these words: [3] *TRULY the lying stylus of the scribes has wrought falsehood —* עט שקר סופרים *Het seeker sophrim,* that is, *the lying stylus of the scribes.* For which the seventy interpreters translated: εἰς μάτην ἐγενήθη σχοῖνος ψευδὴς γραμματεῦσιν — that is, *In vain was the false measuring-line made for the scribes.* Origen interprets by this Stylus the lying traditions of the scribes and of the doctors of the law — especially those which they had proposed concerning oblations to be offered to the priests and the temple beyond the divine command, commuting the penalty of any most grievous crime whatsoever into oblations appointed at their own discretion. Which Jeremiah, a little above, reproving, was saying: [4] *TRUST not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord it is.* Prochetus, in the first book of the *Victory against the Hebrews*, thinks that Jeremiah, by the lying Stylus of the Scribes, wished prophetically to foretell [5] a certain correction of the divine volumes — which in the Talmudic books is very frequently recalled, called תיקון סופרים *Tikkun Sophrim,* that is, *the Correction of the Scribes* — according to which the Scribes, not long after the return from Babylon, changed certain [things] in the books of the law and the prophets: now distinguishing the scripture by certain points, now adding other [things] in the margins, which — in place of those which were written in the text — might, for civility's and modesty's sake, be read more honorably and more decently: as, for *To lie with a concubine*, [they put] *to sleep with her;* and for *Dung*, [they put] *excrement.* For which cause sometimes also, erasing that which had been written by the prophet, they replaced [it], in the place of that, with what they themselves had judged more [suited] to the decorum of Scripture. Whence it came about that in many places a sense much diverse from the prophet's meaning — and even often contrary and false — emerged. See more fully of this below, book 8, heresy two.

T.

THE TABLES OF HEAVEN — of what kind of writing they are, see above in [the entry] *Joseph* [the oration].

TERTIUS, bishop of Iconium, disciple and amanuensis of Paul, wrote (the Apostle dictating) that Epistle which is to the Romans; at the end of which, adding also his own salutation, he says: [6] *I, TERTIUS, who wrote the Epistle, SALUTE you in the Lord.* This [man], since he was little skilled in speech, nor sufficiently practiced in writing, [7] rendered far more obscure the epistle — which, on account of the multitude and sublimity of [its] questions, is more obscure than the rest of Paul's epistles — while he tried to explain the meanings and thoughts of Paul with elocutions sometimes confused, with unfinished sentences, and with the order-series sometimes transposed. Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, in the exposition of the epistle to the Romans, is witness of this matter. Theodolus, presbyter of Coele-Syria, in the exposition of the epistle to the Romans, reads, for *Tertius, Terentius.* [8]

THADDAEUS the Apostle — who is also called Lebbaeus and Judas — author of the Catholic epistle which is numbered last among the seven catholic [epistles], is said to have written a Gospel, which Gelasius reprobated in the fifteenth Distinction. [9]

THE INSCRIPTION THAV, or the letter ת *Thau* [Tau], is a vital, auspicious, and most salutary sign, [10] with which the divine mercy is wont spiritually to mark the foreheads of those whom it has decreed to snatch away from the fury of the divine vengeance. Ezekiel makes mention of this mystery in that celebrated vision, which he saw in the sixth year of the Babylonian transmigration, in the sixth month, on the sixth day, in these words: [11] *AND the glory of the Lord of Israel was taken up from the Cherub; and he called the man that was clothed with linen, and had a writer's inkhorn at his loins. And the Lord said to him, Pass through the midst of the City, in the midst of Jerusalem, and mark Thau upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and mourn for all the abominations that are done in the midst thereof. And he said to the others, in my hearing — to the men in whose hand were the weapons of destruction — Go through the city, following him, and strike: let not your eye spare, nor be moved with pity: the old man, the youth, and the virgin, the little one, and the women, slay unto utter destruction; but upon whomsoever you shall see Thau, kill [him] not.* These [things] Ezekiel [says] concerning the letter Thau — which God therefore willed to be inscribed on the foreheads of those to be saved, [12] to show that he deservedly snatched such [men] away from so great a slaughter of the whole people, because they alone in the whole city had kept the law of God, whose first letter they bore before them on [their] forehead. For Thau is the letter with which begins the Hebrew word תורה *thorah*, which signifies the divine law; and ת Thau is likewise the last of all the Hebrew letters — the completion, end, and consummation of the whole Jewish alphabet: by whose mark God willed those to be discerned who had fulfilled the whole will of the law (so far as human frailty permits), and had accomplished all the precepts of the divine scripture from the first even to the last letter. And hence, I judge, flowed that custom of distinguishing the living from the dead among the notaries of the ancient soldiery of the Gentiles, [13] who — when in the little rolls, in which the proper names of the soldiers were contained, they wished to show how many of the soldiers survived and how many had fallen in war — set the mark T (*tau*) at the head of the line to designate a survivor; but Θ (*Thita* [Theta]), [14] because it is transfixed through the middle with a dart (that is, with the sign of death), they set beside the name of each dead man. And judges set the same Θ Theta before the names of those whom they visited with punishment. [15] This same [mark], too, painters and sculptors used to write on the epitaphs of tombs — because it is the capital letter of the Greek word Θ θνήσκω, which signifies *I die*, or θανάτου, which signifies *death.* To which the Etruscan poet Persius not ungracefully alluded, when he urged the slaying of vice, in this verse:

> *And one can set the black Theta before a vice.*

And again another Poet:

> *O letter Theta, unhappy far beyond the rest.*

IT IS TO BE KNOWN also, as Jerome in

[→ *most [copies]* (plerisq[ue])]

[1] The Apocalypse of Stephen forged by Manichaeus [2] What the lying stylus is [3] Jer. 8 [4] Jer. 7:4 [5] A slight conjecture of Prochetus concerning a corruption of the Scriptures made by the Scribes — refuted below in book 8, heresy 2 [6] Rom. 16:22 [7] This reason for the obscurity of the epistle to the Romans — that Tertius, who wrote it, was little practiced in writing — does not seem to be approved [8] For Tertius, Theodolus reads Terentius [9] The Gospel of Jude, reprobated [10] ת [Tau], a saving sign [11] Ezek. 9:3-5 [12] Why God willed ת [Tau] to be inscribed on the foreheads of those to be saved [13] Whence the gentiles' custom of distinguishing the living from the dead flowed [14] Θ [Theta] designated the dead [15] Θ [Theta] was set before the names of those to be punished, and written on the epitaphs of tombs

---

*(Rich PDF p. 133 — printed folio 116, verso. **THAV** concluded: Jerome — the Jews' old (Samaritan) letters, changed by Ezra; the old cross-shaped Tau; the cross as the seal of salvation (Gal 6; Matt 16; Rev 7); opinions on Ezek 9 (Theodotion, Isidore, Chrysostom, Origen). Then **THOMAS** the Apostle (the Gospel/Acts of Thomas — Manichaean forgeries; the lion-and-dog fable; the Itinerary, Apocalypse, epistle to Clement); **TIBERIUS CAESAR**'s writings (Suetonius); and **TIMOTHY** of Lystra (co-author with Paul). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …as Jerome, in] most places of his works, is witness — that the Jews, before the Babylonian captivity, had other [letters] (that is, of another shape than now), [1] letters common with the Samaritans, received namely from Moses; whose shapes afterward Ezra, having returned from the captivity, changed, [2] so that the Jews — who in the number, order, sound, and signification of [their] letters agreed with the unbelieving Samaritans, [those] enemies of the Jewish name — might at least differ from them in the shape of the letters: the last of which is called, by the common word of both nations, Thau; and which formerly represented the figure of a cross †, [3] Ezra transformed into this mark ת, which the Jews now use. It was, therefore (unless I am mistaken), the sign Thau written on the foreheads of those who were rescued from the devastation of the city — [4] the figure of the life-giving cross, the symbol of human salvation, and the sign of the redemption of the whole world. By the inscription of which sign it was mystically signified that no one escapes the punishment of everlasting death who has not been marked with the seal of the cross: that is, who has not had inwardly impressed the faith of the cross, passion, and death of Christ; and who, outwardly on his forehead — which is the index of inner confidence, boldness, and constancy — has not borne the cross of Christ; that is, [who has not] with bare and open forehead intrepidly preached the cross of Christ, and reposed all his glory in it, saying, together with Paul: [5] *FAR be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world.* In the cross, I say, of Him who summons his soldiers with these words: [6] *IF anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me* — indicating by this saying that no one can enter into eternal life with Christ, unless he first, in this world, through the way of tribulations, follow the footsteps of Christ going before, bearing before him the sign of Christ's cross in heart, mouth, and hand. [7] This is that sign of the living God, concerning which the Angel in the Apocalypse cries out to the devastating Angels: [8] *HURT not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, until we sign the servants of our God on their foreheads.* Assuredly a sign of victory and of triumph, [9] by which whosoever shall have been protected will break the efforts of all enemies, invisible and visible; neither sin, nor death, nor the world, nor Satan, nor the gates of hell shall prevail against him.

Nevertheless I judge it not to be passed over, that the name Tau is taken as much for the last letter of the Hebrew Alphabet as for any sign whatsoever; whence, since in Ezekiel not the sole figure of the letter Thau itself, ת, is written separately, but the whole word — which almost all interpret as *Sign* — it is indeed uncertain [10] whether the words of the prophet are to be understood of the letter Thau itself, or of some other sign. Theodotion understood [it] of Thau, the last letter of the alphabet; and for that which the Seventy, Aquila, and Symmachus translated *sign*, he put the Hebrew ת itself. Isidore, bishop of Seville, judged that by Thau is signified the Greek letter T (*taf*), because it represents the figure of the Lord's cross. But Chrysostom, in the eighteenth homily to the people of Antioch, expounds by Thau nothing else than an indeterminate sign. Finally, Origen, in the homily *On the Epiphany*, concludes that the letter Thau was the very figure of the cross.

THOMAS the Apostle. The Gospel which was familiar to the Manichaeans under the name of the same Apostle [11] (Gelasius being witness) he is believed to have written: of which Origen makes mention, in the first homily on Luke, saying: *I KNOW a certain Gospel which is called ACCORDING TO THOMAS and ACCORDING TO MATTHIAS; and we read several others, lest we should seem to be ignorant of anything, on account of those who think they know something if they have known these [things]: but in all these we approve nothing else than what the Church [approves], that is, only four gospels.* Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, in the sixth catechetical oration, hands down that the author of this gospel was a certain Thomas, [12] disciple of Manes the Persian. Athanasius in the Synopsis, and Gelasius in distinction 15, reject [it] among the condemned scriptures. [13] Epiphanius, in the second book of the Panarion, relates that the Encratite heretics had in use a certain book whose title is THE ACTS OF THOMAS — which Innocent, the first Pope, reprobates in the epistle to Exuperius. [14] Augustine, in the first book *On the Lord's sermon on the mount*, and in the book against Adimantus, and in the 22nd book against Faustus, attests that the Manichaeans [15] had writings of this kind, in which it was read that the Apostle Thomas — when he was, at a certain marriage-feast, a stranger and wholly unknown — being struck on the palm [cheek] by a certain servant, imprecated upon the man a continual and savage vengeance. Him [the servant], when he had gone out to the fountain to serve water to the guests, a Lion, rushing upon [him], slew; and his hand — with which he had struck the Apostle's head with a light blow — torn from the body (according to the word of the Apostle desiring and imprecating it), a dog brought to the table at which the Apostle was reclining. There are enumerated by Athanasius in the Synopsis, together with the repudiated books, the *Circuits,* or *Itinerary of Thomas the Apostle;* and by Gelasius, distinction 15, his *Apocalypse* is repudiated. It is also SAID that this Apostle wrote to Clement (who was pontiff after Peter) an epistle concerning the [things] seen by him in Parthia, Media, Persia, and India — of which Clement himself makes mention in the ninth volume of the *Recognitions.*

TIBERIUS CAESAR — in whose fifteenth year Luke writes that John preached [16] — published writings of various kinds, in an affected and harsh style, after the imitation of Messalla Corvinus, whom, as a youth, he had attended [as an old man]. [17] He composed also a lyric poem, whose title is: A COMPLAINT ON THE DEATH OF JULIUS CAESAR. He made also Greek poems, imitating Euphorion, and Rhianus, and Parthenius — with which poets he was so delighted that he dedicated their writings and images in the public libraries, among the ancient and chief authors. Suetonius [attests this], in [the life of] Tiberius.

TIMOTHY of Lystra — born of a gentile father [and] a Hebrew mother [18] — was made first bishop of Ephesus by Paul, while yet quite a youth, on account of his eminent virtues. Him the Apostle, in the salutations of his letters, seems to indicate to have been a co-adjutor to him in the writing and composing of some epistles, [19] which are inscribed with the names of Paul and Timothy joined together. And these are:

TO-

[→ *TO […]* (Ad)]

---

[1] The Jews before the Babylonian captivity used letters common with the Samaritans [2] The form of the letters which the Jews now use, devised by Esdras [3] The letter Thau once represented the form of the cross † [4] The sign of the cross inscribed on the foreheads of those rescued from the devastation of the city [5] Gal. 6:14 [6] Matt. 16:24 [7] He who wishes to be Christ's disciple must bear his own cross [8] Apoc. 7:3 [9] The sign of the Cross is a sign of victory and triumph [10] Various opinions concerning the sense of the words of Ezekiel, ch. 9 [11] The Gospel which was thought to be St. Thomas's, familiar to the Manichaeans [12] A certain Thomas, disciple of Manes, was the author [13] The Gospel according to Thomas is numbered among the condemned scriptures [14] The Acts of Thomas, reprobated by Innocent I [15] A fable forged by the Manichaeans about St. Thomas [16] Luke 3 [17] Tiberius Caesar, disciple of Messalla Corvinus [18] Acts 16:1 [19] Some epistles are inscribed with the names of Paul and Timothy together

---

(Rich PDF p. 134 — printed folio 117, recto. End of ***TIMOTHY*** *(the Paul-Timothy epistles; the four spurious* Books to the Church = *Salvian; why Luke wrote to "Theophilus"). Then* ***TITVLVS*** *— the four senses of the word: an inscription (the title on the cross), a monument (Saul's arch; Absalom's pillar), an idol (Lev 26), a standing stone (Jacob's* matsevah, *Gen 28); the* ***Book of Tobias the Younger*** *(a magic forgery);*

*the **Traditions of the Jews** (Epiphanius; the brothers of the Lord); and the **Traditions of the Elders** (Matt 15 — the Pharisees' hand-washing). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ TO] the Corinthians, the second [epistle]; [1] to the Colossians, one; [2] to the Philippians, one; [3] to the Thessalonians, two; [4] [5] to Philemon, one. [6]

These, however, Photius, bishop of Constantinople, judges to have been first composed by Paul alone, [7] and then communicated and ascribed to [his] uniquely beloved disciple Timothy, out of the inborn modesty and charity of the Apostle.

THERE ARE carried about, likewise, under the name of Timothy the bishop, four Books to the catholic church, [8] which Salvian, bishop of Marseilles — prefixing a preface to them — shows not to be of this Timothy, but published by a certain writer of his own times; who, fleeing the breath of human praise, [his] own name concealed, feigned the word *Timothy* (by which the honor of the Divinity is expressed), that he might signify that he had written not to catch the honor of men, but for the honor of God alone — imitating in this the example of Luke the evangelist, who, in the exordium of each of his works, feigned the name of Theophilus, [9] pretending that he was writing to a man, when he was directing [his] writings to the love of God, by whom he had been impelled to write. [10] [11] The character of this work, unless my taste deceives me, savors of the phrase and style of that same Salvian.

TITULUS, in the sacred letters, sometimes signifies [12] ἐπιγραφή, that is, an inscription which is written over things, that at once, at first sight, it may be known what the superscribed thing is. [13] So the Evangelists report the title set over the Lord's cross by Pilate, written in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew letters, [14] [15] that thereby the cause of Christ's death might be manifest. Sometimes it signifies [16] marble columns, pyramids, pillars, or arches, inscribed with the names and eulogies of illustrious men, for preserving the memory of the [things] brilliantly done by them. Thus in the first volume of Kings we read [17] that Saul, the nation of the Amalekites being conquered, erected for himself a title [18] — or, as our edition has it, a triumphal arch — on Mount Carmel. So in the second book of the same work we read [it] written: [19] *NOW Absalom had erected for himself, while he was yet alive, a title [pillar], which is in the King's Valley: for he had said, I have no son, and this shall be the monument of my name. And he called the title by his own name; and it is called THE HAND OF ABSALOM even to this day.* Which words Josephus, expounding in the seventh book of the Antiquities, [renders]: *NOW Absalom had erected for himself, in the King's Valley, a marble column with an inscription, distant two stadia from Jerusalem, which he willed to be called the Hand of Absalom — saying that, if it should befall his children to perish, yet in this his name would remain.* Sometimes Titulus, in the sacred letters, is the same as a statue, [20] image, and likeness set up for the veneration and worship of some man — which, [under] the setting-up of a Title, God, forbidding in the third volume of the law, [21] says: *YOU shall not make for yourselves an idol and a graven thing, nor erect titles.* Sometimes also Titulus denotes [22] an unshaped stone — standing without any inscription, and without any polishing of art, and erected on the surface of the earth — such as we read in Genesis was the stone which Jacob, sleeping at Bethel of Luz, put under his head, and, [23] roused from sleep, set up as a title, pouring oil upon it, and saying: *THE Lord shall be to me for a God, and this stone [shall be] a title.* From these words it is clear that that Title was not a column or a pyramid, but a rude stone, at first lying on the ground, then erected on high, for the perpetual remembrance of the [things] which had befallen the Patriarch Jacob in that place. This Moses called מצבה *matsevah,* that is, *a standing Stone;* and the seventy interpreters at times translated [it] λίθον, that is, *Stone.*

TITULUS, or the Inscription of the cross of Jesus Christ [24] — see above, [in] those [things] which are written by us in [the entry] *Pontius Pilate.*

THE BOOK OF TOBIAS THE YOUNGER, forged by sorcerous men, [25] contains incantations and certain magical images, by which Tobias, son of Tobit, is feigned to have driven off the demons from his spouse Sara. The Senate of the Sacrosanct Roman Inquisition condemned the book, [it being] rejected among the

works of magical impiety.

THE TRADITIONS OF THE JEWS Epiphanius very frequently cites, certain [of them] without the author's name: out of whose authority he himself brings forward — against the Hieracites — the Genealogy of Melchizedek [26] from the nation of the Sidonians; and against the Melchizedechians, the Genealogy of the prophets Elijah and Daniel. Likewise, against the Antidicomarianites, he shows from the same traditions that Joseph, the spouse of the Virgin Mary, had another wife before Mary, [27] and had by her four sons — who in Mark and John are named James, Joseph, Jude, and Simeon — and two daughters, Mary and Salome; [and] that, she being dead, when he was a widower and eighty years old, he took the Virgin Mary to wife. Likewise, against the Collyridians, he relates that the parents of the Virgin Mary were Joachim and Anna. Again, disputing against the Manichaeans, he proves from the same [traditions] that Lazarus, when he was raised by Christ, [28] was thirty years old, and after the resurrection survived thirty other [years]. Jerome also cites other Hebrew traditions in the book of *Hebrew Traditions*, very often. Euthymius, in chapter 23 of Matthew, alleges a certain kind of Jewish traditions, which — because they are not written — are called ἄγραφα [unwritten].

THE TRADITIONS OF THE ELDERS — which Matthew in Hebrew called גזירות הזקנים *Ghezerot ha-zekenim*, that is, *the Constitutions of the Elders* (but the Greek codex, in the singular number, calls [it] τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, that is, *the tradition of the Elders*) — the divine scripture commemorates in several places, especially in Matthew chapter 15, [29] where the Pharisees, accusing the Apostles, question Christ, saying: *WHY do your disciples transgress the Traditions of the Elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.* Whom Christ, convicting of a greater crime, and in turn questioning, says: [30] *WHY do you also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition?* And a little after he adds: [31] *IN VAIN do they worship me, teaching the doctrines and commandments of men.* At the observers of these Traditions God, being angry, threatens through his prophets, saying in Isaiah: [32] *BECAUSE they have feared me with the commandment and doctrines of men, wisdom shall perish from their wise men.* And in Jeremiah: TRULY

[→ *TRULY* (Vere)]

---

[1] 2 Cor. 1:1 [2] Col. 1:1 [3] Phil. 1:1 [4] 1 Thess. 1:1 [5] 2 Thess. 1:1 [6] Philem. 1:1 [7] The singular modesty of St. Paul [8] Timothy, disciple of St. Paul, is not the author of the four books to the Catholic Church [9] Why St. Luke used the name Theophilus, as if he were writing to someone of that name [10] Luke 1:3 [11] Acts 1:1 [12] *Titulus* in the sacred letters signifies various things [13] The first signification of *Titulus* [14] Mark 15:26 [15] John 19:19 [16] The second signification of *Titulus* [17] 1 Kings 15:12 [18] Saul erected for himself a triumphal arch [19] 2 Sam. 18:18 [20] The third signification of *Titulus* [21] Lev. 26:1 [22] The fourth signification of *Titulus* [23] Gen. 28:21-22 [24] John 19:19 [25] Sorcerers published a book under the name of Tobias [26] Melchisedech, of the nation of the Sidonians [27] Epiphanius thinks that Joseph, before the Blessed Virgin, had another wife [28] Lazarus, when he was raised by Christ, was 30 years old [29] Matt. 15:2 [30] Matt. 15:3 [31] Matt. 15:9 [32] Isa. 29:13-14

---

*(Rich PDF p. 135 — printed folio 118, verso. **The Traditions of the Elders** concluded: Paul's denunciations of vain traditions (1 Tim; 2 Tim; Titus; Gal 1) — but not ALL human tradition is condemned; the **Manichaean** and **Ptolemaite** misreadings refuted; the **Lutherans** likewise wrong (Christ wills the ecclesiastical traditions kept — 2 Thess 2:15; Matt 23; Luke 10; Basil). Then **STRATONICUS** (the traditions = the tenets of the four Jewish sects) and the **five dogmas of the Pharisees** (providence + free will, immortal souls, transmigration, reverence for elders, the traditions). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ TRULY] the lying stylus of the scribes has wrought falsehood. The wise are confounded… they have cast away the word of the Lord, and there is no wisdom in them. [1] These same Traditions Paul the Apostle, everywhere deriding — and calling [them] now Jewish fables, now old-wives' trifles, now foolish questions and profane vanities — deters Timothy from the handling of them, in these words: [that they] should NOT attend, he says, to endless Genealogies, [2] which afford questions rather than the edification of God which is in faith — as some, wishing to be teachers of the law. And again to the same he says: [3] Avoid FOOLISH questions, and [those] without instruction. And again: Avoid silly and old-wives' fables. And, to Titus,

repeating the same: Avoid [4] [5] foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions of the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. Nor does he warn this in vain, [being] himself experienced [in it], how much the observance of these traditions had harmed himself and others; for on account of these (as the epistle written to the Galatians testifies) [6] he himself persecuted beyond measure the Church of God, and assailed it, being a zealot of the paternal traditions in Judaism. Since, therefore, both Christ and Paul so sharply inveigh against Traditions of this kind, therefore — lest anyone should perhaps think that human Traditions of whatsoever kind are universally condemned — it will not be beside the purpose briefly to indicate [7] what are the doctrines and commandments of men reprobated by God.

THE MANICHAEANS impiously affirmed that, by the Traditions of the Elders, all the Scriptures of the old Testament are to be understood; [8] and these, they said, were called by Paul Jewish fables and profane vanities. [9] But against the madness of these, Paul himself, writing to the Romans, [10] cries out: [11] *THE LAW indeed [is] holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good.* And to Timothy he says: [12] *BUT do you continue in the [things] which you have learned, because from infancy you have known the sacred letters, which can instruct you unto salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus: for all Scripture, divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished unto every good work.*

THE PTOLEMAITE Heretics, as Epiphanius hands down in the first [book] against the heresies, understood, by the Traditions condemned by Christ, not all, but some, Scriptures of the old Testament, [13] which they divided into three parts: of which one they said was founded by God, another by Moses, the third written by the Elders of the Jews, and afterward rejected by Christ, saying: [14] *WHY do you also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition? For God said, Honor father and mother; and, He that shall curse father or mother, let him die the death.* [15] [16] *But you say, If a man shall say to father or mother, KORBAN ([which is] a Gift), whatsoever from me shall profit you: and you no longer permit* [17] *him to do anything for his father or mother — rescinding the word of God by your tradition, which you have delivered,* &c. But since the words of this tradition are nowhere found in the whole old testament, it is manifest that Christ, under the name of Traditions, condemned no part of the divine Scriptures, [18] but other Jewish constitutions, foreign to sacred Scripture, and contrary to the word of God.

LUTHER, and all the foul filth of the Lutherans, interpret — by the traditions and doctrines of men rejected by Christ — all ecclesiastical Sanctions [19] which have not, in the divine letters, an open and express testimony of God. But it appears that they lie wickedly, [20] from this: that Christ and Paul, in the places already cited, do not condemn good and just traditions of men (although these have not the express word of God), but only Jewish constitutions — that is, [those] repugnant to the commandments of God; such as was that [tradition] of the Pharisees, [21] *Whatsoever GIFT is from me shall profit you* [22] — which destroyed the divine precept concerning piety toward parents. But the ecclesiastical Sanctions, and the decrees of the Fathers, which promote and increase the worship of God, [23] Christ wills to be observed — so that through Paul he says: *STAND, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by our word or by our epistle.* [24] And he himself, establishing a law concerning the traditions of the Pastors to be kept, says: [25] *ALL THINGS whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do.* And to the Pastors he says: [26] *HE who hears you, hears me; and he who despises you, despises me.* And: [27] *IF he will not hear the church, let him be to you as the heathen and the publican.* For no less does he deserve to be cast out among the Heathen who refuses the ecclesiastical traditions [28] than he who refuses the gospel; since — the constitutions of the church being rejected — the gospel too must needs be cast off. [29] Which also blessed Basil, in the book *On the Holy Spirit*, plainly attests in these words, chapter 27: *If we shall attempt once to repudiate the unwritten ordinances and customs — as though a great force were not in them — we shall, secretly and by degrees, disapprove the very established sentences of the gospel, or rather shall contract its preaching into an empty name. I judge it therefore Apostolic to continue in these traditions also, which are not written.* But of these we have spoken

more fully elsewhere.

STRATONICUS, Bishop of Cumae, in his Collectanea, judges that these Traditions were the tenets and decrees of the Jewish sects. [30] For there were four modes of life among the Jews (as Josephus and Epiphanius write): [31] of which the Pharisees professed one, the Galileans another, the Sadducees a third, the Essenes a fourth.

Now the dogmas of the Pharisees were of this kind: [32]

1. That all things are done by Fate — that is, by the prescience and immovable decree of God — the free assent of the human will nevertheless remaining. [33] For with such a tempering does God, the best, govern the affairs of men, that, although all things depend on his deliberation, yet in man there is entire the faculty of approaching to virtue and to vice.

2. That souls are incorrupt and immortal, and that their judgments take place beneath the earth, and that rewards befall to each according to the desert of virtue and of malice.

3. That the souls of the pious return from the lower regions into this life, to new bodies, and again pass from these into other bodies; [34] but that the souls of the wicked, condemned to perpetual prisons, are tormented with unending punishment.

4. That the elders are to be venerated, and that it is not lawful either to answer back to those admonishing, or to gainsay [them].

5. That the traditions of the elders — which are not written among the Mosaic laws, but delivered by the forefathers from hand to hand — are to be received with the highest veneration, and to be honored with equal honor with the Mosaic law.

[→ *the other sects' tenets follow*]

---

[1] Jer. 8:8-9 [2] 1 Tim. 1:4 [3] 2 Tim. 2:23 [4] 1 Tim. 4:7 [5] Titus 3:9 [6] Gal. 1:13-14 [7] Scripture does not condemn traditions of every kind [8] The Manichaeans understood, by the name of the condemned Traditions, the Scriptures of the Old Testament [9] 1 Tim. 4 [10] The Manichaeans are refuted [11] Rom. 7:12 [12] 2 Tim. 3:14-17 [13] What the Ptolemaites understood by the name of the condemned Traditions [14] Matt. 15:3-5 [15] Exod. 20 [16] Deut. 5 [17] Mark 7:11 [18] Under the name of Tradition Christ condemns the Jewish constitutions foreign to sacred scripture and contrary to the word of God [19] The Lutherans reject the ecclesiastical Sanctions [20] The lie of the Lutherans [21] The Pharisees destroyed the divine precept concerning piety toward parents [22] Matt. 15:5 [23] Christ wills the ecclesiastical Sanctions to be observed [24] 2 Thess. 2:15 [25] Matt. 23:3 [26] Luke 10:16 [27] Matt. 18:17 [28] Whoever rejects the ecclesiastical traditions is to be cast out among the heathen [29] The gospel too will at length be cast off if the ecclesiastical traditions are rejected [30] There were four modes of life among the Jews — of the Pharisees, Galileans, Sadducees, and Essenes [31] Josephus, Antiquities bk. 18 ch. 18, and bk. 2 of the Jewish War ch. 7 [32] The dogmas of the Pharisees [33] The Pharisees admitted the free will of man [34] The Pharisees impiously asserted the migration of souls

---

*(Rich PDF p. 136 — printed folio 119, verso. The Jewish sects continued: the **Galileans** (Judas of Galilee — God alone is Lord, refusing tribute; John 8:33); the four dogmas of the **Sadducees** (no fate, no immortality, no angels, only the Mosaic books); and the fifteen rules of the **Essenes** (the monastic community — celibacy, common goods, white garments, the latrine-mattock, the fifth-hour meal, the three-year probation). Then the **Traditions of the Elders** per Epiphanius, Jerome (the* deuteroseis *— Shammai, Hillel, Akiba…), and Thomas Aquinas (the **Talmud**). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

THE GALILEANS, who took their origin from Judas the Galilean, of the country of Gamala, followed the same tenets as the Pharisees, [1] adding only this one thing of their own: namely, that God alone is to be held for Lord, and that no mortal prince is to be obeyed, but that, for the asserting of liberty, all hard and harsh [things] are to be endured. Josephus relates that this kind of men often stirred up the peoples to cast off the empires of kings and lords, and to refuse the payment of tribute [2] (which is a manifest testimony of servitude); and among these he writes that there were, in the time of Herod, six thousand men who — when the whole nation of the Jews had bound their fidelity by oath to Caesar and the King — these alone would neither take the oath nor promise fidelity. There are also [those] who think that of this sect were those Jews

whom we read, glorying in liberty, [3] to have said to Christ (in whom they had lately believed): [4] *WE ARE THE SEED OF ABRAHAM, AND WE HAVE NEVER SERVED ANYONE;* and that they therefore had adhered to Christ, because they hoped that he would one day be the asserter and vindicator of Jewish liberty.

The **SADDUCEES** had opinions diverse from these, [5] namely:

1. That there is no Fate at all, nor any decree of divine deliberation, but that all things are so in the power of men that each is the author to himself of his happiness as well as of his misfortune.

2. That souls are altogether extinguished together with the body, [6] and that no rewards or punishments remain after this life.

3. That there is no nature of Angels, [7] but only names — by which either the motions which God breathes into men are designated, or those demonstrations of his power which he himself puts forth.

4. That, besides the Mosaic books and the divine laws comprised in the same volumes, [8] no other authority of scriptures, nor tradition of men, is to be received.

The **ESSENES,** more notable cultivators of piety, and not much unlike Christian monks, [9] had bound themselves to these laws and sanctions:

1. That all things are ruled by fate — that is, by the will of God — and that nothing befalls men beyond the determination of fate.

2. That souls are immortal, and that to them, after this life, the rewards and punishments of their deeds are repaid — to the good, indeed, beyond the Ocean, where there is a region which neither cold nor heat oppresses, but a pleasant Zephyr breathes; but to the wicked, among the lower regions, where the places are wretched and full of groanings.

3. That every oath is to be avoided as a kind of perjury, because whatever a perfect man shall say ought to have the force of an oath; and that he is condemned as guilty of a lie, who is not believed without God as witness.

4. That the highest reverence, after God, is to be shown to Moses the lawgiver — whom, if anyone shall blaspheme, let him be condemned to death.

5. That the chief study is to be applied to the divine letters, and to the writings of the ancient fathers; and thence are to be sought the [things] that avail for the care of souls.

6. That the prefect of the common fellowship is to be so obeyed, that nothing may be done without his command.

7. To lead a continent and celibate life, and to abstain from all wedlock through the whole [of] life.

8. That all goods are common, and [that there is] one patrimony of all, which is dispensed through common stewards.

9. That they neither buy nor sell anything among themselves, but that it is free for all to receive, from whom they please, what is needful.

10. That white garments are to be used, and that the cloak and shoes are not to be changed, unless the former be altogether torn, or consumed by long use.

11. That so great a care of cleanliness is to be had, even in natural [bodily] purgations, that each one daily, in the most secret places, digs for himself a pit with a little mattock, in which he may relieve his belly [10] — the garment being first let down all around for the sake of covering the body, and then the earth which he had dug out being brought back into its place — namely, lest an injury be done to the splendor of the divine light.

12. That before the rising of the Sun, the author of the light about to be born is to be celebrated with public praises; but afterward each is to go to his own arts and studies.

13. That at the fifth hour of the day they come together into a common dining-hall, clothed in sacred garments (that is, in linen coverings); and there, sitting in silence, they eat of the same bread and pottage; nor is it lawful for anyone to taste anything, unless a public prayer precede the meal, and follow [it] — [a prayer] which praises God, the giver of sustenance, both before and after food.

14. That after the meal, the sacred vestments being laid aside, each withdraws to his own works until evening.

15. That those lately approaching to the discipline of the Essenes are not at once to be taken into fellowship, but — clothed in a white garment and an apron [perizoma], and girt with a little mattock — are to be tested by their curators for three whole years, until they give approved proofs of [their] virtue.

EPIPHANIUS, in the first book against the heresies, says that the Traditions of the elders are four Jewish Expositions of the divine law, [11] devised by certain masters of the Hebrews — that is, by Moses the Prophet, by Rabbi Akiba, by Rabbi Ida, and by the sons of Asamonaeus — who, out of the aforesaid expositions, deduced certain constitutions, full of superstition and vanity, which they also commanded to be observed, together with the rest of the commands of the divine law, with equal obligation.

JEROME, in the third commentary [12] on Isaiah, and in the tenth question to Algasia, and on the third chapter of the epistle to Titus, writes that these are certain constitutions of the Jews, called by the Greeks δευτερώσεις [*deuteroseis*], which the first among the Hebrews, before the coming of Christ, taught — Shammai and Hillel, whose school Akiba took up (the teacher of Aquila the proselyte); and after him Meir, whom Jochanan the son of Zaccai succeeded; and after him Eliezer; and in order Delphon; and again Joseph; and lastly Joshua — even to the last destruction of the holy city.

THOMAS Aquinas, in the commentaries on both epistles to Timothy, once and again asserts that by the name of Traditions is signified that huge and vast work of Jewish traditions, [13] called by the Jews תלמוד *Talmud*, that is, *Instruction* [Discipline]; in which are collected—

[→ *are collected* (collecta sunt)]

---

[1] The Galileans spurned the dominions and empires of men [2] The payment of tribute is a manifest testimony of servitude [3] The Galileans gloried in liberty [4] John 8:33 [5] The dogmas of the Sadducees [6] The Sadducees denied the immortality of souls [7] The Sadducees denied that Angels exist [8] The Sadducees admitted no scriptures besides the Mosaic books [9] The dogmas of the Essenes, who were not much unlike Christian monks [10] A like law is had in Deut. 23:13 [11] The traditions of the elders, to Epiphanius, are the four Jewish expositions of the divine Law [12] Jerome's opinion concerning the Traditions of the Elders [13] Talmud is the same as "instruction"

---

*(Rich PDF p. 137 — printed folio 120, recto. The **Talmud** entry: its contents and dating (the Mishnah ~150 after Jerusalem's fall; the Jerusalem Talmud ~300; the Babylonian Talmud, AD 476, at "Babylon of Egypt" = Cairo); its blasphemies; the papal burnings (Gregory IX 1230, Innocent IV 1244, Julius III 1553, Paul IV 1559 — 12,000 codices burned at Cremona); Sixtus's rebuke of Galatinus's defense (the Council of Vienne's decree misread); and his announcement of a catalog of the Talmudic volumes. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[→ …in which] are collected all the decrees of the aforesaid masters — Shammai, Hillel, Akiba, Joseph, and the sons of Asamonaeus — together with innumerable other statutes, opinions, and expositions of the Rabbis, both of divine and of human laws, by which the whole nation of the Jews is now governed. This work had its beginning [1] (as the Talmud expositors themselves write) in the year one hundred and fiftieth after the last destruction of Jerusalem, [made] by Judah, son of Simon, who gathered into one volume the explanations of the law and the prophets, and all the writings which the above-mentioned Rabbis and the other doctors — as much before as after the coming of Christ — had thus far written; which [volume] they called משנה *Misna*,

that is, *Repeated reading*, or *Repetition.* But in the three-hundredth year from the same last devastation of Jerusalem, Rabbi Jochanan — taking to himself as colleagues Rab and Samuel — joined this Misna and certain other writings into one volume, which they called the JERUSALEM TALMUD, [2] because it was written among the ruins of the city of Jerusalem. Again, in the year four hundred thirty-sixth from the same destruction (which was the year of Christ four hundred seventy-sixth), Rabbi Ashe and Rabbi Hammai — dwelling in Babylon of Egypt, which is now called Cairo [3] [4] — reducing all the writings of [their] predecessors into one, constructed a new body of many volumes, called the BABYLONIAN TALMUD; which, since they could not (being prevented by death) complete it, Rabbi Meir, son of Rabbi Ashe, put the finishing hand to the work. But since both he, and his forefathers and posterity, had gathered through the several books of this Talmud not only many and execrable contumelies and blasphemies against Christ our God, [5] but had also written many sanctions and precepts against that very law of Moses which they profess, and against all the law of nations, and all the law of nature (which they — as being men — are bound to keep), it seemed [good] to the Supreme Pontiffs and to other Christian princes [6] that the reading and use of so nefarious a doctrine should be forbidden to all the Jews who live under the dominion of Christians, and that all the Talmudic books throughout the whole Christian world should be given to the flames. Which also has often been done, certain writers worthy of credit attest. Among whom Bernard of Luxembourg, in the catalog of heretics, book two, relates that Pope Gregory the ninth of that name, in the year of the Lord 1230, adjudged all the Talmudic volumes to the flames; and likewise that Pope Innocent the fourth of that name did the same again, in the year of our salvation 1244. Again, when the same volumes had been restored by the Jews, and, by the help of the printing art, propagated to a well-nigh infinite number, Pope Julius III — a new edict being promulgated — commanded [them] to be sought out, and (in the year 1553, when the feast of Tabernacles was being celebrated by the Jews in the month of September) to be burned throughout all the cities of Italy. Pope Paul IV, together with the Senate of the Sacrosanct Roman Inquisition, in the year 1559, again commanded the same to be done, and willed the Talmudic books to be numbered among the writings condemned [7] by the Catholic Church.

Wherefore I cannot but here greatly marvel at the vain zeal of Peter Galatinus, of the order of the Minors [Franciscans], [8] who — when, in the first book *On the arcana of the catholic truth*, he had undertaken the defense of the Talmudic volumes — fell into such vanity that he not only affirmed that the Talmudic works ought to be translated into Latin and publicly expounded in the schools of Christians, [9] but even tried to establish this very [thing] by the authority of Pope Clement V, who — in the Council of Vienne, the same holy synod approving — decreed that in the schools of Christians there should be teachers skilled in the Hebrew and Chaldaic tongue, who should translate the books of the Jews into Latin and publicly teach their language (as is noted in the fifth volume of the Clementine sanctions, in the title *On Masters*). This decree of Clement (says Peter), since it cannot be understood of the Hebrew books of the divine scripture — because these had already been translated so many times — it is consonant that his words are to be understood of the Talmudic works of the Jews, not yet turned into Latin. A pretty argument indeed, and worthy of such a defender — who did not observe that Clement's canon speaks of the first rudiments and instructions of the Hebrew and Chaldaic tongues, [10] which are rather to be sought from those who, among the Jews, wrote grammatical traditions and Hebrew and Chaldaic dictionaries, than from those who collected the Talmudic writings.

I MYSELF had indeed decided to make no mention of such books, and to abolish by silence all memory of this doctrine, as much as could be done: but since the experience of past times has taught me that volumes of this kind, so often extinguished, revive again like the heads of the hydra [11] — the avarice of Christian princes permitting it, who, induced by any small price, sell to the Jews the faculty of restoring these books — therefore I judged that I should be doing a work worth the labor, if I should in some part make manifest certain of the basenesses, impieties, and blasphemies comprised in the Talmudic volumes, the books being named expressly where these are had; so that, if ever these nefarious writings (with which Asia, Africa,

Greece, and Germany still abound) be recalled to light among us, the champions of Christian piety may have an index, by which — as it were by the hand — they may be led to finding out and detecting the particular books of this work, and the places in which the aforesaid blasphemies are written; so that, these being detected, they may again inflame the Christian princes against the necks of the reviving hydra. But that the citations, inscriptions, and arguments of the same books and places may be more easily and more openly understood, I have judged it necessary to append in this place a catalog of all the Talmudic volumes — once transcribed by me out of that most opulent Library of the Jews of Cremona, out of which, in the year of our salvation 1559, by command of the Senate of the Sacrosanct Roman Inquisition, twelve thousand Talmudic codices were burned.

[→ *I willed* (volui)]

---

[1] The Talmud had its beginning in the year 150 after the last destruction of Jerusalem [2] When the Jerusalem Talmud was composed [3] The Babylonian Talmud was composed in the year of the Lord 476 [4] Babylon of Egypt, its name changed, is called Cairo [5] The Talmud is full of blasphemies [6] At what time the Talmudic books were published, and forbidden to the Hebrews by the Pontiffs of the Holy Roman Church [7] The Talmudic books are condemned by the Church [8] Galatinus, the patron of the Talmudic books, is reprehended [9] The Hebrew and Chaldaic tongues are to be expounded in the schools of Christians, by decree of the Council of Vienne [10] The Council of Vienne's decree concerns the Hebrew tongue (the rudiments) to be expounded in the schools [11] By the avarice of Christian princes it came about that the Talmudic books were restored

---

*(Rich PDF p. 138 — printed folio 121, verso. **A Catalog of the Talmud's volumes** (announced on p137): the six orders (*sedarim*), each divided into tractates (*massechtoth*) and chapters (*perakim*). Order 1, **ZERAIM** (Of Seeds) — 11 tractates; Order 2, **MOED** (Of the festivals) — 12 tractates; and Order 3, **NASHIM** (Of Women) begins. Each tractate is given with its Hebrew name, meaning, subject, and chapter-count. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

[→ I willed] also to note the titles of the books in Hebrew characters and points, [1] lest their appellations — written only in Latin letters — might so easily be corrupted by the copyists.

A CATALOG OF THE VOLUMES OF THE WHOLE TALMUD.

The whole תלמוד *Talmud* is divided into six orders, which they call סדר *seder*. Now each *seder* is distributed into several tractates, which are called מסכת *Massecheth;* and these again contain several chapters, which are named פרקים *Parachim*, that is, *divisions.*

זרעים **ZERAIM,** that is, *Of Seeds*, the first order, containing these eleven tractates:

1. ברכות *Berachoht*, that is, Of Blessings, or concerning the blessings and thanks to be rendered to God; contains nine chapters. 2. פאה *Phea*, that is, Of the Corner, or concerning the portion of the harvest to be left for the poor in the corner of the field; has ten chapters. 3. דמאי *Demai*, that is, Of Doubt, or concerning the giving of tithes of doubtful things; has ten chapters. 4. תרומות *Tneroma [Terumoth]*, that is, Concerning the fiftieth part of things to be rendered to the priests; has ten chapters. 5. שביעית *Ceuiith [Sheviith]*, that is, Of the Seventh, or concerning the seventh year of the resting field; has ten chapters. 6. כלאים *Chilaim [Kilaim]*, that is, Of Mixtures, or Concerning crops which it is unlawful to mix together; has nine chapters. 7. מעשר ראשון *Mahaster riscion [Maaser rishon]*, that is, Of the First tithe, or Concerning the first tithes which were given to the Levites; has nine chapters. 8. מעשר שני *Master sceni [Maaser sheni]*, that is, Of the Second tithe, which — after the tithes given to the Levites — had to be eaten and consumed in Jerusalem; has five chapters. 9. חלה *Challa*, that is, Of the Cake, or Concerning the first portion of the cake, which always had to be offered from the mass of bread; has four chapters. 10. ערלה *Arla [Orlah]*, that is, Of the Enclosure, or Concerning the enclosure which was made for trees lately planted, in sign that before the completed third year it was lawful for no one to eat of their fruits; has three chapters. 11. ביכורים *Bicurim*, that is, Of Firstfruits, or Concerning the firstfruits — out of only seven things — to be offered in the temple; has four chapters.

מועד **MOED,** that is, *the second order, of the festivals,* containing the twelve tractates written below:

1. שבת *Sciabath [Shabbat],* that is, Of the Sabbath, or Concerning the Sabbath and the [things] which on it are lawful, or not; contains twenty-four chapters. 2. עירובין *Eruuin [Eruvin],* that is, Concerning the associations which were mutually lawful to the Jews on the Sabbath; has ten chapters. 3. פסחים *Pesachim,* that is, Of the Passovers, or Concerning the [things] which pertain to the celebration of the Passover; contains ten chapters. 4. שקלים *Sekalim [Shekalim],* that is, Of the Sicles, or Concerning the exaction of the Sicles which had to be made for the buying of the lambs which were daily offered in sacrifice; eight chapters. 5. יומא *Ioma [Yoma],* that is, Of the great Day, or Concerning the day of propitiation, and the [things] to be done on it; has eight chapters. 6. סוכה *Succa [Sukkah],* that is, Of the Hut, the Tabernacle, or Concerning the feast of Tabernacles; contains five chapters. 7. ביצה *Beza [Beitzah],* that is, Of the good Day (that is, of the feast), or Concerning all the [things] which ought to be done on it; has five chapters. 8. ראש השנה *Roshasaua [Rosh Hashanah],* that is, Of the head of the year, or Concerning the [things] which are to be done in the solemnity of that day; contains five chapters. 9. תענית *Thaanith [Taanith],* that is, Of Fasting, or concerning fasting; has four chapters. 10. מגילה *Meghila [Megillah],* that is, Of the History, or Concerning the history of Esther, which is to be read in the solemnity of Mordecai and Esther; four chapters. 11. מועד קטן *Moed Katan,* that is, Of the Little Feast, or Concerning the lesser feast-days which fell between the first and last day of the Passover of Tabernacles; has three chapters. 12. חגיגה *Chagiga [Chagigah],* that is, Of the Solemnity, or concerning the precept by which all males are bound to go three times a year to Jerusalem for the solemnity; has three chapters.

נשים **NASIM [NASHIM],** that is, *Of Women, the third order,* containing seven tractates, namely:

1. יבמות *Ieuamot [Yevamoth],* that is, Of Sisters-in-law, or Concerning the taking [to wife] of the wife of a brother deceased without children; contains sixteen chapters. 2. כתובות *Chetuboth [Ketuboth],* that is, Of Contracts, or Concerning the contracts of dowries, and the mutual obligations between husband and wife; has thirteen chapters. 3. נדרים *Nedarim,* that is, Of Vows, or Concerning the vows of women; has eleven chapters. 4. נזיר *Nazir,* that is, Of the Nazirite, or concerning the vow of the Nazirites, separated from the common food; contains nine chapters.

[→ *5. Sotah* (סוטה)]

[1] 12,000 Talmudic codices burned at Cremona

(Rich PDF p. 139 — printed folio 122, recto. The ***Talmud catalog*** *continued: Order 3* ***NASHIM*** *finished (Sotah, Gittin, Kiddushin); Order 4* ***NEZIKIN*** *(Of Damages) — its 10 tractates (the three* Bavot, *Sanhedrin, Makkot, Shevuot, Eduyot, Avodah Zarah, Avot, Horayot); Order 5* ***KODASHIM*** *(Of Sanctifications) — its 11 tractates (Zevachim → Kinnim); and Order 6* ***TAHAROTH*** *(Of Purifications) begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

5. סוטה *Sota [Sotah],* that is, Of Deviation, or Concerning the deviation which a wife makes from [her] husband, by cleaving to another man; has nine chapters. 6. גיטין *Ghitin [Gittin],* that is, Of Bills of divorce, or Concerning the bill of divorce and divorce; has nine chapters. 7. קידושין *Kiduscin [Kiddushin],* that is, Of betrothals, or Concerning espousals; contains four chapters.

נזיקין **NEZICHIN [NEZIKIN],** that is, *of damages,* or concerning damages — *the fourth order,* containing these ten tractates:

1. בבא קמא *Baba kamma,* that is, the first part [gate], which treats Of damages that are wont to be done both by men and by beasts; has ten chapters. 2. בבא מציעא *Baba Mezia,* that is, the Middle, or second, part, which deals with lawsuits, rights, and usuries; contains ten chapters. 3. בבא בתרא *Baba batra,* that is, the third part, which deals with sales and purchases, &c.; has ten chapters. 4. סנהדרין *Saneedrin [Sanhedrin],* that is, Of the

ordinary Judges, and of the [things] pertaining to judgment; likewise concerning those who have a part in the world to come, and concerning the Messiah especially, in the chapter which is called *Helec [Helek];* has eleven chapters. 5. מכות *Macoth [Makkot],* that is, Of Stripes, or Concerning the stripes to be inflicted on the guilty; has three chapters. 6. שבועות *Seuuoth [Shevuot],* that is, Oath, or Concerning oaths, and concerning the keepers of things [deposits]; contains eight chapters. 7. עדיות *Hedioth [Eduyot],* that is, Of Testimonies, or Concerning the determinations which were made from the witnesses of [their] predecessors; has eight chapters. 8. עבודה זרה *Auada zara [Avodah Zarah],* that is, Of foreign servitude, or Concerning idolatry, and concerning those [things] in which the Jews are forbidden to communicate with the gentiles; contains five chapters. 9. אבות *Aboth [Avot],* that is, Of the Fathers, in which it is treated of the ancient fathers, who from Moses even to Simon the Just shone forth above the rest; has five chapters. 10. הוריות *Oraioth [Horayot],* that is, Of Decisions, or Concerning the sentences determined by the Ordinary judges, and concerning the penalties against those who do contrary; has three chapters.

קדשין **CHADASCIN [KODASHIM],** that is, *of sanctifications, the fifth order,* containing eleven tractates, that is:

1. זבחים *Zeuachim [Zevachim],* that is, Of Immolations, or Concerning the immolations of sacrifices, and the place of sacrificing; has fourteen chapters. 2. חולין *Chulin [Chullin],* that is, Of Slaughterings, or Concerning the animals to be killed for common food; contains twelve chapters. 3. מנחות *Menachoth,* that is, Of Meal[-offerings], or Concerning the farinaceous meals to be offered by the priests in the temple; has thirteen chapters. 4. בכורות *Becoroth [Bechorot],* that is, Of Firstborn, or Concerning the firstborn of animals — whether to be offered, or to be redeemed; has nine chapters. 5. ערכין *Erachin [Arachin],* that is, Of Prices [Valuations], or Concerning the prices of things which anyone had promised to give to God; has nine chapters. 6. תמורה *Themura [Temurah],* that is, Of Substitution, or Concerning the substitution not to be made in sacrifices; contains seven chapters. 7. מעילה *Meila [Meilah],* that is, Of Prevarication [Sacrilege], or Concerning the prevarication of those who wrongly used things sacrificed; has six chapters. 8. כריתות *Cherithuth [Keritot],* that is, Of Excisions, or Concerning the souls of sinners to be destroyed in the world to come; has six chapters. 9. תמיד *Thamid [Tamid],* that is, of the continual, namely sacrifice — or Concerning the continual sacrifice of two lambs; has five chapters. 10. מדות *Midoth [Middot],* that is, Of Measurements, or Concerning the dimensions and measures of the temple; has five chapters. 11. קינים *Kinim [Kinnim],* that is, Of Nests, or Concerning the offerings of chicks, doves, and turtledoves to be made by the poor; has five chapters.

טהרות **TAHAROTH,** that is, *the sixth order, of purifications,* containing these twelve tractates:

1. כלים *Chelim [Kelim],* that is, Of Vessels, or Concerning the purification of vessels; has thirty chapters. 2. אהלות *Ahaloth [Ohalot],* that is, Of Houses [Tents], or Concerning the purifying of houses in which human corpses have lain; has eighteen chapters. 3. נגעים *Negaim,* that is, Of Plagues, or Of Strikings, or Concerning the purification from leprosy and the other plagues; has fourteen chapters. 4. פרה *Para [Parah],* that is, Of the Heifer, or Concerning the purification to be made from the ashes of the red cow; has twelve chapters. 5. טהרות *Taharoth,* that is, Of Purifications, or Concerning the purification from an uncleanness contracted otherwise than from a human corpse; contains ten chapters. 6. מקואות *Mikuaoth [Mikvaot],* that is, Of Congregations, or Collections of waters — or Concerning the fountain and the waters in which men of both sexes were immersed [baptized], that they might be cleansed from spiritual uncleannesses; has ten chapters.

[→ *7. Niddah* (נדה)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 140 — printed folio 123, recto. The **Talmud catalog** concluded: Order 6 **TAHAROTH** finished (Niddah, Makhshirin, Zavim, Tevul Yom, Yadayim, Uktzin) — the whole Talmud totaling **sixty-three tractates**. Then begins **A Catalog of some Errors** gathered by Sixtus from the Talmud: first **Against Christ our God** (five questions, each with its Order / tractate / chapter / folio citation), then **Against the sublimity***

***of the divine Majesty**. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

7. נדה *Nida [Niddah],* that is, Of the Menstruant, or Concerning the purification of a woman from uncleanness contracted both by reason of the menstruum and of childbirth; contains ten chapters. 8. משקין *Maskin [Makhshirin],* that is, Of Emissions, or Concerning the purification of men from the uncleanness [contracted] from the putrefaction of the seed flowing through the male member; has ten chapters. 9. זבים *Zabim,* that is, Of those with a flux, or Concerning the purification of those with a flux from the uncleanness contracted through contamination; has six chapters. 10. טבול יום *Tuul Iom [Tevul Yom],* that is, Of the [one] baptized of the day, or Concerning the one immersed of the same day — who, although through the washing of that water he was purified from spiritual uncleanness, yet not perfectly, until on the following day he should make an offering in the temple for the uncleanness from which he had been purified by the water; contains four chapters. 11. ידים *Iadaim [Yadayim],* that is, Of Hands, or Concerning the hands to be washed of those wishing to touch sacred things, or to eat of consecrated things; and concerning the vessel and the waters with which the hands are to be washed; has ten chapters. 12. עוקצין *Okezin [Uktzin],* that is, Of the Stalks of fruits, or [concerning] when the stalks by which the apples and the other fruits adhered [to the tree] were said to be contaminated from the touch of unclean fruits; has five chapters.

The sum of the whole Talmud contains sixty-three tractates.

A CATALOG OF SOME ERRORS,

which out of the innumerable follies, blasphemies, and impieties of the Talmudic work we have collected, that from these few we might exhibit to you some specimen of these execrable volumes, in which almost infinite blasphemies are contained not only against Christ our God, but also against the Mosaic law, against the law of nature, and against the very majesty of divine sublimity.

AGAINST CHRIST OUR GOD.

The blasphemies which the impious Jews emit against Christ our God are so execrable that the mind shudders, and the hand recoils from writing them: therefore it will suffice only to have here indicated certain places where these are had.

By what birth Christ was born, and what mother he had. Order one, tractate nine, verse forty-ninth, beginning from the word *Mehila.*

What was Christ's profession, study, and craft. Order four, tractate four, chapter five, folio seventeen.

What God Christ worshipped. Order four, tractate four, chapter two, folio 107.

For what cause, and by what punishment, the Jews killed Christ. Order four, tractate four, chapter six, folio 43.

In what place the soul of Christ is now detained. Order three, tractate six, folio 57.

AGAINST THE SUBLIMITY OF THE DIVINE MAJESTY.

God, before the creation of the world — lest he grow torpid with idleness — exercised himself in building various worlds; which, when he had founded them, a little after he destroyed, and again restored, until he had learned to make this world which we now have. Order one, tractate four, chapter three.

God spends the whole first three hours of the day in the reading of the Jewish law. Order two, tractate one, chapter fourteen.

Moses, when he had once ascended into heaven, found God writing the accents in the holy scripture. Order five, tractate six, chapter five.

God, on the first day of the new moon of the month of September, judges the whole world; then, on the remaining ten following days of the same Moon, applies himself to writing the just in the book of life, but the wicked in the book of death. Order two, tractate eight, chapter five.

God daily makes prayers and supplications with devout mind. Order one, tractate one, chapter one.

God has a certain separate place, in which at many appointed times he weeps with tears and afflicts himself, because — angry with the Jews — he overthrew the temple of Jerusalem and dispersed his people into captivity. Order two, chapter five; and order one, chapter seven.

God daily puts upon himself, about the head and arms, fillets, or certain leathern little straps, called *Thephilin* **[Tefillin],** and clothes himself with a certain linen tunic which is called *Zizith* [Tzitzit]; and, thus adorned, he prostrates himself upon [his] knees, and prays. Order two, tractate eight, chapter five.

God commanded the people of the Jews that at each new moon they should perform a sacrifice of expiation, to expiate the crime perpetrated by God, when he unjustly took away from the Moon the light which he attributed to the Sun. Order four, tractate six, chapter one.

God, as often as he remembers the calamities which the Jews suffer from the Gentiles, pours out two tears into the Ocean sea, and, from grief, beats his breast with both hands. Order one, tractate one, chapter nine.

God, in the three last hours of the day, for the sake of relaxing [his] mind, once played with a certain fish of vast ma—

[→ *magnitude* (magnitudinis)]

(Rich PDF p. 141 — printed folio 124, verso. Sixtus's polemical ***Index of Errors*** *continued — passages he ascribes to the Talmud, each with its Order / tractate / chapter / folio citation.* ***Against the divine Majesty*** *(Leviathan slain and salted for the banquet of the saints; God angry once daily; "My sons have conquered me"; the dispute over leprosy; the Rabbi who outwitted both God and the Devil). Then* ***Against the Saints of the Old Testament*** *(Gabriel scourged, Adam, Noah's raven, Job, David);* ***Against the Law of Moses****; and* ***Against Charity and Humanity****. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

—of vast magnitude, which is called Leviathan. Order two, tractate one, chapter fourteen; and order four, tractate 8.

God, for an unknown cause being angry with the great fish Leviathan, killed it, and salted its flesh, that from it he might furnish food to the souls of the saints in the world to come. Order four, tractate three, chapter five.

God is angry once daily, and then the combs of the barnyard cocks lose their redness, and meanwhile [the cocks] stand upon one foot; then, if anyone at that same moment curse someone, he [the cursed] straightway falls down dead. Order one, tractate one.

God created the element of fire on the day of the Sabbath. Order two, tractate three, chapter four.

When once certain Rabbis had entered into a disputation against Rabbi Eliezer, God — a voice being sent down from heaven — pronounced the sentence against them in favor of Rabbi Eliezer; wherefore the Rabbis, indignant, condemned God with the penalty of anathema. Then God himself, smiling, said, "My sons have conquered me." Order four, tractate two, chapter seven.

When God, on a certain day in the court of heaven, was disputing about a certain kind of leprosy — which he himself said was clean, the other Rabbis dissenting, who affirmed it to be unclean — the matter at

last, by the common assent of all, devolved to a certain most wise Rabbi; who, when he was preparing to bring forth [his] sentence, straightway his soul, leaving the body, began to cry out, "Clean, Clean." Order four, tractate two, chapter seven.

So great once was the prudence in a certain Rabbi, that by this cunning he eluded both the Devil and God at once. When the Rabbi was laboring in the last article of life, he entreated the Devil with prayers that he would lead him — now already dying — even to the gates of the heavenly kingdom, that, the place of the divine habitation being inspected thence, he might depart glad from this life. When the Devil had granted this favor to [his] old friend, the Rabbi, casting himself at once within the gates of heaven, swore by the living God that he would never withdraw thence; for which cause God was compelled to keep the man with him, lest he make him a perjurer. And thus, by this one art, the most prudent man deceived God and the Devil at once.

AGAINST THE SAINTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

When the Angel Gabriel had committed a grave crime, God commanded him to be scourged with a fiery whip. Order two, tractate five, chapter eight.

Adam coupled with all living things, as well males as females, nor ever satisfied his lust, until [afterward] he lay with Eve. Order three, tractate one, chapter six.

The Raven sent out by Noah at the time of the flood was unwilling to depart from the ark; for it feared lest, after its departure, Noah should couple with the crow, its wife. Order four, tractate four.

Job never was among human affairs [never existed], and his history is a fiction. Order four, tractate three.

David did not sin in adultery and in homicide; and whoever shall have believed that he sinned in these is a heretic. Order two, tractate one, chapter five.

AGAINST THE LAW OF MOSES.

That it is lawful to use one's own wife in the masculine manner. Wherefore, when two women had complained of this matter before the synagogue, the Rabbis answered that the man is the lord of the wife, and that therefore he can use the body of his wife howsoever he will — not otherwise than he who buys a fish; for he can eat at his pleasure of both the anterior and the posterior parts of his fish. Order three, tractate three, chapter two, and folio twenty, face two.

If anyone shall have joined to himself in matrimony either his own daughter or his own sister, he does a thing most acceptable to God. Order two, tractate one.

A Rabbi who does not hate his enemy even unto death, and who does not seek vengeance against him, is unworthy of the name of Rabbi. Order five, tractate one, chapter two.

That those who contradict the words of the Scribes are to be punished more grievously than [those who contradict] the words of the Mosaic law: whoever contradicts the latter can be absolved, but whoever shall have contradicted the words of the Rabbis, let him die the death. Order four, tractate four, chapter ten.

If witnesses shall have been convicted of falsity, they ought to be punished with the penalty of retaliation [talion]; but if it shall have happened that the accused was unjustly condemned, and so afflicted with punishment, then the false witnesses ought to be absolved, and punished with no penalty. Order four, tractate 4.

If the greater part of the Judges shall have condemned someone to death, he ought to die; but if all, none excepted, shall have consented in his condemnation, let him be absolved. Order four, folio

seventeen.

If anyone shall have found a purse in a public place, and shall have known that its owner has already despaired of finding the purse, he is not held to the restitution of the purse. Order four, tractate two, chapter five.

AGAINST CHARITY AND HUMANITY.

We ordain that every Jew thrice in the day blaspheme the whole nation of the Christians, and pray God that he confound and exterminate it together with its kings and princes; and this the priests of the Jews do especially, praying in the synagogue thrice daily, in hatred of Jesus of Nazareth. Order one, tractate one, chapter four.

That God commanded the Jews that, by any means whatever — whether by fraud, or by force, or by usury, or by the sword — they should claim to themselves the goods of the Christians. In the same place.

It is commanded to all the Jews that they hold all Christians in the place of brutes, [and] that they treat them not otherwise than brute animals. Order four, tractate 8.

If the beast of a Jew shall have killed the beast of a Christian, the Jew is not held to pay the price for it; but if the beast of a Christian shall have killed a Jew's beast, the Jew is held to compel the Christian to make restitution for the beast. Order four, tractate one, chapter four, folio thirty-eighth.

[→ *The Jew* (IVDAEVS)]

(Rich PDF p. 142 — printed folio 125, recto. The left column finishes Sixtus's polemical ***Index of Errors*** *(against charity/humanity, then* ***Other Heresies and Superstitions*** *— transmigration of souls, the calves created before the Sabbath, prayer-direction and camels). The right column* ***resumes the alphabetical lexicon at letter V****: the* Book of the Words of the Lord *(cited in Clement's Recognitions; Paul's "more blessed to give than to receive," Acts 20), and* VERBA vetera *— the "Ancient Words" of 1 Chronicles 4:22, where the Vulgate ("who made the Sun stand still…") diverges sharply from the Hebrew and Greek. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS.)*

A Jew may do to the gentiles neither good nor evil in any wise; but let him strive, with all zeal and industry, to take a Christian out of life. Order four, tractate eight, chapter two.

If any Hebrew, while he wishes to kill a Christian, should by chance happen to kill a Jew, he is worthy of absolution. Order four, tractate four, and nine.

If any Jew shall have seen a Christian near a precipice, he is bound straightway to cast him down. Order four, tractate eight — with which, in the same tractate, the author Raualfez [R. Alfasi] agrees, chapter two, folio 355, face two; and the volume *Arba Turim*, in the book *Ioradea* [Yoreh Deah], chapter one hundred fifty-eighth.

The empire of the Christians is more execrable than the empire of the other nations; and it is a lighter sin to serve a gentile prince than a Christian. Order two, tractate one, chapter five, folio eleven and fifteen.

That the temples [churches] of the Christians are houses of perdition and places of idolatry, which the Jews are bound to destroy. Order two, tractate one, chapter two.

The Gospels of the Christians — which ought to be entitled "iniquity revealed and sin made manifest" — ought to be burned by the Jews, even if the name of God should be contained in them. In the same place.

OTHER HERESIES AND SUPERSTITIONS.

That the souls of men migrate from body into body by this law: that if the soul sin in the first body, it be sent into a second; in which, if it sin again, it is sent into a third body; in which, if it cease not to sin, it is at last thrust down into gehenna. Order four, tractate 2, and in many other places.

That the soul of Abel migrated into Seth, but the soul of Seth into Moses. In the same place.

The souls of unlearned men will not receive their bodies in the resurrection. Order three, tractate two, folio three.

Two Rabbis, each several week, on the day before the Sabbath, used to create two calves, which then they ate whole. Order four, tractate four, chapter two, folio 65.

Whosoever shall have eaten thrice on the Sabbath will attain eternal life in the other world. Order two, tractate one, chapter six.

Nothing ought to be eaten in an even number, but in an odd; for in this number God is especially delighted. Order four, tractate 2, chapter 7.

If anyone shall have prayed with face turned to the south, he will attain wisdom; but to the north, riches. Order four, tractate 3, chapter 2, folio 25.

If anyone shall have passed under the belly of a camel, or between two camels, or between two women, he will never be able to learn anything from the Talmud. Order four, tractate 10, chapter 1.

If anyone shall have denied the Talmudic books — in which are contained the aforesaid most holy precepts — he denies God himself. In the Preface of the whole Talmud.

V.

VERBORVM Domini Liber — *The Book of the Words of the Lord* — is cited in the *Recognitions* of Clement. There are those who suppose this to be the book out of which Paul (as is had in the volume of Acts, chapter twenty), speaking to the presbyters of Ephesus, brought forth the oracle of Christ, saying:[1] "It behooves [us] to remember the word of the Lord Jesus (since he himself said): It is more blessed to give than to receive." But certain others think that Paul said this either as received from tradition, or that he deduced it by reasoning out of various sentences of the Gospels signifying the same thing — such as these: "Give to everyone that asks you," and "Lend, hoping for nothing thence."

VERBA vetera — *Ancient Words*, in Hebrew הַדְּבָרִים הָעַתִּיקִים *Haddevarim Hatthikim*, or, according to the Seventy interpreters, λόγοι παλαιοί (*logoi palaioi*), that is, *Ancient sayings* — this work is cited in the first [book] of Paralipomenon, chapter four,[2] the expositors being in doubt as much about the work itself as about the things which are reported to be written in it. The author of the book of *Questions*, or of the *Hebrew Traditions*, reckons this work to be the book of Ruth,[3] because it contains those same things which in the first [book] of Paralipomenon are taken from the book of the Ancient Words. Certain of the Hebrews think it to be another work far different, comprising a particular history of the ancestors of King David. And concerning those things also which were written in the same volume of the Ancient Words, there is no less hesitation. For our Vulgate edition shows that in this book was described the history of certain princes of the tribe of Judah who reigned in Moab, and the history of a certain illustrious man of the same tribe, who — about two hundred years after Joshua the Ephraimite, leader of the Hebrews, who first made the Sun to stand still — himself, the miracle being renewed, delayed the course of the Sun. For thus it is read in the Vulgate Latin edition:[4] "AND [they] WHO made the Sun to stand still, and the Men of Lying, and Secure, and Walking, who were princes in Moab, and who returned to Lehem [Bethlehem]. These are the

ancient words." But, on the contrary, in the Hebrew exemplars and in the Greek codices, nothing of these things is read, but other things far distant from these are had,[5] in these words: *"And Joachin, and the men of Cozeba, and Joash, and Saraph, who reigned in Moab, and [those] dwelling in Lachem. And these are ancient words."* For which the Seventy thus translated (λόγοι παλαιοί): that is, *"And Joachin, men of Chozeba, and Joash, and Sapham, who had dominion over the people of Moab, and [those] dwelling in Lehem. And these are ancient sayings."* Which words indeed — as well the Greek as the Hebrew (as appears even to those who have but tasted Hebrew and Greek with the outermost lips) — have nothing concerning the miraculous standing of the Sun which is read among us. Yet the author of the Hebrew Traditions, in the reading of our—

[→ *[edition]* (nostrae)]

[1] Luke 6:30, 35 [2] 1 Chronicles [Paralipomenon] 4:22 [3] By the name of "Ancient Words," some understand the Book of Ruth [4] 1 Chronicles [Paralipomenon] 4:22 [5] The Vulgate edition dissents from the Hebrew and the Greek

(Rich PDF p. 143 — printed folio 126, verso. The VERBA vetera *entry concluded (Jerome's Hebrew-Questions exposition of Elimelech, Mahlon and Chilion, and Ruth's return to Bethlehem; then Lyra's gloss). Then the* ***VITAE Liber*** *— the* Book of Life *(*Sepher Chaiim*) — a long treatment of predestination: it is God's eternal foreknowledge of the elect (Augustine,* City of God *20); the objections of some (the Book seems to admit deletion — Exod. 32, Rev. 3, Ps. 68) and the answers (Augustine on Ps. 68, Aquinas,* Summa *I q. 24 a. 3). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE. Dense marginal citations.)*

—our [edition] seems to approve; which also, expounding, he thus writes: "But that which follows — WHO MADE THE SUN TO STAND STILL — returns to the offspring of Pharez, from whom David sprang, judging it opportune to terminate in David the reckoning of the offspring of Judah, from which tribe the royal line arose. For the Hebrews hand down that this [man] was Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, the father of Mahlon and Chilion, in whose time the Sun stood still on account of the transgressors of the law — so that, such a miracle being seen, they might be converted to the Lord their God; which, because they scorned to do, therefore the famine grew strong: so that he who in the tribe of Judah had seemed the foremost, by the want of famine, together with his wife and sons, was not only driven from his fatherland, but also died, together with his sons, in that same pilgrimage. But that the 'men of lying' are Mahlon and Chilion — who here are called *Securus* [Secure] and *Incedens* [Walking], according to the proper interpretation of the name, and of whom it is said that they were 'princes in Moab,' because they took Moabite wives — is more expressly set down in the Hebrew; and we have learned from those learned in that tongue that they are to be called not 'princes,' but 'husbands.' But that which follows — WHO RETURNED TO LEHEM — Naomi and Ruth show, who returned into Lehem, that is, into Bread (the abundance of bread being heard of after the want of famine), into Bethlehem. And because this history is written in the book of Ruth, therefore there follows: AND THESE ARE THE ANCIENT WORDS." Thus far the author of the Hebrew Questions.

Lyra,[1] from the opinion of the Hebrew masters, adds that the Sun ceased from its course not by the prayers and supplications of Elimelech (who was most avaricious, and in the time of famine withdrew into the region of Moab, lest he should be compelled to bring aid from his riches to his imperiled fatherland), but that this happened by the most pious will of God, who by that miracle willed to deter his people from [their] crimes.

VITAE Liber — *The First Book of Life,*[2] which David in Psalm 63 names ספר חיים *Sepher Chaiim,* that is, *the Book of the living* — is the divine enrollment of the predestined unto eternal life; or, as Augustine hands down in the twentieth [book] *On the City of God,* it is the knowledge of God by which he predestined those to whom he foreknew that he would give eternal life. Of which book Paul, in the epistle to the Philippians, says:[3] "WHOSE names are in the book of Life." And Christ said to his disciples:[4] "REJOICE, because your names are written in heaven." Now this book is of such moment for eternal felicity[5] that no one can attain it who has not been enrolled in it — John saying:[6] "THERE shall not enter into it [any], save those who are

written in the book of life of the Lamb." And Daniel says:[7] "IN that time shall thy whole people be saved, whosoever shall be found written in the book." But, on the contrary, whosoever shall not have been written in this book will either live forever in [his] sins, or at least will depart a sinner out of this life, and, after this life, will be smitten with the punishment of eternal damnation. For concerning the wicked life of those who are not in this book, John is witness, saying:[8] "ALL WORSHIPPED the beast, whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb, who was slain from the origin of the world." And again:[9] "THEY SHALL WONDER, the inhabitants of the earth, whose names are not written in the book of Life from the constitution of the world." Concerning the everlasting perishing also of the same, the same John adds:[10] "THIS is the second death: he who was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the pool of fire." There is, then, a *First Book of Life*,[11] consisting of the standing and perpetual knowledge, in the mind of God, of predestination — of which Paul, writing to Timothy, said:[12] "The firm foundation of God stands: the Lord knows who are his."

But some,[13] to whom it is not altogether pleasing that the Book of Life be the knowledge of predestination, are wont to use these arguments against the aforesaid [view]. First: because the knowledge of predestination contains not all, but only some — and those very few — as elect; whereas the Book of Life seems to comprehend all men, however many there are, according to that sentence of David:[14] "In thy book all shall be written." "All," that is, not only the perfect, but also (as Augustine says) the imperfect. Then: since the decrees of divine predestination are eternal, fixed, and indelible, the knowledge of predestination cannot rightly be signified and expressed by the Book of Life — in which both that things written are deleted, and things deleted are written again, the divine letters testify in many places, especially in the volume of Exodus, where God says to Moses:[15] "WHOEVER shall have sinned against me, I will delete him out of my book"; and in the Apocalypse:[16] "HE that shall conquer, I will not delete his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." And David, among other evils which he imprecates upon the impious, says:[17] "LET THEM BE DELETED out of the Book of the living, and with the just let them not be written." Lastly: if the Book of Life were the very enrollment of the elect and predestined, Moses would never have wished and sought to be deleted out of this very Book, saying:[18] "LORD, either forgive them this offense; or, if thou do it not, delete me out of thy Book which thou hast written." For as no wise [man] ought to ask that those things be done which he already knows can in no way be done, so no one who truly loves God ought — or is able — to wish that he be cast out of the number of the friends and elect of God, and be excluded from the eternal fruition of the divine majesty.

TO THESE ARGUMENTS it is easily answered: namely, that that sentence of Psalm 138 pertains not to all — as much reprobate as elect — but to the elect alone,[19] of whom David said, "IN thy book all shall be written" — "all," namely, whosoever are elect before the constitution of the world unto eternal life, whether they be perfect, or whether they be as yet imperfect in the way of virtue. But as to what they say — that the Book of Life is different from the enrollment of eternal predestination, because the former can be deleted and changed, but the latter is wholly immovable and indelible — Augustine dissolves [this], in the exposition of Psalm 68, saying that no one[20] is deleted from the Book of Life according to the truth of the matter; because, if a man, concerning the title which he had inscribed upon the Lord's cross, said:[21] "WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN, I HAVE WRITTEN," how much more will God will that what he has written remain undeleted? But some[22] are said to be deleted according to the opinion and hope of certain men, who thought that they were written in the Book of Life — in which they had never been written. According to which manner of speaking it is said, "LET THEM BE DELETED OUT OF THE BOOK OF THE LIVING"[23] — that is, let it become known even to them, and be made manifest, that they had never been enrolled in the Book of God. In another way also, from the doctrine of Augustine, D[ivus] Thomas answers, in the 24th question of the first part, article 3: that some are [written] in the Book of God simply — that is, according to the purpose of eternal predestination unto—

[→ *life* (vitam)]

[1] The opinion of Lyra [Nicholas of Lyra] [2] What the Book of Life is [3] Philippians 4:3 [4] Luke 10:20 [5] No one attains blessedness who has not been written in the book of Life [6] Revelation 21:27 [7] Daniel 12:1 [8] Revelation 13:8 [9] Revelation 17:8 [10] Revelation 20:14–15 [11] The Book of Life is the knowledge of predestination [12] 2 Timothy 2:19 [13] The argument of those who deny that the Book of Life is the knowledge of Predestination [14] Psalm 138:16 [139:16] [15] Exodus 32:33 [16] Revelation 3:5 [17] Psalm 68:29 [69:28] [18] Exodus 32:32 [19] Only the elect are written in the book of life [20] No one is deleted from the book of life [21] John 19:22 [22] Some are said to be deleted from the book of Life according to the opinion of certain men [23] Psalm 68:29 [69:28]

*(Rich PDF p. 144 — printed folio 127, recto. The **Book of Life** treatise continued: Aquinas's two senses (written* simply *vs. by present grace), and the "written within and without" and "two Books of Life" views; then the Fathers on **why Moses asked to be blotted out** (Exod. 32:32) — Jerome/Origen and Chrysostom (bodily, not eternal, death), Augustine (a dialectical argument), Euthymius Zigabenus (three books of divine knowledge), Bernard (paternal affection for his people), and Rupert of Deutz. Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS. Dense marginal citations.)*

—unto eternal life to be attained, are written [in the Book of God], and these cannot be deleted; but certain [others] according to something — that is, according to the sole grace of present justice — and these can be deleted, because they had been written in the Book of Life not for eternal time and for the attaining of eternal glory indelibly, but designated only for the brief time of present grace by a deletable writing. Which same sentence, others — expressing it in different words — say that the Book of Life is written within and without,[1] and that some are written within, who can in no way be deleted, but others without and extrinsically, whom nothing prohibits both to be deleted, and, being deleted, to be written again.

There are also [those] who add a third response similar to this, saying that there are two Books of Life:[2] one, in which are written those alone whom God has destined for everlasting beatitude by the infallible and immutable decree of predestination — and from this [Book] none of those enrolled [can] be deleted; the other, in which are written those who live according to this present justice and the disposition of temporal grace, remaining written in it so long as, exercising the grace of God, they live pleasing to God, but who are deleted straightway, when — the grace of God being rejected — they cease to live justly.

But as to that which they add — that Moses, a most wise man and most loving of God, would by no means have sought to be deleted from the Book of Life,[3] if that Book contained the indelible writing of the predestined — there are various responses of the Fathers, showing that this petition of Moses is in no way adverse to our opinion; which [responses] it does not irk [me] to relate in this place, that from these each one may choose that which shall more please him.

JEROME,[4] in the ninth question to Algasia, following the opinion of Origen (which is had in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans), says that Moses, out of charity toward God and toward his people, was unwilling to be deleted from the Book of Life forever, but for the present — not in spirit, but in flesh, that is, through bodily death — just as Paul also wished to be made anathema for his brethren,[5] that is, to be mortified the whole day (according to the sentence of the psalm), alone to perish for them in the flesh, and to shed [his] blood, that his brethren might be saved in spirit.

JOHN Chrysostom,[6] in the book *On Compunction of Heart,* and in book 3 *On the Providence of God,* and in homily 16 on the epistle to the Romans, rejects the opinion of those who think that Moses and Paul spoke of temporal death, judging [thus]: "FOR HOW," he says, "could Paul have wished to be made anathema from Christ — that is, to be separated from him through the death of the flesh — since death itself rather joins him to that choir which is with Christ, and makes [him] obtain his glory? This suspicion, therefore, is [that] of little worms lurking in the mud; for both Moses and Paul, when they said these things, not only in thought transcended all the contests and death of the present life, but even — for God, whom they loved more than themselves — surmounting the heavens and the angels, and despising all invisible things, and, for the love of God, to fall away from the very fruition of God and [his] ineffable glory, not only sought, but (what is more)

even wished. For thus the insatiable affection of charity overcame their whole mind, that even that which above all other things was more lovable [to them] — to enjoy God, and the kingdom of the heavens, and the divine fruition which they were expecting, the reward of [their] labors — they suffered to be forfeited: namely, lest God should be so mocked and blasphemed by the impious on account of the very beloved [ones], because — since he could not fulfill the promises made to his people, whom he had chosen — he should have deserted them, and should have introduced into their goods other nations, which had never known him."

AUGUSTINE,[7] in question 147 on the book of Exodus, says that Moses, out of a certain immense security of divine familiarity, interpellated God with such a reasoning: "Either forgive them this offense, or delete me out of thy book — but thou wilt not delete me out of thy book, in which thou hast enrolled me with an indelible character: forgive them, therefore, this offense." Which kind of argumentation the common crowd of Dialecticians is wont to deduce from that rule:[8] "From the whole disjunctive [proposition], affirmatively, with the destruction of one part, the argument avails unto the other part of it" — as if we should say: "It is necessary that the soul be either mortal or immortal; but it is not mortal; therefore [it is] immortal."

EUTHYMIUS Zigabenus,[9] on Psalm 68 and 138, thus writes: "The Book of God is the sum of his knowledge; but the scripture [writing], indeed, [is] the perpetual memory" — for by "books" they figuratively understand the various and manifold cognition of God, [figured] by the divine letters. But here the book of divine knowledge is threefold:[10] of which one is more universal, in which all are written, as well the just as sinners, who are to come into this mortal life and a little after are to die — which David in Psalm 68 called "the book of the living," and which in Psalm 138 he signified, saying: "In thy book all shall be written." There is also another book of the knowledge of God, more private, in which the just alone are written, for this reason: that he knows them only — that is, approves [them] — according to that which is written:[11] "THE LORD knows the way of the just"; which [book] David indicated to us, saying:[12] "AND with the just let them not be written." There is also a third, particular book, in which sinners are written;[13] for "the judgment," as Daniel says, "sat, and the books were opened, and from these were judged the living and the dead."[14] Moses, therefore, spoke to God concerning that first universal book: "if indeed thou forgive them [their] sin, forgive [it]; but if not, delete me out of the book which thou hast written."[15]

BERNARD,[16] in sermon 12 on the Canticle of Canticles, thinks that Moses sought to be deleted from the Book of Life not in this sense, that he should be excluded from eternal glory, but rather that he asked this out of a certain paternal affection — namely, lest he alone, without his nation, should remain written in the Book of Life, and he alone should be introduced into eternal felicity, his people being excluded; but, as some poor little woman, invited to the banquet of a rich man on this condition — that she leave outside the little infant which she carries in [her] bosom, because it cries and will be troublesome to the banquet — would answer that she had rather fast than, the beloved pledge being set aside, dine alone with the rich [man]: so neither does Moses wish to be introduced alone into the joy of his Lord, his people (namely) remaining outside — to which, although restless and ungrateful, he clings in turn, and with a mother's affection.

RUPERT, Abbot of Deutz, in book 3 of the commentaries on Exodus, writes that Moses wished by these words to convince God that he should pardon the people, and that he used such an argument: "If [thou do] not—

[→ *that* (non id)]

[1] The Book of Life is written within and without [2] There are two Books of Life [3] In what manner Moses sought to be deleted from the book of Life is variously explained by the Fathers [4] Jerome's opinion concerning the petition of Moses [5] Romans 9:3 [6] Chrysostom's opinion concerning the petition of Moses [7] What Augustine held concerning the petition of Moses [8] A rule of the Dialecticians [9] Euthymius's discourse is not here transcribed word for word [10] The book of divine knowledge is threefold [11] Psalm 1:6 [12] Psalm 68:29 [69:28] [13] Exodus 32 [14] Daniel 7:10 [15] Exodus 32:32 [16] Bernard denies that Moses sought to be excluded from eternal glory

*(Rich PDF p. 145 — printed folio 128, verso. The Fathers on **Moses's petition** concluded (Rupert, Hugh of St-Cher, Cajetan, Lyra, Tostatus of Ávila, Nachmanides, Rashi) — "enough of the **First** Book of Life." Then the **Second Book of Life** = Holy Scripture itself (Sirach 24, Baruch 4, John 5), whose whole scope is Christ, "our Life" ("In the head of the book it is written of me," Ps. 39 / Ps. 1 — and the* bereshith *vs.* be-ben *dispute against Tertullian and Hilary). Then the **Third Book of Life** = the Lamb's Book of Life (Rev. 13:8). NB: "Vitae Liber Tertius" is the third **sense** of the Book of Life, not Book III of the work — running head is still BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE / Book II. Dense marginal citations.)*

—delete me out of the book of the law, that the memory of my name be not had in it — preferring rather that the memory of the things done by me be deleted by perpetual oblivion, than that the people perish." And let these things concerning the First Book of Life be enough said.

HUGH,[1] presbyter Cardinalis [Hugh of Saint-Cher], in the exposition of Psalm 138, says that there are twin Books of Life: one, of present justice and grace, out of which Moses preferred to be deleted rather than that the people should perish; the other, of everlasting predestination, out of which Moses did not wish to be deleted, knowing that from it none could be deleted.

THOMAS Cajetan, Cardinal of St. Sixtus, in the commentary on Exodus, believes this book to be the ordination of divine providence concerning those who in this world are to be princes; and he calls this book "of the principate." For it is written in the divine mind, and in it — as in a book — most diligently engraved who and how many and of what sort in this life are to be, among mortals, princes, leaders, and kings. But since God had said to Moses:[2] "LET ME ALONE, that my fury may be angry against the people, and I may delete them; but thee I will make into a great nation" — Moses had understood that God had written him in the book of the principate, from this: that even if that people should be destroyed, God would nonetheless constitute him Prince over a great nation. Therefore he asks that God either pardon this sin, or delete him out of the book of the principate — signifying by this that he does not wish to be prince of another nation, if this nation be consumed.

NICHOLAS of Lyra says that, just as our Savior — according to the will of the sensitive part [of the soul], dreading death — sought that the chalice of the passion be transferred from him (which the rational will most ardently desired): so Moses, according to the desire of the lower part of the soul,[3] sought from God to be deleted out of the book of life; which, however, according to the superior portion of the soul, he did not wish [done] — explaining by this prayer not what the Mind itself, consenting to God, would will, but what the will of the flesh itself would desire for its own flesh, that is, compassionating his own people.

ALPHONSUS [Tostatus], bishop of Ávila, in the commentaries on Exodus, teaches that this saying is not to be understood according to the naked and simple signification of the word, but according to a hyperbolic trope, by which we are wont to express the most ardent desire of a thing eagerly demanded, saying: "Either grant me this, or I shall die" — which trope indeed Rachel used, when she said to her husband:[4] "Give me children, otherwise I shall die." Not that she preferred children to life did she say this, but that she might demonstrate, by this figure of pathetic speech, hyperbolically, [her] most vehement desire of having offspring.

RABBI Moses Gerundensis [Nachmanides] hands down that Moses, scarcely master of himself, and almost rapt out of himself, uttered these [words] rather from the impulse of a most abundant charity than from the deliberation of reason.

RABBI Solomon Iarchi [Rashi] the Frenchman expounds: "DELETE ME OUT OF THY BOOK" — that is, "Delete me out of the book of the law, that the memory of my name be not had in it" — as above.

VITAE Liber Secundus — *The Second Book of Life,* which is also called the Book of the commandments of God — is the sacrosanct and divine scripture, deservedly called the Book of Life,[5] because in it are contained

the promises of eternal life, together with the precepts necessary for attaining eternal life. Speaking of which, the most wise son of Sirach said:[6] "ALL THESE THINGS are the book of life, and the testament of the Most High, and the knowledge of truth." And the prophet Baruch:[7] "THIS is the book of the commandments of God, and the law which is forever; all who hold it shall come to life, but those who forsook it, unto death." And Christ, making words about this book to the lawyers, says:[8] "SEARCH the scriptures, for you think in them to have eternal life." Divine scripture is also called the Book of Life because the argument, scope, end, and whole intent of all sacrosanct scripture[9] is Christ, who everywhere calls himself Life, and our Life; whence also in Psalm 39 it is said:[10] "IN the head of the book it is written of me." Which Arnobius and Augustine expound of the book of Psalms, in the beginning of which is written:[11] "BLESSED is the man who has not gone in the counsel of the impious, and in the way of sinners has not stood, and in the seat of pestilence has not sat." Which words indeed can suit none more than Christ, who alone is without sin.[12] But Tertullian, in the book against Praxeas, and Hilary in the exposition of the second Psalm, understand by the "head of the book" the beginning of the whole divine scripture; where, for that which we read, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth,"[13] they read "In the son" — which the truth of the matter itself proves to be false.[14] For in the Hebrew it is not read בבן *be ben*, that is, "in the son," but בראשית *bereshith*, which the Seventy interpreters, and Symmachus, and Theodotion, and Jerome interpreted "In the beginning";[15] which beginning, nevertheless, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory assert (according to the mystical and spiritual sense) to signify Christ the Son of God — who, both in the very front of Genesis (which is the head of all the books) and also in the beginning of John the Evangelist, is approved [to be] the founder of heaven and earth,[16] where it is said:[17] "ALL things were made through him, and without him was made nothing."

VITAE Liber Tertius — *The Third Book of Life* — is that which, in the Revelation of John, is called τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου [ἐσφαγμένου] ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου,[18] that is, *the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the origin of the world.* Now this Lamb is our Savior, whom it is not doubtful to have been slain for our sins; although it be not so manifest to all how he was slain from the very first constitution of the world. Certain expositors — among whom is Rupert, Abbot of Deutz —[19] say that that phrase "from the origin of the world" is not to be referred to the slaying of the Lamb, but to those whom John had said were not written in the book of Life; so that it is to be read and understood by transposition: "Whose names are not written from the origin of the world in the Book of Life of the Lamb, who was slain." But others, and perhaps more rightly—

[→ *[more] rightly* (rectius)]

[1] Hugh the Cardinal says there are twin Books of Life [2] Exodus 32:10 [3] Moses, according to the desire of the inferior part of the soul, sought to be deleted from the Book of Life [4] Genesis 30:1 [5] Holy Scripture is called the Book of Life [6] Ecclesiasticus [Sirach] 24:32 [7] Baruch 4:1 [8] John 5:39 [9] The end of Scripture is Christ, who is our Life [10] Psalm 39:9 [40:7] [11] Psalm 1:1 [12] Christ alone is without sin [13] Genesis 1:1 [14] Tertullian and Hilary are refuted [15] See Jerome, at the beginning, in the book of Hebrew Questions [16] Christ is the founder of heaven and earth [17] John 1:3 [18] Revelation 13:8 [printed "Apoc. 12"] [19] Rupert's opinion is little to be approved

---

*(Rich PDF p. 146 — printed folio 129, recto. The **Third Book of Life** concluded: Christ crucified* is *the book — the Lamb slain from the world's origin in his members (Abel, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses — Heb. 11), in Saul's persecution (Acts 9), in the eternal foreknowledge/predestination, and prefigured by every Old-Testament sacrifice; the cross as the open "book of the flesh" from which every Christian reads the pattern of life (Gal. 2, 6). Then the **Fourth Book of Life** = the Book of past life / conscience, opened at the Judgment (Rev. 20:12; Augustine,* City of God *20.14). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS — still Book II; Book III not yet reached. Dense marginal citations. Last page of the batch.)*

—more rightly, wish the slaying of the Lamb to be joined with the very origin of the world: in which [origin] the Lamb first began to be slain — not indeed in himself, since he was not yet clothed with flesh, but in his members and elect,[1] in whom the impious began to afflict him from the very first constitution of the world,

slaying him in Abel, mocking [him] in Noah, casting [him] out in Abraham, persecuting [him] in Jacob, accusing and selling [him] in Joseph, making [him] an exile in Moses — who, as Paul says,[2] "esteemed the reproach of Christ above all the treasure of the Egyptians, choosing rather to be afflicted with the people than, in the court of Pharaoh, to be held in the place of a son." Whatever things, therefore, before the coming of the Lamb into the flesh, his members suffered, the Lamb himself is understood to have borne — just as also, after the resurrection of Christ, the persecutions brought upon his servants by Saul, Christ himself testified to be brought upon himself, saying:[3] "SAUL, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" The Lamb was also slain from the very first constitution of the world — not only in a temporal [way], but in an eternal [way], from the beginning and before the ages and the secular times, in that blessed foreknowledge and predestination of the divine mind,[4] in which God, in one and the same moment, established the creation of the world, foresaw the perdition of the world in the sin of Adam, and preordained the death of Christ for the life of the whole world: which the Apostles, after the Savior's assumption, openly knowing, said:[5] "LORD, who madest heaven and earth, &c. Truly there came together against Jesus, Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles and the peoples of Israel, to do what thy hand and thy counsel decreed to be done." The Lamb was also slain from the origin of the world, because — from the founding of the world even to the taking-up of our humanity — through the diverse ages of the flowing world he was, by various and innumerable figures, types, shadows, mysteries, sacraments, oblations, oracles, prophecies, libations, victims, and sacrifices of the old testament, adumbrated and foreshown:[6] that one and everlasting sacrifice by which the Lamb, slain on the altar of the cross, offered himself to the living God for an odor of sweetness. This Lamb, therefore, lifted up and slain on the cross, is called the Book of Life[7] — not only for this, that his death is our life (life, I say, and resurrection from the death of sin — the life of present grace, and the life of everlasting felicity), but because Christ, exalted on the wood of the cross, is, as it were, a certain famous and conspicuous book: not [written] on papyrus and parchments, but fitted [written] in the very flesh and members of Christ; not with ink or vermilion inscribed, but with the precious and undefiled blood of the immaculate Lamb; not with pens and the feathers of birds, but with thorns, nails, whips, and lances engraved from head to heel; and with the twin wood of the cross, as it were within two writing-tablets, joined together and enclosed. Out of which book, indeed, any Christian can take the most perfect institution of the Christian life; nor is there anyone — however rude and dull a mannikin — who, if only he will, cannot in it (as in a compendium, and, as it were, at a single glance) at once read and learn thoroughly whatsoever things are necessary to a pious and truly Christian life: singular innocence, humility, obedience, the highest poverty, sublime contempt of the world, assiduous patience, incredible endurance of sorrows, most ardent charity, and all the other virtues most necessary for the entrance to eternal beatitude. For on this account the Book of Life of the Lamb — the pages of the whole fleshly volume being spread out on the cross — willed, as it were, to be opened and extended in a display-book [*ypobiblium*]: that in the very form of the cross and the effigy of the affixed body we might read, and as in a mirror contemplate, what manner of form and exemplar it behooves the best Christian to be — namely, that he compose himself to the image of the crucified man; that is, that he not only, denying himself, take up his cross daily and follow Christ, but (what is more laborious and more glorious) extend his whole body and soul, hands, feet, and works into the service of God,[8] and so affix his flesh, with all its vices, concupiscences, and carnal desires, to the cross, that he may piously glory with Paul, saying to Christ:[9] "I am nailed [crucified] with the Cross" — and likewise: "I bear the marks of the Lord Jesus in my body";[10] and again: "To me the world is crucified, &c., and I to the world." This, then, is the Book of Life of the Lamb, slain from the origin of the world; on beholding which, no one — unless utterly mad, or altogether impious — is not straightway compelled to acknowledge in what manner he ought to live.

VITAE LIBER QVARTVS — *The Fourth Book of Life,* or the Book of past life. This is called by another name by John,[11] *the Book of the life of each one;* for so the edition has [it] which he cites from the 20th chapter of the Apocalypse, and which Augustine expounds in book 20 *On the City of God,* and in homily 17

on the Apocalypse: καὶ βιβλίον ἄλλο ἠνοίχθη, ὅ ἐστι ζωῆς ἑκάστου — that is, "And another book was opened, which is [the book] of the life of each one." This book the Theologians say to be a certain divine power, by whose virtue, in the day of judgment, there shall so be brought back into the memory of each one his past deeds, and set before the eyes of the mind, that it shall be lawful to none then either to be ignorant of, or to dissemble, or to hide his sins.[12] Concerning this book also Augustine, in chapter 14 of book 20 *On the City of God*, writes thus:[13] "AND I saw," says John, "the dead, great and small: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, [which is] of the life of each one; and the dead were judged out of those scriptures of the books, according to their deeds. He said the books were opened, and a book — but the book, of what sort it is, he was not silent: WHICH IS," he says, "of the life of each one. Therefore those books which he placed in the first place are to be understood [as] the holy [scriptures], both old and new, that in them might be shown what things God had commanded to be done; but in that [book] WHICH IS of the life [of each one], what things each one had either done or not done of these [commands] — whether he had done [them], or had not done [them]. Which book, if it be carnally thought of, who could avail to estimate its magnitude or length? or in how great a time could that book be read, in which are written all the lives of all men? Or shall there be present a number of Angels equal to the number of men, that each one may hear his own life recited to him by an Angel assigned to him? There shall be, therefore, not one book of all, but single [books] of single [persons]. But this Scripture, wishing one [book] to be understood, says: another book was opened. There is, therefore, a certain divine power to be understood, by which it shall come to pass that to each one all his deeds, whether good or bad, shall be recalled into memory, and be discerned by the intuition of the mind with a wondrous swiftness, so that knowledge may accuse or excuse conscience; and thus at once both all and single shall be judged. Which divine power, indeed, has received the name of 'book'; for in it, in a certain manner, whatsoever is done by the doer is read [back]." These things Augustine, in—

[→ *[These things Augustine,]* (Haec Augustinus, ad)]

[1] The Lamb is slain from the origin of the world, in [his] elect [2] Hebrews 11:24–25 [3] Acts 9:4 [4] The Lamb is slain from all eternity, in the foreknowledge and predestination of the divine mind [5] Acts 4:24, 27, 28 [6] The Lamb was slain from the origin of the world, because his death was prefigured by various sacrifices [7] In what manner Christ on the cross was the Book of Life is excellently explained [8] Galatians 6 [9] Galatians 2:19 [10] Galatians 6:17, 14 [11] Revelation 20:12 [12] In the day of Judgment it shall be lawful to no one to hide his sins [13] Revelation 20:12

(Rich PDF p. 147 — printed folio 130, verso. End of the preceding entry (a hymn — the Dies Irae *— sung in the obsequies of the dead). Then* ***THE FIFTH BOOK OF LIFE*** *(*liber Vitae aeternae*): Augustine's* On the threefold dwelling *on the beatific vision, and the view that it signifies a created light (Ps. 36:9; John 8:12). Then* ***VOLVMEN*** *— the scroll (*Megillath Sepher*): Ezekiel's vision of the book written within and without, eaten sweet then bitter, expounded by David Kimchi, Rashi (the three words* Kinim, Hegha, Hi*), and Jerome & Gregory (the scroll = divine scripture). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p146] …—nus, to whose opinion the author of that rough Rhythm seems to have looked back — [the hymn] which the Church chants in the sacred obsequies of the dead:

A written book shall be brought forth,

In which the whole is contained,

Whence the World shall be judged.

THE FIFTH BOOK OF LIFE, and the last of all — which is also called the book of eternal Life — is the blessed and everlasting presence of Christ the Son of God according to [his] divinity, by the sight of which he bestows upon his beholders the eternal felicity of the glorious life. Of which book Augustine, in the treatise *On the threefold dwelling*, chapter 4, thus speaks: [1] "IN THAT heavenly city the food and drink of all will be the vision of Christ and of the holy Trinity, and the contemplation, with the pure eye of the heart, of his very divinity, and the assiduous reading — so to speak — of the book of Life, that is, of eternal truth, and

of the highest wisdom, and of the Word of God, because it is the vision of Christ Jesus: where whatsoever is now hidden from us will be manifest; where the reason will be manifest why this man was elected and that one reprobated; why this one was taken up into the kingdom, and that one reduced into servitude; why one dies in the womb, another in infancy, another in youth, another in old age; why one is poor and another rich; why the son of an adulteress is baptized, and sometimes the son of a lawful spouse dies before baptism; why he who begins to live well sometimes ends ill, and he who begins ill often ends well. All these things, and many of this kind, will be plain and open to all in the book of Life." Thus far the words of Augustine — to which we once alluded, in the epitaph of Cyprian, that most excellent Theologian, in this distich:

If aught of sacred things by chance lay hidden from you,

Now, Cyprian, you read [it] in the book of life.

There are also [those] who judge that by this last book of Life is signified a certain created light, flowing forth perpetually from that uncreated, Vital, and perennial fountain of divine light: by the splendor of which created light our mind — by its own nature blind, and too weak to behold the incomprehensible majesty of God — lays aside the dullness of its darkened eyes, and is raised up to the sublimity of the divine vision. Of which volume, and of the vital fountain of the same light, David sang in the Psalm: [2] FOR with thee is the Fountain of Life, and in thy light we shall see light. And John in the Apocalypse, [3] speaking of the fellowship of the blessed who see God; and Christ, concerning the same light, added: [4] HE who follows me walks not in darkness, but shall have the light of life. According to the opinion of these, it is the same as the book of Life.

A VOLUME (in Hebrew מגלת ספר *Meghilath Sepher* [the Roll of the Book]), for which the Seventy put κεφαλὶς βιβλίου, that is, "the head-roll of a book," and by Jerome "a rolled-up book," is a kind of oblong sheet, rollable around itself in the manner of a coil, after the manner of the Orientals, who even in this age thus roll up their books. A book of this kind, filled with great mysteries, the prophet Ezekiel describes as shown to him in a vision, in the 2nd chapter of his prophecy, in these words: [5] AND I SAW, and behold, a hand was sent to me, in which was a rolled-up book, and he spread it before me, which was written within and without; and there were written in it lamentations, and a song, and woe; and he said to me, Son of man, eat this volume, and go, speak to the sons of Israel. And I opened my mouth, and he fed me with the volume, &c. And I ate it, and it became in my mouth sweet as honey.

Which words Rabbi David Kimchi thus expounds: [6] THE VOLUME of the book signifies the knowledge of prophesying divinely given to Ezekiel; but that which is in it — the writing of lamentations, and mournful songs, and woe — denotes the lamentable matter of the prophecies which the prophet was to announce to the people, namely the just wrath of God for the crimes of the Jews, and the imminent vengeance of divine justice upon the holy city, and the other future calamities of his whole nation — so copious that, since they could not be grazed [contained] upon the inner face of the sheet, it was necessary that they be extended also over the whole outer part of the page. And the volume was spread open before Ezekiel, that he might know that the understanding of prophecy falls to no one, save to him for whom God has opened the wrapping of his secrets. He was also commanded first to devour the book before he should speak to the people, that he might mark that the prophetic revelations were not to be run over cursorily by him, but to be eagerly received, and to be thoroughly digested [cooked down] in the belly of inner meditation, before they be poured out.

But the prophet's volume was at first sweet, like honey: because the knowledge of the divine judgments, and the meditation of the divine vengeances — which the impious shun and abhor — are to the just the greatest delight. For the just man shall rejoice, says the Psalm, when he shall see the vengeance. [7] But after the prophet had digested the volume in his belly, he perceived it to be bitter; and on account of this, a little after its devouring, he added: AND I went away bitter and sad in the indignation of my spirit. For when he began to preach the things which he had learned with the highest sweetness, straightway he experienced in himself the bitterness of toil, of persecution, of prison, and at last even the punishment of inflicted death. Rabbi Solomon [Rashi] judges that in this volume, on account of the narrowness of the page, the several afflictions

of the Jews were not described in particular, but only those three words mentioned by the prophet — namely קינים והגה והי *Kinim, Hegha, Hi,* that is, Lamentations, Muttering [Sighing], Woe — by which all the losses of the Jews are denoted, comprised in a summary. And the book is said to be written on front and back, because its words contain the signification both of present and of future calamities. Jerome and Gregory, [8] interpreting this place mystically, say that that volume is the book of divine scripture — which indeed is therefore called "rolled up," because it is wrapped in so great a depth of mysteries that it is permitted to no one to look into and understand it, unless the extended hand of God, which is Christ, first spread it open, and, spread open, explain it. And it is written within and without: that is, within by allegory and the spiritual understanding, without by the sense of the letter and history; within, teaching invisible things and promising heavenly [things]; without, prescribing visible and earthly [things], insofar as they are to be sought or to be shunned. There are also written in it, according to the interpretation of the Seventy, θρῆνος, καὶ μέλος, καὶ οὐαί — Lamentation, Song, and Woe. And first Lamentation, because in it, before all things, penitence is proclaimed to sinners; Song, or Verse, or Canticle, because there is promised to the just as a re—

[→ *reward* (praemium)]

[1] The food and drink of all the blessed will be the vision of Christ and of the most holy Trinity [2] Ps. 36:9 (Vulg. 35:10) [3] Rev. 21:23 [4] John 8:12 [5] Ezek. 2:9–10; 3:1–3 [6] The "volume of the book" in Ezekiel, in R. Kimhi's judgment, is the knowledge of prophecy and the authority of prophesying [7] Ps. 58:10 (Vulg. 57:11) [8] Obscure scripture

---

(Rich PDF p. 148 — printed folio 131, recto. End of the scroll-eating exhortation (Ps. 119:103). Then ***VOLVMEN VOLANS*** *— the Flying Volume of Zechariah 5 (the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, the Seventy, Jonathan, Jerome; the vision; the two Hebrew curses against the thief and the perjurer; Kimchi on the temple's dimensions; Chrysostom on the flying sickle; Paul of Burgos taking it for the Talmud). Then the lexicon reaches* ***X*** *— XERXES (= Artaxerxes) — and* ***Z*** *— the apocryphal book of ZACHARIAS (the "Assumption"). Running head: LIBER SECVNDVS. Still Book II — Book III not yet reached.)*

[continuing from p147] …reward, song, and exultation of eternal felicity; Woe, because there [in it] the misery of everlasting damnation is foretold to the impious. It is likewise needful to eat a volume of this kind — that is, of truth — to store away in the depth of the heart the pastures that are in it, and to ruminate [upon them] with the assiduous thought of the mind so long, until you are compelled to burst forth into that voice of David: [1] HOW sweet are thy words to my jaws, above honey to my mouth.

A FLYING VOLUME (which by Zechariah is called מגלה עפה *Meghila Apha*): Aquila and Theodotion rendered [it] διφθέρα, that is, a Skin, or a goatskin membrane — like that skin of the goat Amalthea, on which the poets feign that Jupiter writes human affairs; Symmachus rendered [it] τὴν κεφαλίδα, that is, the Chapter, or the summary, according to that [text]: "In the chapter of the book it is written of me"; the Seventy translated δρέπανον πετόμενον, that is, a Flying Sickle; Jonathan, a Flying Little-book; but Jerome rendered [it] "a Flying Volume." The vision of this volume is described by the prophet Zechariah in this manner: [2] AND I TURNED, and lifted up my eyes, and saw, and behold a flying volume; and he said to me, What seest thou? And I said, I see a flying volume: its length twenty cubits, and its breadth ten cubits. And he said to me, This is the curse that goes forth over the face of the whole earth; for every thief, as it is there written, shall be judged, and everyone who swears [falsely], from this likewise shall be judged. I will bring it forth, says the Lord of hosts, and it shall come to the house of the thief, and to the house of him who swears a lie in my name; and it shall abide in the midst of his house, and shall consume it, both its timbers and its stones. Thus far Zechariah.

That volume was not compacted of many sheets, as ours are, but of only one oblong membrane, rollable around itself — which our notaries call a Roll [Rotulus]. [3] And it is said to have had a length of twenty cubits, and a breadth of ten cubits, which are dimensions equal to the vestibule of the temple; because it

seemed to the prophet that the volume itself was going forth out of the temple. For although — Rabbi David Kimki says — at that time that temple of Solomon (whose vestibule's length extended to twenty cubits and breadth to ten) lay utterly wasted and demolished, yet from thence, the proportion of length and breadth which had formerly been in it being preserved, Zechariah saw that volume go forth. And this is what he says: This is the curse that goes forth, &c.

AND this volume was written on both sides, as well on the back as on the front. On the one side was written the execration of the [false] swearer, in these words: כל הגונב מזה כמוה נקה *Cal haggoneb mize camoah nikka*, that is, Everyone who steals from another, even as he is, shall be cut off. On the other side was contained the curse of the perjurer, of this kind: כל הנשבע מזה כמוה נקה *Cal annischba mize camoah nikka*, that is, Everyone who swears falsely against another, even as he is, shall be cut off. Now when this volume flew through the whole earth, it came to the houses of those who stole and who swore mendaciously; and there it began to abide in the very inner chambers of the houses; nor would it depart thence before it had consumed the timbers, the stones, and the walls of the houses together with the owners themselves.

John Chrysostom — in homilies 15 and 26 to the people of Antioch, reading (according to the edition of the Seventy) "a Flying Sickle" — interprets this place thus: [4] A FLYING SICKLE signifies the most swift onset of vengeance, pursuing false oaths. The breadth and length of many cubits indicates the vehemence, and the magnitude, of the evils; but that it flies from heaven [signifies] that the sentence is borne from the supreme tribunal. The sickle-shaped form [signifies] the inevitable lot of punishment; for just as a sickle, wherever it strikes, not only seizes [the thing] with itself, but also cuts off the head, so likewise the penalty rushing upon perjurers is most difficult [to escape]. And it dissolves the stones and timbers of the perjurer's house, that its ruin may be a correction to others; for after the dead perjurer must be buried in the earth, the house being dissolved and the ruin made, it will be an admonition through the sight to all who pass by and behold, lest they dare the same things and suffer the same. For God wills the punishments of the most grievous sinners to remain continual, and the accusers of the dead man's crime to be perpetual, that all hereafter may be corrected.

Paul, bishop of Burgos, judges that by the Flying Volume is signified the impious volume of the Talmudic books: which is called "Flying," because it has no solidity of a stable foundation; and is called "a Curse," by reason of its execrable doctrine; but because it seems to go forth from the temple and holy doctrine, it is said to have measures of length and breadth conformable to the temple. And it destroys the houses to which it comes, because this cursed volume will at last bring the utmost destruction of souls and of bodies upon the whole race of the Jews.

X.

XERXES, whom Ezra calls Artaxerxes, king of the Persians and Medes, son of Darius Hystaspes, wrote to Ezra the high priest one letter concerning the bringing back of the people of the Jews into [their] fatherland, and concerning the restoring of the temple for the Jerusalemites; the copy of which is read in the first [book] of Ezra, chapter 7, and in the third [book] of Ezra, chapter 8, and in Josephus in book 11 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 5. He wrote likewise to Sadaeus, prefect of Syria and Samaria, a letter of commendation for Nehemiah, his cupbearer, [5] setting out for the restoration of the temple of Jerusalem. See in the second [book] of Ezra [Nehemiah], chapter 2, and Josephus in book 11 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 5.

Z.

A book OF ZACHARIAS, the father of John the Baptist, which is called the ASSVMPTIO [Assumption], contained — among the other blasphemies feigned by heretics — [the tale] that Zacharias, [6] while he was burning incense in the Holy of Holies, being caught up in an excess of mind, saw a certain God in the inner shrine clothed in the body of an ass; and when he wished to signify this to the people, lest they should worship an ass for a divinity, he was suddenly made mute, lest he should announce what he had seen. The Synopsis of Athanasius [places] this work among the writings to be de—

[→ *detested* (detestanda)]

[1] Ps. 119:103 (Vulg. 118:103) [2] Zech. 5:1–4 [3] The flying volume was but a single oblong membrane [a roll] [4] False oaths are most gravely punished by God [5] Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes [6] A blasphemy to be detested

(Rich PDF p. 149 — printed folio 132, verso. End of the Zacharias "Assumption" entry. Then the last lexicon entry, ***The Book OF JEALOUSY*** *(*Sepher Kenaoth*) — the ordeal of the suspected wife from Numbers 5, per Philo: the admonition, the mournful garb, the uncovering of the head, the written curse dissolved in the bitter water, the drinking, and its effects; then the Church's abolition of such ordeals — the Council of Worms canon (purging monks by the Eucharist) and Pope Stephen V's condemnation of the hot-iron and boiling-water ordeals. The page closes with* ***"The End of the Second Book."*** *Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.* ***This is the last page of Book II; Book III (LIBER TERTIVS) begins on the next page.)***

[continuing from p148] …the Synopsis of Athanasius enumerates [it] among the writings of impiety to be detested.

The Book OF JEALOUSY (ספר קנאת *Sepher Kenaoth*), that is, the Book, or leaf, or paper of Jealousy, was that which the priest cast into the cup of reproof of a woman suspected of adultery, either for the detecting of her hidden crime, or for the defending of her doubtful innocence. For — as the fourth book of Moses, and Philo, and the other Rabbis of the Jews testify [1] — among the Hebrews the occasion and rite of writing this book was of this kind:

When a husband had come into a vehement and just suspicion of his wife, first he admonished her that she should abstain from the suspected company [of the man]; and if the woman had neglected to do so, the husband was bound to abstain from her until she should be purged. Meanwhile he went up to Jerusalem, to the chief Judges of the Synagogue, and disclosed the causes of his suspicion. They, on a day appointed for the woman, when she had appeared, admonished her that she should prudently weigh the matter with herself; and if she were innocent, that she should purge herself with confidence; but if not, that she should beware of the danger which she was about to bring upon herself, and not so obstinately court victory at the peril of death, but ingenuously confess her fault; [and] that she should remember [that] before her other women — even illustrious ones — had slipped into the same error through womanly frailty, such as the concubine of the Patriarch Jacob with Reuben, and Tamar with Judah. If she, being persuaded, did not deny the sin, she was dismissed to lead thenceforth a solitary life, without a husband, without dowry, and without any honor. But if she persisted in the resolve of purging herself, then the woman was clothed in a mournful and dark garment, and was led by women robed in black into the temple, and was set before the priest — not without the tears of those leading her; and the priest, with outstretched hand, drew off the covering of the woman's head, that she might be judged with head uncovered, without the insignia of modesty, as was the custom in all capital controversies. Then, a little book or paper being taken, he wrote in it the execration taken from the fourth book of Moses, in these words: [2] IF a strange man has not slept with thee, and if thou art not defiled, having deserted thy husband's bed, these most bitter waters, into which I have heaped up curses, shall not harm thee; but if thou hast turned aside from thy husband, and art defiled, and hast lain with another man, thou shalt lie subject to these curses: MAY the Lord make thee a curse, and an example among all in his people; may he make thy thigh to rot, and thy swollen belly to burst. Let the cursed waters enter into thy

belly, and, the womb rotting, let thy thigh rot, and thy swollen belly burst.

These things, together with the name of the wretched woman, being written on the little sheet, he read out with a loud voice; and, the woman answering, AMEN, AMEN, the priest, taking an earthen urn, poured into it certain most bitter waters, into which he had mixed dust of the earth gathered from the floor of the temple, and had heaped in many dire and lethal execrations; then, the little book being cast into the urn, he washed it so long, until the water had dissolved the letters. These things done, he handed the water to the woman to drink, saying: DRINK now the cup of reproof, which will lay bare and uncover things uncertain and hidden — [thou] who art presently to receive either the reward of chastity or the utmost penalty of a violated marriage. And she drank the water; and if she had suffered calumny [been falsely accused], the water gave [her] a happy conception and childbirth; but if she was not free from fault, straightway, as she had drunk down the washing of that little book, her face grew pale, her eyes started out, her belly swelled, her thigh fell away, her knees gave way, and with intolerable torments her womb was burst — [that womb] which she had refused to keep pure for her husband. And this was the wretched end of her life.

This mode of purgation — as well in this [matter] as in the other vehement suspicions of crimes — the Church of Christ afterward abolished. [3] Yet there is found in the acts of the provincial Council of Worms a canon concerning the purging of monks from the suspicion of theft, [4] written in these words: IT OFTEN happens that thefts are perpetrated in monasteries, and he who commits them is unknown; therefore we ordain that, when the brothers themselves must purge themselves of such [charges], a Mass be celebrated by the Abbot, or by someone whom the Abbot himself has appointed, in the presence of the brothers; and thus, in the last celebration of the Mass, for their purgation, let them receive the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thereby they may show themselves to be innocent; and to the communicants let the Eucharist be delivered with these words: MAY THE BODY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST BE TO THEE THIS DAY FOR A PROOF. Thus the Council of Worms.

But this canon was abrogated by the decree of Pope Stephen V: who, being consulted by Humbert, bishop of Mainz, whether parents — in whose bed infants were found dead in their sleep — ought, by the trial of hot iron, or of boiling water, or by some other similar experiment, to show that they had not smothered the children sleeping together with them, answered in this manner: [5] The sacred Canons do not grant that a confession be extorted from anyone by the trial of hot iron, or of boiling water, or by any other superstitious invention: for offenses made public by spontaneous confession, or by the approval of witnesses, the fear of God being had before the eyes, are committed to our government to judge; but hidden and unknown [things] are to be left to Him who alone knows the hearts of the sons of men.

The End of the Second Book.

[1] Philo, in the book *On the special laws.* The occasion and rite of writing the book of Jealousy [2] Num. 5:19–22 [3] The Church of Christ abolished the mode of purgation for hidden crimes that was used by the Jews [4] The purgation of monks suspected of theft [5] The ordeal of hot iron or of boiling water is condemned by the Church

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK III

On the art of expounding the volumes of the Holy Library

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, Book III

Note on the Latin sources. This English version is drawn from two copies of Sixtus's *Bibliotheca Sancta.* The front matter and pages 6–108 were translated from the 1586 Cologne edition (Maternus Cholinus), which carries few marginal notes; the marginal glosses were then supplied from a second, more heavily annotated copy of the same work. From page 109 onward the translation is made directly from that margin-rich copy. The printed leaf- and page-numbers in both copies are frequently misprinted, so pages are aligned by content and scan sequence rather than by the printed folios.

*(Rich PDF p. 150 — printed folio 133, recto. **The opening page of BOOK THREE**,* On the Art of Expounding the Volumes of the Holy Library. *A full-width title and **Preface** run across the top; below, the page divides into two columns, each beginning a section: the left on the **Definition and Division of the Art**, the right **On the Twofold Sense of Divine Scripture** (historical and mystical). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS. Book III is a treatise, not a lexicon; track it by section headings.)*

BOOK THREE

By F. Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On the Art of Expounding the Volumes of the Holy Library.

Preface

Concerning the sacred Scriptures and writers, and concerning the writings and writers that are mentioned in the sacred letters, enough (as I judge) has been said by us in the two preceding books. Now we must speak of those authors who illumined the divine Scriptures by the pious labors of their expositions. But since this cannot be done fittingly enough unless first there be explained the art, the method, and the order which those very expositors employed in expounding the sacred volumes, we have thought it worth the effort to comprehend briefly, in this third volume of the *Holy Library*, the plan and force of the whole art which the Catholic expositors have followed in explaining the divine letters; for once this has been rightly understood, those things will be grasped more easily and readily which we are to write, in the fourth book of this work, concerning the various explanations of the holy expositors.

The Definition and Division of the Art by which Sacred Scripture is Expounded

First of all, then — that we may begin from the Definition of the Art: we call the art of expounding the sacred letters [1] that [art] which teaches the precepts and rules necessary for the elucidation of divine Scripture. This whole [art], moreover, is divided into three parts, [2] that is, into the **Definitive**, the **Inventive**, and the **Dispositive**. The Definitive [3] enumerates, distinguishes, and defines the senses and expositions of the sacred letters, indicating how many and what are the senses of divine Scripture, and the kinds of its expositions. The Inventive [4] teaches [us] to seek out the senses — already defined — that lie hidden in the abstruse discourses of the sacred volumes, and, once they have been searched out by diligent investigation, to find them. The Dispositive [5] teaches [us] to bring the discovered senses of divine Scripture into the light by a fitting and duly accommodated arrangement of explanation, and to set them forth in the most apt order through the various modes, formulas, and methods of expounding — so that the greatness and majesty of the divine oracles may, so far as can be done, be nobly expressed according to the dignity of the matter, and that the devotees of the sacred volumes may be made more eager to read those beautifully arranged explanations of them. Approaching, therefore, the first part of this art, which is concerned with the definition of the senses and expositions, let us speak first about the senses themselves of sacred Scripture.

On the Twofold Sense of Divine Scripture

There are two senses of divine Scripture, the **Historical** and the **Mystical**. The Historical [6] is that which the narration of the deed done, and the series of the words under their common and customary signification — whether proper or metaphorical — represents in the outer bark of the letter. For there is a twofold variety, or

mode, of the historical sense, [7] namely the proper and the metaphorical. The **Proper** is that which words and names present according to the first and bare signification of the word: as when by "wolf" and "fox" we understand the animals which are first signified by these words. But the **Metaphorical** [8] is that which words transferred and carried over to a new signification signify; or [that] which a figurative expression circumscribes — as when in common speech we designate some greedy person by the name of "wolf," and some crafty person by the word "fox"; or as when in the divine letters Christ is called lamb, lion, rock, vine, worm, and many more of that kind, [9] all of which are ascribed to Christ not properly, but through a certain likeness. The other sense, however — the **Mystical** and spiritual — is far more hidden and more sublime, which is not open to all, but lies concealed in the inmost marrow of the words; signified not through the words, but through the very things themselves, [10] as when by the bronze serpent, hung upon the wood, Christ lifted up on the cross is designated. The difference of the two senses Paul taught us in his second epistle to the Corinthians, [11] saying [that the Jews…]

[1] The art of expounding the sacred letters is defined. [2] The division of the Art of expounding the sacred letters. [3] What the Definitive art is. [4] The Inventive. [5] The Dispositive. [6] The historical sense of Scripture is defined. [7] The historical sense is twofold. [8] What the metaphorical historical sense is. [9] Christ is called lion, rock, vine, worm, etc., not properly but through a likeness. [10] The mystical sense of Scripture is signified not through the words, but through the very things themselves. [11] 2 Cor. 3[:15].

---

*(Rich PDF p. 151 — printed folio 134. The chapter **On the Twofold Sense** finishes (the veil on the Jews' hearts; circumcision of flesh vs. heart), then a new section **On the Two Kinds of Exposition of the Sacred Writings** — the Historical (illustrated by Christ's exposition of the Mosaic divorce law) and the Mystical, itself divided into Allegorical, Tropological, and Anagogical, each keyed to past, present, and future. Origen and Porphyry, the Essenes and Philo; then Christ's own allegorical and tropological expositions. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p150] …[that the Jews] read daily and hear the reading of the Old Testament according to the letter, but that a veil is placed over their heart, so that they do not understand the spiritual understanding which gives life; [1] and, writing to the Romans, he showed that the law concerning circumcision has a twofold sense: [2] one according to the letter — signifying the circumcision of the flesh only, whose praise is among men; the other according to the spirit — enjoining the circumcision of the heart, greatly praised by God.

On the Two Kinds of Exposition of the Sacred Writings

For the explication of these senses, then, two kinds of exposition have been devised, namely the **Historical** and the **Mystical**. Now the Historical exposition is that which elucidates the historical, or literal, sense; [3] which indeed our Lord Jesus Christ very often used in expounding the holy Scriptures. From these we may take, for example, His exposition of the law of Moses concerning the giving of the bill of divorce, which is written in Deuteronomy in these words: [4] *If a man take a wife, and have her, and she find no favor in his eyes because of some uncleanness, he shall write a bill of divorce, and give it into her hand, and send her away out of his house.* Since the Pharisees understood this law wrongly [5] — thinking that Moses had commanded husbands to dismiss, for any cause whatever, wives who had become hateful to them, and to take another — Christ declared it according to the true meaning of the Mosaic letter in this manner, saying: [6] *Moses, for the hardness of your heart, permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her that is put away committeth adultery.* Our Savior would have wished to say: You Jews are a race of men fiercer and wilder than the beasts, without the fear of God, without love and without mercy; and therefore Moses indeed permitted you [7] — but did not command you — to put away wives held in hatred: not as though it were anything lawful, but as a remedy provided against the avoidance of a greater evil, lest, driven by hatred and by despair of an inseparable marriage, you should turn to the

murder of your spouse. For it has always been an evil to put away a wife for any cause whatever, and to take another — indeed [it is] against the very nature of matrimony, established from the beginning of the human race, whose law is: [8] *For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.* This, therefore, is the first exposition — the historical, pertaining to the first sense of divine Scripture.

The other kind of Exposition — which is called **Mystical**, [9] that is, hidden, secluded, and spiritual, and is necessary for the elucidation of the mystical senses that are enclosed in the holy Scripture — comprises three particular species, or parts, of explanation: namely the **Allegorical**, the **Tropological**, and the **Anagogical**; distinguished according to the threefold difference of past, present, and future time. The Allegorical [10] makes manifest the foretokens and presages of the shadows and figures of things past under the old law. The Tropological turns whatever things were done and said in the holy Scriptures to the moral instruction of the present life. The Anagogical raises the mind to the loftier mysteries of future blessedness and of heavenly glory. [11] So then, according to the threefold division of the times, there are [these] species of Mystical explanation.

The first invention of this [mystical exposition] Porphyry — an enemy of the Christian name — supposed to have proceeded from Origen Adamantius; [12] concerning whom, as Eusebius reports, he himself wrote these words in the third volume against the Christians: "The Christians cling to the discourses of the Jewish Scriptures, and affirm that those things which Moses wrote in a rustic and simple style are divinely sanctioned, and set beneath figures and riddles; and they expound them as though filled with immense mysteries. This kind of exposition had its beginning from a man whom I myself, when I was still quite a boy, [13] saw holding the ark of all erudition. This is Origen, whose immense glory is held among their teachers." But Philo the Jew, in the book to which he gave the title *On the Contemplative Life*, reports that this kind of spiritual interpretation was long before most usual among the Essenes [14] — men foremost among the Hebrews in religion and holiness — who from the rising of the dawn until evening were accustomed to spend whole days in the reading of the divine Scriptures, which they also strove with the utmost zeal to render into spiritual and allegorical senses. But we Christians believe, much more rightly and truly, that Christ Jesus — in whom are all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God — was the first author of this hidden exposition, [15] and first of all showed to us, both through Himself and through His disciples, each and every species of Mystical elucidation.

He taught the **Allegorical** explanation when, speaking to the Jews about John the Baptist, He said: [16] *Elias indeed shall come, and shall restore all things: but I say unto you, that Elias is already come, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they would* — signifying by these words that the life of Elijah in the Old Testament was a type and shadow of the life of John, [17] who at the outset of the New Testament came in the spirit and power of Elijah. Paul likewise, in the epistle to the Galatians, explaining allegorically the history of Abraham's two sons, [18] says: *It is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondwoman, and the other by a free woman: but he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh; he of the free woman, by promise: which things are said by an allegory; for these are the two testaments*, etc. [19]

Our Redeemer used the **Tropological** exposition [20] when He turned the history of the repentance of the Ninevites, and of the coming of the queen of the South to Solomon, to the reproach of the most abandoned morals and the most obstinate unbelief of the Jews, saying: [21] *The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas; and behold a greater than Jonas here. The queen of the South shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold a greater than Solomon here.* And Paul, in the epistle to the Corinthians, accommodating to morals the history of the Hebrews who perished in the desert, [22] says: [23] *Our fathers all [passed through] the sea…*

[1] Rom. 2:29. [2] The law concerning circumcision has a twofold sense. [3] What the historical exposition of Scripture is. [4] Deut. 24:1. [5] Christ explained the law of Moses, which was badly understood by the Pharisees. [6] Matt. 19:8–9. [7] Moses permitted the Jews to put away wives, but did not command this. [8] Matt. 19:5. [9] The mystical kind of exposition is distributed into three species. [10] The allegorical exposition. [11] Tropology. Anagogy. [12] Porphyry's lie. [13] Porphyry as a boy saw Origen. [14] The Essenes were, among the Hebrews, foremost in holiness. [15] Christ the Lord was the author of the mystical exposition of the Scriptures. [16] Matt. 17:11–12. [17] Elijah's life was a type and shadow of the life of John the Baptist. [18] Gal. 4:22–23. [19] Paul explains allegorically the history of Abraham's two sons. [20] Christ the Lord used the tropological exposition. [21] Matt. 12:41–42. [22] Paul accommodated the history of the Hebrews to morals. [23] 1 Cor. 10:1, 5–9.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 152 — printed folio 135. The tropological example from 1 Cor 10 finishes; then Paul's **anagogical** exposition (the promised land → the heavenly Jerusalem). A key principle follows: one passage can bear all the senses at once — shown by **Eucherius's** fourfold exposition of the word "Waters" (historical, tropological, allegorical, anagogical). Then two alternative schemes are cited: **Augustine's** fourfold division (History, Allegory, Analogy, Aetiology, from* On the Usefulness of Believing*) and **Jerome's** threefold one (to Hedibia). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p151] …[our fathers all] passed through the sea; but with the greater part of them God was not well pleased. Now these things were done in a figure of us, that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted; neither become idolaters, as some of them, as it is written: The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication, and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted, and perished by the serpents. Now all these things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the ages are come.

Paul used the **Anagogical** exposition [1] in the epistle to the Hebrews, when he adapts that land of the Palestinians, promised to the fathers, to the promise of future glory, saying that that land — so greatly desired by the Patriarchs, and sought out through so many wanderings — is not the present, visible, earthly region of the Canaanites, but a future, invisible, and heavenly fatherland, having better foundations, whose builder is God; [2] and [that it is] the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, thronged with many thousands of angels. So many, then, are the species of the sacred expositions.

But it must be known that not only can all things which are found in the sacred letters be plainly explained by one or another of these expositions, but also that it very often happens that one and the same passage and words of divine Scripture admit all these expositions at once. [3] Of this the most apt example is furnished by St. Eucherius in his book of *Spiritual Formulas*, illustrating by a fourfold exposition the word "Waters," which is most frequent in the holy Scriptures, in these words: **There are four kinds of divine Expositions: the Historical, the Tropological, the Allegorical, and the Anagogical.**

The **Historical** exposition is that which impresses upon us the truth of the deeds and the faith of the revelation.

The **Tropological**, or moral, exposition is that which refers the mystical understandings to the amendment of life.

The **Allegorical** exposition is that which shows the narration of the deeds to have prefigured the shadow of things to come.

The **Anagogical** exposition is that which brings forth the more sacred secrets of the heavenly figures; and these very [secrets] are made plainer by the examples set beneath them.

Water, according to history, signifies the elemental water which washes and flows through the earth, as in the beginning of Genesis: [4] *Let the waters be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear.*

Tropologically, Water signifies tribulations. The Psalm: [5] *We have passed through water and fire, and thou hast brought us out into refreshment;* and in Isaiah: [6] *When thou shalt pass through the waters, I will be with thee, and the rivers shall not cover thee.* Likewise it signifies wisdom, as Solomon says: [7] *The words from*

the mouth of a man are deep water, and an overflowing torrent the fount of wisdom. Likewise heresies, the same Solomon writing: [8] *Stolen waters are sweeter.* Likewise the prosperities of the world, in John, who says: [9] *Whosoever shall drink of this water shall thirst again.*

Allegorically, Water signifies baptism: concerning which it is read in the volume of Ezekiel: [10] *I will pour upon you clean water, and you shall be cleansed from all your defilements.* Likewise, in the Apocalypse, Peoples: [11] *Many waters, many peoples.* And in Isaiah: [12] *Blessed are you that sow upon all waters.* Likewise grace — [that] of the Holy Spirit — in John: [13] *If any man thirst, let him come and drink; and out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*

Anagogically, Water is expounded of eternal beatitude, as in Jeremiah: [14] *They have forsaken me, the fountain of living water.* Likewise it is sung of the Angels in the psalm: [15] *Let the waters that are above the heavens praise the name of the Lord.* Thus Eucherius.

But I think it by no means to be passed over that Augustine, in the book *On the Usefulness of Believing,* to Honoratus, chapter 3, seems to divide these kinds of exposition far otherwise than we and Eucherius have distinguished them, [16] speaking in this manner: **Four modes of expounding the law are handed down by certain treaters of the Scriptures: according to History, according to Allegory, according to Analogy, according to Aetiology.**

According to history, then, it is delivered when it is taught what was written, or what was done — [or] what was not done but only written as though it had been done. According to Aetiology, when it is shown for what cause a thing was either done or said. According to Analogy, when it is demonstrated that the two testaments, namely the old and the new, are not adverse to one another. According to Allegory, when it is taught that certain things which are written are not to be taken to the letter, but understood figuratively. In all these modes our Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles made use. For [something] is taken from history, when it was objected that on the Sabbath day His disciples had plucked the ears of grain: [17] *Have you not read,* He says, *what David did, and they that were with him? how he entered into the house of God, and ate the loaves of proposition, which it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for them that were with him, but for the priests alone.*

To **Aetiology** pertains that [passage] which — when Christ had forbidden a wife to be put away, except for the cause of fornication, and it had been cited to Him by those questioning [Him] that Moses had permitted the license of putting away by giving a bill of divorce — He says: [18] *This Moses did for the hardness of your heart.* For here the cause is rendered why that was rightly permitted by Moses for the time, so that what Christ was enjoining might show that other times had now come.

To **Analogy** pertains that [passage] which — when Matthew had narrated the slaughter of the infants perpetrated by Herod — he straightway added the agreement of this deed with the sayings of the old testament, saying: [19] *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying: A voice in Rama was heard, weeping and much wailing, Rachel bewailing her sons: and she would not be comforted, because they are not.*

To **Allegory** pertains that which Paul says to the Galatians: [20] *It is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondwoman, the other by a free woman: which things are said by an allegory.* Thus Augustine.

But Jerome seems to distinguish these kinds of exposition somewhat more diversely, [21] thus writing in the twelfth question to Hedibia: **There is a threefold description and rule of the Scriptures in our heart: the first, that we understand them according to History; the second, according to Tropology; the third, according to spiritual understanding.**

In **History,** the order of the things which are written is preserved.

In **Tropology,** we rise up from the letter to greater things; and whatever was carnally done in the former people, we interpret according to a moral sense, and turn to the profit of our soul. [continues p153: In…]

[1] The use of the anagogical exposition in St. Paul. [2] Heb. 11:13. [3] One and the same passage of Scripture sometimes admits all four kinds of exposition. [4] Gen. 1:9. [5] Ps. 65:12. [6] Isa. 43:2. [7] Prov. 18:4. [8] Prov. 9:17. [9] John 4:13. [10] Ezek. 36:25. [11] Rev. 17:15. [12] Isa. 32:20. [13] John 7:38. [14] Jer. 2:13. [15] Ps. 148:4. [16] Augustine divides the kinds of exposition of sacred Scripture otherwise than Eucherius and Sixtus do. [17] Matt. 12:4; Mark 2:23; Luke 6:1. [18] Matt. 19:7–8. [19] Matt. 2:17–18. [20] Gal. 4:22–24. [21] St. Jerome distinguishes the kinds of exposition of Scripture otherwise than those above.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 153 — printed folio 136. Jerome's threefold scheme closes ("Thus far Jerome"); then Sixtus reconciles the Fathers — they agree on the number of senses and differ only in how they group them: Eucherius into four, Jerome into three, Augustine into two (the scheme Sixtus follows). Three comparative **division-diagrams** follow. Then a new chapter, **On the Use and Usefulness of the Historical and Mystical Exposition**: only the literal/historical sense has probative force for defending doctrine and refuting heresy. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p152] In the spiritual θεωρία (contemplation), we pass over to loftier things, we let go of earthly things, we discourse of the blessedness of things to come and of heavenly things, so that the meditation of the present life may be a shadow of the blessedness to come. Thus far Jerome.

But that all the diversity which seems to be among these Fathers may be recalled to concord, one must know that they do not disagree at all as to the number of the four Expositions, but differ only in the manner of dividing. [1] For that partition of the expositions which Eucherius distributed into four members, Jerome [reduced] to three, and Augustine (whom we have followed) reduced to two members — in the manner which appears in the figure set below.

Eucherius's Fourfold Division. The exposition of the sacred letters is fourfold, namely:

- **Historical** — [either] Proper [or] Metaphorical
- **Tropological**
- **Allegorical**
- **Anagogical**

Jerome's Threefold Division. The exposition of the sacred letters is threefold, namely:

- **Historical**
- **Tropological**
- **Spiritual** — which is twofold, namely: Allegorical [and] Anagogical

Augustine's Twofold Division. The exposition of the sacred letters is twofold, namely:

- **Historical** — [subdivided into] Analogical [and] Aetiological
- **Allegorical** — which in the book *On True Religion*, chapter fifty, is assigned as threefold; of which:
- the **First** accommodates the figures of past things to things present: this retained for itself the name of *Allegorical*;
- the **Second** pertains to morals and the affections of the soul: this is called *Tropological*;
- the **Third** exalts [the mind] to unchangeable eternity: this is called *Anagogical*.

Let these things be said concerning the two kinds of sacred exposition; to which a few little points concerning their necessary use and usefulness seem worth adding.

On the Use and Usefulness of the Historical and Mystical Exposition

The historical kind of exposition is, first of all, supremely necessary [2] for the instruction of those matters which are to be believed by us, for the confirmation and defense of the faith, and for refuting those who resist

the truth, and for convicting all heresies. For no exposition brought in for the proof of dogmas has force and strength, unless it be one that truly, purely, and genuinely unfolds the meaning of the letter. [3] For since other explanations search out the senses hidden within the marrow of the letter, and thence endeavor to draw them forth from certain likenesses of things, they can easily be deceived by the images of like things — especially since this deduction and elucidation of the spiritual senses is made by the thought, discourse, and inquiry of the human wit, which is often deceived, and in obscure matters is wont frequently to invent those things toward which the mind is most inclined, whether by nature or by exercise. For if I myself should wish to establish [4] that priests have the power of binding and loosing from sins, by the mystical exposition of that saying of Christ to the Apostles, *Loose him, and let him go*, the adversary will at once reply that this was said of the loosing of the linen cloths in which Lazarus was wrapped, and not of the loosing of sins. But if I show the very same thing from the authority and literal exposition of that saying of Christ to the Apostles, [5] *Receive the Holy Spirit: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained*, he will straightway be compelled to acquiesce and to assent to the words. Accordingly, St. Augustine rightly writes thus in the epistle to Vincentius the Donatist: *But who would not most impudently strive to interpret in his own favor something set in an Allegory, unless he also had most manifest testimonies by whose light the obscure things might be illumined?* Jerome too, in the second [book] of his commentaries on Matthew, treating of the leaven hidden by the woman in three measures of meal [6] — after he had reported the exposition of certain persons who applied that parable to the trinity of persons and the unity of essence — subjoins these words: *A pious sense, indeed; but a parable and the doubtful understanding of riddles can never avail for the authority of the dogmas.* Thus he. Therefore the literal [exposition] alone is strong for supporting truth and destroying falsehood; [7] for since from the [first…]

[1] The Fathers are recalled to concord, as far as concerns the distinction of the expositions of Scripture. [2] For what matters the historical kind of exposition is necessary. [3] What exposition of Scripture has force for proving the dogmas of the faith. [4] John 11:44. [5] John 20:22–23. [6] Matt. 13:33. [7] Only the literal exposition is valid for supporting truth and destroying falsehood.

*(Rich PDF p. 154 — printed folio 137. The second usefulness of the historical/literal sense: it is the foundation of every mystical exposition (the Manichaeans' error over "In the sun he set his tabernacle" shows the danger of neglecting it). Then the counterpart: the **mystical** sense is no less necessary — without it we would be dragged back into Judaizing, and the Law's sacrifices and histories would seem absurd (Abraham's two wives = the two Testaments, per Paul). Finally, hold the mean: condemn both the dead-letter literalists and those who reject the letter to force insipid allegories. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p153] …[for since] it is drawn from the first signification of the words, or from transferred words most closely joined to the first signification, it is more open and more efficacious than the other explanations. And this is the first and most necessary use of the historical exposition.

Its second usefulness and necessity arises from its relation to the other mystical expositions, beneath which it must needs be laid as their base and as the stable foundation of the whole spiritual edifice. [1] For unless the sense of the letter be first clear to us, how will it be possible for us to illustrate by spiritual elucidations those [passages] whose words are most obscure to us? There will be danger, too, if from words not understood we should wish to express some hidden sense, that we fall into various heresies; and that the same befall us which has befallen many heretics, especially the Manichaeans: who, since from ignorance of the Hebrew tongue they did not understand the literal sense of that saying, [2] *In the sun he hath set his tabernacle*, turned themselves to the supports of an allegorical exposition, [3] saying that Christ after his resurrection ascended without flesh to the Father, having left his body within the compass of the solar globe — so that his flesh should be adored by us in the sun, as in the tabernacle of the Lord's body — whereas nevertheless the genuine and proper sense and exposition of the letter is this: that God set a tabernacle for the Sun in heaven, from which the Sun himself, in the early morning, like a bridegroom coming forth from his chamber, goes forth to show the splendor of his countenance to all mortals. These, then, are the necessity and the benefits of

the Historical exposition.

But the Mystical kind of exposition contains no lesser advantages, being far most useful both for the integrity of the faith and for the instruction of morals. For it is, first of all, most necessary for discerning, preserving, and explaining the purity of the gospel doctrine [4] — which must needs be contaminated and defiled by us with Jewish institutions, if we should everywhere wish to explain the Scriptures, especially the old ones, according to the bare letter. And it would then be necessary to return again to that ancient observance of the Jewish ceremonies, and again to be circumcised with the Jews, to sacrifice cattle, to eat the lamb and the unleavened bread, to abstain from unclean foods, and to follow the other shadows of the Hebrews — which, now that the gospel light has shone forth, have vanished away. Next, hardly any kind of defense or answer is left to us against the enemies of the law and the prophets, if they object to us: why did God once give such absurd laws — to cut off the little skin of the foreskin, to kill a lamb, to slaughter a calf, to cut the throat of a goat, to defile everything with beastly blood, to carry a peg upon the belt, and, after the manner of cats, to cover the excrements of one's own body with dug-up earth? We shall also find but few things in the old histories that would spiritually delight the soul and feed the mind, if we neglect the mystical expositions; [5] rather, all those things will seem to us insipid, rustic, senseless, and utterly unworthy of the divine majesty, which God commands concerning the lamb, the ram, the ox, the red heifer, the goat, the fat, the right shoulder, the liver, the breast, the belly, and the other entrails of brute beasts. And God himself will seem to command nothing great, nothing sublime, nothing worthy of God — [nothing] but sacrifices of this kind, which seem cheap, lowly, and to be despised by the wise of this world — unless you refer [them] to the sacrifice of Christ, which was made for us contemptible, abject, and despised even unto the death of the cross; outwardly indeed clothed in a sordid and cheap garment of flesh, but inwardly great, lofty, magnificent, and beautiful beyond the sons of men — [Christ] who suffers himself to be figured by unworthy words and cheap sacrifices. Therefore, in carnal sacrifices of this kind, unless we admit a mystical sense and explanation, the laws of the gentiles — whether of the Athenians or of the Lacedaemonians — will seem more rational.

But neither will the old histories be able at all to profit for the forming of morals, if we consider them according to the bare letter. For what does it profit toward salvation to know the wars and seditions of the ancient Jews, if in them we understand nothing else than slaughter and effusions of blood? What does it matter toward attaining piety to know, according to the letter, that Abraham had two wives and [two] sons, Ishmael and Isaac; that the boy Isaac was weaned from milk; that on the day of the weaning a banquet was made; that [Ishmael] played with Isaac; that Sara is indignant that the son of the handmaid should play with the son of the free woman — unless you refer the carnal history to the mystical understanding, and, together with Paul, expound that Abraham having two wives signifies Christ having two testaments and two peoples: [6] the one carnal, and the other spiritual, weaned from the milk of the carnal Life; and that the play of infancy [signifies] the persecution of the carnal people against the spiritual; and that on this account Sara — that is, the new law — is indignant against Hagar, the old law which perceives only carnally? [7] If you should expound these things mystically in this fashion, the history will help in a wonderful manner to foster and nourish in us the fire of faith and love, and will bring to our taste the delight of a wondrous savor.

Here, however, those who take up the task of expounding the sacred Scriptures must be admonished to hold the mean in these expositions, and to flee the extremes (which are always faulty). For just as certain expositors of our age are by no means to be approved, who — the mystical senses being spurned as chance thoughts devised at pleasure — perpetually sit beside the drowsy letter, and lean upon dead syllables and words alone, cold, without spirit, bloodless and lifeless: so also gravely to be condemned are certain inept expositors of our times, who — having utterly rejected the literal exposition as a matter of the slightest moment, and (as they say) worthy of Grammarians rather than Theologians — drag forth in each passage of Scripture certain forced and insipid allegories, doing violence to the divine Scripture; and, the truth of the

history being destroyed, peddle their ridiculous notions as great and hidden sacraments of the Church. These I most lovingly beseech and adjure to consider that the literal exposition is not a thing so common, cheap, and worn out, [8] and [that… to all…]

[1] The literal exposition is the foundation of the other expositions. [2] Ps. 18:5. [3] The folly of the Manichaeans, born of ignorance of the literal sense of Scripture. [4] The mystical kind of exposition is necessary for preserving and explaining the sincerity of the gospel doctrine. [5] Few things in the old histories delight the soul spiritually, if we neglect the mystical expositions. [6] Gal. 4:24, 29. [7] Abraham having two wives signified Christ having two Testaments and two peoples. [8] The literal explication of Scripture is the most difficult of all.

(Rich PDF p. 155 — printed folio 138. The literal sense is in fact the hardest of all: Jerome and Augustine came to it only late — Jerome's confession in his preface to Obadiah (his youthful allegorizing vs. the literal commentary of his old age), and Augustine's in the Retractations *(worn out by the labor of expounding Genesis to the letter). The historical sense is thus most noble. A new chapter follows,* ***On Three Particular Expositions*** *(Elemental, Physical, Prophetic), opening with the* ***Elemental*** *— letters as sounds and as numbers (the Resolutory and Composing modes: acronym-expansion and anagram). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p154] …[and that the literal exposition is not so common, cheap, and worn out, and] open to all — as they themselves boast — [as merely fit for] the pedagogues of boys, but is the most difficult of all expositions, and the most laborious, on account of the unusual and abstruse properties of the holy tongue, and on account of the abundance of most difficult matters — namely of all the arts, sciences, and disciplines — which are comprehended under the historical sense of Scripture. Witnesses of this are the two most brilliant lights of the Latin church, Jerome and Augustine, [1] who did not dare to set their hand to the Historical explanation except when already advanced in age, after they had spent many years in mystical explanations, as in easier studies. Whose words it pleases [us] to bring in here for the confirmation of our opinion, so that those who approach the exposition of the Scriptures may recognize how greatly the Historical explanation is to be esteemed. Concerning it, Jerome, in the preface of his commentaries on Obadiah, speaks thus:

When I was a little child, I spoke as a little child, I understood as a little child, I thought as a little child; but when I became a man, I put away the things that were of a child. [2] If the apostle advances, and — daily forgetting the things that are past — *reaches forth to the things that are before,* [3] according to the precept of the Lord and Savior (holding the plough-handle, he looks not back behind him), [4] how much more ought I — who have not yet come to the age of a perfect man and to the measure of Christ — to deserve pardon for this: that in my youth, provoked by ardor and zeal for the Scriptures, I interpreted allegorically the prophet Obadiah, whose history I did not know? My mind burned with mystical knowledge; and because I had read that *all things are possible to them that believe,* I was ignorant that the charisms are diverse. I knew the letters of the age [secular learning], and on that account I thought I could read the sealed book. I hoped that what I had written lay hidden in my little chests, and had vowed the first rashness of my little wit to the fire — when suddenly there is brought from Italy a copy [of it], by a certain youth as many years old as [the years] since I had once written it, praising my little work. I confess, I marveled that, however badly anyone has written, he finds a reader like himself. He was proclaiming [it]; I was blushing. He was carrying, as it were, the mystical understandings up to heaven; I, with lowered head, was kept from confessing my shame. What then? Do we condemn that in which we played as boys? By no means. But I freely profess that that was [the work] of a boyish wit, and this, which I now write, [the work] of ripe old age. Thus Jerome, when in extreme old age he wrote a commentary on the prophet Obadiah according to the letter.

But Augustine testifies that, having first written easily on Genesis according to allegory, he attempted much later a literal exposition upon the same book, but, deterred and worn out by the magnitude of the labor, was compelled to desist. [5] His words are these, in the first volume of the *Retractations*: *When I had composed two books on Genesis against the Manichaeans — since I had handled the words of Scripture according to the allegorical exposition, not daring to expound to the letter such great secrets of natural things (that is, in what*

manner the things there said might be taken according to historical propriety) — I wished to try, in this most laborious and most difficult work also, what I could do; but in expounding the Scriptures my apprentice-effort sank beneath so great a burden of the load; and before one book was finished, I rested from the labor which I could not sustain. Thus far the words of Augustine. From which it is clear that the historical explanation is not to be neglected by the expositors of our age as if ignoble, trivial, and unlearned, [6] since it itself surpasses almost all the mystical expositions by the excellence of noble and most learned matters.

And let these things concerning the four general and principal explanations of divine Scripture be said sufficiently; it remains for us to proceed to certain other particular explications of the same Scripture.

On Three Particular and Little-Used Expositions of Divine Scripture

After those four kinds of sacred exposition — the most excellent, and most usual among all expositors — already described by us, there are found also three particular explanations of divine Scripture, [7] namely the **Elemental**, the **Physical**, and the **Prophetic**: of which, although the use among the divine interpreters is rare, and they seem in some way to be contained under the aforesaid common kinds, nevertheless, lest we leave untouched anything pertaining to the present purpose, we shall explain them as not unworthy to be known, beginning first from the Elemental exposition itself.

On the Elemental Exposition

The Elemental explanation — from which the elemental expositors are so named [8] — is that which is concerned with the signification of the simple elements, or letters. But since letters signify chiefly two things, that is, the individual parts of syllables, and the marks that indicate numbers (especially among the Greeks and Hebrews, who represent every kind of number by letters), [9] this explanation is necessarily divided into two modes of explaining.

On the First Mode of the Elemental Exposition

The First Mode — that is, the one which, from the resolution of the elements of each word, and again from a new and different connection of those same elements, deduces manifold senses, both historical and mystical, from the sacred Scriptures — this mode is cut into two parts, that is, the **Resolutory** and the **Composing**. Now the former part, in which single letters signify single words, and single [words] are expounded through single [letters], is on that account called **Resolutory**, [10] because it consists wholly in the resolution of the elements: for it tears apart and separates the letters of any given word, one from another, and from each single letter draws out certain words beginning with that same letter — which lay bare the mysteries hidden in the whole marrow of that word. The latter part, which treats of **composition**, [11] transposes those same elements of the same word — before scattered and disjoined — again in a new order, and, placing one in the room of another with position changed, connects them, and composes from them new syllables, words, [and] parts of speech,

---

[1] Jerome and Augustine did not dare to set their hand to the historical explanation of the Scriptures until they were advanced in age. [2] 1 Cor. 13:11. [3] Phil. 3:13. [4] Luke 9:62. [5] Augustine desisted from the literal exposition of Genesis, deterred by the magnitude of the labor. [6] The historical explanation of Scripture is the most noble. [7] There are three particular explanations of the Scriptures. [8] Whence the elemental expositors are so named. [9] Numbers among the Hebrews and Greeks are represented by letters. [10] What the Resolutory exposition of Scripture is. [11] What the Composing exposition of Scripture is.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 156 — printed folio 139. The **Resolutory** elemental exposition (letters standing for words). The Hebrews claim it as part of their Cabala, but Sixtus finds it also among the Greeks — Plato's* Cratylus, *and the tale of **Aesop** reading a marble column's seven letters three different ways to find (and then withhold) a treasure. Then Hebrew examples: Jerome's* notarikon *of* נמרצת *("grievous," 1 Kings 2:8) into Shimei's five reproaches of David; the acronym **ADAM** = the four directions (with a Sibylline verse); and Daniel's*

MENE, TEKEL, PHARES *— single words standing for whole sentences. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p155] …[composes from them new syllables, words, and] parts [of speech], and formulas of discourse, by whose aid the understandings of the diverse senses, and the most secret mysteries, are laid open. The Hebrews claim for themselves the intention of this explanation, asserting it to be a part of the **Cabala** [1] — that is, of their more secret and Anagogical, or Allegorical, wisdom — which their Fathers received, handed down from hand to hand from their elders a little after the times of Moses. Which indeed is not sufficiently ascertained to me, since I find that the same skill of expounding existed also among the most ancient Greeks — not only in Plato, in the *Cratylus*, where he treats of a not dissimilar discipline concerning the etymology of names, but also in **Aesop** the Phrygian, [2] who is believed to have flourished long before the times of the Trojan war, in the same age as Orpheus and Linus. For he, as is read in his *Life*, when together with his master Xanthus he was surveying the ruins of certain old buildings, chanced upon a certain marble column on which seven Greek letters were engraved, indicating a treasure buried in that place, not far from the column. And when Xanthus was anxiously inquiring into their meaning, Aesop — having found words which began with those same characters — illustrated that writing by applying three [different] expositions. [3] The letters were of this sort: **A, B, Δ, O, E, Θ, X**; which Aesop, disclosing to his master the place of the treasure that the letters designated, first expounded thus:

A — ἀπόβαθι (*ascend*); **B** — βήματα (*steps*); Δ — τέσσαρα (*four*); **O** — ὀρύξας (*digging*); **E** — εὑρήσεις (*thou wilt find*); Θ — θησαυρόν (*treasure*); **X** — χρυσίον (*golden*): that is, "Ascending four steps [and] digging, thou wilt find a golden treasure."

And so, when Xanthus had dug up the treasure and would assign no part of the gold to Aesop, Aesop modestly admonished him to obey the precept engraved on the column — [namely] what those letters contained — in this way:

A — ἀνελόμενοι (*taking [it] up*); **B** — βαδίσαντες (*go*); Δ — διέλεσθε (*divide*); **O** — ὅν (*which*); **E** — εὕρετε (*ye have found*); Θ — θησαυρόν (*treasure*); **X** — χρυσίον (*golden*): that is, "Taking [it] up, go, divide the golden treasure which ye have found."

But when Xanthus disdained to do this, and wished to possess the gold alone, Aesop, indignant, threatened that, unless he received a part, he would carry out yet another command of the same writing, the letters prescribing thus:

A — ἀπόδος (*render*); **B** — βασιλεῖ (*to the king*); Δ — Διονυσίῳ (*to Dionysius*); **O** — ὅν (*which*); **E** — εὗρες (*thou hast found*); Θ — θησαυρόν (*treasure*); **X** — χρυσίον (*golden*): that is, "Render to King Dionysius the golden treasure which thou hast found."

But however the matter may stand — whether the Greeks or the Hebrews first devised this manner of expounding — there are, as we have already said, two parts of it. Of the former, or **Resolutory** part, in which single letters denote single words, not a few examples exist among the ancient Fathers. Among these, Jerome, in the *Questions on the third book of Kings*, examining those words of the dying David to Solomon [4] — *Thou hast also with thee Shimei, the son of Gera, the son of Jemini, of Bahurim, who cursed me with a most grievous curse* — explains the force of that word of execrable cursing, showing the reproaches which Shimei heaped upon David [to be drawn] from the letters which are in that word, **GRIEVOUS** — which in Hebrew is written נמרצת (*nimretzeth*), and consists of these five letters: נ *nun*, מ *mem*, ר *resh*, צ *tsade*, ת *tav*. [5]

In נ *nun* is signified נאף (*naaph*), that is, **Adulterer** and ravisher of another's wife — because he had defiled himself with adultery of Uriah's wife.

In מ *mem* is signified **Moabite** — by which word Shimei reproached him with the ignobility of his own stock, that he was descended from the ignoble and unbelieving seed of the Moabites.

In ר *resh* is denoted רצח (*rotseach*), that is, **Homicide** and slayer — who took off innocent Uriah by evil guile, and slaughtered the whole royal line of Saul.

In צ *tsade* is signified צרוע (*tsarua*), that is, **Leper** — because he would be cast out from all men from his kingdom, after the likeness of a leprous man, whom the law commanded to be driven from the cities and from the company of men.

In ת *tav* is signified תועבה (*to'evah*), that is, **Abominated** — not only by men, but by God, who had utterly cast him off as an impious man.

But Augustine, in the ninth tractate on John — and before him Cyprian, in the treatise on Sinai and Sion, and after both Bede, in his commentaries on John — declaring the etymology of the name **Adam**, [6] think the first man was so called because that earth from which he was formed was taken by God from the four cardinal points of the world, which are comprehended in the four letters of that same name. For **A** [signifies] ἀνατολήν (*Anatol■*), that is, the East; **D**, δύσιν (*Dysis*), that is, the West; the other **A**, ἄρκτον (*Arktos*), that is, the North; and **M**, μεσημβρίαν (*Mes■mbria*), that is, the South. This interpretation of the name the Sibyl had expressed many ages before, in the second book of the *Oracles*, in these verses — whose sense is this:

> *Truly it is God who fashioned four-lettered Adam, who was first formed, and who fills up by his name the Rising [East] and the Setting [West], the South and the vigorous North.*

To this part of the Resolutory exposition can also be referred the interpretation of those words of which single ones signify single whole sentences — such as those three words which (as is had in the fifth chapter of Daniel) that prodigious hand wrote on the wall before the king of Babylon, [7] namely מנא **MENE**, תקל **TEKEL**, ופרסין **PHARESIN**, that is, NUMBERED, WEIGHED, DIVIDED. Daniel, expounding these by three whole sentences, interpreted thus: **NUMBERED** signifies, "Numbered is thy kingdom by God, and completed"; **WEIGHED** signifies, "Weighed in the balance, and found wanting"; **DIVIDED** signifies, "Divided is thy kingdom, and given to the Medes and the Persian."

There follows the latter part of this exposition, pertaining to **composition**, which is made by the commutation and transposition of letters. [8]

[1] What the Cabala is to the Hebrews. [2] Aesop lived before the Trojan war. [3] Aesop's pleasant and varied interpretation of the seven letters. [4] 1 Kings 2:8 (cited as 3 Kings). [5] The reproaches which Shimei heaped upon David are contained in one Hebrew word. [6] An excellent observation on the name Adam. [7] Dan. 5:25–28. [8] The expounding composition is made by the commutation and transposition of letters.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 157 — printed folio 140. The **Composing** elemental mode (letters commuted and transposed). Example one: the ATBASH cipher — Jeremiah veils **BABEL** as **SESAC** (Sheshach, Jer 25:26), with the mechanics of the reversed alphabet. Example two: **Pico della Mirandola's** Heptaplus, permuting the first word of Genesis,* בראשית *(*Bereshith*), into a dozen Hebrew words that compose the sentence "The Father, in and through the Son, created…", unfolded as man-the-microcosm mirroring the three worlds. Then Sixtus turns to **Jerome's** interpretation of the Hebrew alphabet (Aleph = doctrine, Beth = house…). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p156] …[the latter part, pertaining to composition, which is made by the commutation and transposition] of letters. That this was in use among the most ancient Hebrews, [1] an argument is Jeremiah's prophecy against the king of Babylon, written in the 25th chapter of his prophecies. In which place the prophet, lest he should openly provoke the king himself against himself, artfully transformed the name **BABEL**, by commuting its elements, into **SESAC**, saying: [2] *And Sesac shall drink the cup of the wrath of God after them* — hinting that, by the word Sesac, according to the rule of this explanation, the name Babel must be understood. Now the rule of explaining this name is, as Jerome there reports, that just as we read the Greek alphabet from A to Ω in order, and again, to exercise the memory of boys, we are wont to reverse the

order of reading and to mix the last with the first — joining A with Ω, and B with Ψ — so the Hebrews proceed from א (*aleph*) through ב (*beth*) and ג (*gimel*), in the straight order, up to the last ת (*tav*), whose penultimate is ש (*shin*); and then, joining together at once א and ת, ב and ש, until they reach the middle of the alphabet, where the letter ל (*lamed*) meets כ (*kaph*). Whence it comes about that, just as running through the alphabet in the straight order we read BABEL, so with the order permuted we read SESAC. (For the vowel-letters between the ל, ב, and ב of the name BABEL, and between the ך, ש, and ש of the name SESAC, are, according to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, not written.)

John Pico [della Mirandola], in his *Heptaplus*, brings a most brilliant example of this explanation, expounding that first word of Genesis, **IN THE BEGINNING**. In which place he writes these words:

> *That word is written among the Hebrews in this way:* בראשית *(Bereshith). From this word, therefore: if we join the third letter to the first, the word* אב *(ab) is made; if, the first being doubled, we add the second, bebar is made; if we read all but the first,* ראשית *(reshith) is made; if we connect the fourth to the first and last,* שבת *(shabbath) is made; if we set the three first in the order in which they lie,* ברא *(bara) is made; if the first be omitted [and] the three following [taken],* ראש *(rosh) is made; if, the first and second being omitted, [we take] the two following,* אש *(esh) is made; if, the three first being omitted, we join the fourth to the last,* שת *(Seth) is made; again, if [we join] the second to the first,* רב *(rab); if after the third [we set] the fifth, then the fourth,* איש *(ish) is made; if we join the first two to the two last,* ברית *(berith) is made; if [we put] the last for the first, the last word is made, which is* טוב *(tob), the* ת *(tav) being turned into the element* ט *(teth) — a change most frequent among the Hebrews.*
>
> *Let us see, therefore, first what these signify in Latin, then what mysteries about all nature may be revealed by them to those not unversed in philosophy. Ab signifies "father"; bebar, "in the Son and through the Son" (for the preposition be- signified both); Reshith, "beginning"; Shabbath, "rest" and "end"; Bara, "he created"; Rosh, "head"; Esh, "fire"; Seth, "foundation"; Rab, "of the great"; Ish, "of man"; Ber [berith], "by a covenant"; Tob, "good." And if we weave the whole into a sentence in consequent order, it will be of this sort: "**The Father, in the Son and through the Son — the beginning and the end, or the rest — created the head, the fire, and the foundation of the great man, by a good covenant.**" This whole sentence leaps forth from the resolution and composition of that first word. How lofty, how full of all learning its sense is, cannot be plain to all. But as some of the things signified to us by these words are at once open to all, so certain [others] are obscure. For it is known to all Christians what it is that the Father created in the Son and through the Son, and likewise what it is that the Son is the beginning and the end of all things — for he is alpha and omega, as John writes, and he himself called himself the beginning, and we have shown the end of all things to be that they be restored to their beginning. The rest is somewhat more obscure: namely, what those [words] mean — the Head, the fire, and the foundation of the great man; what that covenant is, and by what reasoning it is called good. For it cannot be seen at once and readily by all that there is here explained the whole reason, kinship, and also the felicity of the four worlds, of which we have treated and about which we finally disputed. First, then, it must be noted that the world is called by Moses a **great man**.* [3] *For if man is a little world, surely the world is a great man. Taking occasion hence, he most aptly figures the three worlds — the intellectual, the celestial, and the corruptible — by the three parts of man,* [4] *at the same time indicating by this figure not only that all the worlds are contained in man, but also briefly declaring which part of man answers to which world. Let us therefore consider in man three parts: the highest, the head; then that which reaches from the neck to the navel; the third, that which extends from the navel to the feet — for these too, in man's figure, are divided and separated by a certain variety. But it is wonderful how beautifully, how exactly, by most precise reasoning, they correspond in proportion to the three parts of the world. In the head is the brain, the fount of knowledge; in the breast is the heart, the fount of motion, life, and heat; in the last part are the genital members, the beginning of generation. Likewise also in the world: the highest part, which is the angelic or intellectual world, is the fount of knowledge, because that nature was made for understanding; the middle part, which is heaven, [is] the beginning of life, motion, and heat, in which the Sun, like the heart in the breast, holds dominion; below the Moon (as is known to all) is the beginning of generation and corruption. You see how aptly all these parts of the world and of man mutually agree. Now Moses designated the first [part] by its proper name, namely the head; the second he called fire — both because by this name heaven is reckoned by many, and because in us this portion is the beginning of heat; the third he called foundation, because by it, as is known to all, the whole body of man is founded and sustained. He added, moreover, that he created these by a good covenant, because among them a covenant of peace and friendship has*

been sanctioned — out of the kinship of natures and by mutual consent — through the law of God's wisdom. Which covenant is therefore good, because it is so directed and ordered toward God, who is the good itself, that, just as the whole world is one among itself, so at last it may be one with its author. Let us too imitate the most holy covenant of the world, that by mutual charity we also may be one with each other, and all together, through the true love of God, may happily become one with Him. Thus Pico.

But if these [examples] seem few to you, and you desire to see an example of both parts joined together at once, you have St. Jerome, in the epistle to Paula of Rome, and in the preface of his commentaries on the Lamentations: [5] in which places, delivering certain things as, so to speak, the first rudiments of this art, he first of all interprets separately the individual elements of the Hebrew Alphabet, then shows what Mysteries are contained in the several combinations of them. His words — that I may indulge you, friendly reader — I will not be loath to subjoin here. They are these: *But now what you asked is fulfilled: that the interpretation annexed may signify the sense of each element. Aleph is interpreted "doctrine"; Beth, "house"; Gimel, "fullness"; Daleth, "of tablets"; He, "this"; Vau, "and"; Zain, "these"; Heth, "life"; Teth, "good"; Iod, "beginning"; Caph…*

[1] This composition was in use among the ancient Hebrews. [2] Jer. 25:26. [3] The world is a great man. [4] In man there are three principal parts. [5] Jerome shows what mysteries are contained in the several combinations of the Hebrew elements.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 158 — printed folio 141. **Jerome's** interpretation of the Hebrew alphabet finishes: the letter-meanings, then the twenty-two letters grouped into **seven "connexions,"** each read as a spiritual sentence, climaxing in Christ ("Thus Jerome"). Then the **five mystical Greek letters** (Isidore): **Y** (the Pythagorean letter of the two life-paths, with a poem from Lactantius), Θ (death), **T** (the cross, Ezek 9:4), and Α/Ω (Rev 1:8) — with X (Justin Martyr, Plato) and Cicero's A/C. Sixtus's balanced verdict: value it in moderation (the alphabetic Psalms, Lemuel, Lamentations), but it also bred Gnostic madness. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p157] …[Aleph, "doctrine"; Beth, "house"; Gimel, "fullness"; Daleth, "of tablets"; He, "this"; Vau, "and"; Zain, "these"; Heth, "life"; Teth, "good"; Iod, "beginning";] Caph, "hand"; Lamed, "discipline," or "of the heart"; Mem, "from them"; Nun, "everlasting"; Samech, "help"; Ayin, "fount," or "eye"; Phe, "mouth" (understand it said from "mouth" [*os, oris*], not from "bone" [*os, ossis*], lest you be deceived by the ambiguity of the letters); Tsade, "justice"; Coph, "calling"; Resh, "of the head"; Shin, "of teeth"; Thau, "signs." After the interpretation of the elements, the order of their meaning must be told; for out of these letters there are seven connexions [groups].

Of which the **first** is Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth — "doctrine, house, fullness, of tablets": namely, that the doctrine of the Church, which is the house of God, may be found in the fullness of the divine books. [1]

The **second** connexion is He, Vau, Zain, Heth — "this, and, these, life": for what other life can there be without the knowledge of the Scriptures? — through which also Christ himself is recognized, who is the life of believers. [2]

The **third** connexion has Teth, Iod — "good beginning": because, although we now know all things that are written, yet we know in part, and we prophesy in part, and now we see through a glass in a riddle; but when we shall have merited to be with Christ, and shall be like the angels, then the doctrine of books shall cease, [3] and then we shall see, face to face, the good beginning as it is.

The **fourth** connexion is Caph, Lamed — "hand, discipline (or, of the heart)": hands are understood in [outward] work, heart and discipline in the understanding — because we can do nothing unless we first know what is to be done.

The **fifth** connexion is Mem, Nun, Samech — "from them, everlasting help": this needs no explanation, but is clearer than all light — [namely] that from the Scriptures eternal helps are ministered.

The **sixth** connexion has Ayin, Phe, Tsade — "fount (or eye) of the mouth of justice"; according to that which we expounded in the fourth number.

The **seventh** connexion (which is also the last, because in this very seven-fold number too there is a mystical understanding) is Coph, Resh, Shin, Thau — "calling of the head, signs of the teeth": through the teeth the articulate voice is uttered, and by these signs one comes to the head of all, who is Christ, through whom one comes to the everlasting kingdom. Thus Jerome.

There are also among the Greeks, as Isidore relates, five mystical letters, [4] namely **Y, Θ, T, A,** Ω. Of which the first, **Y**, signifies human life: [5] this Pythagoras of Samos first shaped after the example of human life; its lower stem shows the first age — uncertain, indeed, and which has not yet given itself either to vices or to virtues. But the fork that remains begins from adolescence: whose right part is steep, yet tending toward the blessed life; the left, easier, but leading down to ruin and destruction. Concerning which letter a certain most ancient poet, as Lactantius testifies in book VI, chapter 3, wrote thus:

> *The letter of Pythagoras, cleft by its two-horned division,*
>
> *seems to present the likeness of human life.*
>
> *For the way of virtue, steep, seeks the right-hand path,*
>
> *and offers a difficult approach, at first, to those who look on,*
>
> *but gives rest to the weary at the topmost peak.*
>
> *The broad road displays a soft journey; but the final goal*
>
> *hurls down the captured, and rolls them over steep rocks.*
>
> *For whoever, out of love of virtue, has conquered*
>
> *hard misfortunes, he shall win for himself praise and honor;*
>
> *but he who will follow idle sloth and luxury,*
>
> *while, with incautious mind, he flees the labors set against him,*
>
> *base and needy at once, shall pass a wretched age.*

The second [letter] is Θ theta, which signifies death: [6] for the judges used to append this same letter to the names of those whom they punished with execution. And it is called θ theta, ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου, that is, "from death"; [7] whence also it has through its middle a dart — that is, the sign of death — of which a certain poet says thus: "O letter Theta, unhappy far beyond the others."

The third, **T**, shows the figure of the Lord's cross: [8] whence in Hebrew it is interpreted "Sign." Of which it is said in Ezekiel: *Mark Thau upon the foreheads of the men that mourn and grieve.* [9] But the remaining two, α and ω, Christ claims for himself — the highest and the last — for he is the beginning and the end, saying: *I am* α *and* ω. [10] For, these two letters running together into one another, [the series] rolls down from α all the way to ω, and again ω is folded back to α — that the Lord might show in himself both the running-down of the beginning to the end, and the running-back of the end to the beginning. To these letters Justin the Philosopher and Martyr adds also **X**, whose form he affirms — in the second *Apology* to Antoninus Pius — to contain the mystery of the most sacred cross of Christ, [11] calling Plato as witness of the matter; who, in the *Timaeus,* discoursing of the Son of God, says that God placed his Son in the world in the likeness of the letter X. I pass over, for brevity's sake, that Marcus Tullius [Cicero] calls **A** the salutary letter, because it was the mark of acquittal, [12] but **C** the unlucky one, because it was the sign of condemnation. [13]

There are those who explode this whole kind of exposition as a ludicrous and fortuitous thing; and again others who admire it superstitiously and extol it to heaven. Not approving the extremes of these opinions, I judge, first, that an invention of this kind is not altogether to be despised — both because this view has great

authors, as I have already shown, and because there are many things in the sacred letters which cannot be mystically explained without it: such as certain Sacred poems, which are therefore called **Alphabetary**, because they are arranged according to the order of the alphabetic elements [14] — like David's seven Psalms, the maternal Instruction of King Lemuel [Prov. 31], and the Threni [Lamentations] of Jeremiah — which indeed Jerome judges to have been digested into this order of letters not in vain, nor without immense mysteries and sacraments of the Church. Besides these, there are certain other things concerning some particular letters, both Hebrew and Greek — such as, in Ezekiel, the Hebrew letter ת Thau, marked on the foreheads of those to be preserved, and, concerning A alpha and Ω omega, the Greek characters in the Apocalypse of John.

But, as I do not condemn those who moderately and aptly accommodate these things in their places from time to time, so neither do I praise those who pursue the same too anxiously, and with useless and utterly empty labor — since it does not escape me that from this fount emanated the prodigious madness of the Valentinians and Gnostics, [15] who, as both Irenaeus and Epiphanius show in the first book against the heresies, examining all divine Scripture according to this dissection of the elements, divulged unheard-of monsters of new heresies. And let these things be said sufficiently concerning the first mode of this explanation.

On the [second mode…]

---

[1] The doctrine of the Church is found in the fullness of the divine books. [2] Christ, who is the life of believers, is recognized through the Scriptures. [3] The doctrine of books will cease in heaven. [4] The Greeks have five mystical letters. [5] Y signifies human life. [6] Θ signifies death. [7] Whence Theta is named. [8] T is the figure of the Lord's cross. [9] Ezek. 9:4. [10] Rev. 1:8. [11] The letter X contains in its form the mystery of the cross. [12] A is the letter of acquittal. [13] C is the unlucky letter of condemnation. [14] There are some Alphabetary poems in the sacred writings. [15] Whence the madness of the Valentinians and Gnostics emanated.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 159 — printed folio 142. The **Second (Arithmetical) Mode** of the elemental exposition — gematria, where letters carry number-values (Hebrew and Greek do, Latin only partly: I V X L C D M). Examples: **Appion** on Homer (μῆνιν → μη = 48 books); kabbalistic gematria on the **Tetragrammaton** (Iod 10, Vau 6, double He — per Philo); **Peter Brutus** on the "closed mem" of Isaiah 9:7 (a dating of the Messiah, Rabbi Hammai in* Sanhedrin*: 585 years); Augustine on the temple's "46 years" = **ADAM** (1+4+1+40) = the days Christ's body was formed in Mary's womb; and the number of the Beast, **666** (Rev 13:18). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p158]

On the Second Mode of the Elemental Exposition

The second mode of the elemental explanation — which we may call the **Arithmetical** [1] — labors in investigating the significations of the numbers which the letters, placed in words and syllables, represent. Which mode, as it is almost unknown among us, so among the Greeks and among the Hebrews was used chiefly for this reason: that their individual letters signify some number. [2] For among the Hebrews א Aleph signifies one, ב beth two, ג ghimel three, ד daleth four, and so on in succession, the individual elements of the Hebrew alphabet indicate some number. Among the Greeks too, α represents one, β two, γ three, δ four, and the rest that follow. But among the Latins it is not so: they have only seven letters as indices of numbers, [3] that is, **I, V, X, L, C, D, M** — of which I signifies unity, V the number five, X ten, L fifty, C a hundred, D five hundred, M a thousand. And therefore the Latins neglect this mode of explanation as unfit for Latin letters — [a mode] which certain widespread expositions of both peoples show to have once been usual among the Jews and Greeks.

Of their number, among the Greeks, was that explication of Appion the Grammarian of Alexandria, who was called by Tiberius Augustus "the Cymbal of the World." [4] He, when he expounded that first word of the

Homeric Iliad, Μῆνιν [*M■nin*, "wrath"], used to say that Homer had artfully begun his book with the syllable μη, namely so that by these two letters he might comprehend the whole number forty-eight — [the number] of the volumes by which the whole body of the Iliad and the Odyssey published by him is completed. For the Greeks designate the number forty-eight by μ [40] and η [8].

There are also among the Hebrews innumerable explanations of this kind, proceeding from the kabbalistic discipline, by which many hidden mysteries in the sacred words are opened. As, for example, in that name of God which among them is ineffable, and is written with these four letters, יהוה IEHOVA, they say that three numbers are contained: that is, Ten in the letter Iod, Six in the letter Vau, and a double Five in the two ה He. By which numbers also, they say, is signified the infinite and admirable abundance of the divine powers — because Ten by its own nature designates the fullness of all knowledge and wisdom, and Six the power that is the procreatrix of all things and of all good — just as Philo the Jew shows learnedly enough in his explanations of the *Hexaemeron* and of the *Decalogue*, whose words I omit for brevity's sake.

Peter Brutus, bishop of Catania, also brings a signal example of this exposition, in his volume against the Jews. In the fourth chapter of it, expounding that prophecy of Isaiah concerning the Messiah, *His empire shall be multiplied*, [5] he asks why the letter ם Mem — placed in the middle of the word למרבה (*Lemarbe*, that is, "shall be multiplied") — is closed [in its final form], contrary to its nature, since nowhere in all divine Scripture is it found closed in the middle of a word, but always open. [6] And he answers, following the opinion of Rabbi Hammai in the book *Sanhedrin*, that Isaiah wished by this closed letter ם Mem to signify — by a certain hidden device of computation — the number of the years from his own time up to the time of the Messiah. Which computation the same Rabbi Hammai, in the place just cited, set forth thus, saying: *If anyone wishes to know the time of the Messiah, let him take the number of the letter Thau, which is 400; then let him take the individual numbers of the individual letters from* א *aleph up to* ם *closed mem, whose sum is 185; and let him join it with the number 400: you will have 585 years — which, according to the computation of the Hebrews, complete the space of the whole time, from the days of Isaiah up to the coming of the Messiah, our Savior.* Which words become clearer when the significations of each Hebrew letter are considered, which are these: Aleph signifies 1, Beth 2, Ghimel 3, Daleth 4, He 5, Vau 6, Zain 7, Cheth 8, Teth 9, Iod 10, Caph 20, Lamed 30, Mem open 40, Mem closed 40, and so on; but Thau signifies 400.

To this also pertains what Augustine, in the tenth tractate on John, expounding that [saying] from the gospel of John, *Forty and six years was this temple in building*, said: that the number of the forty-six years of the temple's building signifies the building of the bodily temple which Christ built for himself out of the flesh of Adam — whose name, ΑΔΑΜ, among the Greeks is composed of letters comprehending the number forty-six, [7] since Α signifies 1, Δ 4, Α 1, Μ 40, which numbers joined together make forty-six; [8] for in so many days was the body of Christ completed in the womb of Mary.

But it seems to me that this form of explanation is not altogether to be despised, on account of certain places of divine Scripture which cannot be conveniently explained without a certain observation of the numeral elements. Among these, most notable is the place from the 13th chapter of the Apocalypse, whose arithmetical letters the Holy Spirit bids us diligently consider and compute, in these words: [9] *Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred sixty-six.* By which words the Holy Spirit warns that the name by which that wicked Antichrist will call himself is composed of numeral letters signifying the number 666. Concerning which arithmetical letters, and the name resulting from them, various things have been said by the Fathers — more for the exercise of wit than for the stability of assertion — of which it pleases [me] to subjoin some here.

[continues p160: In…]

[1] What the arithmetical mode of expounding the Scriptures is. [2] The letters of the Hebrews and Greeks signify some number. [3] The Latins have only seven letters as indices of numbers. [4] Appion the grammarian was called by Tiberius "the Cymbal of the World." Why Homer began his book with the syllable μη. [5] Isa. 9:7. [6] Why ם [final mem] is closed in the middle of a word. [7] The number of the 46 years of the

temple's building signifies the formation of Christ's body in his mother's womb. [8] ΑΔΑΜ is composed of letters signifying the number 46. [9] Rev. 13:18.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 160 — printed folio 143. The **666 name-tables**: four Patristic guesses at the Antichrist's name whose Greek letters sum to 666 — **Teitan** (Irenaeus & Hippolytus), **Lateinos** (Arethas), **Lampetis** (Tyconius), **Antemos** (Primasius). Sixtus closes the elemental exposition, then opens a new chapter, **On the Physical (Natural) Exposition** — which transfers Scripture's mystical discourse to the workings of nature. Its worked example: the **Tabernacle** (Exod 26–27), read as a model of the cosmos (from Philo, Josephus, Clement, Jerome) — its three parts = the three worlds; the Court = the sublunar world; the Holy Place = the celestial world (the seven-lamped candelabrum = the seven planets). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p159] The name of Antichrist, according to Irenaeus and Hippolytus, is ΤΕΙΤΑΝ [Teitan], that is, "Giant"; [1] and the numeral marks from which this name is deduced are these:

Τ *300,* Ε *5,* Ι *10,* Τ *300,* Α *1,* Ν *50* — ***Sum: 666.***

According to Arethas, his name is ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ [Lateinos], that is, "the Latin"; and the numeral letters are these:

Λ *30,* Α *1,* Τ *300,* Ε *5,* Ι *10,* Ν *50,* Ο *70,* Σ *200* — ***Sum: 666.***

According to Tyconius, his name is ΛΑΜΠΕΤΙΣ [Lampetis], that is, "illustrious"; and the numeral letters are these:

Λ *30,* Α *1,* Μ *40,* Π *80,* Ε *5,* Τ *300,* Ι *10,* Σ *200* — ***Sum: 666.***

According to Primasius, it is ΑΝΤΕΜΟΣ [Antemos]; and the elements of the numbers are these:

Α *1,* Ν *50,* Τ *300,* Ε *5,* Μ *40,* Ο *70,* Σ *200* — ***Sum: 666.***

And these things concerning the elemental explanation we have recounted perhaps more at length than was needful, that we might more fully explain a matter unusual and known to few.

On the Physical Exposition

The **Physical**, that is, Natural exposition [2] is that which transfers the mystical discourses of divine Scripture to the universe, or to the powers and works of all nature — that is, to the matter, form, and parts of this sensible world — inquiring, in the divine oracles, into the motion, order, and adornment of the celestial spheres, the qualities of the elements, the properties of metals, the virtues of plants, and the habits of living creatures. This way of expounding certain notable expositors of Exodus and Leviticus especially entered upon among the Hebrews, who explained the natures of almost all things in the interpretation of these volumes, showing how Moses — according to the correspondence of the threefold world and the universal nature of things — ordered the ark, the tabernacle, the vessels, the vestments, the rites, the sacrifices, and the other mysteries as an image of these things, for placating God and the heavenly powers and for the expiation of man. An example of this explanation, gathered from Philo, Josephus, Clement of Alexandria, and Jerome, upon the tabernacle of Moses, is this:

An Example of the Physical Exposition, in the Tabernacle described by Moses (Exodus, chapters 26 and 27)

If anyone contemplates the structure of the Mosaic tabernacle, and the things which are in it, and considers each not idly but prudently, he will find that Moses, that divine man, represented in all these things, in a certain manner, the nature of the whole universe. [3] For it was fitting that he who had determined to build for God, the author of the whole world, a tabernacle made by hand, should take a likeness of those things out of which the world was founded by God. First of all, therefore, for this cause, he divided the admirable structure of his tabernacle into three parts [4] — namely, into the vestibule, the Hall, and the inner shrine (or, into the

Court, the Hall, and the innermost sanctuary) — which might represent to us the totality of the divine workmanship, distinguished into three parts, or into three worlds: [5] that is, into this sublunar world which we inhabit; into the one next to it, the celestial world; and into the highest of all, the ultramundane world — which the Theologians call angelic, the Philosophers intellectual, and which "by no one," as Plato says, "has been sufficiently extolled according to its dignity."

The **first part** of the tabernacle, therefore, called the Court and Vestibule, bore the image of this sublunar world; [6] to whose likeness it was placed under the open sky, defended by no roof or shade, but ever exposed to rains, to the Sun, to heat and cold. And there were engaged in it, promiscuously, not only men clean and unclean, sacred and profane, but also animals of every kind; and there was in it — on account of the sacrifices and continual immolations — a perpetual vicissitude of life and death.

The **second part**, or the Hall, which was called the Holy [Place], occupying the middle place between the vestibule and the inner shrine, and shining with the whole splendor of gold, figured the celestial world, [7] set between the supercelestial and the subcelestial world. For there was, in its southern region, a golden candelabrum distinguished with seven burning lamps, [8] which seven signify the motions of the wandering luminaries; for the Sun and the Moon, with the other planets, deflecting far from the northern regions, are more observed in the southern parts of the world. And among these lamps, the one which holds the middle summit of the candelabrum — having three lamps on either side — bears the likeness of the solar star. [continues p161: re-]fert…

[1] Various opinions of the Fathers on the name of the Antichrist. [2] What the physical exposition of Scripture is. [3] Moses, in the construction of the Tabernacle, represented in a certain way the nature of the whole universe. [4] Why Moses divided the structure of the tabernacle into three parts. [5] There are three worlds: the sublunar, the celestial, and the ultramundane. [6] The Court of the Tabernacle bore the image of the sublunar world. [7] The second part of the Tabernacle figured the celestial world. [8] The seven lamps in the golden candelabrum signified the seven planets.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 161 — printed folio 144. The cosmic **Tabernacle** finishes: the Sun tempers the music of the spheres; the **Holy of Holies** = the supercelestial/angelic world; the High Priest bearing the Name **IEHOVA** on his forehead = Christ/God; the hidden **Ark** = divine providence, its tablets/rod/manna = the laws of wisdom, the scepter, and liberality; the **Cherubim** = the Angels. Then a new chapter, **On the Prophetic Exposition** — its definition, and its **twofold mode** (unfulfilled prophecy pointed to its fulfillment; already-fulfilled prophecy to be fulfilled again), with examples (2 Sam 7:14 → Christ; Rachel's weeping at three levels) and its masters — Melito, Methodius, Proclus (before Theodosius, on Gog and Magog), Joachim of Fiore, and **Savonarola**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p160] …[the middle lamp] bears the likeness of the solar star. For the Sun — possessing the fourth orb equally from the highest and the lowest heaven, and shining in the midst among the other six wandering stars — tempers that musical and truly divine instrument of the celestial spheres.

But the **third part** of the tabernacle — most sacred and most secret of all, which was called the Penetrale, the Adytum, and the Holy of Holies — expressed the figure of the supercelestial and angelic world, [1] which is the habitation of the Angels and of God, the best [of beings]. For just as that secret adytum of the Mosaic tabernacle was invisible and inaccessible to mortals, and no one could enter into it except the High Priest, who bore on his forehead that ineffable name, the Tetragrammaton IEHOVA: so into that supercelestial and divine world it is lawful for no one to enter, nor to look into and exactly comprehend with the mind the things which in it are invisible and incomprehensible — save for Him alone whom the highest prelate of sacred things foreshadowed, bearing on his forehead the unspeakable name IEHOVA, which is expounded, "Who is, and who shall be, and who makes to be." [2] And this is the supreme governor of all things, God — He alone bearing the ineffable name IEHOVA, that is, "Ever-existing, and bestowing on the rest the power of being" — and He alone embracing the incomprehensible things of the supercelestial world with that same wisdom by which He comprehends Himself.

The **Ark**, too, which was hidden in the innermost recesses of the tabernacle, signified the divine providence and governance toward the world. [3] For as the ark had been appointed for keeping the tablets of the divine law, and the rod of Aaron, and the manna, so in the storehouses of divine providence are contained all the laws of wisdom by which the whole totality of creatures is governed; the rod, and the scepter of ruling power, by which it is ruled; and the manna of most bountiful liberality, by which it is vivified and fed. And the **Cherubim**, encompassing the ark with the bendings of their wings, denote those celestial minds and blessed spirits who surround and attend the divine majesty with the obedience of most ready swiftness, as with a winged and swift ministry. [4]

On the Prophetic Exposition

The Prophetic exposition is that which — devised by no human wit, but revealed only by the inbreathing of the divine Spirit — turns the holy Scriptures to the prediction of future things with a certain and immovable truth, [5] referring the oracles, prophecies, visions, prophesyings, and typical actions of the Prophets which are contained in the sacred letters to future changes of the times and revolutions of the ages, to the vicissitudes of kingdoms, to the adversities of nations, peoples, and cities — wars, disasters, ruins, victories, restorations, felicities, and other things like these — which the divine providence (whether the merits of mortals so demanding it, or by its hidden but nevertheless just judgment) has decreed shall come to pass hereafter.

Now there is a **twofold mode** of this exposition: [6] of which the one refers to certain not-yet-fulfilled, or not-yet-understood, prophecies of the ancient Prophets (the divine light illuminating them), showing — and, as it were, most certainly pointing out with the finger — the places, persons, and times in which oracles long ago foretold, but not yet understood, are being fulfilled. The other mode announces that the ancient predictions of the seers — already fulfilled and recognized for many ages — are to be fulfilled again in future times. For there are in the divine letters many Prophecies which have various and manifold senses, both historical and typical, [7] yet one more eminent than the rest, and primary, and more properly their own — namely, that to which the mind of the one prophesying was borne at first glance, and to which the Prophet especially directed the keenness of his mind. Since, therefore, some of these prophecies have been fulfilled according to their primary sense, certain divine expositors have handed down that the same are to be fulfilled again according to other, secondary senses — whether historical or typical — bringing as an example that oracle from the second book of Kings which God promised He would fulfill in Solomon: *I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son* — [8] which Paul, writing to the Hebrews, affirms was consummated anew in Christ. And likewise that prophecy of Jeremiah: *A voice was heard in Rama: much weeping and wailing; Rachel bewailing her sons, and she would not be comforted, because they are not* [9] — which, when the Prophet had uttered it concerning the sons of Israel about to be led away into the Babylonian captivity, Matthew — according to the truth of another understanding — transferred to the slaughter of the little ones; [10] and likewise others, again, according to yet another sense, said the fulfillment of the same prophecy took place in the final destruction of the holy city, when, by the road on which Rachel is buried near Bethlehem, infinite thousands of captive Jews were sent off to Rome.

In both parts of this explanation there excelled Melito of Sardis, Methodius the Martyr, Proclus Archbishop of Constantinople, Joachim Abbot of Fiore, and others; of whom, in the first part, especially eminent was Proclus, who — as Socrates testifies in the seventh [book] of his history — when the Scythians, under their leader Rugas, had taken up arms against the Roman empire, delivered before Theodosius Augustus and his army a Prophetic oration, in which, expounding that prophecy from the book of Ezekiel, *Son of man, prophesy against Gog and Magog,* [11] he so bent the Prophet's words to the occasion of the imminent war that he foretold all the punishments described by Ezekiel to be hanging over the Barbarians. To which prediction God, a little afterward, gave a happy issue: fire being sent down from heaven, and the chief of the Barbarians consumed by the burning. The other part of this exposition, not far from our own times, Jerome Savonarola

professed — a man of most ardent spirit [12] — in his public exposition of the Prophets, especially Amos, Zechariah, and Ezekiel, whose already-fulfilled prophecies he foretold would be fulfilled again in his own times. How much he availed in this part, let others judge; he himself [being] another's servant, and, according to [the word] of Paul… [continues p162]

[1] The third part of the tabernacle — namely, the Holy of Holies — expressed the figure of the Angelic world. [2] The name IEHOVA is explained. [3] The Ark, which was hidden in the Tabernacle, signified divine providence. [4] The rod of Aaron signified the ruling power of God; the manna hidden in the Ark signifies divine liberality; the Cherubim denoted the Angels. [5] What the prophetic exposition of the Scriptures is. [6] The prophetic exposition has a twofold mode. [7] Prophecies have many and various senses, both historical and typical. [8] 2 Sam. 7:14 (cited as 2 Kings); Heb. 1:5. [9] Jer. 31:15. [10] Matt. 2:18. [11] Ezek. 38:2. [12] Jerome Savonarola, a man of most ardent spirit.

*(Rich PDF p. 162 — printed folio 145. Sixtus closes the **First Part** of the art (the Definitive), then opens the **Second Part — On Invention**, which he chooses only to* summarize *(a full treatment would need its own volume, and others have covered it) so as to reach his own **Third Part**. He gives a catalogue of Invention's sub-disciplines with their authors — the **Historical** kind (Tropical, Topical, Chronical, Physical, Mathematical, Ethical) and the **Mystical** kind — then opens the **Third Part — the Dispositive**, which he says no author before him had ever described. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p161] …[he himself another's servant, and, according to] the opinion of Paul, standing to his own master — I would not rashly dare to judge [him]. Thus far let it be said concerning the kinds of the sacred expositions, both universal and particular, pertaining to the first part of this art; now we must pass over to the second part of the same art.

On the Second Part of the Expository Art, or, On Invention

Concerning the first part of this sacred interpretive art, which we have named the **Definitive** — that is, concerning the senses of divine Scripture, and concerning the kinds of the sacred expositions, and concerning their number, definition, and usefulness — I have discoursed thus far, as much as the plan of the present undertaking seemed to require. It would now be consequent that I should pursue **Invention**, [1] which is the second part of this Art, expounding all the rules and the several precepts of investigating and finding out the manifold and obscure varieties of the senses hidden in the divine letters. But since an exact treatment of Invention — scarcely to be unfolded [even] in a large and separate volume — cannot be comprehended in the small portion of a little book, and since many most excellent authors have left writings about it, accessible to all, it has seemed [good] to me to pass over the complete exposition of this part (as more than sufficiently explained by others) and to proceed to the third part of this art, which is called the **Dispositive** — by no author, up to this day, ever either described or observed. Yet, lest the curious reader complain that the Inventive part of the expository faculty has been utterly neglected by me, I will run through, in the briefest words, the sum of the chapters by which invention itself is comprehended, noting at the same time the names of the Authors who have treated of its several chapters.

Invention — which introduces us to the investigation of the hidden and abstruse senses of divine Scripture — is accomplished in a twofold kind: namely, the **Historical**, which hunts out the historical understandings, and the **Mystical**, which searches out the mystical meanings. Now the Historical kind of Invention embraces many species or parts, of which the more notable — and, among the rest, the more necessary — are: the **Tropical, Topical, Chronical, Physical, Mathematical,** and **Ethical.**

The **Tropical** [2] is that which introduces the reader to the understanding of tropes, phrases, figures, idioms, properties, and locutions — especially Hebrew and Greek — and of all figurative expressions, in which the divine letters abound above the writings of all nations; [3] in which part Jerome, Augustine, Bede, and Sanctes Pagninus wrote many things, to be reviewed in the following volume. [4]

The **Topical**, or Topographical, [5] is that which furnishes particular descriptions and maps of the provinces, regions, seas, mountains, rivers, forests, cities, towns, and other places which are read of in the sacred letters; which, among the Greeks, Eusebius of Caesarea did abundantly, and, among the Latins, Jerome, Bede, Matthaeus Aurogallus, Adamnan, Callistus, Orontius, and others to be enumerated in the next book. [6]

The **Chronical**, or Chronographical, [7] is that which — for removing certain obscurities in the sacred letters that arise from the various computation of days, months, and years — explains all the series, successions, and enumerations of times, ages, years, Olympiads, weeks, and generations, with which the whole divine scripture is everywhere strewn. This part had, as its writers, notable beyond the rest: among the Greeks, Philo and Eusebius; among the Latins, Bede, Hermann the Lame, and John Driedo — of whom we shall speak in the fourth book. [8]

The **Physical** [9] teaches the history, properties, habits, and chief powers of all natural things — that is, of the heavens, the elements, animals, and plants — which are described everywhere in the sacred letters. In this part there labored, among the Latins, Bede (in the book *On the Nature of Things*), Anselm (in the book *On the Image of the World*), Honorius of Autun (in a book of the same title), and Vincent bishop of Beauvais (in the *Natural Mirror*). [10]

The **Mathematical** [11] is that which opens the way to understanding certain Geometrical, Astronomical, Arithmetical, and Musical considerations — some of which are in the divine letters — treating of measures, of figures, of numbers, of the plan of buildings, of the motions of the heavens, of stars, of musical instruments, of the various harmony of sounds and voices. Of these Bede, Honorius of Autun, and Isidore wrote some things. [12]

The **Ethical** [13] is that which exhibits certain brief little introductions concerning the moral virtues which are delivered in the sacred letters — such as those which Bonaventure the Cardinal, Humbert Master General of the Preachers, William bishop of Lyons, and Chrysostomus Javellus composed. [14] These, then, are the chief species of invention, comprehended under the historical kind of finding-out.

The **second kind of Invention**, which is called **Mystical**, [15] raises the readers to understanding the spiritual and loftier senses of divine Scripture — that is, the Allegorical, Anagogical, and Tropological understandings — with rules, formulas, and certain precepts applied to this end, by which (as by keys) the abstruse mysteries of spiritual understanding are unlocked, and the mystical significations of all words and terms are explained. In this part there flourished, among the Greeks, Cyril; among the Latins, Tyconius the African, Eucherius, Rabanus [Maurus], Hugh of St. Victor, Sanctes Pagninus, and very many others whom we shall enumerate in the following volume. [16] Now let it suffice to have noted these few things concerning the Inventive part of this art.

On the Third Part of the Expository Art, which is called the Dispositive

[continues p163: Ter-…]

[1] What the inventive exposition is, and into what natural parts it is distributed. [2] What the tropical exposition is. [3] The sacred writings abound in figurative expressions. [4] What authors have explained the tropical exposition. [5] What the topical exposition is called. [6] The authors of the topical exposition. [7] The chronical exposition is defined. [8] Who the sacred chronologists were. [9] What the physical exposition teaches. [10] What authors have illustrated the physical exposition. [11] What the mathematical exposition is. [12] What authors have treated the mathematical exposition. [13] The ethical exposition is defined. [14] The authors of the ethical exposition. [15] What the mystical kind of exposition is. [16] Who excelled in the mystical exposition of the Scriptures.

*(Rich PDF p. 163 — printed folio 146. The **Third Part — the Dispositive (Methodical) exposition** opens: arranging the found senses into an ordered exposition through diverse **"Methods."** A numbered list of **24 Methods** follows, with **Psalm 116** (the shortest psalm) chosen as the running example to be worked through all of them. Then **Method One: Translation** — its definition, the need for word-for-word fidelity in Scripture,*

*the great translators (Jerome, Giustiniani, Pagninus; the Seventy; Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion), and Origen's **Tetrapla / Hexapla / Octapla**. Sixtus announces he will set out Psalm 116 in a ten-column "decapla" — the table itself follows on the next page. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p162] The **third and last** part of this sacred art — which we call the Dispositive and the Methodical [1] — is that which teaches how to arrange the already-found senses of divine Scripture, and the already-described kinds of exposition, into an ordered series of narration, and to accommodate them through diverse modes of speaking and various ways of teaching, which we call **Methods**. Now the Methods, or ways, suited for handling and adapting the kinds of the sacred expositions, are almost innumerable; of which, those that are chief among the Catholic expositors of divine Scripture, and most used among the rest, are comprehended in the enumeration set below.

An Enumeration of the Methods which the holy expositors use in arranging the kinds of the sacred expositions; they are these:

1	Translatio (Translation)	13	Tabellaria (Tabular)
2	Stigmatica (Stigmatic)	14	Enarratio (Narration)
3	Syllabica (Syllabic)	15	Collatio (Collation)
4	Partitio (Partition)	16	Meditatio (Meditation)
5	Epitome (Epitome)	17	Poëma (Poem)
6	Egloge (Ecloge / selection)	18	Epistola (Epistle)
7	Notariaca (Notariac)	19	Inquisitio (Inquiry)
8	Paraphrasis (Paraphrase)	20	Coacervatio (Heaping-up)
9	Lexice (Lexical)	21	Thematica (Thematic)
10	Annotatio (Annotation)	22	Collectanea (Collectanea)
11	Commentatio (Commentary)	23	Scholastica (Scholastic)
12	Sciographica (Sciographic)	24	Pandesiaca (Pandesiac)

These, therefore, and so many, are the Methods serving the sacred expositors, of which, in the present treatise, we are about to explain the descriptions, parts, offices, and examples, each separately. And we shall take, in place of a general theme and a most apt example for expressing the peculiar conditions and properties of each Method, **Psalm 116** [2] — the shortest of all — showing how we may deduce its exposition through all the species of Methods, and turn it through the several varieties of the species, with the clearest rules and examples, taking the beginning of our treatment from the very translation of divine Scripture.

On Sacred Translation — The First Method

Translation, or Interpretation [3] — which, both according to the order of nature and according to the order of doctrine and of time, claims for itself the first place among the other explanatory methods of divine Scripture — is the Method which turns the holy scriptures from one language into another, rendering not only sense for sense, but word for word, with the utmost care and fidelity. For although, in the interpretation of secular writings, the highest praise of the interpreter is that he express not word for word (for that often renders the translation absurd), [4] but sense from sense, aptly and elegantly: yet in the sacred scriptures — on account of the order of the words, and the innumerable sacraments of mysteries which lie hidden in almost every single word — a duty and a necessity lies upon the faithful interpreter, that he render word for word most faithfully. In this zeal of translating there excelled, among the Latins, St. Jerome, Augustine [Giustiniani] bishop of Nebbio, and Sanctes Pagninus; [5] but among the Greeks, the seventy-two interpreters — approved by the

authority of the Apostles and Evangelists, who everywhere used their translation — and after them Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and some others, from whose editions various volumes of many translations were collected, both by Origen and by other Greeks and Latins. And of these, some were called Tetrapla, others Hexapla, others Octapla, from the number of columns.

For first they called **Tetrapla** [6] those Greek codices in which the single pages were distinguished by four little columns, so that in the first column was the edition of the seventy-two interpreters, in the second the translation of Aquila, in the third that of Symmachus, in the fourth that of Theodotion.

They named **Hexapla** [7] those Greek volumes in whose single pages six columns were arranged: of these, the first had the Hebrew text of holy Scripture, written in Hebrew letters; the second, the Hebrew text set out opposite in Greek letters, for the sake of those who did not know how to read Hebrew; the third contained the version of Aquila; the fourth, the translation of Symmachus; the fifth, the edition of the seventy-two; the sixth, the edition of Theodotion.

Octapla, [8] however, they called those copies whose eight columns were so arranged that in the first six columns the six aforesaid translations were had; but in the seventh column, the fifth Greek edition, found by Origen at Jericho; and in the eighth, the sixth Greek edition, found by the same Origen on the Actian shore.

But, that these things may become clearer, we shall take (as we have already said), for the sake of an example, the hundred and sixteenth Psalm, [9] whose various translations — arranged in a **decapla**, that is, in a series of ten columns — we here set before the eyes: placing in the first column the Hebrew text of the Psalm; in the second, the Chaldaic; in the third, the Greek of the seventy interpreters; in the fourth, a Latin corresponding to the Hebrew; in the fifth, a Latin corresponding to the Greek; in the sixth, a Latin corresponding to the Chaldaic; and in the four following [columns], again, four different Latin editions corresponding to the Hebrew.

[continues p164: the table (TYPVS) — Psalm 116 in ten columns]

[1] The definition of the methodical exposition. [2] Psalm 116, the shortest of all. [3] Translation of Scripture is defined. [4] Translation is often absurd when word is rendered for word. [5] Authors who excelled in the translation of the Scriptures. [6] What were called Tetrapla. [7] Hexapla. [8] Octapla. [9] Ps. 116.

*(Rich PDF p. 164 — printed folio 147. The **TYPVS**: the promised ten-column "decapla" of **Psalm 116** (Vulgate 116 = "Praise the Lord, all nations," the two-verse psalm) — the same psalm in Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and seven differing Latin versions, displaying the variety of the Translation method. Then **Method Two: the Stigmatic (Punctuary)** — the interpretation of the Hebrew vowel-points: since the 22 Hebrew letters are all consonants, the ancient writers (and Ezra, who restored the books after the Babylonian burning) supplied the vowels by living voice. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

Model of the tenfold translation upon Psalm 116

I. Hebrew — *(the psalm in the Hebrew text)*

II. Chaldaic — *(the psalm in the Aramaic/Targum)*

III. Greek (of the Seventy) — Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐπαινέσατε αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί· ὅτι ἐκραταιώθη τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μένει.

IV. Latin, answering to the Hebrew (Jerome's): *Alleluia. Praise the Lord, all nations; praise him, all peoples. For his mercy is confirmed over us, and the truth of the Lord [endureth] for ever.*

V. Latin, answering to the Greek: *Alleluia. Praise the Lord, [ye] nations; celebrate him, all peoples. For his mercy is made strong over us, and the truth of the Lord abideth unto an age.*

VI. Latin, answering to the Chaldaic: *Alleluia. Praise God, all peoples; praise him, all nations. For his goodness is made strong over us, and the truth of the Lord [is] for ever.*

VII. Latin, answering to the Hebrew: *Alleluia. Praise Jehovah, all nations; him celebrate, all nations. For the clemency of Jehovah toward us excelleth, and his faithfulness is eternal.*

VIII. Latin, answering to the Hebrew: *Alleluia. Praise the Lord, all nations; proclaim him, all peoples. For his kindness toward us prevaileth, and the truth of the Lord remaineth for ever.*

IX. Latin, answering to the Hebrew: *Alleluia. Praise God, all nations; honor him, all ye nations. For his loving-kindness toward us is increased, and the truth of the Lord abideth unto an age.*

X. Latin, answering to the Hebrew: *Alleluia. Praise the Lord, all nations; all peoples also, praise him. For his grace toward us groweth more and more, and his faithfulness endureth for ever.*

On the Stigmatic Mode of Expounding — The Second Method

After the first Method of translating the holy letters, there follows at once, in the second place, the **Stigmatic** (ΣΤΙΓΜΑΤΙΚΗ), or Punctuary, method of expounding, [1] which the Hebrews call פירוש הנקודות (*Perush hannekudoth*), that is, the "Interpretation of the points" [vowel-points]. Now this is a peculiar exposition of the Hebrews upon the sacred letters, which — from the various positions of the vowel-points — shows the sounds, the utterances, and the pronunciations, and the significations of the individual words, and the sense of the whole sacred reading. The invention of this interpretation had this occasion:

The old language of the Hebrews, which is called the Holy [tongue], and which the writers of the divine volumes used — and especially Ezra himself (who, after the Babylonian captivity, most faithfully restored the sacred books consumed in the burning of Jerusalem) [2] — has twenty-two letters; among which there are no vowel letters — that is, [letters] sounding of themselves, and filling out the voice without the aid of another letter, such as among us are a, e, i, o, u — but all are soundless, or consonants, which by themselves alone cannot burst forth into voice. For although א Aleph, and ע Ayin, and ה He, and י Iod, and ו Vau — Hebrew letters — seem at first sight to have a vowel sound, yet they are, as it were, mute, and scarcely present anything by themselves to the ears. [3]

Since, therefore, the ancient Hebrew writers were altogether destitute of vowels, [4] they were compelled to use the writing of consonant letters alone; and when they wished to read it, and to express with mouth and tongue the words composed of soundless and utterly mute letters, they supplied — by the sound of the living voice — what was lacking to the Writing, adding to the consonant letters certain vowel sounds, borrowed from the common speech of their own nation and from the custom of ordinary pronunciation. For example: if this name *Lamech* had to be written, they marked it with three consonant letters only, namely למך (*Lmk*); then, when the same had to be pronounced with the living voice, from a certain natural [property] of their own pronunciation… [continues p165]

[1] What the stigmatic mode of expounding the Scriptures is. [2] Ezra, after the Babylonian captivity, restored the sacred books that had been consumed in the fire. [3] The Hebrews, among the 22 letters they have, reckon none as vowels. [4] The ancient Hebrew writers were destitute of vowels.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 165 — printed folio 148. The Stigmatic method continues: the origin of the Hebrew **vowel-points**. After the dispersion the Jews forgot Hebrew and misread/mistranslated Scripture (the crux זכר — "memory" vs. "male," which some blame for Saul's ruin), so the Rabbis devised the ten points (plus the **Scheua**) to fix the reading — yet decreed the synagogue Torah scrolls stay unpointed. Then the disputed **age of the pointing**: Elias Levita's "Tiberias, 406 years after the fall" (which Sixtus refutes) vs. the more likely late origin among the Jews of Cairo (Rabbis Hama and Assi); but the charge that the Jews maliciously*

corrupted the whole text Sixtus rejects — because Jerome's Vulgate agrees with the pointed (Masoretic) reading in the key doctrinal passages. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[continuing from p164] …[from a certain natural] skill and habit of their own pronunciation, they supplied to the eye, or sounded together, that L itself, with the sound of the vowel-letter A added, and the M, likewise, with the sound of the vowel E applied; [1] and thus, filling out the whole word with sound, they pronounced למך *Lamech*. And according to this custom all the Jews were wont to read whatever Hebrew writings [they read].

But after the kingdom of Jerusalem was utterly overthrown, and the Jews were led away by the Romans into their final and everlasting captivity, and scattered over the whole globe of the lands, they began little by little to forget their native speech, to unlearn the holy tongue, to lose the understanding of the sacred reading, and — because of the lack of vowel letters — to utter, read, understand, and expound the words of divine Scripture by themselves (as we have already said) senselessly, with various and ambiguous sounds; and even to translate them into other languages with diverse and mutually discrepant words and senses, both from ignorance and from malice. When the Rabbis, the masters of the Jews, had noticed this — fearing lest the true and genuine reading of divine Scripture, destitute of vowel letters, should utterly perish — they devised, in place of vowels, certain points and little marks [2] which, set to the individual consonants, would reveal the sound of each letter and open up the proper signification of each word.

That this may be [made clear] by an apt example set before [us], let us take more clearly the word זכר (*zkr*), written with three consonants, in that divine oracle which God uttered in the book of Exodus against the Amalekites, saying: *I will blot out* זכר — that is, "the memory of Amalek from under heaven." [3] Which word (as certain Jews affirm, excusing the disobedience of King Saul more piously than truly) gave occasion to the ruin of Saul himself. For when Samuel had commanded him to fulfill the aforesaid oracle upon the Amalekites, soon to be conquered by him, he — deceived by the ambiguity of the word זכר — believed the command would be satisfied if he only took away the *males* of the Amalekites (since זכר signifies both "male" and "memory"); and, on that account, all the males being slain except the king, he reserved for himself all the booty, the gold, the silver, and the herds of the Amalekite nation. Lest, therefore, occasion of slipping should thereafter arise from equivocations of this kind, it seemed [good] to the masters of the Jews to "point" all the sacred words. For example, lest it should henceforth be brought into doubt how the aforesaid word זכר should be read, they placed under the ז (zayin) these two points ■ ·· ■, which are called *Tsere*, expressing the sound of the long vowel E; but under the כ (kaph) they set these three points ■ ·.· ■, called *Segol*, which render the sound of the short vowel E. By which annotations of points they showed that the twofold and perfect pronunciation of this word is זכר *Zecher* (which signifies "memory"), and not זכר *Zachar* (which denotes "male").

Now, to express the sounds of all the vowels — both short and long — they invented ten positions of points and little strokes, whose names, forms, and sounds are these:

- **Short:** a, e, i, o, u *(patah, segol, hiriq, qamets-hatuf, qibbuts)*
- **Long:** a, e, i, o, u *(qamets, tsere, hiriq-with-yod, holem, shureq)*

There is also, besides these ten points, another point, called **Scheua** (shewa), expressed by two little points, one standing perpendicularly above the other, thus ■ ■ ■. Yet this is not reckoned among the vowels, but is called by the Grammarians, from its office, the "servant of servants," [4] because it serves the other vowel-points.

Although the doctors of the Hebrews interpreted [i.e. pointed] the whole of divine Scripture by these [points], and published it, so interpreted, to be read by all in common: nevertheless, that they might keep the venerable antiquity and majesty of the ancient writing untouched, they sanctioned by inviolable decree — after the image of the ancient scriptures which Moses, Ezra, and the other writers of the divine books had written —

that those lights of the Mosaic law, which are kept in the synagogues with the utmost reverence, should be written without any vowel-points, [5] lest some detriment should seem to be brought to the authority and majesty of the divine law by adventitious and novel additions.

Rabbi Elias the German [Elias Levita], in the preface of his book *Masoreth ha-Masoreth*, judges that the invention of points of this kind was made in the four hundred and sixth year after the last overthrow of the holy city, by the Jews of the city of Tiberias, who were always held the most cultivated of all the Hebrews in the holy tongue. [6] But since neither Epiphanius nor Jerome made any mention of such points, and clearly enough indicate that they had only the consonants in their codices, it seems to me more likely — what James, bishop of Christopolis, writes in the preface to the Psalms — namely, that this kind of exposition was devised long after the times of Constantine, by the Jews of Babylon of Egypt (which is now called Cairo), [7] by the work and skill of Rabbi Hama and Rabbi Assi, authors of the Talmudic doctrine, who first showed these marks of points. I would not, however, easily affirm what the same bishop asserts in the same place: namely, that the Rabbis of the Jews, out of hatred of the Christian religion, by unanimous consent contaminated, depraved, and perverted from the true sense all the old scripture by this addition of points, so that by this perverse artifice they might, so far as possible, obscure and extinguish the truth drawn by the Christians from the Hebrew fount; and that, for this cause (he adds), no faith is to be given to the Hebrew copies, as corrupted and falsified by an interpretation of points of this kind. [8] From assenting altogether to this opinion I am prevented by the translation of St. Jerome, which — in the chief passages of divine Scripture, by which the foundations of the Christian faith and the truth of our dogmas are especially proved, and about which in particular there is controversy between the Jews and us — almost always agrees with this punctuary [pointed] exposition of the Hebrews, although in matters of the slightest moment, and which… [continues p166]

[1] Jerome noted this same thing about the "pointing" of the Hebrew consonants, in his epistle to Evagrius. [2] Certain points, in place of vowels, were devised by the Rabbis after the overthrow of the city of Jerusalem. [3] Exod. 17:14. — The Jews try to excuse the disobedience of Saul. [4] The Scheua is called by the Grammarians the "servant of servants." [5] The volumes of the Mosaic law which are kept in the Synagogue have no points in place of vowels. [6] Rabbi Elias, who thinks the Hebrew points were invented in the year 436 (so the margin; the body says 406) after the last overthrow of the city, is refuted. [7] The Jews of Babylon of Egypt (now called Cairo) invented the points in place of vowels. [8] The opinion of James of Christopolis, concerning the corrupted sacred books, is not approved.

*(Rich PDF p. 166 — printed folio 149. The Punctuary method closes: Jerome's Vulgate agrees with the Masoretic pointing except in trivia, and **Augustine** (*City of God *15) denies the Jews corrupted their own books. Then the **Prosodic** illustration — the Greek analog to Hebrew pointing (accents, breathings, punctuation) — anciently absent (Epiphanius, Cisneros), added to fix reading and resolve ambiguities, illustrated by **Luke 2:14** (the Gloria: "peace to men of good will," resolved by Origen's point). Then the **Stigmatic paradigm** on Psalm 116 (four columns: unpointed Hebrew / pointed Hebrew / transliteration / Latin), and the opening of **Method Three: the Syllabic (Indicatory)** — the making of indices and concordances. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p165] …[although in matters of the slightest moment, and such as] can be interpreted in several senses without any prejudice to the truth, [Jerome's translation] often disagrees [with the pointing]. To this is added also that persuasion of Augustine, in the fifteenth [book] of the *City of God*: that no one of sound mind could ever believe that the Jews — however evil and perverse — in codices so many, and so widely and far dispersed, came together into one and conspired, out of hatred of the Christians, unto the corruption of their own volumes; [1] so that, namely, while they envied to others the truth of Scripture, they should deprive themselves of the truth. And [let] these things [be said] concerning the Punctuary Exposition of the Hebrews.

With this [the punctuary method] the **Prosodic** illustration of divine Scripture among the Greeks seems to have some shadow of likeness [2] — that is, the addition of tones, breathings, accents, points, and

hypostigmata [subscript marks]: which are now seen everywhere in the Greek codices. That these were anciently written with the bare letters only, without any marks of accents, [3] there are witnesses: Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in his book on the parts of divine Scripture, and Francisco Ximenes [Cisneros], Archbishop of Toledo, in his edition of the New Testament. But it seemed [good] afterward to the Greek Fathers to add these [marks], [4] not only for the correct and distinct reading of holy Scripture, but also for distinguishing certain ambiguities of no small moment, which without these little marks, apices, and points could not be resolved. For example: when it came into controversy in what sense that sentence should be understood which is had in the song of the Angels, in Luke the Evangelist — καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, [5] that is, *And on earth peace to men of good will* — namely, whether it should be understood [that] peace was brought to men endowed with good will, on account of their good will (which sense the aforesaid Greek words seem to make, written without any punctuation, and with a point affixed under the last letter of the final word); or whether it ought rather to be understood [that] not only peace, but also good will, together with that peace itself, was exhibited to men (which sense the same words render, if they be read thus: καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, that is, *And on earth peace*; then, a mark of punctuation being interposed, there is added ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, that is, *good will to men* — the point being removed, namely, which lay under the last letter). Origen took away the whole controversy, a small point being placed under the last letter of the word εὐδοκία, which would indicate that word to be not of the first case, but of the third [i.e., an oblique, genitive form], and to conclude the sentence thus: *And on earth peace to men [endowed] with good will.* And there are also many other ambiguities of this kind, which are removed in the sacred Greek codices by little marks of this sort — which anyone even moderately skilled in Greek letters will easily recognize by himself.

A Paradigm of the Stigmatic Interpretation upon Psalm 116, comprising four little columns:

- **I** — contains the Hebrew text, destitute of vowel-points;
- **II** — has the same text, interpreted [supplied] with vowel-points;
- **III** — contains the Hebrew words, written in Latin letters according to the interpretation of the vowel-points;
- **IV** — has the Latin translation of the same Hebrew text.

III. (Hebrew transliterated)	IV. (the Latin, in English)
Allelu & Iehova	Praise the Lord,
cal goim	all nations;
sciabachuuhu	laud him,
cal haummin	all peoples.
Chi gauar	For… is confirmed
alenu	over us
chasedo	his mercy;
ve emeth	and the truth
iehova	of the Lord,
le olam	for ever.

(Columns I and II present the same words in Hebrew script — unpointed, then pointed.)

On the Syllabic Mode of Expounding — The Third Method

The **Syllabic** (ΣΥΛΛΑΒΙΚΗ), or Indicatory, Method — which composes the indices of books (called by the Greeks *syllaboi*) — is a most ancient invention, [6] as Marcus Tullius [Cicero], writing to Atticus, testifies. For since those studious men of old always desired to have a rich store of all things and of all words ready at hand, and with the greatest convenience, they devised for themselves indices arranged in alphabetical order, by which, with the least expense of labor and time, they might be led as if by the hand to whatever each one sought. Imitating their invention, the later lovers of letters — especially the Jurisconsults and the Theologians — reduced almost all the books of their profession into lists, syllabi, indices, tables, and most copious repertories; among which the first place is held by that most opulent Biblical Index, which they call the *Greater Concordances of the sacred Bible*, collected by Hugh the Cardinal [of St-Cher] and Conrad of Halberstadt the Monk, with five hundred monks of various monasteries assisting… [7] [continues p167]

[1] St. Augustine denies that the Jews corrupted the sacred books. [2] What the prosodic illustration of the Scriptures is. [3] The sacred books among the Greeks were anciently written without accent-marks. [4] Accents were rightly added in the Greek copies of the Scriptures. [5] Luke 2:14. [6] The syllabic method is most ancient. [7] The Concordances of the Bibles were collected by Hugh the Cardinal and Conrad of Halberstadt — with the help, nevertheless, of 500 monks.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 167 — printed folio 150. The Syllabic method worked out on **Psalm 116**: the great biblical **Concordance** (its authors gathered every word of the Bible alphabetically) and its immense usefulness; Sixtus recalls his own little rule-book on it. Then the **three steps** for building an exposition from it: (1) harvest every "Laudare" (praise) citation; (2) select the apter ones onto a slip, restoring from the Bible the periods the Concordance truncated; (3) sort the "forest" of texts into logical headings — the loci of "Divine Praise" (definition, causes, effects, parts, etc.). He then displays the raw first stage: an **undistinguished medley** of Scripture's praise-texts, verbatim from the Concordance (continuing onto the next page). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p166] …[with five hundred] monks [of various monasteries] — who gathered all the nouns, verbs, participles, adverbs, prepositions, and all the parts of speech (both declinable and indeclinable) comprehended in the whole body of the Bibles, and arranged them in alphabetical order, noting the books, the chapters, and the individual lines of the chapters, in which any word similar and concordant to the word sought might be had. And so great is both the convenience and the usefulness of this great Index, [1] that when the studious reader has first learned to handle it prudently and with judgment, and has begun to grow accustomed to familiarity with it, he immediately perceives that he has found in it a certain inexhaustible treasure — that is, a universal and most complete exposition of the whole of divine Scripture — from the use of which he may take no less fruit and delight than if he had unrolled innumerable commentaries of the expositors.

I remember that once, at the request of friends, I gave to this index a brief little commentary, entitled *On the Use and Usefulness of the Concordances of the sacred Bible*, comprising certain brief and clear rules, [2] by which the lovers of sacred letters, being instructed, might easily be able — from this one volume of Concordances alone, even without any commentaries of the expositors — to understand and explain the senses and the various and manifold understandings of almost innumerable passages obscure in the divine letters; and not only to explain [them], but (what is far more laborious) to procure for themselves, upon any sentence of divine Scripture, the amplest exposition, and, if there were need, even to find the matter for a whole and copious sermon. An example of this device I will set before you upon the beginning of Psalm 116, showing by what method one may, from this Index of concordances, gather a most abundant exposition upon the two first words of this Psalm; for the explaining of which, three things must first be performed by you.

First, the volume of the Concordances being opened, you will seek, under the syllable LAV, the word *Laudare* [to praise], and all the words likewise akin to that word — such as *Laus*, *Laudatio*, *Laudans*,

Laudabilis, *Laudandus*, and the like; and you will immediately find, under these words, all the sayings, testimonies, authorities, and sentences of both testaments pertaining to the praise of God, cited by number — though with the periods truncated, and noted very strictly.

Secondly, out of so numerous a multitude of sentences you will gather only those, and copy onto a slip, which you shall see to be more distinguished, and which you shall recognize as apter and more accommodated to your purpose; and you will easily discern them among the others, and separate them, with little labor, from the less apt — if you have first been versed in the reading of the sacred letters, and are not utterly destitute of judgment. But it will be necessary, in copying out the aforesaid authorities, always to have the codex of the Bible before your eyes, so that, it being inspected, you may faithfully supply and restore to their pristine integrity those periods which you had found truncated in the Concordances.

Thirdly, after you have written out integrally the sentences suited to your purpose, run through them all again, from first to last, with a little thought, and weigh with yourself for a while the sense of each; and then — according to that common method of partition which the Dialecticians, the rhetoricians, and all the best writers are wont [to use], and which it was necessary you should first have learned in the schools — distinguish the now-collected forest of sentences, and reduce [them] into certain orders and classes; and in these orders, separately, and under diverse titles, [arrange] the individual authorities, as they shall have seemed to you more related among themselves in sense and scope; so that, from their very disposition, the whole series of the argument "On Divine Praise" may be unfolded — that is, that there may be gathered by you the definition, the causes, the effects, the parts, the offices, the modes, the places, the times, the necessity, the usefulness, the impediments, and the like, of divine praise, which the Dialecticians and Rhetoricians bid [us] inquire into in any proposed matter.

But, that you may understand these things more plainly, I will first set before your eyes the undistinguished **medley** of sentences of divine Scripture pertaining to divine praise, taken word for word from the book of Concordances with its own numbers; then I will distribute the same authorities into particular titles by that method, so that in them you may read an exact and copious explanation of the words with which Psalm 116 begins.

An Undistinguished Medley of the Sentences of Sacred Scripture pertaining to the Praise of God, transcribed word for word from the Index of Concordances

TO PRAISE (*Laudare*).

- Ps. 23:23 — *In the midst of the church I will praise thee.*
- 21:27 — *They shall praise the Lord that seek him.*
- 34:18 — *Among a grave people I will praise thee.*
- 34:28 — *All the day thy praise.*
- 62:6 — *With lips of exultation my mouth shall praise.*
- 68:31 — *I will praise the name of God with a canticle.*
- 83:5 — *For ever and ever they shall praise thee.*
- 99:4 — *Praise his name, for it is sweet.*
- 118:175 — *My soul shall live and shall praise thee.*
- 134:3 — *Praise the Lord, for he is good.*
- 144:2 — *I will praise thy name for ever and ever.*
- ibid. 4 — *Generation and generation shall praise thy works.*

- 145:1–2 — *Praise the Lord, O my soul; I will praise the Lord.*
- 146:1 — *Praise the Lord, for he is good.*
- 148:2 [the page misprints 548] — *Praise the Lord, all his angels.*
- ibid. 2–3 — *Praise him, [all] his hosts; Sun, [and] Moon…* [continues p168]

(The Psalm-numbers are the Concordance's own, in the Vulgate reckoning.)

---

[1] The usefulness of the Concordances of the Bibles is very great. [2] Precepts to be observed in the use of the Concordances of the Bibles.

(Rich PDF p. 168 — printed folio 151. The ***undistinguished medley*** *of praise-texts finishes (under the headwords* To Praise, Not to Praise, Praising, Laudation, Praiseworthy, Praise*). Then the payoff of the Syllabic method: the* ***Methodical Partition*** *of that same medley — the texts re-sorted into topical headings (****Definition, Encomium, Necessity, Causes, Mode****…) to build a full exposition of the theme "Praise the Lord." Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing the medley from p167]

TO PRAISE (*Laudare*), continued:

- Ps. 150:2 — *Praise him according to the multitude of his greatness.*
- 150:3 — *Praise him with the sound of the trumpet, the psaltery, the harp.*
- Acts 16:25 — *At midnight they praised God.*

NOT TO PRAISE (*Non laudare*):

- Ps. 113:17 — *The dead shall not praise thee, O Lord.*
- Isa. 38:18 — *Neither shall hell nor death praise thee.*

PRAISING (*Laudans*):

- Ps. 17:4 — *Praising, I will call upon the Lord.*
- Luke 24:53 — *They were always in the temple, praising God.*

LAUDATION (*Laudatio*):

- Ps. 49:16 — *Why dost thou declare my praises?* [1]
- 144:21 — *My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord.*
- 146:1 — *To our God let praise be pleasant and comely.*

PRAISEWORTHY (*Laudabilis*):

- Ps. 144:3 — *Great is the Lord, and exceedingly to be praised.*

PRAISE (*Laus*):

- Deut. 26:19 — *He created [thee] unto his own praise.*
- Ps. 21:26 — *With thee is my praise in the great church.*
- 33:2 — *His praise [shall be] always in my mouth.*
- 49:14 — *Offer to God the sacrifice of praise.*
- ibid. 23 — *The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me.*
- 68:31 — *I will magnify him with praise.*
- 115:17 — *To thee I will sacrifice the host of praise.*
- 118:164 — *Seven times a day I have given praise to thee.*
- 150:6 — *Let every spirit praise the Lord.*

• Eccli. 15:9 — *Praise is not seemly in the mouth of a sinner.*

• Eccli. 43:33 — *He is greater than all praise.*

• Isa. 63:7 — *The praise of the Lord for all things.*

• Jon. 2:10 — *With the voice of praise I will sacrifice.*

• Eph. 1:6 — *Unto the praise of his glory.*

• Heb. 13:15 — *Let us offer the host of praise.*

• Rev. 19:1 — *Praise and glory to our God.*

The Methodical Partition of the aforesaid Medley

(distributed into various classes of sentences, and beautifully accommodated to the exposition of the two first words of Psalm 116.)

The theme to be expounded: PRAISE THE LORD.

Definition

To praise God is to declare the amplitude of the divine perfections, so far as it can be done by us.

• Ps. 144:5–7 — *Generation and generation shall praise thy works, and shall declare thy power; they shall speak the magnificence of the glory of thy holiness, and shall tell thy wondrous works; and they shall speak of the might of thy terrible acts, and shall declare thy greatness; they shall utter the memory of thy sweetness,* etc.

• Eccli. 43:32,35 — *Who shall declare, and who shall magnify God as he is from the beginning? For he is greater than all praise. Glorifying the Lord as much as ever you can, still his wonderful magnificence will surpass [it].*

Encomium

Praise is the most excellent sacrifice of all, in which God is most greatly delighted.

• Ps. 49:14,23 — *Offer to God the sacrifice of praise; and the sacrifice of praise shall glorify me.*

• Ps. 68:31–32 — *I will praise the name of God with a canticle, and I will magnify him with praise; and it shall please the Lord above the young calf that bringeth forth horns and hoofs.*

• Ps. 115:8 — *To thee I will sacrifice the host of praise, and I will call upon the name of the Lord.*

• Jon. 2:10 — *But I, with the voice of praise, will sacrifice to thee for my salvation.*

• Heb. 13:15 — *By him therefore let us offer the host of praise, always pleasing to God — that is, the fruit of lips confessing to his name.*

[That God made all things unto the praise of his glory:]

• Deut. 26:19 — *God created all nations unto his praise, and name, and glory.*

• Eph. 1:4–5 — *He chose us before the foundation of the world, and predestined us unto the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ, unto the praise of the glory of his grace.*

Necessity

All creatures — insensible, sensible, and intelligible alike — are bound by divine precept to the praise of God, according to their own measure.

• Ps. 148 — *Praise the Lord, all his angels; praise him, Sun and Moon, all stars and light; praise him, ye heavens of heavens, all waters, hail, snow, ice, beasts, cattle, birds, kings of the earth, peoples,* etc. — down to the end of the Psalm: *Let every spirit praise the Lord.*

Causes

God is to be praised by us for innumerable causes; but chiefly for his surpassing goodness, [and] the innumerable benefits daily bestowed on us out of the bounty of the divine Goodness and mercy.

• Ps. 134:3 — *Praise the Lord, for the Lord is good; sing to his name, for it is sweet.*

• Isa. 63:7 — *Let us give praise to the Lord for all the things he hath rendered to us, and for the multitude of good things which he hath bestowed according to his indulgence, and according to the multitude of his mercies.*

• Ps. 99:4–5 — *Praise his name, for the Lord is sweet; his mercy [endureth] for ever.*

Mode

God is to be praised first in the mind, then with the voice — with Psalms, canticles, and musical instruments — and above all with good works.

• Ps. 145:1–2 — *Praise the Lord, O my soul; I will praise the Lord in my life.*

• Eccli. 51:8 — *My soul shall praise the Lord even unto death.*

• Ps. 62:6 — *With lips of exultation my mouth shall praise.*

• Ps. 146:1 — *Praise the Lord, for a Psalm is good; to our God let praise be pleasant and comely.*

• Ps. 150:3–5 — *Praise him with the sound of the trumpet; praise him on the psaltery and harp; praise him with timbrel and choir; praise him on strings and organ; praise him on well-sounding cymbals.* [continues p169: Time…]

[1] Here the Psalm actually reads "my justices" (*iustitias*), the Concordance having listed it under "Laudation."

*(Rich PDF p. 169 — printed folio 152. The Methodical Partition of "Praise the Lord" finishes — the headings **Time, Place, Utility, Impediments,** and **Conflicting Passages** (apparent contradictions to be reconciled). Sixtus then closes the Syllabic method with a note to the reader on how looking up the **synonyms** of "praise" would enrich the exposition still further. Then **Method Four: On Partition** — its two offices (dividing each book into numbered chapters, and gathering the parts under titles) — with the observation that the chapter-numbering now in our Bibles is recent. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Methodical Partition from p168]

Time

God is to be praised not only at the appointed hours of day and night, in heart and mouth, but is to be celebrated through the whole time of life, in affection and in work.

• Ps. 118:164 — *Seven times a day I have given praise to thee.*

• Acts 16:25 — *At midnight Paul and Silas, adoring, praised God.*

• Ps. 33:2 — *I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise [shall be] always in my mouth.*

• Ps. 34:28 — *My tongue shall meditate thy justice, thy praise all the day.*

• Ps. 144:2 — *Every day I will bless thee, and I will praise thy name for ever and ever.*

• Ps. 145:2 — *I will praise the Lord in my life; I will sing to my God as long as I shall be.*

Place

God is to be praised in every place, but especially in the church and the temple.

- Ps. 112:3 — *From the rising of the sun unto the going down, the name of the Lord is worthy of praise.*
- Ps. 21:23 — *I will declare thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the church I will praise thee.*
- Ps. 34:18 — *I will confess to thee in the great church; among a grave people I will praise thee.*
- Ps. 134:1–2 — *Praise the Lord, ye servants who stand in the house of the Lord, in the courts of the house of our God.*
- Luke 24:52–53 — *The disciples, returning to Jerusalem with great joy, were always in the temple, praising and blessing the Lord.*

[That in the other life there are two eternal places — in one of which God is perpetually praised, in the other never:]

- Ps. 83:5 — *Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, O Lord; for ever and ever they shall praise thee.*
- Rev. 19:1 — *I heard as it were the voice of many trumpets in heaven, saying: Praise and glory and power to our God.*
- Ps. 113:17 — *The dead shall not praise thee, O Lord, nor any that go down into hell.*
- Isa. 38:18 — *For hell shall not confess to thee, neither shall death praise thee.*

Utility

The rewards of those who praise God are: the help of divine grace, salvation from enemies visible and invisible, and a life eternally blessed.

- Ps. 118:175 — *My soul shall praise thee, and thy judgments shall help me.*
- Ps. 17:4 — *Praising, I will call upon the Lord, and I shall be saved from my enemies.*
- Ps. 21:27 — *They shall praise the Lord that seek him; they shall live for ever and ever.*

Impediments

Sins impede us from the divine praises.

- Eccli. 15:9 — *Praise is not seemly in the mouth of a sinner.*
- Ps. 49:16 — *God said to the sinner: Why dost thou take my covenant in thy mouth?*

Conflicting Passages [to be reconciled]

That in the divine scriptures there are passages seemingly conflicting concerning the divine praise, which must be reconciled.

- Ps. 116:1 — *Praise the Lord, all nations; praise him, all peoples.*
- Ps. 150:6 — *Let every spirit praise the Lord.*

On the contrary:

- Ps. 49:16 — *God said to the sinner: Why dost thou take my covenant in thy mouth?*
- Eccli. 15:9 — *Praise is not seemly in the mouth of a sinner.*

Likewise this:

- Ps. 150:2 — *Praise the Lord according to the multitude of his greatness.*

On the contrary:

• Eccli. 43:33,35 [the page prints 44:35,33] — *Who shall magnify God as he is from the beginning? for he is greater than all praise.*

You see here, ingenious reader, how great a store of sentences the volume of the Concordances has supplied to you — in the particular little index of one word only — and how copious a furniture of words and of things it has furnished for explaining the first word of this psalm. And if, taking up the codex of the Concordances again, you shall search out in it the words synonymous with the verb "to praise" [1] — such as *celebro* (I celebrate), *magnifico* (I magnify), *glorifico* (I glorify), *benedico* (I bless), *exalto* (I exalt), *confiteor* (I confess), *canto* (I sing), *psallo* (I sing psalms), *prædico* (I proclaim) — and shall gather, with like zeal, the fragments of the sacred sentences placed under those synonymous words, you will again enrich your exposition with a new and far richer abundance of speech. And finally, if you shall apply the same diligence to the individual words of the same psalm, so great an affluence of all things will present itself to you that you can scarcely find the ends of the exposition you have undertaken. And let these things be said sufficiently concerning the Syllabic Method.

On Partition — The Fourth Method

Of Partition — which itself also brings much light to the divine scriptures — there are two chief offices: [2] namely, to **divide**, and to **gather together** the divided [parts]. Division [3] divides the whole body of each volume — not rashly, but according to the analogy of the divisible matters, with the greatest reason — into members, and into parts (which they call heads, or chapters), dividing [them] by number and distinguishing [them] by the addition of numbers. And this device of dividing was invented for the convenience of teachers and learners, so that what could not be grasped as a whole at once, and in a single glance, might be more conveniently and more openly learned when divided into parts. Collection, [4] on the other hand, gathers the particular sums of the divided parts under the strictest titles or inscriptions, by which — as by eyes — it illustrates and adorns the fronts of the individual chapters. But as regards division, it must be known that this arithmetical distinction of chapters which we now have in the Bibles is recent; [5] for before five hundred [years…] [continues p170]

[1] Words synonymous with "to praise." [2] The two offices of partition. [3] Division is convenient for teachers and learners. [4] What collection provides. [5] The arithmetical distinction of chapters in the Bibles is recent.

*(Rich PDF p. 170 — printed folio 153. **Method Four (On Partition)** continues: the history of chapter and verse numbering. Before ~500 years ago Scripture was cited by narrative content, not number (the LXX added only the psalm-numbers, per Hilary; ancients like Augustine and Gregory cited by story-span). The ancient Jewish verse-division (Jerome's preserved colometry; **Elias Levita**: the Law, once one continuous text, was divided into* Pesukim ***436 years** after Jerusalem's fall — corroborating the p165 margin). Verses were measured by word-count (Augustine's* Speculum*: 6 / 12 / 18 words); verse-totals gauged a book's length (Origen on the Song = 20,000; Aristotle = 5,330). The Jews' verses are unequal (Ezra & the great synagogue; Gen 1:1 vs 1:2). Finally the old sectioning of the Gospels for the **Harmony** (Ammonius / Eusebius / Tatian: Matthew 355, Mark 235, Luke 343, John 232). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p169] …[for before five hundred] years no passage of divine Scripture is found cited by number, either among the Hebrews or among the Greeks, except the psalms — of which, as appears from the Acts of the Apostles, they were wont, from the very beginning of the nascent church, to make mention with numbers added (for these numbers, as Hilary testifies in the preface of the psalms, the Seventy interpreters affixed to the psalms). [1] And those chapter-divisions and numbers which are now seen in the Greek copies, as well as in the Hebrew and Latin, were taken from our Latin codices. For those most ancient expositors used to divide the divine scriptures, and to cite them, not by the enumeration of chapters and the recitation of numbers, but by the allegation of particular histories — as Augustine said that he had written from the

beginning of Genesis up to the expulsion of the first parents from Paradise, and Gregory too [said] that he had expounded from the beginning of the book of Kings up to the anointing of King David — instead of what we would now say, "on the first three chapters of Genesis," and "on the first fifteen earlier chapters of 1 Kings." They divided likewise, and set forth publicly, the scriptures by places, or periods, or verses or versicles, or the sentences of the sacred volumes expressed verbatim — which they also sometimes called Chapters or Capitula — saying, for example: "On that passage of Paul where it is written, *I speak the truth in Christ* [2] up to that place where it is said, *of whom is Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever*"; [3] or "on that which is written in Job, *The oxen were plowing, and the asses feeding.*" [4]

I find that a similar mode of division existed also among the ancient Jews: [5] that their codices were divided by sentences, commata, members, and verses, and distinguished by certain intervals — of which Jerome is witness, in the preface of Paralipomenon [Chronicles] and of Isaiah, asserting that, for the utility of readers, he had preserved in his own translation the same cuttings of the commata and the distances of the intervals which he had found in the Hebrew codices. Although Elias Levita, in the preface of the book *Masoreth ha-Masoreth*, affirms — following the opinion of the Rabbis [6] — that the whole Law was once as it were one single *Pasuk*, or one sentence, in which all things cohered without any distinction of verses, and that it was divided into *Pesukim* (that is, into verses and sentences) by the Jews of Tiberias **four hundred and thirty-six years** after the last destruction of the holy city. The author of the book of *Hebrew Questions on the books of Kings* (whom St. Thomas thinks was a Jew reborn in Christ) [7] shows that the Jews cut the books into a certain number of sentences, or verses — since he says that the book of Proverbs among them contains nine hundred and fifteen verses; [8] yet I myself have nowhere read, in the commentaries of the Hebrews, any of these sentences marked with an arithmetical mark, or expressed by a numeral word.

But it must be known that the partition of verses among the Jews is different from [that] among us and the Greeks. For the ancient Greeks and Latins distinguished the verses by an equal number of words, writing in each verse almost always six words [9] — partly monosyllables, partly polysyllables: which Augustine indicates clearly enough in the book whose title is *The Mirror of Divine Scripture*, in which — often noting the number of verses (sometimes collected by himself from the divine books, sometimes indeed omitted) — he sets, as an example of one verse, that saying of the ninety-ninth Psalm: *His people, and the sheep of his pasture.* [10] As an example of two verses, that sentence of Psalm 118: *How many are the days of thy servant? when wilt thou execute judgment on them that persecute me?* [11] Again, as an example of three verses, he brings that from Psalm 149 [so the margin; the body prints 148]: *Let them praise his name in choir; on timbrel and psaltery let them sing to him; for the Lord is well pleased with his people.* [12] In these examples, if you count the words, you will find in the first six words, in the second twelve, in the third eighteen. According to this partition of verses, therefore, I judge that the measure of the ancients is to be understood, who were wont to signify the size of volumes by the number of verses, as by a more certain mark — because books are frequently unequal, on account of the diverse abundance of their matter. In which way Jerome, expressing the size of certain books, says that Origen wrote on the Song of Songs nearly **twenty thousand** verses; [13] that Gregory Nazianzen comprised all his works in **thirty thousand** verses; that Hilary, in his commentaries on the psalms, borrowed from Origen nearly **forty thousand** verses; and that he himself, while expounding the epistle to the Ephesians, dictated a **thousand** verses into it daily. So too Diogenes Laertius affirms that the sum of certain Aristotelian volumes is contained under **five thousand three hundred and thirty** verses.

But the Jews, in distinguishing the verses, neither attend to the number of words, nor follow the cola or commata of the discourse, but [follow] a certain ancient custom, supported only by the authority of the elders and the tradition of the Rabbis; nor do they bring any other reason for their partition, except that Ezra and the men of the great synagogue, inspired by the divine spirit, distinguished the divine scriptures in this fashion. Whence among them the *Pesukim* — that is, the verses — are almost all unequal, [14] as appears at the outset

of Genesis, where the first *Pasuk*, or verse, is *In the beginning God created heaven and earth,* [15] but the second is much longer: *And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters;* [16] after which follows the third verse, *And God said,* etc., far shorter. This mode of dividing, then, the ancients had — among whom, although Ammonius of Alexandria (or Eusebius of Caesarea, or Tatian) divided the four gospels by number into chapters [17] — that is, the Gospel of Matthew into **355** chapters, Mark into **235**, Luke into **343**, John into **232** — yet I do not think that they had regard to this, that they might establish for us a fixed partition of the scriptures, but only to this, that they might indicate the places of the **Evangelical Symphony** [Harmony], in which the Evangelists said things consonant among themselves. After these, then, I have found among the ancients no numeral division of the scriptures, except in one [author]… [continues p171]

[1] The Seventy interpreters affixed the numbers to the Psalms; the Hebrews and Greeks received the chapter-divisions in the Bibles from the Latins; [and] in what manner the ancient expositors of the Scriptures divided them. [2] Rom. 9:1. [3] Rom. 9:5 (the same chapter). [4] Job 1:14. [5] By what method the codices of the ancient Jews were distinguished. [6] Elias Levita thinks the whole Law was once as it were one single sentence. [7] St. Thomas thinks the author of the book of *Hebrew Questions on the books of Kings* was a Jew reborn in Christ. [8] The book of Proverbs among the Jews contains 915 verses. [9] The Greeks and Latins of old wrote, almost always, six words in each verse. [10] Ps. 99:3. [11] Ps. 118:84. [12] Ps. 149:3–4. [13] In what sense the name "verse" was used by the ancients; Origen wrote on the Song of Songs nearly 20,000 verses. [14] Almost all the verses in the Hebrew Bibles are unequal among themselves. [15] Gen. 1:1. [16] Gen. 1:2. [17] What the division of the Gospels into chapters once was.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 171 — printed folio 154. **Method Four (Partition)** finishes. The history of numbered division: Hilary (Matthew into 33 canons); Luke sectioned by copyists (Ambrose 64, Bede 93); the Greeks' titles/chapters (Euthymius, Suidas, Arethas — with Gospel chapter-counts); and the twofold Latin enumeration (an older, fuller one vs. the modern chapters used by the scholastics — Hugh of St-Cher, Aquinas, etc., and followed by Kimchi). Then **On Collection** (the second office of Partition — compressing each part under a title), whose difficulty is shown by **eleven different "arguments" (summary-titles) for Psalm 116** gathered from the Fathers (Paul, Arnobius, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Cassiodorus, Euthymius, Remigius, Honorius, Smaragdus, David Kimchi). Then **Method Five: On the Epitome** opens. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p170] …[no numeral division of the scriptures, except in] one Hilary, who cut the gospel of Matthew, expounded by himself, into thirty-three canons. [1] For as to what we noted in the first book of this work — that the Gospel of Luke, in the commentaries of Ambrose, is divided into sixty-four titles, and in the commentaries of Bede into ninety-three chapters [2] — we believe this was done not by the authors themselves, but interpolated by the copyists or readers, who love frequent breathing-pauses in writing or reading.

But among the Greek expositors, who flourished five hundred years ago, certain ones began to divide the sacred writings into parts numerically distinguished and marked with the characters of numbers — which they sometimes called **titles**, and sometimes **capitula** [chapters]. For thus Euthymius — or, as it seems to some, Oecumenius — divided the Gospel of Matthew into sixty-eight titles, or chapters, [3] of which he inscribed the first "On the Magi," the second "On the children slain," the third "On the preaching of John," the fourth "On the doctrine of Christ," etc. But some, separating the *capitula* from the *titles*, cut the volumes into titles, and again subdivided the titles into chapters — as is gathered from Suidas and Arethas: of whom the former testifies that the Gospel of Matthew was distributed into sixty-eight titles [so the margin; the body prints 28] and into 355 chapters, [4] and the gospel of Mark into forty-eight titles and fifty-six chapters; while the latter relates that Andrew [of Caesarea] cut the Apocalypse of John into twenty-four parts, and each of these into three chapters, so that the chapters of the whole book were seventy-two.

But among the Latins who [lived] from the thousandth year of our salvation up to these our times, I find a **twofold enumeration** of chapters: [5] the one, as [being] older, so also more numerous — according to which the Gospel of Matthew, even in old printed codices, contains ninety-four chapters, the Gospel of Luke one

hundred and seven chapters, and the Epistle to the Romans fifty chapters; the other, later, which we now have in the common Bibles, more contracted and comprised in fewer chapters — by whose numeral citation there used, in their commentaries, Hugh presbyter Cardinal of St. Sabina [Hugh of St-Cher], Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, and the rest, up to this day, the scholastic Theologians, whose chief care was to bring forth the divine testimonies from the holy scriptures by number. These Rabbi David Kimchi, and the other more recent Jews, follow in the division, calculation, and citation of the chapters of the old testament. Thus far concerning Division.

But concerning **Collection** — which is accomplished according to the [second] office of partition — it must be observed that this part is not a matter of common industry, [6] but of a keener skill. For just as, before we approach the division, we must diligently inspect that which is set forth to be divided, and rightly know the analogy of the parts to be divided, lest the division turn out wrongly: so, in collecting, there is need of a certain keen judgment, which may gather the separate little summaries of the individual divided parts, or chapters, aptly, briefly, and completely, and compress them as briefly as possible under certain witty and very strict titles and inscriptions, to be prefixed to the beginnings of the chapters. How difficult this is to do, that manifold diversity of the chapter-titles, or arguments, which are prefixed to the chapters of divine scripture, argues — varying in almost every one of the common codices, but especially in the chapters of the more obscure books, such as many are in the Prophets and in the epistles of Paul. In the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Romans I found ten arguments, or inscriptions: [7] of which some grazed the sum of one or two sentences of the whole chapter, the rest being omitted; others strayed far from the whole scope of the chapter; and some even fought diametrically against the whole meaning of the chapter. Which now, for brevity's sake, I pass over, subjoining in their place various formulas of inscriptions, or arguments, upon **Psalm 116** — so that from these you may somehow perceive the varied artifice of collecting.

Argument of Psalm 116, from Paul to the Romans, chapter 15: 1. The Gentiles [praise] God for [his] mercy, the Jews for [his] truth.

Another of Paul's, from the same place: 2. The Gentiles honor God from mercy alone, the Jews from the promises.

Of Arnobius: 3. The Gentiles, the Jews being excluded, are invited to the praises of God.

Of Eusebius of Caesarea: 4. A prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles.

Of Chrysostom: 5. A prediction of the evangelical preaching, about to occupy the whole world.

Of Cassiodorus: 6. The beginning, end, and compendium of all psalms and hymns.

Of Euthymius: 7. A laudatory psalm, calling together the whole race of mortals to the praises of Christ, and to the giving of thanks to him for such great benefits conferred upon us.

Of Remigius: 8. The whole human race is invited to celebrate God on account of the mercy shown to us in the coming of Christ.

Of Honorius: 9. The Gentiles first, then the Jews, are invited to the divine praises.

Of Smaragdus: 10. The praise of God from mercy and truth — because by these two virtues all the works of the divine perfections are comprehended.

Of David Kimchi the Jew: 11. A laudatory hymn, לימות המשיח (*limoth Hammashiach*) — that is, looking forward to the days of the Messiah.

On the Epitome — The Fifth Method

The **Epitome** (ΕΠΙΤΟΜΗ) — that is, the Breviary, or compendium — is the briefest summary of the divine volumes, [8] comprehending in the fewest words, and (so far as can be done) in succinct and clear speech, grazing [the whole]… [continues p172]

[1] Hilary divided the gospel of Matthew into 33 Canons. [2] The gospel of Luke, in Ambrose's commentaries, was divided by the copyists into 64 titles, and in Bede's commentary into 93 chapters. [3] Euthymius divided the gospel of Matthew into 68 titles. [4] The gospel of Matthew was once divided into 68 titles and 355 chapters; Mark into 48 titles and 56 chapters; the Apocalypse into 72 chapters. [5] Among the Latins there was a twofold enumeration of the chapters of Scripture. [6] Collection is not a matter of common industry. [7] What arguments are extant on chapter 4 of the Epistle to the Romans. [8] What the Epitome of the Scriptures is.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 172 — printed folio 155. **Method Five (Epitome)** finishes: since Psalm 116 is too short, the worked example is **Sabellicus's compendium of Genesis 1** (Cassiodorus and Richard of St. Victor named as authors). Then **Method Six: On the Ecloge (Excerpt)** — plucking scattered Scripture-excerpts — and its three forms: **Specula** (Mirrors — Augustine's* Speculum*); **Loci Communes** (Commonplaces grouped under headings of faith/hope/charity — Melito's* Six Books of Excerpts to Onesimus, *Cyprian's three books to Quirinus, Bede & Defensor's* Scintillæ*); and **Harmonies** (weaving parallel passages into one work — twofold: literal weaving, or Eusebius's numeral canon-tables; the Gospel harmonies of Tatian, Theophilus, Ammonius, variously titled* Monopanton, Monotessaron, Pandect, Evangelical Harmony*; Zacharias of Chrysopolis). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p171] …grazing those things which are narrated more fully, and through many repetitions, in the divine scripture (to which **Tautology** is most familiar), [1] the integrity and sense of the sacred narration being always preserved. Since an example of this Method cannot be exhibited in Psalm 116, on account of its narrow brevity, I will set before you, in its stead, the first chapter of Genesis, which Marcus Antonius Sabellicus thus contracted into a Compendium.

An Example of a Compendium upon the whole first chapter of Genesis

That eternal Majesty, the maker of all things — having wrought the whole world from the beginning in six days — first separated light from darkness, when the raw matter was now present, and that formless, which God had prepared from the beginning; and this was the first light of all, the day, which shone upon the world. Night was straightway joined to it. Heaven thence, on the second day, was established on high; and this was called the firmament. Then, on the third day, the earth was made stable, and moisture was poured around the earth. The Sun, on the fourth day's light, the Moon, and the stars flashed forth into the world; of these, a few — like those greater lights — wander in fixed spaces, while the rest of the multitude, which is moreover immense, and diffused in variety, describes almost innumerable effigies of things and of animals. Soon, on the fifth day, the birds and all swimming things were given to the two elements. Finally, on the sixth day, the creeping things, and the very race of quadrupeds, were assigned to the earth; and with these, the most noble animal, man — who alone, having obtained a heavenly mind, was made to the image of God. They have left us, as report has it, not-to-be-despised monuments of this labor upon the whole of divine scripture: Aurelius Cassiodorus, and Richard [of St.] Victor.

On the Ecloge, or Excerpt — The Sixth Method

The **Ecloge** (ΕΚΛΟΓΗ), or Excerpt (for thus Melito and Cyprian called this mode of expounding), [2] is a Method plucking here and there, scattered from all the divine volumes, diverse authorities of the scriptures — sentences, periods, testimonies, examples, and various sayings and deeds — either for the instruction of the faith and the proof of Christian dogmas, or for the discipline of morals and the exercise of piety. Of which Method diverse formulas have been devised by ecclesiastical men, among which three are held more

usual: [3] namely, **Specula** [Mirrors], **Loci Communes** [Commonplaces], and **Harmonies.**

Specula [Mirrors] [4] are those volumes so called in which, according to the order of the books of both Testaments, there is heaped up indiscriminately, and without any order, a huge and undigested medley of the sentences of divine scripture, pertaining either to the erudition of faith or of morals — as Augustine did in the book which he himself entitled the *Speculum* [Mirror].

Loci Communes [Commonplaces] [5] are those so called in which the sentences, dispersed here and there through diverse parts of holy Scripture, are reduced into certain peculiar orders, or classes, distinguished among themselves by various titles, arguments, and chapters — such as the "places" on faith, on hope, on charity, and the like; under which are separately placed all those sentences which pertain either to faith, or to hope, or to charity, and which show and expound their nature, force, properties, and offices, each in its own words. In this part there labored Melito, bishop of Sardis, and Cyprian: [6] of whom the former gathered from the divine letters a work entitled Ἐκλόγων Βιβλία ἓξ — that is, *Six Books of Excerpts, to Onesimus* — in which, under various titles, he arranged in fitting order all the ethical sentences which are delivered in the sacred letters for living well and blessedly. Cyprian, moreover, wrote three books of like argument to his son Quirinus — the two former necessary for the support of faith, the third for the edification of good works. Many others also labored in this very kind; of whom some, among the Commonplaces of sacred sentences collected by themselves, inserted many sentences of the orthodox fathers, conformable to those "places," which might be, as it were, expositions of the preceding places — as Bede the presbyter did, and Defensor, an old author, in those books which they entitled *Scintillæ Scripturæ Sanctæ* [Sparks of Holy Scripture]. But others gathered the deeds and sayings of only one theme from the divine letters, and reduced [them] into one body, and illustrated [them] with brief little expositions inserted of their own — as was done by the author of the three books which are inscribed under the name of Augustine, *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture.*

A **Harmony** [7] is called a work constructed from the similar sayings and sentences of diverse un-joined and un-ordered volumes, woven together mutually for the exposition of one matter, and reduced into one continuous, ordered, whole, and perfect volume. Nor are there lacking those who assign a twofold kind of Harmony: [8] the One, in which the parts and periods of the literal context, having a like sense, are accommodated [together]; the Other, which, without any writing of letters, is composed from numeral marks alone. In this latter kind Eusebius of Caesarea gave us an example, in the book of the Evangelical Canons, to Carpianus. But of the former kind, illustrious monuments were left [9] by Tatian of Alexandria, Theophilus bishop of Antioch, Ammonius of Alexandria, and many others, who compacted the histories of the four Evangelists into the body of one history — which some entitled **Monopanton** (that is, "one out of all"), others **Monotessaron** (that is, "one out of four"), others **Pandect** (that is, "containing all"), others **Evangelical Harmony.** And among these there were also some who elucidated Harmonies of this kind — whether published by themselves or by others — by adding their own explanations: as Zacharias, bishop of Chrysopolis, who [wrote] upon the Harmony of Am[monius]… [continues p173]

[1] Tautology is familiar to divine Scripture. [2] The definition of the Ecloge. [3] There are three more usual formulas of the Ecloge. [4] What are called "Mirrors" (Specula). [5] Commonplaces are defined. [6] Melito and St. Cyprian wrote commonplaces of the sacred Scripture. [7] The Harmony of the Scriptures is defined. [8] The Harmony is of a twofold kind. [9] Authors who published Harmonies of Scripture.

(Rich PDF p. 173 — printed folio 156. The Ecloge (Excerpt) method concludes — Zacharias's Catena, *Bruychius, and Sixtus's own forthcoming* ***Monotessaron of Wisdom*** *(harmonizing Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Sirach) — then its* ***three worked examples****: (1)* ***Commonplaces*** *from Cyprian's third book* to Quirinus *(two topics: "In nothing should we glory"; "The freedom of belief lies in the will"); (2)* ***literal Harmony*** *— the Temple-cleansing woven from all four Gospels (Matt 21 / Mark 11 / Luke 19 / John 2), with sigla a–g; (3)* ***numeral Harmony*** *— Eusebius's ten* ***canon-tables****, built on Ammonius's Gospel chapter-counts, enumerated by which Evangelists agree. The figure of the table itself follows on the next page. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p172] …[Zacharias, bishop of Chrysopolis, who] upon the Harmony of Ammonius wove together a *Catena* [Chain] of explanations from the fathers; and Antonius Bruychius, who followed up the evangelical Monotessaron collected by himself with his own exposition. We too hope, if God favor our undertakings, to send forth into the light shortly a **Monotessaron of Wisdom**, [1] which we now have in hand — that is, "one out of four," namely from the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus — in which work we have reduced the individual sentences of each kind and theme, dispersed here and there through those same volumes, under fixed and distinct orders and titles, separately, and have begun to illustrate [them] with brief commentaries applied. Let these things suffice concerning the Ecloge, of whose Method we subjoin only three examples: the first, of Commonplaces, from the aforementioned books of Cyprian to Quirinus; the second, of literal Harmony, from the evangelical Harmony of Ammonius; the third, of numeral Harmony, from Eusebius.

An Example of Commonplaces, from St. Cyprian, book 3, to Quirinus (which Augustine also used against Pelagius)

THAT IN NOTHING SHOULD WE GLORY, since nothing is ours:

In the Gospel according to John: *No man can receive anything, unless it be given him from heaven.* [2] Likewise in the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: *For what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received?* [3] Likewise in the first book of Kings [1 Samuel]: *Glory not, neither speak lofty things; let not magniloquence come out of your mouth: for the Lord is the God of knowledge.* [4] Likewise there: *The bow of the mighty is made weak, and the weak are girded with strength.* [5] Concerning this same [matter] in the Maccabees: *It is just to be subject to God, and that a mortal should not think things equal to God.* [6] Likewise there: *Fear not the words of a sinful man, for his glory shall be dung and worms; today he is lifted up, and tomorrow he shall not be found, because he is turned into his earth, and his thought is perished.* [7]

THAT THE FREEDOM OF BELIEVING, OR OF NOT BELIEVING, is placed in the [free] will:

In Deuteronomy: *Behold, I have set before thy face life and death, good and evil: choose life, that thou mayest live.* [8] Likewise in Isaiah: *And if you be willing, and will hearken to me, you shall eat the good things of the land; but if you will not, and will not hearken to me, the sword shall devour you: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken these things.* [9] Likewise in the gospel according to Luke: *The kingdom of God is within you.* [10]

An Example of Literal Harmony, from the evangelical Harmony of Ammonius

(on the history of Christ casting the sellers and buyers out of the temple, woven from the sayings of the four Evangelists — namely from Matthew ch. 21, Mark ch. 11, Luke ch. 19, and John ch. 2)

JOHN: The pasch of the Jews was near, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. **MATTHEW:** And when he had entered Jerusalem, the whole city was moved, saying: Who is this? And the people said: This is Jesus the Prophet, from Nazareth of Galilee. **JOHN:** And Jesus entered into the temple of God; and when he had made a scourge of cords, he cast out all the sellers and buyers in the temple; the sheep also, and the oxen, and he poured out [the coin] of the money-changers, and overturned the brass and the seats of the sellers and the doves, and said to them: Take these things hence, and make not the house of my Father a house of business. [11] **[a] MATT., MARK, LUKE:** For it is written, *My house shall be called a house of prayer* — [12] **[b] MARK:** for all nations. [13] **[c] MATT., MARK, LUKE:** But you have made it a den of thieves. [14] **[d] MARK:** And he suffered not that any man should carry a vessel through the temple. [15] **[e] JOHN:** And his

disciples remembered that it is written: The zeal of thy house hath eaten me up. [16] **[f] MATT.:** And there came to him the blind and the lame in the temple, and he healed them. [17] **[g] LUKE:** And he was teaching daily in the temple. [18]

Such, then, is the example of literal Harmony, taken from Ammonius.

Eusebius of Caesarea, stirred by the zeal of Ammonius, himself also devised a new method of **Numeral Harmony**, composed from the marks of numbers alone, without any writing of the evangelical text. [19] First he considered that Ammonius had cut each of the four Evangelists into many chapters [20] — namely Matthew into three hundred and fifty-five chapters, Mark into one hundred and thirty-five [so here; p170 gave 235], Luke into three hundred and forty-four, John into two hundred and thirty-two. Then he set these chapter-numbers one against another, according as they variously agreed or differed among themselves, and arranged them into ten classes of numeral figures — tables, or titles, which he called **canons** — in an elegant and clear order, in this manner:

- The **First** Order contained in itself four series of numbers, indicating the places, or chapters, of the gospels in which similar things were said by all four Evangelists: namely Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.
- The **Second** contained the numbers of the chapters in which three agree: Matthew, Mark, and Luke.
- The **Third** had the numbers in which three were concordant: Matthew, Luke, and John.
- The **Fourth** comprised the numbers of the chapters in which three concur: Matthew, Mark, and John.
- The **Fifth**: in which two, Matthew and Luke.
- The **Sixth**: in which two, Matthew and Mark.
- The **Seventh**: in which two, Matthew and John.
- The **Eighth**: in which two, Mark and Luke.
- The **Ninth**: in which two, Luke and John.
- The **Tenth**: in which the individual [Evangelists] wrote of certain things proper [to themselves].

You have an example of this artifice in the figure set below. [continues p174: the table]

[1] This work, promised by the author, has not yet come to light. [2] John 3:27. [3] 1 Cor. 4:7. [4] 1 Sam. 2:3 (cited as 1 Kings). [5] Ibid. 2:4. [6] 2 Macc. 9:12. [7] 1 Macc. 2:62–63. [8] Deut. 30:16. [9] Isa. 1:19–20. [10] Luke 17:21 (the margin prints "27," an impossible chapter). [11] John 2:13; Matt. 21:10–11; John 2:14–16. [12] Marker *a*: Matt. 21:13; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46. [13] Marker *b*: Mark 11:17. [14] Marker *c*: Matt. 21:13; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46. [15] Marker *d*: Mark 11:16. [16] Marker *e*: John 2:17. [17] Marker *f*: Matt. 21:14. [18] Marker *g*: Luke 19:47. [19] Eusebius devised the method of numeral harmony. [20] Ammonius cut each of the Evangelists into many chapters.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 174 — printed folio 157. The **figure** promised on p173: **Eusebius's Canon I** — the Gospel sections where all four Evangelists run parallel, laid out in four columns of section-numbers (Matthew / Mark / Luke / John), with instructions for reading it and one worked row (the four "voice crying in the wilderness" texts). Then **Method Seven: On the Notariac Exposition** — interpretation by **critical marks and signs** set in Scripture (much used by the ancient Greek expositors, chiefly in the Old Testament), which are of two kinds: **Literate marks** (Greek letters, each with a name) and **Illiterate marks** (the cross, anchor, asterisk, obelus, metobelus…). The mark-lists continue on the next page. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

An Example of Numeral Harmony, from the book of the Evangelical Canons of Eusebius, to Carpianus

Of the evangelical chapters in which all four Evangelists agree.

THE FIRST CANON

(the numbers are the Ammonian section-numbers; each row lists the parallel sections in the four Gospels)

Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
VIII	II	VII	X
XI	IIII	X	VI
XIIII	V	XIII	XV
XXIII	XXVII	XVII	XLVI
LXX	XX	XXXVII	XXXVIII
XCVIII	XCVI	CCV	XL
CXXXIII	XXXVII	LXXVII	CIX
CXLI	L	XIX	LIX
CXLII	LI	XXI	XXXV
CXLVII	LXIIII	XCIII	XLIX
CXLVI	LXXXII	XCIIII	XVII
CCIX	CXII	CCXXXIIII	C
CCXI	CXXI	CCXXXVIII	XXI
CCXX	CXXII	CCXXXIX	LXXVII
LXXXVII	CXXXIX	CCL	CXLVI
CCXLIIII	CXXXIX	CCL	CXLI

You will most easily attain the understanding of this canon, and of others like it, if you know that all the numbers which are placed from left to right in the same line indicate places of the gospels consonant and concordant among themselves. As you can observe in the first line — in which the eighth chapter of Matthew, the second of Mark, the seventh of Luke, [and] the tenth of John show that the four evangelists' sentences written below are very much alike:

- **Matthew VIII:** *This is he of whom it was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying: The voice of one crying in the desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.* [1]
- **Mark II:** *As it is written in Isaiah the prophet: The voice of one crying in the desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.* [2]
- **Luke VII:** *It is written in the book of the sayings of Isaiah the prophet: The voice of one crying in the desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.* [3]
- **John X:** *I [am] the voice of one crying in the desert: Make straight the way of the Lord, as said Isaiah the prophet.* [4]

In the other lines of this figure, and in the others which are had in the canons of Eusebius — as the same order is preserved, so the same manner of understanding is to be had.

On the Notariac Exposition — The Seventh Method

The **Notaria**, or Notariac, exposition is a Method which demonstrates the meaning of words, of sentences, and of latent senses, by means of certain marks — whether of characters, or of lines, or of points — either set beside, or inserted into, the divine Scriptures. [5] Of these there was a most frequent use among the most ancient (especially the Greek) expositors, and chiefly in the old testament. Of these we have gathered a few, for example's sake, from Epiphanius, Jerome, Stratonicus, Suidas, and Isidore, of which the sum is this:

Every exposition made by marks consists of a twofold variety of marks: [6] of these, some are called **Literate**, others **Illiterate**; whose figures and names are these.

LITERATE MARKS: 1. **A** — *apile* 2. Γ — *gehennon* 3. Δ — *diabolos* 4. **E** — *ecclisis* 5. **Z** — *zitima* 6. **M** — *mellon*

ILLITERATE MARKS: 1. ✚ (cross) — *stauron* 2. ■ (anchor) — *ancyra* 3. (anchor-form) — *ancyranos* 4. ⁕ (asterisk) — *asteriscus* 5. — (horizontal stroke) — *obelus* 6. ■· — *metobelus*

(both lists continue on p175)

[1] Matt. 3:3. [2] Mark 1:2. [3] Luke 3:4. [4] John 1:23. [5] What the notariac exposition is. [6] There are two kinds of marks.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 175 — printed folio 158. The two mark-lists finish — **Literate marks** 7–16 (Xenion, Uranion, Pneuma, Tropos, Ypsilon…, and the Hebrew* Sagur/*"closed" &* Pethach/*"open") and **Illiterate marks** 7–16 (the ancient critical signs: Ceraunion, Obelus, Lemniscus, Subliniscus, Antigraphus, Antisigma, Cryphia, Diple, Diple-with-dots, and the Hebrew* nekudot*). Then **On the Literate Marks** — what each signifies, with a Scripture example: **A** (a threat-prophecy of changeable outcome), Γ (Gehenna), Δ (the devil), **E** (the calling of the Gentiles), **Z** (an abstruse question), **M** (the future), **X** (an earthly promise to the Jews), **V** (heavenly bliss), Π (the spiritual sense), **T** (a Hebrew idiom) — continued on the next page. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

(the mark-lists, continued from p174:)

LITERATE MARKS (7–16): 7. **X** — *Xenion*; 8. (digamma) — *Uranion*; 9. Π — *Pneuma*; 10. **T** — *Tropos* (the list misprints "Tdoros"); 11. Υ — *Ypsilon*; 12. ϒ — *Ypsilon ypogrammenon*; 13. Χ — *Character*; 14. ΧΧ — *Character diplos*; 15. (ס) — *Sagur* [Hebrew, "closed"]; 16. (פ) — *Pethach* [Hebrew, "open"].

ILLITERATE MARKS (7–16): 7. (thunderbolt) — *Ceraunion*; 8. (dotted obelus) — *Obelos agnostigmenon*; 9. (lemniscus) — *Limniscus*; 10. (sub-lemniscus) — *Subliniscus*; 11. (C with dot) — *Antigraphus*; 12. (reversed C with dot) — *Antisigma*; 13. (C over triangle) — *Cryphia*; 14. (diple, ■) — *Diple*; 15. (diple with dots) — *Diple periestigmene*; 16. (diamonds/points) — *[nekudot]* ("Scilus nechudot" — the Hebrew extraordinary points).

On the Literate Marks

You now have the forms and names of the literate marks; now receive the individual significations and expositions of each.

A — Apile (that is, *Threat*) signifies that the prophecies of the prophets, to which this mark is prefixed, are not prophecies of an immovable and inevitable decree, but of a changeable outcome, [1] pronounced not for the sake of decreeing but of threatening — such as the prediction of Isaiah the prophet, saying to Hezekiah: [A] *Set thy house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live;* [2] and likewise the prophecy of Jonah crying to the Ninevites: [A] *Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.* [3]

Γ **— Gehennon** marks places which, in the old testament, speak obscurely of the perpetual punishments of Gehenna — such as that in Isaiah: [Γ] *Tophet is prepared from yesterday, prepared by the king, deep and wide; the nourishments thereof are fire and much wood: the breath of the Lord, as a torrent of brimstone, kindling it.* [4]

Δ **— Diabolos**, prefixed to sentences, indicates that they are to be understood of the devil — such as that which Moses wrote in Genesis: [Δ] *And the serpent said to the woman: You shall not die the death;* [5] and that in Job: [Δ] *Behold Behemoth, whom I made with thee: he shall eat hay like an ox… he setteth up his tail like*

a cedar… he is the beginning of the ways of God. [6]

E — Ecclisis (that is, *Calling-out*) shows a period speaking of the calling of the Gentiles, or of the Church of Christ to be gathered from the Gentiles — as that in Isaiah the prophet: [E] *Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee; and the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising*, etc. [7]

Z — Zitima (that is, *Question*) denotes an abstruse and hidden sentence, wrapped in the greatest obscurity, and involved in most difficult questions — such as that pericope of Paul in the epistle to the Romans: [Z] *When [the children] were not yet born, nor had done any 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 have loved, but Esau I have hated. What shall we say then? Is there injustice with God? God forbid.* [8]

M — Mellon (that is, *Future*) is prefixed to a sentence which, although it may seem to speak of the present, yet contains a foreknowledge of future times — as in Isaiah: [M] *Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth.* [9]

X — Xenion (that is, a gift wont to be given to newcomers and guests) points out sentences which are to be interpreted of earthly and temporal gifts and promises, made especially to the Jewish people — as in Isaiah: [X] *If you be willing, and will hearken to me, you shall eat the good things of the land.* [10]

V — Uranion (that is, *Heavenly*) brings forth a place in which the felicity of eternal life is described — as in the eighty-third Psalm: [V] *How lovely are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! my soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord… Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, O Lord; for ever and ever they shall praise thee.* [11]

Π **— Pneuma** (that is, *Spirit*) signifies that the pericope is to be understood not carnally but spiritually — as in the Song of Songs: [Π] *Arise, make haste, my love, my beautiful one, and come, my dove in the clefts of the rock, in the hollow of the wall: show me thy face, let thy voice sound in my ears; for thy voice is sweet, and thy face comely.* [12]

T — Tropos (that is, *a mode of speech*) warns that the subsequent saying is not to be understood according to the first and bare signification which the words present, but according to the customary speech of some nation. This mark the ancients used to indicate places of divine scripture expressed by Hebrew phrases, tropes, and idioms — as in Psalm 15: *The lines are fallen unto me in goodly places* [13] — which is as much as if you should say… [continues p176]

[1] Some prophecies are of a changeable outcome. [2] Isa. 38:1. [3] Jonah 3:4. [4] Isa. 30:33. [5] Gen. 3:4. [6] Job 40:10,11,14 (the Behemoth passage; Vulgate numbering, = 40:15,19). [7] Isa. 60:1,3. [8] Rom. 9:11–14; Gen. 25; Mal. 1:2. [9] Isa. 65:17. [10] Isa. 1:19. [11] Ps. 83:1–3 (Vulgate; = Ps. 84). [12] Song of Songs 2:13–14. [13] Ps. 15:6 (Vulgate; = Ps. 16:6).

(Rich PDF p. 176 — printed folio 159. The critical-marks method continues. The ***Literate marks*** *conclude:* ***T*** *(*Tropos *— a Hebrew idiom, e.g. Naboth "blessed" = cursed God, 1 Kings 21:13);* Y *(rejection of the Jews — Isa 5);* Y***-ypogrammenon*** *(rejection of the old Law — Isa 1);* X Character *(an author's peculiar style — Plato, Gregory);* XX *(distinctive dogmas — Plato, Origen); and the Hebrew* ***Sagur*** *(closed) &* ***Petach*** *(open) paragraph-marks. Then* ***On the Illiterate Marks*** *— the ancient text-critical signs:* ✚ Stauron *(Christ-prophecies),* ■ Ancyra *(the New Covenant),* ■ Anciranos *(nota bene → the pointing hand),* ⁕ Asteriscus *(restorations from the Hebrew — Origen),* — Obelus *(spurious/superfluous — Susanna & Bel),* ■· Metobelus, *the* ***Ceraunion*** *(thunderbolt), and the* ***dotted Obelus*** *(doubtful — the Cainan crux, Luke 3:36). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p175] …[which is as much as if you should say,] "The best and most illustrious lot has fallen to me." And in the third volume of Kings: [T] *Naboth blessed God and the king, and therefore he was*

stoned — that is, because he cursed God and the king, he was killed with stones. [1]

Y — **Ypsilon** indicates that the sentence immediately following is to be expounded of the rejection and deposition of the Jewish people — as in this sentence of Isaiah: [Y] *I will show you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be laid waste; I will break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will make it desolate: it shall not be pruned, and it shall not be digged, but briers and thorns shall come up upon it; and I will command the clouds to rain no rain upon it.* [2]

Y — **Ypsilon ypogrammenon** (that is, "underwritten with a line") signifies that the sentence to which it is prefixed speaks of the rejection of the old Law according to the flesh. For example, when God says through Isaiah: [Y] *Offer sacrifice no more in vain; incense is an abomination to me; the new moon and the sabbath and other festivals I will not abide. My soul hateth your calends and your solemnities: they are become troublesome to me, I am weary of bearing them.* [3]

X — **Character** (that is, a stylus, a figure, or — as Gellius interprets it — a kind of speech peculiar to each author): with this mark, as Diogenes Laertius writes, the Platonists were wont to note, in the books of Plato, the phrases and locutions proper and more choice to Plato; [4] which also, of old, in the writings of Gregory Nazianzen, Stratonicus testifies (in his *Collectanea*) that certain zealous annotators of the "Gregorian character" were wont to do.

XX — **Character duplicatus** (the doubled Character): with this sign, as Diogenes reports, in the Platonic works, was employed to designate the opinions and dogmas proper to Plato, [5] in which he entirely dissented from the other philosophers. This mark, in the volumes of Origen, Gregory Nazianzen and Basil placed, to indicate his peculiar dogmas that were discrepant from the common definition of the fathers.

ס — **Segar** (that is, "Closure"), inserted in the sacred codices of the Hebrews, signifies that the following narration coheres with the prior [a "closed" section].

פ — **Petach** (that is, "Gate," or "opening"), in the same divine volumes of the Jews, shows that the following narration has a different subject from the prior [an "open" section].

On the Illiterate Marks

✚ — **Stauron** (in Greek; in Latin, *Crux*, the Cross) is prefixed to the clauses of the old testament which contain a prophecy of Christ — such as that in the twenty-first Psalm: [✚] *They have dug my hands and my feet, they have numbered all my bones;* [6] and in the sixty-eighth Psalm: [✚] *They gave me gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.* [7]

■ — **Ancyra** (that is, an Anchor prefixed to a sentence) shows that in it mention is made of the new testament and of the Gospel — as in Jeremiah, chapter 31, where it is read: [■] *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant which I made with your fathers, when I led them out of the land of Egypt. And this shall be the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel: I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart.* [8]

■ — **Anciranos** (that is, "the upper Anchor") was placed both to the sacred reading and to the commentaries of the expositors, where some matter was especially to be observed and noted beyond the rest. Now, in the place of this mark, the Jurists have substituted a **hand**, which with extended index finger points out the place. ☞

⁕ — **Asteriscus** (that is, an Asterism, or Star) shows words and sentences of divine scripture which the earlier interpreters omitted, but which the later Interpreters restored from the Hebrew truth. As, for example, in Jerome's translation, at Hosea: the Asterisk shining before that sentence — *Out of Egypt I called my son* [9] — marks that it was passed over by the Seventy interpreters, and was at last restored to its place by Jerome.

In the works of Plato this mark was placed for the approval of dogmas.

— — Obelus (that is, a "Spit," a lance, or a spear; or a "lying-down" [horizontal], or transverse pyramidal little rod) is prefixed to words or sentences of the divine codices superfluously repeated, or in those places where the reading seems adventitious, of uncertain, obscure, or ambiguous authority — so that by such a mark, as by an arrow, suspect and superfluous things may be transfixed. Thus Jerome says that, in the book of Daniel, he transfixed the histories of Susanna and of Bel [10] (because they were not had in the Hebrew volumes) by prefixing the throat-cutting Spit, as narrations taken — beyond the Hebrew truth — from Theodotion's edition. Epiphanius relates that Origen, first of all, applied to the codices of divine scripture the Asterisks (to illustrate what had been lacking before) and the Obeli (to cut the throat of superfluous things). [11]

■· — **Metobelus** (that is, "after the spit") is placed immediately after words or sentences that have been "throat-cut" [obelized], so that the obelized [words] may be distinguished by their wording from the rest that follow in the text. As, when in Psalm 21, according to the Septuagint edition, it is read: *God, my God, look upon me, why hast thou forsaken me?* — it appears that those two words, *look upon me*, placed between the obelus and the metobelus, are superfluous. [12]

Ceraunion (that is, a "thunderbolt") is placed whenever many verses are disapproved, lest they be obelized one by one. With which sign Julius Africanus rejected the histories of Susanna and Bel, added at the end of the book of Daniel. In the Platonic books, the Ceraunion was taken up for the moral instruction of philosophy.

Obelus agnostigmenon (that is, "you have a point above" — the dotted obelus) is placed in those [passages] about which it is doubted whether they ought to be removed or added. For example, in the third chapter of Luke, the generation of Cainan — which the Evangelist interposed between the generation of Arphaxad and of Sale [Shelah], counting fifteen generations from Adam to Heber [Eber] — seems to be marked with an obelus dotted above: because in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis, and in the beginning of the first [book] of Paralipomenon [Chronicles], from Adam to Heber, only fourteen generations are counted, and no mention at all is made of the generation of Cainan. [13] [continues p177]

[1] 1 Kings 21:13 (cited as 3 Kings). [2] Isa. 5:5–6. [3] Isa. 1:13–14. [4] Locutions proper to Plato were marked by his imitators with the sign X. [5] Plato's dogmas were marked by a fixed sign. [6] Ps. 21:17–18 (Vulgate; = Ps. 22:16–17). [7] Ps. 68:22 (Vulgate; = Ps. 69:21). [8] Jer. 31:31–33. [9] Hos. 11:1; Matt. 2:15. [10] Dan. 13. [11] Origen, first of all, applied asterisks and obeli to the divine Scriptures. [12] Ps. 21:2 (Vulgate; = Ps. 22:1). [13] Luke 3:36.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 177 — printed folio 160. The critical-signs method concludes: **Limniscus** & **Sublimniscus** (variant renderings — different vs. identical wording), **Antigraphus** (translators' divergences — Gen 37:2), **Antisigma** (transposed order — the beatitudes, Matt 5), **Cryphia** (unsolved questions — Rom 11:33), **Diple** (Scripture-citations → the modern » mark), **Diple peristigme** (added/removed passages), and **Scilus nechudoth** ("three points" — the Kabalists' letter-reading, e.g. רבים "many" = Rome / Babylon / Greece / Media, on Ps 3:2); Origen borrowed these signs from Plato. Then the **seven sigla** for the Greek versions of the OT (Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Fifth / Sixth / Seventh editions). Finally **Method Eight: On Paraphrase** opens. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p176] **Limniscus** (that is, a little rod lying between twin points — one above, one below) is placed on those [passages] which the various interpreters of sacred scripture translated with the same sense but with different words [1] — as when, in the old psalter, in the seventy-first Psalm, according to the Septuagint edition, was placed *And their name is honorable before him;* immediately, a Limniscus (÷) being added, was subjoined *In his eyes*, according to another translation. Origen therefore interposed the Limniscus between these two translations, so that you might recognize that one sentence had been rendered by two interpreters in two different ways. This mark is taken from the surgeons, [2] among whom a *limniscus* is a lint,

or worn little linen cloth, made into a thin and long form, which is inserted into the two sections of an incised wound.

Sublimniscus (that is, a Simple line having a point beneath it) signifies that the sentence to which it is placed was translated by two or three interpreters with the same sense, and in the same words.

Antigraphus (that is, a Semicircle facing right, and holding a point within itself) signifies that in the translations there is a sense either different among the translators themselves, or dissenting from the Hebrew truth itself — as that place of Genesis which in Hebrew is read, *And Joseph accused his brothers to their father of a most wicked crime*, [3] which Aquila rendered with a sense not only different from our edition, but plainly diverse from the Hebrew scripture itself: *His brothers had accused Joseph to their father of a most wicked crime.*

Antisigma (a reversed C) is placed at those lines and verses of divine scripture whose order is to be transposed — as it is also found placed in the ancient authors. For example, when in the Greek edition of the Gospel according to Matthew (which Chrysostom used and expounded) "the beatitude of those who mourn" is placed before "the beatitude of the meek," the "beatitude of those who mourn" is to be marked with the sign (·), so that the reader may know that the true order of the two beatitudes has been transposed. [4] Jerome, in the place of this sign, in his translation of the book of Esther, employed the first eight letters of the Greek alphabet — written in red, from alpha to theta — so that from their position he might restore the order of the Hebrew history, which had been tossed up and down by the Seventy interpreters.

Cryphia (that is, "Concealment" — the lower part of a circle, containing a point within itself) is placed in those places where a doubtful and obscure question could not be opened or solved. Which mark some of the most ancient fathers prefixed to the words of Paul in the eleventh chapter to the Romans, *O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God!* [5] — wishing by this sign to indicate that that question, about the election of the Gentiles and the reprobation of the Jews (attempted by the Apostle in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters), was not solved by him. The same mark the old expositors used in their commentaries, where they left an arduous difficulty undecided.

Diple (■): writers placed this in the books of ecclesiastical men, to separate or point out the testimonies of the holy scriptures, lest they be confounded with the words and reading of the commentaries. Now, in the place of this mark, this mark » has succeeded.

Diple peristigme (that is, "with twin points"): the ancients placed this on those [verses] which Zenodotus of Ephesus had wrongly added to, or removed from, the Homeric poems. The ecclesiastics used it on those [passages] which the interpreters had added to, or taken from, the Hebrew truth.

Scilus nechudoth [*shalosh nekudoth*, "three points"] — these three points, placed over any letter — are in use among the Kabalists, the Jewish expositors, whenever, through the individual letters of some word, they wish individual words to be understood. For example, when in the third Psalm it is said, *Many rise up against me*, [6] the Kabalists, expounding this of the Jewish people, ask: who are the רבים (*rabim*), that is, the "Many," who rise up against the people of Israel? And they answer: These are those four peoples which David signifies by the four letters of the word רבים *Rabim* — that is, ר (resh), the Romans; ב (beth), the Babylonians; י (Iod), the Ionians, or Greeks; מ (mem), the Medes, or Persians. For these four words the letters, marked above with points, show. There are also very many other marks of this artifice; but these are more than enough for an example of the present discipline. Diogenes Laertius, in the third book *On the Lives of the Philosophers*, testifies that many of the aforesaid marks were placed in the books of Plato [7] — which I judge Origen took thence, and transferred to the illustration of the divine volumes.

Besides these already-described marks, there are also certain characters by which those seven famous translations of the old testament are noted, namely:

• Ο signifies the edition of the seventy-two interpreters [Septuagint]; for which character the Latin expositors frequently put **LXX**, the number "two" being omitted, for brevity's sake. [8]

• ΑΚ connotes the translation of Aquila.

• Σ designates the version of Symmachus.

• Θ shows the interpretation of Theodotion.

• ε (small epsilon) demonstrates the fifth Greek edition, found by Origen in the city of Jericho, in Palestine.

• ☐ (called *Episigmon*, for so this mark is named) shows the sixth Greek edition, found by Origen on the Actian shore, near Nicopolis, in jars.

• Λ designates the seventh edition, published by Lucian the martyr.

On Paraphrase — The Eighth Method

Paraphrase (ΠΑΡΑΦΡΑΣΙΣ), *Ecphrasis*, or *Metaphrasis* — which (the distinction of certain rhetoricians being omitted) I wish to signify the same thing [9] — is that [method] which turns the very narration of divine scripture into another narration corresponding to it in proportion; in which indeed, as Themistius asserts in the preface of Aristotle's *Posterior [Analytics]*, [it is permitted]… [10] [continues p178]

[1] Ps. 71:14 (Vulgate; = Ps. 72:14). [2] What the Limniscus is. [3] Gen. 37:2. [4] Matt. 5:4–5. [5] Rom. 11:33. [6] Ps. 3:2. [7] Origen took many marks from the books of Plato, in order to illustrate the divine Scriptures. [8] The Latins, for brevity's sake, put LXX for LXXII. [9] What paraphrase is. [10] What is permitted to the paraphrast, according to the opinion of Themistius.

*(Rich PDF p. 178 — printed folio 161. **Method Eight (Paraphrase)**, worked out on Psalm 116. The paraphrast's licenses: to compress, expand, supply, clarify, and reorder — always keeping the sense. Two species: a **stricter** one (a free translation — the **Targums** of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph) and a **fuller** one in two varieties — following the sense (Gregory of Neocaesarea, Titelmann) or clinging to every word (the **Interwoven Paraphrase** of Snoy of Gouda). Four worked examples on Psalm 116 follow: a **Translational** paraphrase, a **Broader** one (Titelmann), and two **Interwoven** ones (Snoy's, and Sixtus's own — the biblical words shown in bold, woven through the expansion). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p177] …[in which indeed, as Themistius asserts in the preface of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*,] it is permitted to the Paraphrast — the integrity of the same sense being always preserved — to compress things prolix and poured out at length; freely to dilate and amplify things terse and concise; to supply things omitted; to fill up things gaping; to illustrate things involved and obscure with open and conspicuous words; and to adorn [them] with a becoming elegance of speech; and to connect those things which seem far separated among themselves and disposed in no order, and to arrange [them] in an ordered series.

Now there are **two species of Paraphrase**: [1] the one more compressed and stricter, which is nothing else than a certain freer translation — whether you call it a Paraphrastic translation, or a Translational Paraphrase, you will call it rightly. In this species there excelled, among the Hebrews, Onkelos, Jonathan, and Joseph, who published the **Targum** — that is, a Paraphrase upon the whole old testament in the Chaldaic tongue.

The **other**, which is somewhat fuller and broader, is distinguished by a twofold variety: of which the former, which follows the sense of the words rather than the words themselves, elucidates the meaning of the sacred reading under a certain copious brevity — in which matter, among the Greeks, Gregory bishop of Neocaesarea availed much, and among the Latins, Francis Titelmann. But the latter [variety], which contains more artifice, is so tenacious of the words that it does not suffer even a single word of the sacred context to be transposed, or changed, or omitted. This latter variety is called by us — and not ineptly — the **Interwoven Paraphrase**, [2] because it interweaves and connects the words of the sacred reading together

with the very words of elucidation with such artifice that, unless both be distinguished by characters (whether by size or by form), these could not easily be discerned from those. An example of this skill — no less laborious than profitable — Rainer Snoy of Gouda furnished, in the Paraphrase of all the psalms published by him; which, together with the formulas of the other Paraphrases, I have thought worth inserting here.

An Example of Translational Paraphrase, on Psalm 116

Praise the Lord, all nations; extol him with praises, all peoples wheresoever you are. For most copiously has he used toward us his twofold mercy, and his constancy in the promises themselves is to endure perpetually.

An Example of the Broader Paraphrase, following the sense rather than the words (from Francis Titelmann, on the same Psalm)

[Praise the Lord, all nations:] *O all you nations of the Gentiles, who once were far from God, serving idols and demons and ignorant of the true God — now give praise and glory to God the Lord, in whom, taught by the apostolic preaching, you have believed.*

[Praise him, all peoples:] *Nor let the people of the Jews alone henceforth praise God; but, without distinction, all the nations of the peoples, wheresoever established on earth, equally praise together the Lord God.*

[For his mercy is confirmed over us:] *For now, in this time of grace, it has been fulfilled for all us believers, and by [His] work the mercy once promised to the fathers has been exhibited — that is, the redemption of the human race through Christ. And the mercy of the Lord (from which we were once far, when we were by nature children of wrath) is now corroborated and established over us who believe, so that it can never be taken away from us who believe in Him.*

[And the truth of the Lord remains forever:] *And the truth of His promises will not fail us for ever; but what He promised, He will keep for the believers with infallible truth. Which twofold consideration ought indeed to be matter of the greatest joy to all believers.*

An Example of the Interwoven Paraphrase, from Rainer Snoy of Gouda, in which the words of the sacred context are distinguished from the words of elucidation by differently-formed letters

(the sacred text in **bold**, *the elucidation in plain type)*

Praise the Lord — God — **all nations** of the whole world; **praise him** — and magnify [the] benefits freely bestowed — **all peoples** of the Jews to be converted to the faith. **For it is confirmed** — by the effect of Christ's incarnation — **over us** the faithful — his **mercy**, and our reparation mercifully promised; for what he promised through the prophets, he fulfilled by the coming of Christ — **and the truth of the Lord** — which is Christ — **remains** with us unto eternity, even to the consummation of the age.

Another Example of the Interwoven Paraphrase, from our own commentaries on various psalms, in which the [sacred] context is distinguished from the exposition by capital letters

Praise the one and true God, creator of heaven and earth, and **Lord** of the whole world, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ — **all** you **nations** diffused through the whole world of lands, who live piously and holily according to the laws of nature; but especially, and before all nations, **praise**, celebrate, and with innumerable praises, hymns, Psalms, and canticles extol **him** — not with voice and tongue alone, but with the affections of the mind and works conformable to the voice; proclaim him, **all** you twelve tribes of Israel, and **peoples** of the renowned Jews, whom the Lord chose for himself as a peculiar possession out of all the

nations of the earth by a certain singular privilege. And the Lord is to be praised by you — both Gentiles and Jews — chiefly for this cause: **for**, bestowed and most fully completed, **is confirmed** (and in these latest times bountifully and splendidly poured out) **over us** — not only Jews, but also Gentiles — his **mercy**, the kindness and grace of human reparation exhibited to us in Christ Jesus, **his** only-begotten **Son**; **and** again and again is God to be celebrated by us with perpetual praise, because the **truth** of the promises which God once made through the prophets, in the holy scriptures, concerning the sending of His Son — and the fidelity of God the Father and of our **Lord**, and the firmness of His words, and the constancy of His promises — has not fallen away or utterly vanished, but has remained fixed, and still unmoved **remains**, and is so stable **unto eternity**, and shall abide for ever and ever, that no force can ever break, weaken, or change it. [continues p179]

[1] There are two species of paraphrase. [2] Why the "interwoven" paraphrase is so called.

*(Rich PDF p. 179 — printed folio 162. **Method Nine: On the Lexical Method** — dictionary/vocabulary exposition, in two varieties (**Universal** biblical dictionaries — Philo, Origen, Jerome, Pagninus; and **Particular** word-glosses within a commentary — Guilliaud, Pintus), illustrated by a word-by-word gloss of Psalm 116 with Hebrew etymologies (*Hallelujah = hallelu + Yah, Gentes = goim, gavar, emeth, chasdo, menei*). Then **Method Ten: On Annotation** — brief scattered glosses/scholia (Apollinarius; Hugh of St. Victor; Anselm of Laon's **Interlinear Gloss**); two kinds, **marginal** and **interlinear** — with a worked example on Psalm 116: the Marginal Gloss keyed by letters a–f to its Marginal Annotations. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p178]

On the Lexical Method — The Ninth Method

The **Lexical** (that is, Vocabulary, or Dictionary) exposition, which declares the grammatical signification of words, has two varieties [1] — namely the **Universal** and the **Particular** — distinguished among themselves not otherwise than as whole and parts. Of these, the former first tears apart all the words and terms (Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Latin) comprehended in the whole compass of divine scripture; then, once torn apart and distinguished, it reduces them into lexicons and dictionaries according to alphabetical order. In which kind of labor Philo the Jew and Origen among the Greeks, and Jerome and Sanctes [Pagninus] among the Latins, happily toiled. But the latter variety, of which we now especially speak, can in a manner be called a little part of the former. This [variety] certain expositors, most studious of order and perspicuity, are wont to use: who, in expounding the particular chapters, sections, and periods of the volumes, in the first place set forth the grammatical elucidation of the words, then, in the second place, subjoin the exposition of the senses, separated from the former. Which, among the Latins, Claudius Guilliaud excellently performed in his commentaries on the epistles of Paul, and Hector Pintus in his explanations of Isaiah. An example of this latter part will be this:

An Example of Lexical Exposition, on Psalm 116

HALLELUJAH (הללויה): this word, among the Hebrews, is composed of two words — namely, the verb הללו *hallelu*, and the noun יה *ia* [Yah] — of which the former signifies "Praise," the latter "God." For *Ia* [Yah] is one of the names of God, which — as R. David Kimchi asserts — is called *Ia* because he is the creator of the world, and the cause of being to the world itself; for *Ia* comes from the verb היה *haiah*, which signifies "Was."

NATIONS (*Gentes*): in Hebrew are called גוים *goim*; by which name the Jews are wont commonly to call all the nations which are not of the race of the Jews.

IS CONFIRMED (*Confirmata est*): in Hebrew is said גבר *gavar*; which word the Chaldaic interpreter and the Greek translated more significantly — for the former rendered אגבר *Agebar*, but the latter ἐκραταιώθη — of which both signify "is strengthened, is made valid and strong."

TRUTH (*Veritas*): in Hebrew, אמת *emeth*; in this place it signifies not only the adequation of the thing to the intellect, but chiefly denotes the fidelity, constancy, and firmness of [God's] sayings and promises.

HIS MERCY (*Misericordia eius*): in Hebrew, חסדו *chasdo*; the Chaldaic translated it טוביה *tuvia*, that is, "Goodness," or "kindness."

REMAINS (*Manet*): in Greek, μένει; this word is not had in the Hebrew, but only in the Greek and Latin edition; yet it is understood.

On Annotation — The Tenth Method

Annotations — which the Greeks call Σημειώσεις [*semeioseis*], σχόλια [*scholia*], and Γλώσσας [*glossas*]; we may call them *Annotamenta*, *Vacationes*, *Excerpta*, or *Lingulae* [little tongues] [2] — are those by which, whenever there is no leisure for composing complete commentaries, we illustrate the holy letters here and there, scattered, with brief little interpretations — as with little stars, little tongues, and certain points — annotating only those things which seem either more obscure or more notable. In this labor, most famous among the Greeks was Apollinarius; among the Latins, Hugh of St. Victor, and Anselm of Laon, the author of the Gloss which is called the Interlinear. [3]

Now among the glossators there are two varieties of Glosses, [4] which differ among themselves by no other reason than the site and position of the writing. Of these, the one, which is placed around the margins of the sacred context, they call extrinsic, or **marginal**; the other, intrinsic, or **interlinear** — because it is fitted within the enclosure of the lines, written in smaller letters. Of both, these are examples: in which the little alphabetic marks, interposed among the words, show the places of the annotations corresponding to the places of the sacred context.

An Example of the Marginal Gloss on Psalm 116

(the superscript letters key each word to its annotation below)

■*Alleluia.* Praise ■*the Lord, all nations,* ■*praise him,* ■*all peoples. For confirmed over us is* ■*his mercy,* ■*and the truth of the Lord remains for ever.*

Marginal Annotations

- ■ Although this psalm is now, in the codices of the Hebrews, ἀνεπίγραφος [*anepigraphos*] — that is, destitute of a title — yet in the Greek copies, and in the Latin edition of Jerome, the title *Alleluia* is prefixed; from which title it is gathered that the psalm is ἐπαινετικὸν [*epainetikon*, laudatory], and contains praises and thanksgivings. [5]
- ■ With the heart, with the mouth, with work.
- ■ He puts the Gentiles before the Jews, because few of the Jews believed, [but] many of the Gentiles. [6]
- ■ By "peoples" he understands the Jews; or, under other words, he repeats the same sentence — redoubling the word of praise, and intending [it] more and more.
- ■ [It is] the grace of human redemption.
- ■ The truth, I say, of the Gospel given through Christ; for the law contained not the truth, but the shadow of the truth: for *grace*, says John, *and truth came through Christ.* [continues p180]

[1] There are two varieties of the Lexical [method]. [2] What are called Annotations. [3] Anselm of Laon was the author of the Interlinear Gloss. [4] The Gloss is distributed into interlinear and marginal. [5] Psalm 116 contains praises and thanksgivings. [6] The Gentiles are put

*(Rich PDF p. 180 — printed folio 163. Completes **Method Ten** with the worked **Example of the Interlinear Gloss, from Anselm of Laon** on Psalm 116 (superscript letters keying each word to its interlined gloss). Then **Method Eleven: On Commentary** — a brief, somewhat fuller exposition than annotation (Ammonius Hermeas on* Hyponemata *= "preparations for coordinated writings"; Jerome's Matthew commentary in 15 days; the rival fuller "explanation"). Then opens **Method Twelve: On the Sciographic (Shadow-Drawing) Exposition** — teaching by pictures and diagrams (Noah's Ark, the Mosaic tabernacle, Solomon's temple, Ezekiel's temple and city, a map of Palestine, the priestly vestments); Ezekiel's brick-tile siege-drawing (Ezek 4) as biblical warrant; catalogue of masters begins (Eusebius, Jerome, Richard of St. Victor, Cassiodorus, Bede…). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p179]

An Example of the Interlinear Gloss, from Anselm of Laon — on Psalm 116

(the interlined letters, set above the words, key each word to the little gloss written beneath it)

Praise the Lord, all ■*nations:* praise ■*him.*

■ *the Gentiles.* ■ *others also, and praise him together.*

All ■*peoples.* ■*For* ■*confirmed is*

■ *the Jews.* ■ *for this cause.* ■ *the Holy Spirit being given, while the enemies yield to the Name, on account of which we are set free.*

Over us ■*his mercy:* and the ■*truth* of the ■*Lord*

■ *the restoration of man, mercifully granted.* ■ *Christ's.* ■ *Christ, who is the truth of the Father.*

■*remains for ever.*

■ *otherwise: "unto age of age."*

On Commentary — The Eleventh Method

Commentary — which in Greek is called ἀπομνημάτικη [*apomnematike*] [1] — is a brief exposition of divine scripture, somewhat more copious than Annotation or the scholastic Method; in which we gather together whatever things occur to us day by day, both from the daily reading of authors and from our own invention, and come into the mind; and we write down both our own opinions and those of other expositors, without much care and order, almost extemporaneously — preparing, as it were, material either for ourselves or for others toward constructing far greater and far ampler volumes of explanations. Ammonius Hermeas said that *Hyponemata* (that is, Commentaries) are "preparations for συντάγματα [*syntagmata*]" [2] — that is, coordinated writings, which over much time and with much skill are reduced into order. Now it has passed into custom that under the common name of "commentaries" almost all the kinds of explanation are understood. D. Jerome professed this order of commenting above the rest, in his exposition of the sixteen Prophets, and especially in the four books of Commentaries on Matthew — which he completed within the space of fifteen days with the swiftest haste. This Method needs no adducing of an example. Over against it certain men set another Method of expounding, which by a proper and peculiar appellation they call **explanation** [3] — entirely contrary to the brevity of Commentary; for "explanation," according to their own definition, is a most broad and most copious explication, long and much meditated.

On the Sciographic (Shadow-Drawing) Exposition — The Twelfth Method

The **Sciographic** — that is, the *Shadow-drawing* and *Pictorial* exposition [4] — is that which, by various delineations of figures and images, sets before the eyes more clearly and more openly those things which could not be very openly expressed in words; devised by the sacred expositors not so much for the sake of ornament and beauty as by reason of necessity. For, as in the Mathematical disciplines there are held almost innumerable things which, without the drawing-out of lines and figures, can neither be taught nor learned, so there are very many things in the sacred letters [5] which cannot be conceived by thought unless the images of the things themselves, expressed by shadows or by pictures, are beheld by the gaze of the eyes: such as are the form and figure of the Ark built by Noah; the structure of the Mosaic tabernacle; the disposition of Solomon's temple; the composition of the temple and city described by Ezekiel, and the fitting-together of its wheels; the Geographic description of the Holy Land, or of all Palestine; the ornament of the priestly vestments — which, without the aid of pictures and the addition of certain brief annotations beneath the pictures themselves, can scarcely and with difficulty be understood. But on the contrary, when pictures are employed, we attain much more by a single intuition than by long and numerous reading of commentaries; for what is gathered by the eyes is apprehended far more distinctly by the mind, and retained more tenaciously in the memory, than what is perceived by the ears alone. [6] Whence God himself, when he had put forth the prophecy which the prophet Ezekiel had uttered concerning the future siege of the Holy City, wishing it to be more openly explained and more deeply engraved in the minds of the Jews, commands the Prophet that, upon a brick-tile or abacus, he should delineate by Geometric art the σκιογραφίαν [*skiographian*], or shadowy picture, of the several parts of the prophecy — the form of the besieged city being sketched, together with valleys, ramparts, battering-rams, engines, and hostile camps, and the other things necessary for the siege and assault of cities — so that from the aspect of that picture the Jewish people might more surely and exactly recognize, as it were part by part, the harms foretold to it. [7]

They have given us, in this kind of exposition, most praiseworthy Works: **Eusebius**, chiefly the bishop of Caesarea, who first depicted the topography of the whole Holy Land, a brief declaration of the same picture being added; [8] **Jerome**, who expressed the habit and shape of the entire Pontifical vestment with an elegant delineation; [9] **Richard Victorinus** [Richard of St. Victor], who designed the architecture of Ezekiel's temple in tables by Geometric methods; [10] **Cassiodorus Senator**, whose picture of the old tabernacle is most celebrated; **Bede** the Presbyter, who wrought out the schemata of the Mosaic Tabernacle and of the temple of Solomon's work with the greatest art and fidelity; [11] Al■ [→ p181]

[1] What Commentary is. [2] Commentaries are preparations for coordinated writings. [3] Explanation is by some set over against Commentary. [4] What the Sciographic exposition is. [5] In the Scriptures there are many things which cannot be conceived by thought, unless their images, expressed by shadows or pictures, are beheld by the gaze of the eyes. [6] More distinctly is it apprehended by the mind, and more tenaciously retained in memory, what is beheld by the eyes than what is perceived by the ears alone. [7] Ezekiel 4. [8] Eusebius of Caesarea first depicted the topography of the Holy Land. [9] Jerome depicted the habit of the pontifical vestment. [10] Richard Victorinus designed the structure of Ezekiel's temple in tables. [11] Bede handed down the schemata of the Mosaic tabernacle and of Solomon's temple.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 181 — printed folio 165. Finishes the catalogue of masters of the **Sciographic (pictorial) exposition** (Albrecht Dürer on the Tower of Babel; Johannes Buteo on the shape of Noah's Ark; others in Sixtus's own* On the Catholic Expositors*), then introduces a worked pictorial example: a full-page woodcut of **the Attire of the Aaronic Pontiff** (the High Priest's vestment), with a succinct declaration drawn from Philo, Josephus, Clement (Stromata V), and Jerome, its several parts keyed by letter-marks. The page is mostly the woodcut itself; the lettered key follows on p182. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing from p180]

…**Albrecht Dürer**, who also first demonstrated with the brush the form of the Tower of Babylon, and how many thousands of men could conveniently dwell in it; **Johannes Buteo**, who demonstrated the type of Noah's Ark by Mathematical skill; and, besides these, very many others, enumerated by us in the book *On the Catholic Expositors of Divine Scripture*. [1] Of this [kind of] exposition we display to you an example, in a

picture of the Pontifical vestment [2] which the supreme Priest of the Hebrews once used — a succinct declaration being appended from Philo and Josephus, from the fifth book of the *Stromata* of Clement, and from Jerome — which declares, by the marks of numeral-characters, the several parts and ornaments of that vestment.

The Attire of the Aaronic Pontiff

[The lettered declaration of the vestment continues → p182]

[1] Albrecht Dürer [depicted] the form of the Tower of Babylon, and Johannes Buteo the form of Noah's Ark. [2] We exhibit an example in the picture of the Pontifical vestment.

*(Rich PDF p. 182 — printed folio 165 (recto; the folio numbering runs irregularly through the plate here — see the edition note). The **lettered declaration of the High Priest's vestment** keyed to the p181 woodcut: **P** the linen tunic (*Kethoneth*), **R** the blue robe (*Meil*) with its 72 bells and pomegranates, **C** the Ephod (*Superhumerale*), **E** the two onyx/emerald shoulder-stones (*Shoham*), **T** the girdle (*Abnet — with a swipe at Vatablus and Castalio*), **D** the breastplate (*Choshen/Rationale*) with its 12 tribal gems, **M** and **G** the golden rings and chains, **Q** the mitre (*Mitznepheth*) crowned with the golden plate bearing the Tetragrammaton. Then opens **Method Thirteen: On the Tabular (Columnar) Exposition** — a two-column table (Scripture word / exposition), demonstrated by beginning the **Exposition of Psalm 116**. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing from p181 — the declaration of the vestment, by letters]

P. בכתנת *Kethoneth* — that is, the linen Tunic, or the inner Linen shift; in Greek ποδήρης [*pod■r■s*], that is, ankle-length. This clings to the body, and is so tight, with narrow sleeves, that there is scarcely any wrinkle in it, especially from the upper part; and it descends down to the legs and ankles.

R. מעיל *Meil* — a hyacinth-colored ankle-length tunic of the same color, with narrow sleeves; in the upper part, where it is drawn on around the neck, open as far as the middle of the breast; at its extreme and lowest hem — that is, at the feet — having a border distinguished, by wondrous art, with purple, scarlet, and golden flowers as well as gems; from which hang seventy-two golden bells and as many golden pomegranates, so arranged that between each pair of bells there is one pomegranate, and between two pomegranates one bell — so that, when the Pontiff enters into the Holy of Holies, he may go forth wholly vocal, sonorous, and most to be revered by the people.

C. אפד *Ephod* — which the Septuagint interpreter [renders] ἐπωμίδα [*ep■mida*], Aquila ἐπίγραμμα [*epigramma*]; we may call it the **Superhumerale** (shoulder-piece), because it is laid over both shoulders. It is an elegant little sleeveless cloak, woven of hyacinth, scarlet, purple, and gold, after the manner of a monastic scapular without a cowl; it has two shoulder-pieces — that is, it consists of two equal parts, of which one covers the back, the other the breast down to the navel; in which, around the middle of the breast, a certain empty hollow (*lacuna*) is left for the reception of the Rational.

E. שהם *Shoham* — which the Septuagint translated "emeralds" (*Smaragdos*), Josephus "sardonyxes." They are two gems enclosed in gold, of such magnitude that on each of them the names of six Patriarchs are contained, engraved; which, in place of clasps, join the shoulder-pieces on both sides around the neck.

T. אבנט *Abnet*, in Chaldaic המיינא *Hemyana* — is a girdle, or a broad belt (Zone) four fingers wide, empty within, so woven that it might seem the slough of a serpent putting off its old age, or the intestine of some oblong animal; consisting of a byssine (linen) thread, interwoven with flowers and gems of scarlet, purple, hyacinth, and gold; which, once and again around the breast, binds the ephod and the tunics, and flows down to the ankles. Wherefore Vatablus and Castalio err, [1] who in their scholiastic annotations painted this Zone in the likeness of a short and broad strap descending from the breast down to the navel, according to the

measure of the Ephod; for the aforesaid description of Philo refutes them.

D. חשן *Choshen*, in Greek λόγιον [*logion*] — we may name it the **Rationale** (breastplate). It is a cloth of a palm's breadth square, variegated with gold and the same colors as the Ephod, so that it fills up exactly the square hollow left before the breast; to which are inwoven and bound with gold twelve gems of diverse kinds, incomparable in magnitude, beauty, and price, distinguished into four rows, so that in each little row three stones are placed, and on each stone one of the names of the tribes is engraved.

M. טבעות זהב *Tabbaoth Zahav* — are four golden rings, one at each of the four corners of the Rational, having opposite to themselves — on the edge of the hinder shoulder-piece, under the armpits — four other rings, by which the Ephod is fastened with intervening hyacinthine ribbons.

G. שרשרת זהב *Sharsheroth Zahav* — are golden chains, which, fastened by golden rings to the two upper corners of the Ephod that look toward the neck, were coupled in the upper part with the settings of the sardonyxes, lest the magnitude and weight of the stones should break the hyacinthine ribbons.

Q. מצנפת *Mitznepheth* — which the Greeks [call] τιάραν [*tiaran*]; some call it a Cap (*Galerum*), others an *Infula*, having the figure of a linen half-sphere little cap, and having no peak at the top, common to all the priests. Upon it is set another, somewhat higher, hyacinthine little cap, which the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, and Solomon in the book of Wisdom, call a **Mitre** and a **Diadem**. [2] A golden crown surrounds this with a triple row; in the hinder part of which little golden cups, very like the flowers of henbane, are seen; but in the front part, which overhangs the forehead, the holy Name of God — which by the Jews is reckoned ineffable — is incised with four Hebrew letters, namely י *Iod*, ה *He*, ו *Vau*, ה *He*.

On the Tabular (Columnar) Exposition — The Thirteenth Method

The **Tabular** — that is, the **Columnar** Method [3] — is a most orderly fitting-together of a compendious, lucid, and most rich exposition, by tables and columns; which sets before the eyes most clearly and most distinctly the sense of the Sacred reading, and, as it were in a mirror, demonstrates the elucidation of the individual words in a most beautiful order and a most fitting series of numbers, and greatly conduces to the ease of apprehension and the stability of memory. For this is implanted in us by nature: that the more distinctly and orderly things are set before the eyes, the more easily, lucidly, and distinctly the intellective faculty apprehends them, and the more tenaciously and longer the memory preserves them. Now the artifice of this kind of fitting-together is arranged [4] chiefly in two tablets, or columns, so digested on the same page that the first tablet, or column, contains the individual words of the Sacred reading — expressed in larger letters, collocated one under another from the head to the heel of the same column in most fitting order, and marked with their numbers; but the second column comprehends the words of the exposition, described in smaller characters, corresponding over against (*è regione*) the individual words of the Holy reading, so that in each line of Scripture one of the words of the Sacred context, and the exposition of that same word, are discerned at one and the same view — as appears in the subjoined example.

Exposition of Psalm 116

(First column: the words of the Psalm, numbered; second column: the exposition set over against each.)

1. **PRAISE** — with your minds admire, with your tongues declare, with your works express, the works of God. 2. **THE LORD** — God, and especially the Father, of things vi■ [→ p183]

[1] The error of Vatablus and Castalio, heretics. [2] Wisdom 18:24; Ecclesiasticus 45:14. [3] What the Tabular method is. [4] What the arrangement of the Tabular method is like.

*(Rich PDF p. 183 — printed folio 166. Finishes the **columnar Exposition of Psalm 116** (numbered words 2–14, each glossed). Then opens **Method Fourteen: On Narration** (public preaching) — its two species, the*

***Homily** (a familiar, homely address to the people, in three parts: Preparatory, Didactic, Adhortatory) and the **Declamation/Sermon** (same order but grander in style, sharper against vice; Chrysostom the supreme master). A worked **Example of a Homily on Psalm 116, gathered from St. John Chrysostom** begins: **First Part (Preparatory)** — the meadow-and-garden vs. the ever-green reading of the Psalms; **Second Part (Didactic)** — "Praise the Lord, all nations" as a short psalm of great meaning, the calling of the Gentiles (Hosea 2:23; Rom 9:25). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Exposition of Psalm 116 from p182]

2. **THE LORD** *(cont.)* — God, and especially the Father, the creator of all things visible and invisible: celebrate [him]. 3. **ALL** — as many of you as inhabit the whole globe of the earth, from East to West and from North to South. 4. **NATIONS** — you who, without circumcision, live piously and holily under the law of nature. 5. **PRAISE** — extol [him] with psalms, with hymns, and with all the applause of words and of affections. 6. **HIM** — whose glory all creatures perpetually declare. 7. **ALL** — twelve tribes of Israel: you, I say, above the other nations, praise him together. 8. **PEOPLES** — renowned [peoples] of the Hebrews, whom God by a singular privilege chose for himself, out of all the nations of the earth, as a peculiar possession. 9. **FOR** — for this cause chiefly is God to be praised most highly by us, both Jews and Gentiles: because — 10. **IS CONFIRMED** — that is, granted, and most fully completed, and in the last times poured out in abundance. 11. **OVER US** — not only the Jews, but also the Gentiles; not only the just, but also sinners. 12. **HIS MERCY** — the kindness and grace of human restoration, shown to us in the incarnation of Christ. 13. **AND THE TRUTH** — of the promises which he had made through the prophets concerning the sending of his Son: that [truth], I say. 14. **OF THE LORD** — the fidelity of God the Father, etc.

On Narration — The Fourteenth Method

Narration [1] is an exposition of divine scripture delivered publicly to the people; which is distinguished into the **Homily** and the **Declamation**. The **Homily** [2] — which some call a *Tractate*, others a *familiar colloquy* — is a familiar and homely elucidation of divine scripture to the common people, whose aim [3] is to explain the senses of the scriptures, not only that it may introduce the hearers to a thorough knowledge of the mysteries of sacred doctrine, but that it may exhort them to the observance and the execution of the things they have heard. For you understand in vain, unless you carry out in deed what you have grasped. [4] Now the homilists — that is, those who use such familiar colloquies with the people — are wont almost always to distribute their Homilies into three parts, [5] namely the **Preparatory**, the **Didactic**, and the **Adhortatory**. In the **First**, with brief but varied and pleasant introductions they pave the way for the hearers, while they briefly set before them the sum of the reading to be expounded, and show both its excellence, its delight, and its usefulness. In the **second** part they lucidly explain the words of the divine reading, whether according to the history, or according to the spiritual understanding, or according to both, as the matter requires. Then in the **Third** — which is always concluded in certain brief little prayers or doxologies — they descend to morals and to the ordering of life, exhort to virtue; and, as far as the law of familiar colloquy allows, piously admonish, moderately reprove, lightly rebuke, sweetly stir up the affections, call minds away from base and sordid cares, kindle them to the pursuit of the honorable, and inflame them to living well and blessedly.

The **Declamation**, or Sermon, [6] observes the same, and in nearly the same order, as the Homily — except that it uses a somewhat grander style, and, the course of the exposition being often interrupted, more frequently digresses to morals; more keenly rises up against the crimes of men; and, with greater vehemence of spirit and of words, and with a more stirring voice, reproves the wickedness of the multitude — more freely uncovering the peculiar vices of each order, state, and sex, more severely rebuking, more harshly chiding, and more gravely detesting them, yet always with the modesty of evangelical and true piety preserved. Supreme in both parts of this Method was **John Chrysostom**, [7] to whom the Greek Church never had a superior, nor the Latin an equal, nor perhaps will have hereafter.

An Example of a Homily on Psalm 116, gathered from St. John Chrysostom

First Part: Preparatory

Sweet indeed is a meadow, and a garden; yet far more sweetly than either breathes the divine reading of the Psalms. There, one may find flowers, but such as wither in time; here, on the other hand, there occur sentences that endure in their native vigor. There the west wind (Favonius) breathes; here the breeze of the Holy Spirit blows. There thorns hedge the garden in place of a wall; here the providence of God renders the reader safe. There the cicadas are clamorous with their shrilling; here [are] songs resounding with sweet jubilation. There, from the very sight, a certain delight is conceived; here, from the very hearing, very much of usefulness is plucked. For the meditation of the Psalms brings much pleasure and consolation; it draws the mind away from earth, exalts the thought, raises the spirit, and carries it aloft. A garden is circumscribed within some one place; but the melody of hymns is carried about in every inhabitable place of the earth. A garden, moreover, serves men's needs according to the quality of the seasons; but the reading of the Psalms flourishes alike in winter and in summer time, leafy on every side, and laden (dropping its grains) with the weight of its fruits. Be attentive, therefore, to the words of this Psalm, which we have undertaken to expound — the shortest of them all — for the sake of those who cannot hold long Psalms in memory.

Second Part: Didactic

PRAISE THE LORD, ALL NATIONS: it is a short Psalm, but one having great meaning; for it contains a Prophecy of the Church of believers, and a prediction of the evangelical preaching, which was to occupy the whole globe of the earth. For the Psalm calls together to the praise of God not merely two or three nations only, but ALL NATIONS and peoples. By "all nations and peoples" we understand here not only the Jews, but all the nations, as many as anywhere exist, in the whole world; of whom Hosea said: *I will call not-my-people, my people; and her that was not beloved, beloved: and [one] shall rise up to rule the nations: and the nations shall hope in him* [8] — which indeed came to pass, when the coming of Christ shone forth. Then he shows how much the nations [→ p184]

[1] What Narration is. [2] What a Homily is. [3] What the aim of the Homily is. [4] You understand in vain, unless you carry out in deed what you have grasped. [5] Homilies are wont to be distributed into three parts. [6] In what respects the Declamation differs from the Homily. [7] The greatest preacher was D. Chrysostom. [8] Hosea 2:23; Romans 9:25.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 184 — printed folio 167. Continues the worked **Chrysostom Homily on Psalm 116**. End of the **Didactic** part: "his mercy is confirmed over us" = we are saved by God's mercy alone; "and the truth of the Lord remains" = Christ is that Truth (John 1:17; 14:6). Then the whole **Third Part (Adhortatory)**: praising God is no light thing but the greatest sacrifice (Ps 50:23; 69:31); praise with deeds as well as words (Matt 5:16); the seraphim's praise and Isaiah's "Woe is me" (Isa 6:5); praise God with the angels (Ps 148); a wicked life makes God blasphemed among the nations (Rom 2:24 / Isa 52:5); guard tongue, lips, ears (Eph 4:29,31; Matt 5:33; Ps 50:20). Ends at the catchword "DOXO[logia]." Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing the Homily on Psalm 116, from p183 — Second Part, Didactic]

…the nations have occasion for praising [God], saying: **FOR HIS MERCY IS CONFIRMED OVER US** — that is, because not by our own deeds, nor by our life, nor by our own confidence, but by the mercy and clemency of God alone, are we saved. And this mercy, he says, is "confirmed" — that is, it has been made firm, strengthened, has grown together, and been made firm and solid, and harder than a rock. For it daily receives increase, daily spends itself, and never fails: so that it may daily rejoice in its gains, because *there is greater joy in heaven over one sinner converted from the vanity of his way than over ninety just who have no need of penance.* There follows: **AND THE TRUTH OF THE LORD REMAINS FOR EVER.** What is this truth that remains for ever? The Truth is Christ — so called because in his coming that truth shone forth most greatly which in the old testament had lain hidden under types and figures. Signifying this very thing,

the Evangelist also said: *The Law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Christ.* [1] This same truth is also that which holds a right, true, and whole faith, and which cleaves to Christ, who says, *I am the way, the truth, and the life* [2] — he is the truth that remains for ever, and leads us on to the Ancient of Days, to our eternal God, who abides without end. To his perpetual praise, therefore, the Psalm here calls us together.

Third Part: Adhortatory

Moreover, this praise which God requires of us is no light thing, but a mighty and most excellent ministry, the greatest sacrifice, and by far the offering most acceptable to God of all. For "the sacrifice of praise," he says, "shall glorify me"; and again, "I will praise the name of God, and I will magnify him with praise: and it shall please God above a young calf that puts forth horns and hoofs." [3] *Nothing does God require of us so much as praises and thanksgivings; for this cause he breathed a soul into us, made us rational, and severed us from the brutes by speech — that we might praise, celebrate, and continually glorify him. Not that he himself has need of our praising, but that he may teach us to be grateful, and to acknowledge the Bestower of so many good things; and that whatever gain comes from this celebration may return to ourselves, and make us ever worthy of greater helps. Now it is not, as some wrongly suppose, a matter of small moment and slight labor to praise God. Rather, if we would offer anything to God, we have nothing greater than praise, nothing more difficult than praise. "And what difficulty," you will say, "has praise? To whom, even of humble and abject condition, is it not easy to render this, and to praise God?" If you learn the matter diligently and exactly, O beloved, you will see both the labor that is in it, and the gain — which is very great — that is gathered from it. First, indeed, this praise is required of the just; and one must first rightly order one's life, and so sing hymns to God: for "praise is not comely in the mouth of a sinner."* [4] *Secondly, one must praise not with words only, but also with deeds: and this praise God chiefly requires, this glory. "Let your light so shine before men," he says, "that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."* [5] *So the Cherubim and Seraphim praise God; wherefore Isaiah too, when he had heard that mystical melody of the angels, afflicts himself and accounts himself wretched, saying: "Woe is me, for I am a man having unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people having unclean lips."* [6] *And therefore, when the Prophet enjoins that praises be offered, he begins from the higher Powers, saying thus: "Praise the Lord from the heavens, praise him all his angels."* [7] *One must therefore become an angel, and so praise God, that his glory may be made illustrious by the right ordering of our life. For just as, when we live wickedly, God is visited with insults and reproaches — God saying: "You have made me to be despised among the nations of the earth: and because of you my name is blasphemed among the Gentiles"* [8] *— so, when we take care for virtue, the name of God is glorified because of us by others also. And this is God's most glorious magnifying: when through countless tongues we offer him glorification, praising God not only with our own tongues, but also stirring up our neighbors to magnify God in our name. And this indeed comes to pass when, even in silence and saying nothing, we so live that men are astonished at our good works, and, bursting forth into divine praises, say: "Glory to you, O God — what manner of men are your servants! what philosophy they display! how they despise present things! how all things are reckoned by them a shadow and a dream, and they are fixed on nothing visible, but pass all things by, like men who dwell in a foreign land, as pilgrims, and daily long and pant to migrate out of this life!" How much, do you think, is God celebrated and magnified by these words? And — what is very admirable and rare — even those who so judge of us shortly desist from their error, and, provoked by our example, return to the best life.* [9] *For just as, when a light has appeared, it dispels the darkness, so also virtue, if it be conspicuous in us, puts wickedness to flight and drives off the darkness of error, and stirs up the minds of the beholders to glorify God, no less by words than by deeds. Let us therefore not think this praise of God a light matter, but let us strive that, before our very face, our life may praise him. Let us so order our life that we give no one occasion for blasphemy, but rather make all break forth into the praises of God; let us decline from evil, be zealous for virtue; let each one of you flee vice in continence, and work the virtue of sobriety. Whoever is hasty and of a rash tongue, and blurts out*

whatever comes to hand, let him set a guard upon his mouth, and never utter words without profit, but let him hear Paul saying: "Let all clamor, and wrath, and blasphemy, and obscenity and scurrility be taken away from you, with all malice" [10]; and again, "[Let] any good word [go forth] that is useful for edification, that it may give grace to the hearers." [11] Let him also flee vain oaths in every way, hearing the saying of Christ: "It was said to them of old, You shall not forswear yourself; but I say to you, Swear not at all." [12] And with all these let us fortify our tongue, our lips, and our mind, that nothing of evil thoughts may either be born within, or be uttered abroad through the tongue. Let us also carefully hedge our ears, that they hear not vain fables: as also blessed Moses enjoins, saying, "You shall not receive a vain report." [13] Let us not speak against our neighbor, lest David accuse us, saying: "Sitting, you spoke against your brother, and against the son of your mother you laid a stumbling-block." [14] If, then, we so exercise our ears, our tongue, our mind, and our works, and make our works consonant with our words, not only shall we be worthy praisers of God, but in our name also "all nations shall praise the Lord, and all peoples shall praise him together."

DOXO [logia → p185]

---

[1] John 1:17. [2] John 14:6. [3] Psalm 50:23 (Vulg. 49:23); Psalm 69:31–32 (Vulg. 68:31–32). [4] Ecclesiasticus 15:9. [5] Matthew 5:16. [6] Isaiah 6:5. [7] Psalm 148:1–2. [8] Romans 2:24 (citing Isaiah 52:5). [9] By the example of the good, the impious desist from error and return to the best life. — The praise of God is no light matter. [10] Ephesians 4:31. [11] Ephesians 4:29. [12] Matthew 5:33–34. [13] Exodus 23:1 (so cited; "You shall not receive a vain report"). [14] Psalm 50:20 (Vulg. 49:20).

---

*(Rich PDF p. 185 — printed folio 168. The **Doxology** closes the Chrysostom homily. Then **Method Fifteen: On Collation (Conference)** — expounding scripture by dialogue, in two species, **Continuous** (one speaker reports a conversation — Cassian's* Conferences*; Zacharias of Hierapolis's dialogue on Daniel's golden statue, the* ΧΡΥΣΕΙΚΩΝ*; Sadoleto on Romans) and **Interrupted** (speakers alternate, Plato/Cicero style — Apollinaris the Younger, Salonius, Gerson). Both are demonstrated on Psalm 116: a continuous collation (master and Aurelius) and an interrupted one (dialogue of Aurelius and Augustine: this short psalm is the compendium of all, since all God's works reduce to Mercy and Truth, Ps 25:10). Then opens **Method Sixteen: On Meditation** — the affective, contemplative exposition. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Homily on Psalm 116, from p184]

Doxology

Let us pray, that these things may be granted us by the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ: to whom, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be glory, dominion, and honor, now and always, and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

On Collation (Conference) — The Fifteenth Method

Collation, or the Collative exposition, [1] is that which expounds the divine oracles by familiar and mutual colloquies and dialogues; of which there are two species [2] — namely the **Continuous** and the **Interrupted**. Now the **Continuous** [3] is that in which, the course of the discourse being unbroken, one person speaks throughout, reporting a conversation held by himself or by another with others, and at the same time connecting, by the words "I say" and "he says," the questions and answers of those conversing — as among the Greeks Cebes the Theban did in the dialogue whose title is πίναξ [*pinax*], that is, the **Tablet**, explaining the sense of a mystical picture; and among the Latins Severinus Boethius, in the two dialogues he published on the exposition of Porphyry. But the **Interrupted** [4] is that in which — lest "I say" and "he says" be too often and tediously repeated — the progress of the narration is interrupted, and, after the manner of Plato and Cicero, various persons are brought in conversing among themselves and examining the senses of the sacred volumes by mutual questionings, so that the discourse seems to be held face to face as if by persons present. The former species of Collation was embraced, among the Greeks, by John Cassian, [5] discoursing on many

places of the divine letters in his *Conferences*; and by Zacharias, bishop of Hierapolis, in his dialogue upon the golden statue of Daniel, [6] which is entitled ΧΡΥΣΕΙΚΩΝ [*Chryseikon*, "the Golden Image"]; and among the Latins by Jacobus Sadoletus, bishop of Carpentras, in his commentaries on the epistle to the Romans. The latter species was followed, among the Greeks, by Apollinaris the Younger, bishop of Laodicea, reducing the evangelical and apostolic writings to the form of a dialogue; and among the Latins by Salonius, bishop of Vienne, and by John Gerson — of whom the former expounded the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes of Solomon, the latter the Song of Songs of Solomon, in dialogue. Examples of both species are these:

An Example of Continuous Collation, on Psalm 116

When yesterday, expounding the hundred-and-sixteenth Psalm in a sermon, I had said that this same Psalm is the beginning, end, sum, and compendium of all Psalms and Hymns, our Aurelius, who was then present, came to me when the discourse was finished; and when he had fallen into talk about the things I had spoken, he said that he wondered how this Psalm — by far the shortest of all — could comprehend all Hymns and Psalms; and he asked that this be explained to him by us. Then I: "There is nothing, best son, why you should wonder, if you consider that the whole kind of Psalms and Hymns was invented for the singing of the praises of the divine works, but especially for celebrating those twin virtues of the most high God, Mercy and Truth — the fullness of which comprehends all the deeds and wondrous works of God, David saying: *All the ways of the Lord are Mercy and Truth.*" [7] And thereupon Aurelius: "I confess," he said, "that not only is this the aim of all hymns, but that all the divine works are contained in these two virtues. But what you would gather from this, set forth." I then [said]: "Do you not see how these two most excellent works of God, Mercy and Truth, are set forth in the present Psalm most abundantly — in brief words indeed, yet plainly eloquent and fruitful?" "I see," said he, "and I have both sufficiently in view." Then I, as though drawing a conclusion from what he had granted, said: "Since, therefore, this Psalm declares the praises of the divine mercy and truth, by which all the divine works, everywhere sung in all songs and hymns, are comprehended — it follows that, as many as there are in the whole compass of Psalms and odes, it embraces the praises and encomia of the divine works, as though compressed into a sum and compendium," etc. [8]

An Example of Interrupted Collation, on the hundred-and-sixteenth Psalm

AURELIUS: Tell me, venerable Augustine — is it true, what I lately heard when you were preaching, that the hundred-and-sixteenth Psalm is the beginning, end, and compendium of all Psalms and hymns? **AUGUSTINE:** It is true, my Aurelius. **AUR.:** I wonder how it can be that a Psalm, by far the shortest of all, should comprehend so many and almost innumerable hymns, Psalms, and odes. **AUG.:** Yet so it truly is. For just as all lines run together into the very center of a circle, so into this one Psalm all the rest flow together as into the end and beginning of all Psalms. **AUR.:** I could wish this to be explained more openly. **AUG.:** Do you grant that every kind of Psalm and hymn contains the praises of God, and was framed chiefly for celebrating the divine works? [9] **AUR.:** I grant it. **AUG.:** Do you confess that the sum of all the divine deeds is referred to those two most splendid works — Mercy, I say, and Truth? [10] **AUR.:** I confess it; and often too I have that saying of David upon my lips: *All the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth.* **AUG.:** But do you not see how this Psalm proclaims these two admirable works of God, in brief but most fruitful words? **AUR.:** I see indeed, and acknowledge it well enough. **AUG.:** Therefore, since the aim and argument of this Psalm is to celebrate those two things, within which the arguments of all the Psalms are compressed, it is agreeable [to reason] that all the Psalms are concluded in this one Psalm, etc.

On Meditation — The Sixteenth Method

Meditation [11] — or Contemplation, or the affective exposition — is a narration bursting forth, from the inmost and fervent affections of a glowing spirit, into living and ardent words; which certain devout expositors are especially wont to use, who direct all their efforts to this one end: that they may rouse and

provoke themselves to the love of the things they read and explain; that they may in a manner transform into themselves what they handle, and, by the living experience of affections and works, may feel what they set forth in words — always with [→ p186]

[1] What Collation is. [2] There are two species of Collation. [3] What the Continuous collation is. [4] What the Interrupted collation is. [5] Cassian's *Conferences* are the continuous [kind]. [6] Daniel 2. [7] Psalm 25:10 (Vulg. 24:10). [8] All the divine works are contained in mercy and truth. [9] Every kind of Psalm contains the praises of God. [10] The things done by God are referred to mercy and truth. — Psalm 25:10 (Vulg. 24:10). [11] What Meditation is.

(Rich PDF p. 186 — printed folio 169. Continues ***Method Sixteen (Meditation)****: its three exercises —* ***Ascent*** *into God,* ***Descent*** *into oneself,* ***Return*** *to God (as prayer) — worked on "In Christ are all the treasures of God's wisdom" (Col 2:3); masters named (Bernard, Peter of Ailly, Savonarola, Titelmann). Then a full* ***Meditation on Psalm 116*** *(the affective "That highest Good…"; Sir 43:33). Then opens* ***Method Seventeen: On the Poetic Exposition*** *— two kinds,* ***Verse*** *(*Carmineum*: Apollinaris Sr., Gregory Nazianzen, Juvencus, Arator) and* ***Prose-and-Verse*** *(*Prosocarmineum*, after Boethius and Martianus Capella: Eulalius of Cynopolis, Williram of Marburg). A* ***Verse Exposition of Psalm 116*** *— an iambic ode — begins (text on p187). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing Method Sixteen (Meditation), from p185]

…always dwelling with God in pious thoughts, sweet meditations, ardent desires, and fiery colloquies; ever aspiring, sighing, and panting after those things which, in explaining the divine scriptures, by the enlightening of the Spirit they have learned, and now within themselves, by the enkindling of the same Spirit, have begun to experience. This Exposition many, briefly defining it, call a **soliloquy of the soul speaking with God about the divine scriptures**; or thus: Meditation is the most secret speech of the expositor with God, and the most ardent contemplation of the divine darkness. Now this divine kind of explanation — scarcely known to very few — is accomplished chiefly by three exercises, [1] that is, by **Ascent** into God, **Descent** into oneself, and **Return** into God. For example, if that saying of Paul to the Colossians is to be explained — *In Christ are all the treasures of the wisdom of God* [2] — etc.:

First, the expositor will lift up his mind into God, and will piously contemplate how great and how admirable is the wisdom of God; and, with all the splendor of speech he can, he will display the treasure of the divine wisdom, which by a single and unceasing gaze always beholds and surveys all things — not only the greatest and noblest, but each least and meanest thing; to whom all the stars of heaven and all the sands of the sea are numbered; to whom every mind and every will speaks; to whom lies open every thought however hidden; and whom no secret escapes, reaching even to the inmost and impenetrable and unsearchable recesses of the human heart.

When the expounder has long and much revolved these things in wondering mind, **in the second place** let him turn his pen upon himself, and, descending into himself, let him meditate how that God, who beholds all things, directs his eyes even upon him, and considers all his thoughts and desires, his words too, and all his deeds, and continually observes them. After he has weighed these with himself in utmost reverence, he will apply all that he had already conceived of God to his own person, in this manner: *O how great a necessity of doing well lies upon me, who do all things in the eyes of God who beholds all! O that I, a sinner, might find grace and good-will in the eyes of Christ Jesus, whose knowledge knows me and whose wisdom perpetually beholds me! O that I may please him! O that I may ever do the things that offend not his sight!*

Thirdly, returning into God, whence he had descended, he will frame his explanation, in the manner of a prayer, thus supplicating: *O Savior of men, Christ Jesus, in whom are all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God — you who deign to look with the eyes of your supreme wisdom upon me, a most vile little worm, from whom none of my thoughts are hidden, with whom the groaning of my heart and the desire of my wretched will is not concealed — grant me, your servant, that I may do nothing unworthy of the sight of your*

majesty.

Most renowned in this form of expounding were **Bernard the Abbot**, **Peter of Ailly**, cardinal of Cambrai, **Jerome Savonarola**, and **Franciscus Titelmannus**.

An Example of Meditation, on Psalm 116

That highest Good, than which nothing greater can be conceived, is — as the most wise son of Sirach says — greater than all praise; [3] *for its essence is incomprehensible, its majesty inaccessible, and its name utterly ineffable — which no creature can conceive in mind, much less express in words. Yet God himself commands, and bids, and wills to be praised by the mouth of men: and now especially, in the present Psalm, through the mouth of David he calls together all the peoples of the Hebrews and all the nations of the Gentiles to his own praises. What then shall I do? With what words, with what tongue shall I — a mute little worm — praise the unpraisable God? Though all the members of my body should be turned into tongues, and all my limbs should resound with a human, nay even an angelic, voice, I could say nothing worthy of his divine loftiness: before whose sight all praise falls silent, and every encomium ends in silence. Shall I then be silent? and despise the voice of God, crying to me through the mouth of David, and provoking me to praise my Creator? Far be it. I know what I shall do. I will fall down at the feet of him whom the Cherubim, the Seraphim, and all the hosts of angels ceaselessly praise together with heavenly hymns; and from my inmost heart I will say to him: O most clement Almighty God, whose incomprehensible majesty cannot be praised — grant that at least I may offer you some praises for your works, which can be celebrated; but especially for the mercy which you have shown to me, a wretch, and for the truth of your promises, which you have fulfilled in me. Do not leave me an orphan, but confirm your mercy over me: that your truth — Christ, my life — may remain with me for ever, and unto age of age. Amen.*

On the Poetic Exposition — The Seventeenth Method

Of the **Poetic** explanation — which expounds the divine volumes in various kinds of verse — there are two kinds. [4] The one, consisting of verse only, is called the **Verse** (*Carmineum*) kind; which, in expounding the sacred volumes, was used among the Greeks by Apollinaris the Elder and Gregory Nazianzen, and among the Latins by Juvencus the presbyter and Arator the deacon. The other kind is, after the imitation of the works of Boethius *On the Consolation of Philosophy* and of Martianus Capella *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, intermingled with variety of prose and verse, and for that reason called by most the **Prose-and-Verse** (*Prosocarmineum*) kind; [5] in which kind there prevailed most, among the Greeks, Eulalius bishop of Cynopolis, and among the Latins Williram, abbot of Marburg — each of whom elucidated the Song of Songs of Solomon with a graceful intermingling of prose and verse.

An Example of Verse Exposition, on the hundred-and-sixteenth Psalm

An ode of two cola and two strophes (dicolos distrophos), consisting of iambic senarii and dimeters.

OMNES [→ p187]

---

[1] Meditation is accomplished chiefly by three exercises. [2] Colossians 2:3. [3] Ecclesiasticus 43:33 (Sirach). [4] The poetic exposition of the Scriptures is of two kinds. — The Verse kind of Poetics. [5] The Prose-and-Verse kind of Poetics.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 187 — printed folio 170. The **verse ode on Psalm 116** (iambic; nations praise the Father with one voice; God's mercy = the Son sent, his truth = his oath to Abraham and David, which endures brighter than the sun). A Prose-and-Verse example is skipped for brevity. Then **Method Eighteen: On the Epistle** — exposition by letters to friends (Isidore of Pelusium's 10,000 letters; Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose). Then **Method Nineteen: On Inquiry** — expounding by investigation and untying difficulties, in three species: **Problem** (leaves the question open — Augustine's* Genesis to the Letter*), **Question** (answers with firm*

*brevity), **Disputation** (full debate marshalling both sides — Augustine against the Manichees and Pelagians). All three are demonstrated on one case — the Egyptian midwives' lie (Exod 1:20): the **Problem** and **simple Question** forms given here, each with its Response. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Verse Exposition of Psalm 116, from p186]

ALL nations everywhere, with harmonious voice,

*   with one mouth, [lift] to the stars*

the praises of the best Father — praises drawn, perhaps,

*   from inmost, chaste, and pious senses.*

But what praises will you especially sing, O pious

*   nation of the sons of Abraham?*

— [you] deemed worthy, O wonder, beyond all other nations,

*   with so great a favor of the Deity.*

What outpouring of the mercy of God is this?

*   What greatness? how great its power?*

What bounty? — the Son JESUS sent down

*   from the bosom of the eternal Father,*

who brought auspicious blessings to the auspicious lands,

*   all evils being put to flight.*

He was not — no — forgetful of the faith once given,

*   and of the oath [he swore],*

with which he had willingly bound himself to his servant,

*   to David, after Abraham.*

To lie belongs to mortals; to lie is not

*   [the way] of the one God.*

Sooner shall the earth, lifting itself, mount beyond the stars,

*   and heaven fall down into the depths,*

than the least little stain could be sprinkled

*   upon the truth of God.*

Nay, brighter than the golden light of the Sun,

*   it shall remain for all ages.*

An example of the **Prose-and-Verse** exposition is omitted for brevity's sake.

On the Epistle — The Eighteenth Method

The **Epistolary** Method [1] was used by those who expounded the divine scriptures by letters and epistles, sent especially to friends who consulted them. Of their number, among the Greeks, was Isidore of Pelusium, who, in explaining the sacred volumes, wrote up to ten thousand letters; among the Latins, Jerome, and sometimes Augustine and Ambrose, of whom very many epistles of the holy oracles survive. To append an example of this Method I judge to be superfluous.

On Inquiry (Investigation) — The Nineteenth Method

Inquiry [2] is that which expounds the divine scriptures by the investigation and untying of difficulties; of which there are three species: [3] the **Problem**, the **Question**, and the **Disputation**.

The **Problem** [4] — which is also called a "problematic Question" — is that in which the reply to a proposed interrogation about the holy letters is given rather by inquiring ambiguously than by determining anything certain; or whose answer settles nothing by firm assertion, but still leaves what had been proposed to be inquired into more diligently: as happens in almost all the questions which Augustine, in the twelve books *On Genesis to the Letter*, rather (as he himself confesses) sought than found. [5]

The **Question** — which some call an "Inquiry" (*Percontatio*), others a "Simple question," others a "little question" (*Quæstiuncula*) — is that in which the reply to the proposed interrogations is given with a certain and firm assertion, and a simple brevity: as is done in the two books of the *Evangelical Questions* of St. Augustine. [6]

The **Disputation** [7] — which by some is called a Debate (*Disceptatio*), a Contest (*Decertatio*), and a Composite Question — is that which, upon some part of the sacred volumes, with contraries brought in on both sides (the reasonings and argumentations both of heretics and of catholics), disputes most amply and most learnedly: whether to defend, in an apologetic manner, the truth of the divine scripture shaken by the engines of heretics, or to exercise and more and more sharpen the powers of the wit. Above all mortals in this kind of disputation there prevailed Augustine, bishop of Hippo, [8] especially in the books of disputations against the Manichees and against the Pelagians. Examples of the three species of this Method, adapted to one and the same proposition by St. Augustine, are these:

An Example of a Problem

Or of a problematic Question, upon the lie by which the Egyptian midwives deceived Pharaoh, from Augustine in the Questions on Exodus.

Concerning the lie of the midwives, by which they deceived Pharaoh, it is wont to be asked whether such lies are approved by divine authority — since it is written that God did well to the midwives. [9]

Response. It is answered that it is uncertain whether God, out of mercy, pardoned the lie, or whether he judged the lie itself worthy of reward. For the midwives did one thing in saving the little infants alive, another in lying to Pharaoh; for in saving them alive there was a work of mercy, but that lie they used for their own sake, lest Pharaoh should harm them — which could pertain not to praise, but to pardon. Yet no authority for lying is to be taken from this; but this Question must be discussed more diligently by other examples, which are found in the scriptures like to this.

An Example of a Simple Question

Upon the same lie of the midwives, from Augustine's book To Consentius, Against Lying.

Since God did good to the lying midwives, and built them houses, it is rightly asked whether he approved their lie. [10]

Response. That it is written that God did good to the midwives — it was not so done because they lied, but because toward men they were merciful for God's sake. In them it was not the deceit that was rewarded, but the good-will, the kindness of the mind, not the iniquity of the liar. For just as it would not be strange and absurd if God should be willing to pardon certain evil works committed by them at some earlier time on account of later good ones, so it is not to be wondered at that, at one time, in one case, God, beholding both — that is, the thing done mercifully and the thing done deceitfully — [→ p188]

[1] The Epistolary Method. [2] What Inquiry is. [3] There are three species of Inquiry. [4] What a Problem is. [5] The Questions of St. Augustine on Genesis are Problems. [6] What a Question is. [7] What a Disputation is. [8] Augustine excelled in disputing. [9] Exodus 1:20. [10] Exodus

(Rich PDF p. 188 — printed folio 171. Finishes the midwives' case (their reward was temporal, not eternal). Then the third example of Method 19 — a full ***Disputation*** *on lying (from Augustine,* On Lying, to Consentius*): the* ***Proposition****; the* ***Adversaries' arguments*** *(the Priscillianists: Sarah, Jacob, the midwives; "would you not lie to save a life?"); the* ***Catholics' arguments*** *(the Decalogue, Sir 7:14, Wis 1:11, Ps 5:7, Matt 5:37, Eph 4:25); the* ***Determination*** *(one must never lie); the* ***Refutation*** *(the OT cases are figurative/prophetic; the midwives were rewarded for charity, not the lie; never lie even to save another's bodily life). Then opens* ***Method Twenty: On the Collected Exposition*** *— three species (Rhapsody, Syllegma, Abbreviation), and the first,* ***Rhapsody*** *(Stromatic exegesis), begins. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing the Simple Question on the midwives' lie, from p187]

…both rewarded the good, and on account of it pardoned that evil. It remains, therefore, that we understand a reward to have been rendered to those women for their humanity and mercy — a reward, to be sure, temporal, not eternal.

An Example of a Disputation

Upon the same lie of the midwives, from Augustine's book On Lying, to Consentius.

The Proposition of the Disputation

Great is the question about lying, which often troubles us in our very daily acts — some thinking that one must sometimes lie with a certain honorable, dutiful, and merciful lie, but others affirming that a good man ought in no way to lie.

The Arguments of the Adversaries

Those, then, who agree with the Priscillianist heretics that it is sometimes lawful to lie [1] — that is, to declare a falsehood with the will to deceive — bring forward testimonies for their opinion out of the sacred letters: recalling that Sarah, when she had laughed, denied to the angels that she had laughed; [2] that Jacob, questioned by his father, answered that he himself was Esau, his elder son; [3] and that the Egyptian midwives lied (that the Hebrew infants being born might not be killed), with God even approving and rewarding them. [4] And, choosing many examples of this kind, they recall the lies of those men whom you would not dare to blame; and thus [urge] that you must confess that a lie can sometimes be not only not worthy of reproof, but even worthy of praise. They add also — whereby they may press not only those devoted to the divine books, but all men and common sense — saying: If someone flees to you who by your lie could be freed from death, will you not lie? If a sick man asks something which it is not expedient for him to know, one who might even be more gravely afflicted by your not answering — will you dare either to speak the truth to the man's ruin, or rather to keep silence, than to aid his health by an honorable and merciful lie? By these and such [arguments] they think themselves most abundantly pressed [to conclude] that, if the cause of counsel requires it, we may sometimes lie.

The Arguments of the Catholics

On the contrary, those to whom it seems that one must never in any way lie act much more strongly, using first the divine authority: since in the Decalogue itself it is written, *Thou shalt not bear false witness* [5] — under which category every lie is comprehended; for whoever declares anything bears witness to his own mind. But, lest anyone contend that not every lie is to be called false witness, what will he say to that which is written, *Make no manner of lie* [6] and *The mouth that lieth slayeth the soul* [7]? — which, lest anyone suppose it can be understood with certain liars excepted, let him read in another place, *Thou shalt destroy all that speak a lie.* [8] Whence the Lord himself with his own mouth thus says: *Let there be in your mouth, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatever is more than this, is of evil.* [9] Hence also the Apostle, when he enjoined that the old

man must be put off — by which name all sins are understood [10] — consequently says, laying it among the first: *Wherefore, putting away lying, speak the truth.* [11]

The Determination of the Disputation

These things, therefore, being considered on both sides, those seem to me rather to be heard who say that one must in no wise lie. [12] For all the testimonies of the scriptures counsel nothing else than that one must never lie at all.

The Refutation of the Heretical Objections

Nor are we frightened by those examples of lies brought forward from the old books; for there, whatever was done can be taken figuratively, although it really happened — and whatever is done or said figuratively is not a lie. [13] For every statement is to be referred to that which it states; and everything done or said figuratively states this, which it signifies to those to whom it was uttered to be understood. Whence it is to be believed that those men, who are recorded to have been worthy of authority in prophetic times, said and did prophetically all the things that are written of them, and that no less prophetically there befell them whatever so befell — so that by the same prophetic Spirit they were judged fit to be committed to memory and to writing. But concerning the midwives — since we cannot affirm that, by a prophetic spirit meant to signify some future truth, they reported one thing for another to Pharaoh — we say that they were approved and rewarded by God not for the lie, but for their charity and affection toward the innocent infants of the Hebrews. But what, if someone flees to me who could be freed by my lie? what, if a sick man who is to be healed by my lie consults me — shall I lie? Far be it: for *he who lies slays the soul.* [14] Wherefore, since by lying eternal life is lost, one must never lie for anyone's temporal life; for it is not fitting that one should die spiritually, that another may live bodily. [15] In no way, therefore, and on no pretext, do we determine that one must lie.

On the Collected Exposition — The Twentieth Method

The **Collection**, or the Collected or Collective Method, [16] is an exposition which takes, from any writings whatsoever, either the very words of the authors together with their senses, or the senses alone without the words — turning others' words and senses to its own use. Of this there are three species: [17] namely **Rhapsody**, **Syllegma**, and **Abbreviation**.

On Rhapsody

Rhapsody [18] — which some have called *Stroma*, or *Stromatic exegesis* — is an exposition cemented together out of various compositions of authors, there being heaped into one connection not only the senses, but the very clauses, sentences, and whole periods and paragraphs of the authors, with no word at all changed. And this Rhapsody itself is likewise threefold: [19] [→ p189]

[1] The Priscillianists held that it is sometimes lawful to lie. [2] Genesis 18:15. [3] Genesis 27:19. [4] Exodus 1:19–20. [5] Exodus 20:16. [6] Ecclesiasticus 7:14 (Vulg. 7:13). [7] Wisdom 1:11. [8] Psalm 5:7 (Vulg. 5:7). [9] Matthew 5:37. [10] By the name "old man" all sins are understood. [11] Ephesians 4:25. [12] One must never lie. [13] What is said or done figuratively is not a lie. [14] Wisdom 1:11. [15] It is not fitting that one, by lying, should die spiritually, that another may live bodily. [16] What Collection is. [17] There are three species of Collection. [18] What Rhapsody is. [19] Rhapsody is threefold.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 189 — printed folio 172. Rhapsody's threefold division — **Hagiographic**, **Ecclesiastical**, **Ethnic**. **On Hagiographic Rhapsody** (a self-exposition of Scripture by Scripture; Augustine,* De doctrina *3.26; masters Bernard, Martin of Laon the Carthusian, Henry Elmesius of Germipolis). A worked **cento (Specimen) on Psalm 116** — the psalm's skeleton words woven together out of ~30 other scripture passages, each keyed by a superscript letter to a marginal source. Then opens **On Ecclesiastical Rhapsody, or the Catena** — a word-for-word collection from the Fathers, twofold (Anonymous / Named); the Anonymous*

catena (Procopius of Gaza on the Octoteuch) begins, continuing on p190. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[continuing On Rhapsody, from p188]

…is distinguished by a threefold variety: namely into **Hagiographic**, **Ecclesiastical**, and **Ethnic**.

On Hagiographic Rhapsody

Hagiographic Rhapsody [1] — which some call ἑαυτοῦ ἐξήγησιν [*heautou exegesin*], that is, a "self-exposition" [of Scripture by itself] — is an elucidation of divine scripture, collected out of the very words and bare sentences of divine scripture, dispersed here and there, and reduced into one body, illustrating the more obscure places from the clearer ones. This method Augustine greatly commends in the third book *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 26, and prefers it to the other expositions, [2] asserting that certain obscure places in the sacred letters cannot be better and more rightly understood and expounded than from other clearer places of the holy scriptures, in which those same things are recited more clearly and openly. But the Hagiographic expositor must, in fitting these places together, use such dexterity and art that those sentences may appear not to have been dragged by force into that place, but to have sprung up there of their own accord. And that this may be done more aptly and gracefully, it will be allowed to the expositor — rarely, yet sometimes — to insert a few little words of his own, by which, as by little handles, the sayings of Scripture, far separated from one another, may cohere in a more elegant structure. In this part there labored, in times past, St. Bernard, and Martin of Laon the Carthusian (whose *Paraenetic* book, to a novice monk, still survives — heaped together with wondrous art out of sacred sentences interwoven with one another); and, in our own times, Henry Elmesius of Germipolis, [3] who lately fitted together, with beautiful art, homilies on all the Epistles and Gospels which are read through the circuit of the year, out of the bare *Stromata* and Rhapsodies of holy Scripture. Let a Specimen of this exposition be the following:

A Specimen of Hagiographic Rhapsody, on Psalm 116

(In it those few words written in a different and somewhat larger type are not of the text of divine scripture, but taken in from elsewhere. But the little minuscule letters, interlined together with the numbers set in the margin, show the chapters of the scriptures from which the pieces of this cento are taken.)

PRAISE THE LORD — ■God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ■who blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ; who predestined us unto the adoption of sons, through JESUS CHRIST, unto himself, according to the purpose of his will, unto the praise of the glory of his grace — ■praise and exalt him above all forever — **ALL NATIONS**: ■you who once were Gentiles in the flesh, who were called "uncircumcision" by that which is called "circumcision" made by hand in the flesh; ■you who once were led, going astray, to dumb idols; ■you who at that time were without Christ, alienated from the citizenship of Israel, and strangers to the testaments, having no hope of the promise, and without God in this world — but now, in Christ Jesus, you who once were far off are made near in the blood of Christ; ■you who once were not the people of God, but now are the people of God, who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy; ■you who now are no longer strangers and foreigners, but are fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God. ■To you I say, O Gentiles — ■out of every nation that is under heaven, ■from the East and the West and the North and the South — ■to you, I say, O Gentiles, ■whom God created unto his praise, his name, and his glory: ■bring to the Lord glory and honor; ■shout to God with the voice of exultation, ■sing to him a canticle, sing well to him with jubilation, ■admonishing yourselves in Psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts with joy, ■and giving thanks always, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God and the Father. **PRAISE HIM** — ■give glory to his praise, ■sing him a psalm ■in the voice of exultation and of confession — **ALL PEOPLES**: ■O Israelites, whose is the adoption of sons, the glory, the testament, the legislation, the service, and the

promises; whose are the fathers, of whom is Christ, who is over all things, God blessed forever; ■whom the Lord God chose that you should be to him a peculiar people out of all the peoples that are upon the earth — not because you surpassed all nations in number (since you are fewer than all), but because the Lord loved you, and kept the oath which he swore to your fathers. ■■And do you also, O Gentiles, honor God for his mercy: **FOR HIS MERCY IS CONFIRMED OVER US** — the Gentiles — ■■when the goodness and kindness of God our Savior appeared, not by the works of justice which we had done, but according to his own mercy he saved us, by the laver of regeneration and the renovation of the Holy Spirit, whom he poured out abundantly through Jesus Christ. Do you too, ■■all the seed of Israel, glorify him. For **THE TRUTH OF THE LORD** — ■■who keeps truth forever, ■■whose name is Faithful and True, ■■who is not as man, that he should lie — **REMAINS FOR EVER**; ■■for it is impossible for God to lie: he who ■■swore an oath to Abraham our father that he would give himself to us in his beloved Son, ■■in whom we have redemption through his blood, ■■and the hope of eternal life, which God, who lies not, promised before the ages of the world. ■■To him be glory unto the ages of ages. Amen.

Marginal source-keys (first series): **a** Rom 15:6 · **b** Eph 1:3, 5 · **c** Dan 3:57 · **d** Eph 2:11 · **e** 1 Cor 12:2 · **f** Eph 2:12–13 · **g** 1 Pet 2:10 · **h** Eph 2:19 · **i** Rom 11:17 · **k** Acts 2:5 · **l** Luke 13:29 · **m** Rom 11:13 · **n** Deut 26:19 · **o** Ps 29:2 (Vulg. 28:2) · **p** Ps 47:2 (Vulg. 46:2) · **q** Ps 33:3 (Vulg. 32:3) · **r** Col 3:16 · **s** Eph 5:20 · **t** Ps 66:2 (Vulg. 65:2) · **u** Judith 16:2 · **x** Ps 42:5 (Vulg. 41:5) · **y** Rom 9:4–5 · **z** Deut 7:6–8.

Marginal source-keys (second series, from "And do you also…"): **aa** Rom 15:9 · **bb** Titus 3:4–6 · **cc** Ps 22:24 (Vulg. 21:24) · **dd** Ps 146:6 (Vulg. 145:6) · **ee** Rev 19:11 · **ff** Num 23:19 · **gg** Heb 6:18 (so to be read; printed "6, 8") · **hh** Luke 1:73 · **ii** Eph 1:7 · **kk** Titus 1:2 · **ll** Rom 11:36.

On Ecclesiastical Rhapsody, or the Catena

Ecclesiastical Rhapsody — which by the common appellation is called a **Catena** [4] — is an exposition collected word-for-word out of the various writings of the ecclesiastical Fathers. This is twofold: [5] **Anonymous** and **Named** (*Proonyma*). Now the **Anonymous** catena [6] is that which, the names of the authors being untold and suppressed, reduces their sentences and sayings alone into the consonance of one continuous narration — no otherwise than if one man alone were speaking — in which the expositor sometimes adds some things of his own, that he may more becomingly and more clearly connect the diverse varieties of the unconnected sentences. This, among the Greeks, Procopius of Gaza excellently performed, who [expounded] the Octoteuch — that is, the first eight books of the Old Testament [→ p190]

[1] What Hagiographic Rhapsody is. [2] St. Augustine commends the Hagiographic Rhapsody. — Obscure places of Scripture are best explained through clear places of the same Scripture. [3] Henry Elmesius composed homilies out of the very sentences of Scripture. [4] The definition of Ecclesiastical Rhapsody. [5] Ecclesiastical Rhapsody is twofold. [6] The Anonymous catena.

*(Rich PDF p. 190 — printed folio 173. Finishes the **Anonymous Catena** (Procopius on the Octoteuch from unnamed Fathers; Eucherius of Lyons, Isidore of Seville). Then the **Named Catena** (*Catena Proonyma*) — each excerpt attributed (Oecumenius, Theodolus of Coele-Syria; Bede, Aquinas, Aloysius of Verona) — with a worked **Catena on Psalm 116** (Jerome, Cassiodorus, the Gloss, Lyra, Hugh of St-Cher). Then opens **Ethnic Rhapsody** — culled from Gentile authors, twofold **Catena** and **Cento** (the Cento woven from poets' half-lines; Dominic Nanus of Alba; Empress Eudocia's Homerocentos, Proba Falconia's Virgiliocentos). A worked **Ethnic Catena on 2 Peter 3** (the world's fiery end) begins — the Vulgate text and the Sibylline Oracles, book 2 (verse) — continuing on p191. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing On Ecclesiastical Rhapsody (the Catena), from p189]

…expounded from the Rhapsodies of unnamed Fathers; and among the Latins, Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and Isidore, bishop of Seville.

The Named Catena

The **Named Catena** (*Catena Proonyma*) [1] is that which weaves the periods and sentences of the expositors together by the same art of texture — differing from the former catena in this one thing only, that the former omits the names of the authors, whereas this ascribes the names of its authors within the text of the scripture, or outside the text in the margins of the pages; most of all observing this, that it may not superfluously repeat the sentences of all the authors who have brought the same explanation upon the same place, but may take up only those expositions in which different expositors have said different things about the same matter. So, among the Greeks, did Oecumenius and Theodolus, presbyter of Coele-Syria; and among the Latins, [2] the Venerable Bede, Thomas Aquinas, and Aloysius, bishop of Verona.

An Example of a Catena, on Psalm 116

JEROME: This Psalm is small in the number of its verses, but great in the sacrament of spiritual mystery. **CASSIODORUS:** For the choir of the saints cries out, saying that all nations ought to praise the Lord — *Praise the Lord, all nations.* **THE GLOSS:** that is, all the Gentiles. **LYRA:** [the Gentiles] to be called to the faith of Christ. **JEROME:** You who, the idols being forsaken, have come to him through faith — which the Magi, coming from the East, began, offering gifts to the new-born King, as Matthew says. [3] *Praise him, all peoples.* **LYRA, HUGH the Cardinal, THE GLOSS:** that is, all the Jews divided into twelve tribes, who — as though using reason, because they lived under the law — are called "peoples," in respect of the Gentiles, who lived as it were like cattle, without law. **LYRA:** He sets the Gentiles before the Jews, because few of the Jews believed at first, and many of the Gentiles, as the Apostle says. [4] **CASSIODORUS:** The reason why the Lord ought to be praised throughout the whole world is subjoined, when it is said: *For his Mercy is confirmed over us.* **HUGH the Cardinal:** When, in the coming of Christ, he showed forth the mercy which he had promised through the Prophets. **CASSIODORUS, THE GLOSS:** For what he had promised through the Prophets, he fulfilled in the coming of Christ, and confirmed his mercy; because whatever he gave, he guarded, that it might never be moved. **JEROME, THE GLOSS:** Or, the mercy was then confirmed, when he poured out the Holy Spirit upon believers, according to the promise which Luke the Evangelist records. **LYRA:** And when he says "is confirmed," he speaks of the future in the manner of the past, on account of the certainty of the Prophecy; for in the coming of Christ, and not before, was the mercy of God confirmed in effect, which before was awaited with great longing — *and the truth of the Lord remains for ever.*

On Ethnic Rhapsody

Ethnic Rhapsody is an exposition culled word-for-word from the sayings and sentences of Gentile authors. And this too is twofold, [5] namely the **Catena** and the **Cento** (also called *Centro*). The Cento differs from the Catena in that the latter, without great labor, gathers lengthy periods and long shreds of discourse into one texture — especially from writings that consist of prose, or loose speech; but the Cento is put together with greater labor and more skillful industry, chiefly out of the writings of the poets, from whose various and unconnected verses a certain new structure of verse is solidified — in this manner, namely, that into one verse there come together either two half-lines, or one half-line and the following one together with a middle. For to place two whole verses joined together is unfitting, and to fit three in one series is mere trifling. Not a few wits, by no means to be despised, labored in collecting these Rhapsodies in various ways; but in my own judgment they did not always obtain from the Gentiles the exposition of the divine scriptures which they sought, but rather a certain symphony and consonance between the divine sentences and the profane sentences of the Gentiles — not altogether useless to students of the sacred letters. In the former form of this Ethnic Rhapsody labored Dominic Nanus of Alba, [6] expounding various places of the four Evangelists from the sayings of the Gentile philosophers, orators, and poets. But in the latter form, two most illustrious women exercised their wit with the highest praise: [7] **Eudocia**, daughter of Leo the Athenian philosopher and wife of

the Emperor Theodosius, and **Proba Falconia**, wife of the proconsul Adelphus — of whom the former wove Ὁμηρόκεντρα [*Homerokentra*], or **Homerocentos**, but the latter **Virgiliocentos**: that is, they either transcribed or expounded various places of both Testaments out of the Greek verses of Homer and the Latin verses of Virgil. Examples of these labors are these:

An Example of an Ethnic Catena

On that passage from the second epistle of Peter, chapter three.

This heaven which now is, and the earth, are laid up for fire against the day of judgment: in which the heavens shall pass away like a river, and the elements, set on fire, shall be dissolved; and the earth, and the things that are in it, shall melt away; and the heavens being inflamed, the elements too shall liquefy.

The Vulgate edition has it thus: *The heavens which now are, and the earth, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment… the day of the Lord shall come as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass away with great violence, and the elements shall be dissolved with heat; but the earth, and the works which are in it, shall be burnt up.* [8]

The Sibyl, in the second book of the Oracles:

> *Then a burning, fiery river shall flow down from heaven on high,*
>
> *And shall utterly consume all places;*
>
> *The earth… [→ p191]*

---

[1] The definition of the Named catena. [2] The authors of the Named catena. [3] Matthew 2. [4] Romans 11:25. [5] Ethnic Rhapsody is twofold — Catena and Cento; wherein they differ. [6] Dominic Nanus wrote an ethnic Catena. [7] Empress Eudocia and Proba Falconia wrote Centos. [8] 2 Peter 3:7, 10.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 191 — printed folio 174. Finishes the **Ethnic Catena** — a chain of pagan witnesses to the world's fiery end (the Sibyl, Plato's* Timaeus*, Lucretius V, Ovid* Metam. *I, Seneca* To Marcia*, Lucan* Pharsalia *I). Then a worked **Virgilian Cento on Psalm 116** (half-lines patched from the Aeneid/Georgics/Eclogues, each keyed to its source, making Virgil "sing" the Nativity and the calling of all nations to praise God). Then the two remaining species of Method 20 — the **Syllegma** (collection of senses only; Haymo, Rupert of Deutz, Jerome) and **Abbreviation** (compressing the Fathers' vast volumes; Theophylact; Odo condensing Gregory's* Moralia*). Then opens **Method Twenty-One: On Accumulation** — twofold (of senses / of testimonies); the first mode heaps the four senses (History as base, then Moral, Allegory, Anagogy), continuing on p192. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Ethnic Catena (on the world's end), from p190 — the Sibyl]

> *…and the Earth, and the vast Ocean, and the blue pools of the sea,*
>
> *lakes, rivers, springs, and stern Dis [the underworld],*
>
> *and the celestial pole: the lights of heaven too shall flow together into one*
>
> *molten mass, their form utterly destroyed;*
>
> *the stars shall fall — for all things shall be torn away from heaven.*

Plato, in the Timaeus.

Time was made together with heaven, so that, having been made together, they shall also be dissolved together — if ever any dissolution of them shall come to pass.

Lucretius, book five.

> *One day shall give [it] to destruction; and the mass sustained through many years,*

and the fabric of the world, shall fall in ruin.

Nor does my mind deceive me: how new and wondrous a thing

comes to my mind — the coming destruction of heaven and earth.

Ovid, book one of the Metamorphoses.

He remembers, too, that it stands in the fates that a time shall come

when the sea, when the earth, and the seized palace of heaven

shall burn, and the laborious mass of the world shall be in travail.

Seneca, at the end of the book of consolation to Marcia.

If the common fate can be a solace to you: nothing shall stand in the place where it stands. [Time] shall lay all things low and carry them off with itself; it shall press down mountains, swallow up seas, turn aside rivers; and, the intercourse of nations being broken, it shall dissolve the fellowship and gathering of the race; elsewhere it shall draw mountains down into vast chasms; it shall shake cities with tremors, and send up breaths of pestilence from the depths, and kill every living thing, the world being submerged; and with vast fires it shall scorch and burn up mortal things. And when the time shall come at which the world, about to renew itself, extinguishes itself, these things shall give way by their own strength, and star shall rush upon star, and — all matter blazing — with one fire whatever now shines in its ordered place shall burn.

Lucan, book one of the Pharsalia.

— So, when the frame being loosed, the last hour

shall have gathered so many ages of the world,

seeking again the ancient chaos, all the stars

shall clash with stars mixed together; the fiery stars

shall make for the sea; the earth shall refuse to stretch out its shores,

and shall shake off the sea; and Phoebe [the moon], going contrary to her brother [the sun],

refusing to drive her chariot obliquely across the sphere,

shall demand the day for herself; and the whole discordant

fabric of the sundered world shall confound its covenants.

An Example of a Cento, on Psalm 116

From the verses of Virgil, formerly composed by us: in which the whole race of mortals is invited to celebrate God, on account of the Mercy shown to the human race in the nativity of Christ.

■*You lands, and stretches of the sea,* ■*you nations in long array*

■*who dwell [therein],* ■*various in tongues and in dress* ■*throughout the world —*

■*where Aurora returns to us and brings back the day,*

■*and where the late reddening evening kindles its lamps —*

■*celebrate the common God,* ■*singing a paean.*

■*Great-hearted heroes,* ■*boys and unwed maidens,*

■*mothers and men,* ■*in the office of praises so great,*

■*yourselves lift up joyful voices to the stars:*

■*because a new offspring has come down from heaven on high,*

■*and has brought to us at last, after long time,*

■*help, and the coming of God;* ■*when a woman first,*

■*bearing the face and dress of a Virgin,* ■*wonderful to tell,*

■*brought forth a boy neither of our race nor of our blood —*

■*a boy being born,* ■*whom the stars of heaven obey.*

Virgilian source-keys: **a** Aen. 6 · **b** Aen. 8 · **c** Aen. 6 · **d** Aen. 8 · **e** Aen. [—] · **f** Georg. 1 · **g** Georg. 1 · **h** Aen. 8 · **i** Aen. 6 · **k** Aen. 6 · **l** Aen. 6 · **m** Aen. 6 · **n** Aen. 8 · **o** Ecl. 4.5 · **p** Ecl. 4 · **q** Aen. 8 · [**r**] Ecl. 1 · **r** Aen. 8 · **t** Aen. 1 · **u** Aen. 2 · **y** Ecl. 4 · **z** Aen. 10.

On the Syllegma

The **Syllegma** — that is, a "collection of senses" [1] — is an exposition collected, according to the sense only, out of the various commentaries of the expositors. In it, only the truth of the sense being preserved (which is drawn out of the expositions of others), the kind of diction is varied, and a different style is adopted: as among the Latins Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, and Rupert, abbot of Deutz, did; and, as it also seems to some, St. Jerome, [2] who culled all the commentaries of the Greek expositors.

On Abbreviation

Abbreviation differs from the **Epitome** (of which we spoke above) only in this: [3] that the Epitome gathers the divine scriptures into brevity, whereas this compresses into a compendium and a sum the lengthy explanations and most ample volumes of the expositors of divine scripture, with a succinct and clear brevity — so that they may be more easily read and understood, both by the busy and by the simpler, with little expense of time and labor. In this part there labored more successfully, among the Greeks, Theophylact, the abbreviator of Chrysostom, and among the Latins Odo the Abbot, who compressed the thirty-five books of the Commentaries of Gregory on Job [4] into the narrow bounds of one small volume.

On Accumulation — The Twenty-First Method

Accumulation (*Coacervatio*), or the amassing manner of expounding, is twofold: [5] the one consisting in the accumulation of senses, the other of testimonies. The **first** is that which, for the elucidation of the passage taken up, either heaps together four or six chief expositions of divine scripture at once mingled and confused, or, gathering them singly and separately, subjoins one after another and joins them into one series of continuous explanation. For among the expositors there are some who, keeping no order, confound Historical, Ethical, and Mystical explanations, without any distinction, into one heap; but, on the contrary, some to whom order is pleasing lay down first the Historical narration, as the basis of the whole explanation; in the second place they set over it the Moral, for the profit of readers; thirdly they add the Allegory; fourthly the Anagogy, for delight and ornament — which [→ p192]

[1] The Syllegma is defined. [2] St. Jerome excerpted his commentaries out of the writings of the Greeks. [3] In what respect Abbreviation differs from the Epitome. [4] The 35 books of St. Gregory [the *Moralia in Job*] were reduced to the narrow bounds of one small volume. [5] There is a twofold mode of Accumulation.

(Rich PDF p. 192 — printed folio 175. Finishes ***Method 21 (Accumulation)****: the first mode (heaping the four senses — Denis the Carthusian, William Pepin; Gregory confounds Allegory and Anagogy) and the* ***second mode*** *(aggregating testimonies — the mammoth commentaries of Henry of Langenstein on Genesis and Thomas Hasselbach on Isaiah 1; Gregory's* Moralia in Job *as the great quarry from which Paterius, Bede, and others drew; the example is Gregory on Job 1:20). Then* ***Method 22: On the Thematic Exposition*** *— mapping a whole theme onto a scriptural figure (after Xenophon's* Cyropaedia*): Philo's Abraham = the contemplative man and Joseph = the civil man; Gregory of Nyssa's* Life of Moses*; Ambrose's* On Abraham. *Then opens* ***Method 23: On the Scholastic Method*** *— twofold, Old and New, continuing on p193. Running*

head: LIBER TERTIVS.)

[continuing Method 21 (Accumulation), first mode, from p191]

…which, among the more recent, Denis the Carthusian observed in his commentaries on the Psalms, and William Pepin in his commentaries on Genesis and Exodus, most diligently. But among the ancients, St. Gregory, in his commentaries on Job, immediately after the Historical exposition subjoins the Allegorical and the Anagogical (which with him are the same); [1] and from these, lastly, he draws out the springs of the Ethical (moral) narration, for the forming of morals.

The Second Mode of Accumulation

The **second** mode of Accumulation is placed in the aggregation of testimonies; which, for the untying and confirmation of the passage proposed, brings together into one various testimonies, authorities, and similar passages out of the divine letters, contracted into one — and these again, especially if they be obscure and involved, it expounds in particular, a new exposition being interposed and superadded; whence it happens that, while the expositor proceeds by expounding the individual scripture-testimonies adduced, the body of the explanation grows in a manner immense, and scarcely finds an end. In this kind of expounding there toiled, among the scholastics, **Henry of Langenstein**, [2] who, having spent many years in the public exposition of Genesis, scarcely reached the fourth chapter of that book after four whole years, having published on these four great volumes, in which he interpreted almost all the books of both Testaments. Him **Thomas Hasselbach** surpassed by a far more prolix work, [3] who, when in the space of one-and-twenty years he had not yet reached the end of the first chapter of Isaiah (which he had continuously expounded), at last left twenty-four books of his Exposition on the first chapter of Isaiah. But among the Fathers, St. Gregory labored in this task with greater praise, [4] who in all his writings — but especially in the thirty-five books of his Commentaries on Job — so heaped together the sentences and fragments of so many divine oracles, and expounded what he had heaped up, that from these, as from a most rich storehouse, many not ignoble expositors received entire expositions of almost all the volumes of holy scripture: such as Paterius, notary of St. Gregory; Claudius, abbot of Chiusa; Bede the Presbyter; Alulf the monk; Werner of Paris; and very many other students of the Gregorian reading, who gathered from Gregory's sentences explanations upon both Testaments. Since an example of this Method cannot be given without much prolixity, we remit the curious reader to the commentaries of St. Gregory on Job, but especially to the second book of that work — in whose 29th, 30th, and 38th chapters, for the exposition of that sentence, *Then Job arose, and rent his garments, and, his head being shaved, falling down upon the earth, adored*, etc., [5] there are brought forward and explained twelve divine testimonies gathered from various places of the Bible.

On the Thematic Exposition — The Twenty-Second Method

The **Thematic** Method of explaining [6] is that which applies particular parts of divine scripture, together with their expositions, to the treatment of some particular subject — showing that the whole body of the subject undertaken, and its several members and parts, are to be found, as though painted in a picture, in the proposed places of holy scripture. The artifice of this interpretation, St. Ambrose intimates, flowed from Xenophon, the hearer of Socrates, who — in that book which he entitled Κύρου παιδίαν [*Kyrou paidian*], that is, the **Education of Cyrus** — setting before himself the person of Cyrus king of the Persians, and the narration of the things done by him, described the discipline of a just and wise king from the inmost bosom of Philosophy. Him afterward the distinguished expositors of the divine volumes emulated. Among whom **Philo**, among the Jews, being about to treat of the subjects of the twofold life (namely the contemplative and the political), wrote two separate books: in the former, entitled *On the Life of the Wise Man Perfected by Doctrine*, or *On Abraham*, he expounds summarily the life of Abraham gathered from the 12th to the 23rd chapter of Genesis, showing that Moses wished to paint in Abraham the image of a man perfected through

contemplation; [7] but in the latter, entitled *On the Civil Man*, or *On Joseph*, expounding selectively the deeds of Joseph from the 37th chapter of Genesis to the 48th, he teaches that Joseph is the exemplar of the civil man, [8] and one fit for the helm of the commonwealth. This same thing, among the Greeks, **Gregory of Nyssa** performed, in the book to which he gave the title *On the Perfect Life of Man*, or *On the Life of Moses*, in which, briefly explaining what Moses wrote of himself in the Pentateuch, he expressed in the image of Moses whatever conduces to a perfect kind of life. [9] This very thing also, among the Latins, **Ambrose** did, in various books which, under diverse titles and subjects, he composed for the explanation of the Old Testament — but especially in the two volumes entitled *On Abraham the Patriarch*, or *On the Man Perfect through Action*, in which, explaining the deeds of Abraham from the 12th to the 18th chapter of Genesis, he delineated the idea of the moral and truly active man. In these authors, therefore, you may read an example of the present method, which cannot here be inserted on account of its prolixity.

On the Scholastic Method — The Twenty-Third Method

The **Scholastic** kind of exposition is twofold: [10] **Old** and **New**. Now the **Old** is that which, in expounding the holy letters, those most eloquent Fathers once used, who — after a long exercise of eloquence, coming from the schools of the Rhetoricians to sacred studies — [made] their expositions [→ p193]

[1] St. Gregory confounds the Allegorical and Anagogical exposition. [2] Henry of Langenstein published 4 great volumes on the first 4 chapters of Genesis. [3] Thomas Hasselbach wrote 24 books on the first chapter of Isaiah. [4] The Commentaries of St. Gregory on Job are commended. [5] Job 1:20. [6] The Thematic method is defined. [7] Moses depicted in Abraham the image of a man perfect through contemplation. [8] Joseph was the exemplar of the civil man. [9] Moses was a perfect man. [10] The Scholastic kind of exposition is twofold.

*(Rich PDF p. 193 — printed folio 176. Continues **Method 23 (Scholastic)**: the **Old** scholasticism = the eloquent Fathers who brought rhetorical polish to sacred exposition (Prudentius, called by Bede the noblest Spanish scholastic; Musaeus, Julian, Eucherius per Gennadius; Jerome; Paul at the Areopagus). Then the **New** scholasticism — born c. 1130, after Lothair II revived the buried Roman law-books and monks, seeing scripture eclipsed by legal study, imitated the jurists — distributed into **ten genres**: Concordances, Dictionaries, Histories, Postils, Question-books, Lectures, Compendia, Sermon-books, Metrical works, Meditations — each here described. Then a note on the scholastics' plain, barbarism-laden style (they aim only to teach, not to please) and the rhetoricians' scorn of them, continuing on p194. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing Method 23 (Scholastic), from p192 — the Old scholasticism]

…their expositions with the rhetorical ornaments which they had brought with them, for the sake of delighting — mingling in also the weightiest affections for the stirring of minds, so that the things they said might not only be understood by the hearers, but also loved. And in this signification Bede the presbyter, in the book *On the Metrical Art*, called Prudentius the most noble Scholastic of the Spaniards; [1] and Gennadius, in his catalogue of illustrious writers, reckoned Musaeus, Julian, Eucherius, and very many others among the Scholastics — that is, among the highest professors of Scholastic eloquence. Jerome too writes that he, while still glowing in the very studies of the Rhetoricians, painted many things about sacred matters with a scholastic flower [of style]; and in his Commentaries on the epistle to Titus he says that the Apostle Paul, when he was preaching in the Areopagus, drew the argument of his sermon from the inscription of the Altar of the Athenians, with a certain scholastic elegance.

The New Scholasticism

The **other** kind of scholastic explanation — which we now have, compounded from sacred Theology and Philosophy, especially the Peripatetic — is recent and new, [2] born about four hundred years ago, a little after the times of the Emperor Lothair II, who in the year of the Lord 1130 found the books of the Roman laws covered over with dust, brought them back to light, and commanded that they be publicly read in the schools,

and that law be pronounced according to those laws. And so, by this occasion, the treasury of the laws was recalled into use, whence many wrote many commentaries on the laws. But, the studies of the laws now flourishing everywhere, and being embraced by all the most learned (as is wont to happen in a new thing), certain devout clerics and monks, perceiving that the knowledge of sacred scripture was growing cold and being despised in comparison with the study of the laws, themselves also undertook the Theological study, and, by the example of the Jurisconsults, began to expound the holy books and to publish their expositions in writing. Of these, those which up to this day have been more in use in their schools are distributed into **ten orders**: [3]

- The **first** embraces Concordances;
- the **Second**, Dictionaries;
- the **Third**, Histories;
- the **Fourth**, Postils;
- the **Fifth**, Question-books;
- the **Sixth**, Lectures;
- the **Seventh**, Compendia;
- the **Eighth**, Sermon-books;
- the **Ninth**, Metrical [works];
- the **Tenth**, Meditations.

1. In the **Concordances**, [4] then, they first digested all the words — both declinable and indeclinable — contained in the divine volumes into alphabetical order, all and every one of the books, chapters, and lines being noted, in which any words are found similar and concordant to the word sought.

2. In the **Dictionaries** [5] (which they also called *Distinctionaria*, on account of the manifold distinctions of the words that are in them), they expounded all the words of divine scripture, disposed in alphabetical series, in a manifold sense both literal and spiritual — dividing, distinguishing, defining, and dilating the significations of the individual words, and treating diverse matters according to the nature of each word.

3. In the **Histories**, [6] they reduced all the historical books of both Testaments into one body of continuous and complete history, interspersing (wherever the series of things seemed to require it) many histories not only external — borrowed from undoubted writers — but also apocryphal narrations, received rather by the tradition of the ancients than by any writing; adding besides, for explaining the obscure places of the history, brief little annotations gathered from the sayings of the holy Fathers.

4. In the **Postils**, [7] they elucidated the divine Scriptures according to the literal and spiritual understanding most simply and most briefly, all subtlety of disputations being entirely omitted.

5. In the **Question-books**, [8] on the contrary, almost all expositions of Scripture being set aside, they proposed obscure doubts and questions out of various places of the scriptures, and, with contraries brought in on both sides (both Philosophical and Theological arguments), disputed most subtly and most fully about the places proposed.

6. In the **Lectures**, [9] embracing both parts, they expounded the manifold senses of the Scriptures more broadly and more fully than they had done in the Postils, restricting into a narrow compass the questions which they had treated most amply in the Question-books, and mingling them with their own explanations.

7. In the **Compendia**, [10] they divided the books of divine Scripture (either all, or some) by a certain general partition into parts and members, and, thus divided member by member, compressed them into brief summaries.

8. In the **Sermon-books**, [11] they set forth popular sermons and discourses upon diverse places of divine Scripture, woven together out of scholastic doubts and moral instructions.

9. In the **Metrical** [works], [12] they expounded the holy books with a manifold variety of new verses and Rhythms first invented by themselves.

10. In the **Meditations** [13] (which are also called affective contemplations), they explain the divine letters by certain imaginary representations, which they devised for the moving and inflaming of minds.

Moreover, as regards the phrase — that is, the manner of speaking — it is the same for all of them. [14] They use no coloring of secular eloquence, no choice of accurate elocution; inasmuch as they desire neither to delight nor to sway, but only to teach. They have a simple, brief, and compressed narration; but a lowly, open, and most common, worn-out speech — stuffed, according to the custom of the vulgar, with barbarisms and solecisms; yet in the Lectures, and especially in the Question-books, obscure and abstruse, both on account of the subtlety of the most difficult Questions, and on account of certain new and Barbarous words, unheard by Latin ears, and lately sprung up in their own Schools. Whereby it happens that some of the Rhetoricians, devoted to eloquence, [15] not only abstain from reading them, but also [reject] the very name "scholastic" as Barbarous, unlearned, [→ p194]

[1] Prudentius is called by Bede the most noble scholastic of the Spaniards. [2] When Scholastic Theology began to flourish. [3] The expositions of the sacred Scriptures are distributed into 10 orders. [4] Concordance. [5] Dictionaries. [6] History. [7] Postil. [8] Question-books. [9] Lectures. [10] Compendia. [11] Sermon-books. [12] Metrical. [13] Meditations. [14] What the style of the Scholastics is like. [15] The error of some who are more than fairly devoted to eloquence.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 194 — printed folio 177. Finishes **Method 23 (Scholastic)**. Sixtus defends the scholastics against the rhetoricians who scorn them: Cicero himself asked of a philosopher erudition, not eloquence; Paul was "rude in speech, yet not in knowledge" — and Sixtus was raised in their schools. He lays out the **five props** of the scholastic method (Division, Distinction, Definition, Argumentation, Allegation/Citation), the anatomy of a scholastic commentary (the "subject" + four causes; Preface and Treatise, endlessly subdivided), and of a scholastic sermon (Exordium from a **Theme**; a threefold/fourfold Narration; a closing "Practical" of rebukes; the* Manipulus Florum *and* Polyanthea *as quote-quarries). A roll of masters by genre (Hugh of St-Cher, Bersuire, Peter Comestor, Lyra, Albert, Aquinas, Vincent Ferrer, Godfrey of Viterbo, Bonaventure, Gerson…). Then a worked **Dictionary exposition, from Pierre Bersuire's Dictionary, on the letter A**, begins (continues p195). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing Method 23 (Scholastic), from p193]

…unlearned, and abhor it as worthy of no esteem — who indeed seem to me gravely to err in this, and to despise the judgment of their own Cicero, which they so greatly admire. For he requires of a philosopher not eloquence, but erudition. [1] For in the book *On the Ends of Goods and Evils*, making mention of Epicurus, he says: "The style of that Philosopher does not offend me; for he both embraces in words what he wishes, and says plainly what I understand. And yet from a Philosopher, if he brings eloquence, I accept it; if he has it not, I do not much demand it." Since, therefore, Cicero does not at all require eloquence of philosophers, I do not see why the same should be so greatly demanded of the Scholastic Theologians — who, though (according to Paul's saying) they be *rude in speech, yet not in knowledge*; [2] but the more they are destitute of elegance of elocution, the more they excel in erudition, setting forth things not painted but solid, teaching the things that most profit and that pertain to the intended end, and teaching thus, as is fitting, both with the rude and with the learned. But of these things elsewhere; for I have not undertaken, in the present place, to take up the defense of the Scholastics (in whose schools I was educated and advanced), but only to explain their manner of expounding.

The Five Props of the Scholastic Method

As, then, regards the manner of teaching, the whole Method of their explanation rests chiefly upon five props [3] — namely: **Division**, **Distinction**, **Definition**, **Argumentation**, and **Allegation** (Citation) — according to the custom of the Peripatetics and the Jurisconsults. In **Divisions** they so abound [4] that they explain no period of divine scripture, however brief, unless they first divide and distribute it into diverse parts and members. Of **Distinctions** so great is the force among them [5] that they distinguish almost every single word of the passage taken up into various and diverse significations of words and things, and explain each distinct one by its own definitions and descriptions. Of **Allegations** they are so copious [6] that in any matter proposed they bring forward a numerous multitude of witnesses and testimonies, the name of the authors being always cited, with the title of the books and the number of the chapters, from which the testimonies are drawn.

The **prefaces** of their commentaries — whether these be Postils, Lectures, Compendia, or whatever else — they always begin [7] from some sentence of the holy scriptures, but taken from outside the book which they are about to expound, and from some other sacred volume; and from the words of that sentence they draw out the argument of the whole book (which they call the *subject*), together with the four causes of the work, which they call Material, Formal, Efficient, and Final. These being explained, they divide the whole work into two principal parts [8] — namely, the **Preface** (*Proœmium*) and the **Treatise** — and again subdivide each of these into three or four less-principal [parts], and these again they dissect into yet smaller particles; and in this manner, now dividing, now explaining what is divided, they reach at last the end of the book.

In almost this manner they treat that part which pertains to popular discourses, which they call **Preachings**, dividing them into **Exordium** and **Narration**. [9] The Exordium they begin from some sentence, taken almost always either from the Gospel reading or from the epistle read that same day in the sacred mysteries — which they call the **Theme**. [10] Then, the argument of the sermon being briefly proposed, they divide the things to be said by a partition chiefly threefold or fourfold, into three or four parts — which some call Mysteries, some Doctrines, some Truths, some Advisements — terminating each member of the partition in a rhythmic consonance, that they may be more easily apprehended by the mind and more tenaciously retained in the memory. Then, in the **Narration** (which they call the *Familiar* part), following the order of the proposed partition, at the beginning of each Mystery or truth they accommodate to the exposition of the proposed passage certain scholastic doubts — taken either from the theological summae of St. Thomas, Albert, Alexander, Bonaventure, and Scotus, or from the dogmas of the Peripatetics — confirmed most copiously from many testimonies (of divine scripture and of the ecclesiastical Fathers, as well as of poets, orators, and Gentile writers, gathered either from the *Manipulus Florum* [Handful of Flowers] or from the *Polyanthea*, and cited by name and by number). These being explained, at last, at the end of the Mystery, they turn to the detestation of vices — which they call the **Practical** part, and **Fervor** — using worn-out and most common reproofs, chidings, and rebukes.

The Chief Masters of the Scholastic Method

This, then, is the scholastic Method, described according to its orders and parts; in which the more excellent were: [11] as regards the **Concordances**, Hugh of St-Cher and Conrad of Halberstadt; in the **Dictionaries**, Pierre Bersuire the Frenchman, and Marcus of Ulm; in the **Histories**, Peter Comestor, author of the *Scholastic History*; in the **Postils**, Hugh of St-Cher and Nicholas of Lyra; in the **Lectures**, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas; in the **Sermon-books**, St. Vincent the Spaniard [Ferrer] and Robert of Lecce; in the **Metrical** [works], Godfrey of Viterbo and Peter Riga of Reims; in the scholastic **Meditations**, Bonaventure the Cardinal and Landulph the Carthusian, John Gerson, and Denis the Carthusian. From these, therefore, we have thought fit to insert in this place certain more notable examples of the scholastic variety, for the exact knowledge of the present artifice.

An example of an exposition taken from the **Concordances** you may see above, in the Third Method.

An Example of a Dictionary Exposition

From the Dictionary of Pierre Bersuire, the Frenchman by surname.

Of the Dictionary. — Exposition on the letter A, or, concerning the letter A.

In the first place we may note that this letter, or syllable, **A**, can be taken in three ways; for it is taken as an initial letter (*litera principiativa*); as an interjection of grieving and lamenting [→ p195]

[1] Cicero requires in a philosopher not eloquence, but erudition. [2] 2 Corinthians 11:6. [3] The method of teaching scholastic Theology rests chiefly on five props. [4] Division is very frequent among the Scholastics. [5] Great is the force of Distinctions in Scholastic Theology. [6] The Scholastics are diligent in citing authors. [7] The scholastic Theologians are wont to begin the prefaces of their commentaries from some sentence of Scripture. [8] The Scholastics divide their works into prefaces and treatises. [9] The scholastics divide their sermons into Exordia and Narrations. [10] What the "Theme" is in the sermons of the scholastics. [11] The authors who excelled beyond the rest in the Scholastic Method.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 195 — printed folio 178. Finishes the **Dictionary example** (Bersuire on the letter **A**: three senses — the initial letter = God, "I am alpha and omega" [Rev 1:8]; the interjection of grief = the human condition [Wis 7:3, the newborn's first cry]; the ablative preposition = evil princes [2 Cor 11:32; Ps 140]). The **Scholastic-History** example is skipped (Peter Comestor, "Master of the Scholastic History"). Then a full worked **Scholastic Question** — Whether God is to be praised, especially with the mouth? — in strict Thomistic form (three Objections; Sed contra from Ps 116 & 62; a Respondeo distinguishing why we use words toward God vs. toward man; and Replies to the three). Then a **Scholastic Lecture on Psalm 116** opens, expounding the psalm's four causes from "A shortened word the Lord hath made" (Isa 10:22 / Rom 9:28), continuing on p196. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Dictionary example (Bersuire on the letter "A"), from p194]

…of lamenting; and as an ablative preposition. By the first [sense] I can understand the Author-of-all-beginnings of all things; by the second I can take the wretched man and wayfarer; but by the third, the impious man and sinner.

For, **in the first way**, A is the first letter of the alphabet, signifying him who is first in the order of things — namely God, who says of himself in Apocalypse 1: *I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end.* [1] For "Alpha" in Greek is the same as "A" in Latin. **In the second way**, A is the interjection of one grieving; and so it can signify the human condition, which is doleful and empty (vain) — whence this is that first cry which the boy, coming into this misery, at once utters, saying "A, A," as if grieving for the misery into which he has entered; of which it is written in Wisdom 7: *I, being born, drew in the common air, and, weeping, sent forth my first voice, like all others.* [2] **In the third way**, A is an ablative preposition, serving the Ablative — that is, the princes of the world; and so it can signify to me proud men, who always wish to be set before others — and especially prelates and bailiffs, who serve "the ablative," that is, the princes of the world, who cease not to take away the goods of their subjects. 2 Corinthians 11: *At Damascus the governor of the nation of King Aretas wished to seize me,* etc.; [3] whence of such an "A" can be said that which is written in Psalm 140: *From the wicked man deliver me.* — Again, of the first "A," the initiative, can be said whatever is said of God, or of a beginning; of the second "A," the lamentative, whatever is said of human misery; of the third "A," whatever is said of evil princes, etc. I pass over, for brevity's sake, the other significations of this letter, which the same author pursues at length, with many words, at the beginning of his Dictionary.

An Example of Scholastic History

…which, for brevity's sake, we here omit; you may see it in the history of Peter Comestor, who by a certain excellence is called by the Scholastics the **Master of the Scholastic History**.

An Example of a Scholastic Question, on Psalm 66

[so printed; the objections and reply that follow work with Psalm 116, whose text is cited in the sed contra.*]*

It is asked: **whether God is to be praised, and especially with the praise of the mouth?**

Objection 1. And it seems that [he is] not. For the Philosopher says in the first [book] of the Ethics: "Of the best things there is not praise, but something greater and better." But God is above all the best things; therefore praise is not owed to God, but something greater than praise. Whence in Ecclesiasticus 43 it is said that God is greater than all praise. [4]

Objection 2. Moreover, the praise of God pertains to his worship, for it is an act of religion; but God is worshipped more with the mind than with the mouth — whence the Lord, in Matthew 15, against certain persons adduces that saying of Isaiah: *This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.* [5] Therefore the praise of God consists more in the heart than in the mouth.

Objection 3. Moreover, men are praised with the mouth to this end, that they may be provoked to better things; for as the wicked grow proud from their praises, so the good are provoked by their praises to better things — whence it is said in Proverbs 27: *As silver is tried in the melting-pot, so a man is tried by the mouth of them that praise him.* [6] But God is not provoked to better things by the words of men, both because he is immutable and because he is supremely good and has nothing whereby to grow; therefore God is not to be praised with the mouth.

But on the contrary is that which is said in Psalm 116: *Praise the Lord, all nations,* etc.; [7] and in Psalm 62: *My mouth shall praise thee with lips of exultation.* [8]

I answer that it must be said that we use words toward God for one reason, and toward man for another. [9] For toward man we use words that we may express to him the conception of our heart, which he cannot know except by our words; and therefore we use the praise of the mouth toward man, [10] that it may be made known either to him or to others that we hold a good opinion of the one praised — so that by this we may both provoke him who is praised to better things, and lead others (before whom he is praised) into a good opinion, reverence, and imitation of him. But toward God we use words — not indeed that we may manifest our conceptions to him who is the inspector of hearts, but that we may lead ourselves, and others who hear, to his reverence; and therefore the praise of the mouth is necessary, [11] not indeed for God's sake, but for the sake of the one praising, whose affection is stirred up toward God by praising him — according to that of the Psalm: *The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me.* [12] And in so far as a man ascends toward God in affection through divine praise, in so far by this is he drawn back from those things which are against God — according to that of Isaiah 48: *For my praise I will bridle thee, lest thou perish.* [13] The praise of the mouth also profits toward this, that the affection of others may be provoked toward God — whence it is said in the psalm, *His praise shall be always in my mouth,* and afterward is subjoined, *Let the meek hear and be glad. Magnify the Lord with me.* [14]

Reply to Objection 1. It must be said that we can speak of God in two ways: in one way, as regards his essence; and thus, since he is incomprehensible and ineffable, he is greater than all praise — but according to this comparison there is owed to him reverence, and the honor of *latria* (adoration). [15] Whence also in the psalm, according to Jerome's translation, it is said: *To thee praise is silent, O God* [16] — as regards the first; *and to thee shall the vow be rendered* — as regards the second. In another way, [we speak of God] according to his effects, which are ordained to our benefit; and according to this, praise is owed to God — whence it is said in Isaiah 63: *I will remember the mercies of the Lord; the praise of the Lord over all things which the Lord hath rendered to us.* [17] And Dionysius says, in the first chapter *On the Divine Names*: "Every holy hymn of the theologians (that is, divine praise) thou shalt find dividing the manifestative and laudative namings of God unto the blessed processions of the *Thearchy* — that is, of the divinity."

Reply to Objection 2. It must be said that the praise of the mouth is useless to the one praising, if it be without the praise of the heart; [18] for then [only] does he speak praise to God, when he ponders the great works of his deeds with affection. Yet the exterior praise of the mouth avails to excite the interior affection of the one praising, and to provoke others to the praise of God, as has been said.

Reply to Objection 3. It must be said that we do not praise God for his own benefit, but for our benefit, as has been said.

An Example of a Scholastic Lecture, on Psalm 116

A shortened word (verbum abbreviatum) hath the Lord made upon the earth — Isaiah, chapter 10, and to the Romans, chapter 9. [19] In this sentence of Isaiah are touched the four causes of this Psalm — namely, the Material, the Formal, the Agent [Efficient], and the Final. And **first the Material** is intimated by the word "VERBVM" (Word), because the matter treated in this psalm is the mercy and truth of God, shown forth in the incarnate Word [→ p196]

[1] Revelation 1:8. [2] Wisdom 7:3. [3] 2 Corinthians 11:32. [4] Ecclesiasticus 43:33. [5] Matthew 15:8, citing Isaiah 29:13. [6] Proverbs 27:21. [7] Psalm 116:1 (Vulg.). [8] Psalm 63:6 (Vulg. 62:6): "with joyful lips shall my mouth praise." [9] For a different reason we use words toward God than toward man. [10] Why men are praised. [11] God is praised with the mouth not for God's own sake, but for the sake of the one praising. [12] Psalm 50:23 (Vulg. 49:23). [13] Isaiah 48:9. [14] Psalm 34:1–3 (Vulg. 33:2–3). [15] To the ineffable God, as regards his essence, is owed the honor of *latria* (adoration). [16] Psalm 65:2 (Vulg. 64:2), per Jerome: "praise waits for thee in silence." [17] Isaiah 63:7. [18] The praise of the mouth without the praise of the heart is useless to the one praising. [19] Isaiah 10:22; Romans 9:28.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 196 — printed folio 179. Finishes the **Scholastic Lecture on Psalm 116**: the psalm's four causes worked out (Formal = "shortened"; Agent = "the Lord hath made" [through David]; Final = "upon the earth" = the whole world's benefit); its structure (Title "Alleluia" / Treatise, subdivided); and the scholastic difficulty "whether God is to be praised" with its answer (as to essence, God is above all praise; as to his effects — mercy and justice — he is rightly praised). Then **On the Scholastic Compendium** — Prose vs. Metrical; Universal vs. Particular; the Particular further split into **Tree** (branching-diagram) and **Column** (two-column) forms. A worked **Universal Compendium from Pierre Auriol (Cardinal)** divides all Scripture into eight principal parts by eight modes of teaching, then divides Genesis (the "political/legislative" part) in exhaustive detail. Continues on p197. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing the Scholastic Lecture on Psalm 116, from p195]

…incarnate. **The Formal** is touched in the word "ABBREVIATVM" (shortened), because the form of this psalm is a compendious brevity, comprehending all the divine praises that are dispersed throughout the whole book of psalms. **The Agent** [cause] is touched there, "FECIT" (hath made): "DOMINVS" (the Lord) — for God was the agent cause, who made this Psalm through the mouth of David. [1] **The Final** is touched in the words "SVPER TERRAM" (upon the earth), because the end which moved God to send the incarnate Word, and to pronounce this Psalm concerning the incarnate Word, was the benefit of the whole earth. Now the present psalm is divided, after the manner of the other psalms, into two parts — namely, into **Title** and **Treatise** (which begins, "Praise the Lord," etc.). The Title is "Alleluia," in which it is intimated that this Psalm is *hallelujatic* — that is, laudatory — inviting the whole world to praise God for the mercy obtained in the coming of the incarnate Word. But in the Treatise the author carries out what he had proposed in the title; and it is divided into two parts: in the first he invites all men to praise God; in the second he renders the cause of the invitation, there: "For his mercy is confirmed." The first part is again divided into two: the second begins there, "Praise him, all peoples"; the first there, "Praise the Lord, all nations" — in which he invites the Gentile nations (which are called "nations") to the praise of God. But a difficulty arises: whether God is to be praised? And it seems not; for the Philosopher says, in the first [book] of the Ethics, that of the best things there is not praise, but something greater and better; but God is above all the best things; therefore praise is not owed to God, but something greater than praise — whence in Ecclesiasticus 43 it is said that God is

greater than all praise. [2] But on the contrary is that which is here said in the Psalm, "Praise the Lord, all nations." I answer, it must be said that we can speak of God in two ways: in one way, as regards his essence; [3] and thus, since he is incomprehensible and ineffable, he is greater than all praise — but according to this comparison there is owed to him reverence, and the honor of *latria*. In another way, according to his effects, which are ordained to our benefit (such as mercy and justice); and according to these, God is to be praised, and in fact is praised in the present psalm, etc.

On the Scholastic Compendium

The **Scholastic Compendium** is divided into **Prose** and **Metrical**; [4] and of these, the Prose is twofold: the one **Universal**, which divides, enumerates, and gathers only the chief heads of the whole work; the other **Particular** and more distinct, elaborated with greater industry, which divides the primary parts of the whole work into smaller particles, and the particular members even down to the least articles and the incisions of the articles — enumerating them, and summarily touching upon them, for the easier convenience of the apprehensive faculty and for the help of memory. This [Particular kind] is again distinguished into two, namely into **Tree** (*Arboreum*) and **Column** (*Columnare*): of which the Tree [5] is so called because, digested through many deductions and divisions of lines and branches proceeding from one trunk, it represents the appearance and figure of a branching tree. But the Column [6] is so named because it is wont to be written in two columns of the same page: in the first of which the individual clauses, members, and incisions of the compendium are fitted, in fitting order, one under another; but in the other column, the words or sentences of holy Scripture, corresponding to the individual members of the compendium, are collocated over against them (*è regione*). Examples of both are these:

An Example of a Universal Scholastic Compendium

From the compendium of Pierre Auriol, the Cardinal, on the whole of Scripture.

Divine Scripture can be divided into eight principal parts, according to the eight modes of teaching which it assumes. [7] For it teaches *politically* and *legislatively* in its first part, namely in the Pentateuch; it teaches, secondly, *chronicle-wise* — or historically and narratively — in its second part, namely in the ten books: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Tobit, Judith, and the rest that follow (in which the author briefly pursues the division of the other parts). These being finished, he again undertakes the division of the first part, in these words:

And so the first part, which is Political and legislative, is contained under five books. For it treats: first, of the quality of the **Lord** who enjoins the law; secondly, of the quality of the **servant** who proposes the law; thirdly, of the quality of the **assembly** that contains the law; fourthly, of the quality of the **people** that admits the law; and fifthly, of the brevity of the **epilogue** that expounds the law. **Genesis**, then, begins the political part, and treats of the Lord who enjoins the law — describing his omnipotence, in that he was the creator of all things from the beginning (which it declares in five chapters); in that he was the savior of men in the flood (which it declares in four other chapters); in that he was the disperser of all nations, their lip being confounded, throughout the whole world (which it declares in two chapters). Describing also his benevolence and friendship toward men, especially toward the spiritual fathers of Israel — which it shows from the segregation of Abraham: as to place, *Go forth out of thy land* [8] and *out of thy kindred*; as to the sign of circumcision; as to the deed of the son of oblivion — and this from the twelfth chapter to the twenty-fifth. Likewise from the keeping of Isaac, whom he preserved and guarded among those wicked nations — and this from the 25th chapter to the twenty-ninth. Likewise from the predilection and multiplication of Jacob, from the twenty-ninth chapter to the thirty-ninth. Likewise in the exaltation of Joseph, from the thirty-ninth chapter to the end. As if that book wished to argue thus: "The laws of that Lord who is most omnipotent, and the only benevolent God, are to be observed by men; but that Lord who instituted and enjoined the laws

which shall be set down in this political treatise is the only most omnipotent God, supremely benevolent to the human race, and especially to the holy fathers; therefore his laws are to be observed by men." So that, as the political [sciences] humanly invented begin from the end of all human acts, so this political [science], divinely revealed, may begin from the productive beginning of all things — from whom, as from the one enjoining, all laws, and goodness, and rectitude, take their lot. Thus far Genesis; to which is joined Exodus, as a second book, and it treats, etc.; and so onward it runs through the individual volumes of divine scripture, even to the last.

EXEM [PLVM → p197]

[1] God is the author of this psalm through the mouth of David; the Word was sent by God for the benefit of the whole earth. [2] Ecclesiasticus 43:33. [3] God, as regards his essence, since he is ineffable, is greater than all praise. [4] The scholastic Compendium is divided into Prose and Metrical. [5] The Tree-compendium is defined. [6] What the Column-compendium is. [7] Scripture is divided into eight principal parts. [8] Genesis 12:1.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 197 — printed folio 180. A single-page worked **Columnar Compendium** (the two-column form of the Particular Scholastic Compendium) on the opening of the **Epistle to the Romans** (1:1–7) — from a compendium Sixtus himself gathered in **1557** for Cardinal **Giovanni Battista Cicada of Genoa** (titular of St. Clement). The left column is the analytical breakdown of the salutation into Salutant / Saluted / Greeting (each subdivided); the right column sets, over against each member, the corresponding words of Romans 1. Ends with the catchword "EXEM[plum]" → p198. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing On the Scholastic Compendium, from p196]

An Example of a Particular Scholastic Compendium (the Columnar form)

On the beginning of the epistle to the Romans; from the compendium which we gathered on that same epistle in the year 1557, in favor of the most eminent Cardinal Giovanni Battista Cicada, of Genoa, titular of St. Clement.

The First Part of this epistle, serving for the salutation, comprehends three things, which render the epistle worthy of faith and acceptable — namely, the **Salutant** (one saluting), the **Saluted**, and the **Greeting** (*salus*):

Analysis (Compendium)	Scripture (Romans 1)
I. First, it contains the **person saluting**, described from four things:	**I.**
1. from his name	1. Paul,
2. from his condition	2. a servant of Jesus Christ,
3. from his dignity	3. called an Apostle,
4. from his office of preaching the Gospel — which Gospel is praised from four things:	4. set apart unto the gospel:
1. from its origin	1. of God,
2. from its antiquity	2. which he had promised before,
3. from the truth of its witnesses	3. by his prophets in the holy scriptures,
4. from its fruit — which is the Son of God, incarnate for us; [1] whom it commends as the Son of God from two things:	4. concerning his Son, who was made to him of the seed of David according to the flesh;
1. from the power of [his] might	1. who was declared the Son of God;

Analysis (Compendium)	Scripture (Romans 1)
2. from the bounty of [his] liberality	2. through whom we have received grace.
II. Secondly, it contains the **persons saluted**, whom it expresses and honors by a double title:	**II.** To all that are at Rome:
1. eternal	1. beloved of God,
2. temporal	2. called to be saints.
III. Thirdly, it contains the **Greeting**, or the form of saluting, in which he prays for the Romans two greatest goods:	**III.**
1. the beginning of all goods	1. Grace to you, and
2. the ultimate end of all goods	2. peace, from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

EXEM [PLVM → p198]

[1] The fruit of the Gospel is the incarnate Son of God.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 198 — printed folio 181. A worked **Tree Compendium** (the branching-diagram form of the Particular Scholastic Compendium) on **"Look up, and lift up your heads"** (Luke 21:28) — from the gospel-exposition of **John, Abbot of Vincelles**, entitled* Vade Mecum. *The passage is unfolded through eight parallel bracket-diagrams (three per imperative-cluster), each interspersed with three scripture-proofs; the diagrams are rendered here as tables. Then opens **the last mode of the Scholastic Compendium, the Metrical** — Alexander of Villedieu's verse summary of both Testaments in 112 hexameters, each word tagged with its chapter-number and interlinear gloss (its example continues on p199). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing On the Scholastic Compendium, from p197]

An Example of a Particular Scholastic Compendium (the Tree form)

From the exposition of the gospels of John, Abbot of Vincelles, which is entitled Vade Mecum *(Go-with-me).*

Luke 21: "Look up, and lift up your heads." In these [words] three things are touched.

namely:	toward	with
the intention of the heart	God	affection
the raising of the body	the good	occupation
the bowing of the head	the deep	submission

so that:	[respectively]	through
the heart may look	within	cruelty
the body may rise	without	sanctity
the head may prostrate itself	below	humility

as if to say:	[respectively]	[respectively]
Look	more inwardly	through the clarity of faith
Lift up	more outwardly	through the honesty of faith
Bow the heads	more downward	by pondering your frailty

• **For the first** (Luke 18): *Look up, thy faith hath made thee whole* [Luke 18:42] — namely, the faith also of the sacrament.

• **For the second** (1 Tim 2): *I will that men pray in every place, lifting up pure hands* [1 Tim 2:8] — that is, without crime.

• **For the third** (Ps 110): *He shall crush heads in the land of many* [Ps 110:6] — namely, of the humbled.

Behold Christ coming in:	with	that we may:
flesh	humility	trust
mind	kindness	love
[the] end	majesty	revere him

Since he is our:	from	through
Companion	the humanity assumed	incarnation
Physician	the courtesy of visiting	consolation
Lord	the power of judging	remuneration

Lest we:	[respectively]	[by his]
be afraid	of the summit	divinity
grow faint	because of crime	carnality (humanity)
lie hid den	from the examination	rigor

• **For the first** (Luke 1): *He hath regarded the humility of his handmaid* [Luke 1:48] — namely, powerfully.

• **For the second** (Luke 22): *The Lord, turning, looked upon Peter* [Luke 22:61]; there follows, *And he wept bitterly* — namely, [by repenting].

• **For the third** (Ps 103): *Who looketh on the earth, and maketh it tremble* [Ps 104:32] — namely, because of guilt.

Lift up:	to	through
the tongue	sobriety	the acceptance of fasting
the hands	usefulness	the occupation of exercise
the feet	eternity	the elevation of desire

That:	[respectively]	by
the tongue may take	the food of temperance	fasting
the hand may do	the work of holiness	working
the foot may flee	to the place of security	panting (longing) — etc.

On the Last Mode of the Scholastic Compendium (the Metrical)

The **Metrical Compendium** [1] is a most strict sum of the sacred volumes, comprehended in very few words, in whose individual words the arguments of the individual chapters of divine scripture are compressed with a most artificial brevity. Such is that brief little summary of the whole Old and New Testament, most briefly concluded by **Alexander of Villedieu**, of Dol, in a hundred and twelve hexameters [2] — in which the individual words touch upon the arguments of the individual chapters of the sacred scripture. And, lest the narrowness of the brevity should take away the understanding of the verses, to each word is subscribed, by an arithmetical mark, the number of the chapter whose sum is contained in it — interlinear little glosses of smaller writing being also added, indicating the signification of each word. An example of this compendium, taken from Alexander himself, is this: [→ p199]

[1] What the Metrical Compendium is. [2] Alexander of Villedieu embraced the sum of both Testaments in 112 hexameters.

*(Rich PDF p. 199 — printed folio 182. The worked **Metrical Compendium of Genesis** — Alexander of Villedieu's mnemonic hexameters, one tag-word per chapter (1–26), each glossed. Then **On the Metrical Explanation of the Scholastics**: Sixtus concedes the learned scorn sacred verse, but records it — the scholastics devised it to lure a rhyme-loving age to Scripture, borrowing meter from classical Latin and rhyme from the vernacular; its two species are **Prose-Verse** and **Verse**, the latter split into **Rhythmic** and **Leonine**. **On the Rhythmic Exposition** — a worked rhyming paraphrase of **John 1:1–4** from Denis the Carthusian (Vulgate text ■ verse). Then **On the Leonine Exposition** (from "Leo" its inventor; Heroic and Elegiac; the Heroic threefold: Monorhythmic, Dirhythmic, Isogrammatic), opening **On the Monorhythmic** (continues p200). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Metrical Compendium, from p198]

A Metrical Compendium on the Book of Genesis

Each tag-word is one hexameter's-worth of a chapter; beneath each is subscribed the chapter number and a brief gloss of what it recalls.

Ch.	Tag-word	Recalls
1	**Six**	the six days
2	**He forbids**	the tree of life
3	**They sin**	the first parents
4	**Abel**	is slain
5	**Enoch**	is translated
6	**And the ark is made**	by Noah
7	**They enter**	into the ark
8	**He goes out**	Noah, from the ark
9	**He sleeps**	naked before his sons
10	**They are diversified**	the sons and daughters of Noah [the nations]
11	**The Tower**	Babel is built
12	**And Abram**	goes out of his land
13	**Lot**	is separated from Abraham
14	**Kings**	are conquered by Abraham
15	**He believed**	Abraham, [believed] God
16	**Flight**	of Hagar
17	**Circumcision**	of Abraham and his household
18	**Laughter**	of Sarah, behind the door
19	**Brimstone**	rains upon Sodom
20	**The king of Gerar**	took away Sarah
21	**She bears**	Sarah bears Isaac
22	**He offers**	Abraham [offers] his son
23	**Sarah**	dies
24	**Rebecca**	is joined to Isaac
25	**After the twins**	Esau and Jacob

Ch.	Tag-word	Recalls
26	**The wells**	which Isaac dug

— and the rest, that follow.

On the Metrical Explanation of the Scholastics

I am not unaware that the Poetry of the Scholastics is despised by all the learned, [1] and utterly hissed off as inept, superstitious, and worthy of laughter; yet, lest I seem to be wanting to the plan of the work I have undertaken — in which I proposed to indicate all the varieties of exposition, whatever they be — I shall not be reluctant to explain this part too, briefly, whose occasion was this: [2] When throughout all Europe the custom had already grown up that **Rhythms** (that is, unpolished verses, ending in the same consonance of the final syllable, composed in the vernacular idiom of each province) should be sung, the poetry of Vernacular Rhythms began to be held in such price that no poem seemed worthy of any applause or praise which was destitute of rhythmic harmony. Wherefore, when the Scholastics desired to allure the men of their age (given to rhythms) to the studies of the sacred letters, taking occasion from this, they too devised a new method of the Metrical art, compounded from the old Latin and the recent vernacular poetry. From the old they took the quantity of syllables, the number of feet, and the laws and measures of the whole verse, most diligently to be observed; but from the new and vernacular they took the consonances of rhythms, the like endings of syllables, and sometimes an equal number of syllables and letters in the diverse verses. And they distinguished this new Poetry — or Metrical exposition of divine scripture — into two species: [3] namely, into the **Prose-Verse** (*Prosocarminea*), which is composed of verses with prose intermingled, and into the **Verse** (*Carminea*), which consists of verse alone. This latter they again divided into two parts — that is, into the **Rhythmic** and the **Leonine** — of which we shall here set down both the descriptions and the examples.

On the Rhythmic Explanation

The **Rhythmic** Exposition [4] consists of unpolished and rude verses, which answer to one another by an equal number of syllables and by the likeness of the final syllables. An example of it, taken from the exposition of the Carthusian [Denis the Carthusian] on the beginning of the gospel according to John, is thus:

Scripture (John 1)	Rhythmic paraphrase
In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.	Thou, the Word, in the beginning / wast, with no beginning, / in the Father eternally / abiding, timelessly. // Confounded are the heretics / who slanderously assert / that thou didst begin from a mother, or in time, / and in body: / but that "thou wast not before" — / herein these men are shown to lie. // …Thou wast with God the Father, / true God with him — / not as through an instrumental / cause distinct from the Father.
All things were made by him,	Through thee all things were formed, / O Christ, uncreated Power. / Through thee were all things made, / thou who teachest even through dreams; / O everlasting Glory, / O Light supremely to be loved. // The World was created through thee — / but as through a co-principal, / first exemplary Cause; / through thee it stands firm in good things.
and without him was made nothing.	Apart from thee, nothing — and sin — / was made; thou holdest it not to have / true being as to the formal, / for it is not any posited thing.
What was made, in him was life.	The creatures, in thee, were life, / O infinite Light; / for in thee, ideally, / they existed vitally.

On the Leonine Exposition

The **Leonine** [exposition] — so called from **Leo**, its first inventor [5] — is that which, the metrical laws of the Latin poets being preserved, adds a rhythmic consonance (rhyme) to the verses. And this is bipartite: namely, **Heroic**, consisting of hexameter verse, and **Elegiac**, running in hexameter and pentameter verses. Again, the Heroic is distinguished by a threefold division: namely, into **Monorhythmic**, **Dirhythmic**, and **Isogrammatic** — of which the definitions and examples here follow.

On the Monorhythmic

The **Monorhythmic** [6] is when each two hexameters, in similarly-ending syllables [→ p200]

[1] The poetry of the scholastics is despised by the learned. [2] On what occasion the scholastic Poetry was invented. [3] There are two species of scholastic Poetry. [4] What the Rhythmic exposition is. [5] What the Leonine exposition is. [6] The Monorhythmic exposition is defined.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 200 — printed folio 183. The Leonine sub-forms of scholastic verse: the **Monorhythmic** and **Dirhythmic**, then the **Isogrammatic** ("equal-letter"), divided into **Simple** and **Figured** — the latter a cross-shaped figured poem after Rabanus Maurus. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[continuing the Monorhythmic, from p199]

…syllables, terminate the last foot of the verse, they make a rhythmic symphony. An example of it, contained in the exposition of Peter Riga [Petrus Rigensis] on the beginning of the book of Job, is this: [1]

> *Some masters ascribe the book of Job to Moses,*
>
> *as its author; but the opinion is false, of a perverse*
>
> *judgment it proceeds. Others have held the little books*
>
> *to have had no author born [i.e. no single named author] — but these things too are refuted,*
>
> *as falsehood is wont to be, etc.*

On the Dirhythmic

The **Dirhythmic** exposition [2] is when, in two hexameter verses, a rhythmic consonance (rhyme) is kept both in the middle of the verse and at its end. Of which sort there are many in the same Peter Riga, especially in his exposition of the fourteenth chapter of Job, where the author expounds that sentence, *Who can make clean that which is conceived of unclean seed, save thou, who alone art?* [Job 14:4] in these verses: [3]

> *Scripture unfolds the pure mysteries of Christ,*
>
> *Concerning the sacred Breath [Spirit] who came forth without guilt,*
>
> *Not out of the unclean, proceeding from clean seed,*
>
> *Cleansing the unclean — through whom mind and flesh are made clean.*

Such also is the postillary exposition of Alexander of Villedieu [Alexander Dolensis] on the Acts of the Apostles, thus beginning:

> *If thou wouldst know the transacted Apostolic deeds,*
>
> *This Postil shall handle those for thee in verses.*

On the Isogrammatic

The **Isogrammatic** — that is, the **Equal-letter** — exposition [4] is that in which any two hexameters, succeeding one another, together with the consonance of rhyme have also an equal number of letters, and as many letters are counted in the one verse as in the other. This they are wont to divide into the **Simple** and the **Pictured**, or **Figured**.

On the Simple Isogrammatic

The **Simple** [5] is that to which, beyond the rhyme and the equal number of letters, no further artifice is added. Of this sort there are many verses in Peter Riga, in his exposition of the book of Job, especially upon those words of the third chapter, *Let the day perish wherein I was born* [Job 3:3], which are expounded in these verses: [6]

> *Let that day perish, which brought me forth to birth,* ■
>
> *Nor let that night behold the rising of the noble Dawn,* ■ *34*
>
> *Let that night be heavy, nor worthy of the favor of praise,* ■
>
> *Let it stand sundered, far from the honor of the true light.* ■ *36*

If you count the letters of these verses, you will find in each verse of the former distich 34 letters, and in each verse of the latter distich 36 letters. [7]

On the Figured Isogrammatic

The **Figured** exposition [8] is that which, beyond the rhythmic consonances and the equal number of letters, adds yet another new artifice to the verse — of most curious subtlety and of immense labor and time. For by the arrangement and placement of the letters set within the verses it expresses various images of figures — such as angels, men, birds, quadrupeds, trees, crosses, rings, and other figures like these: which letters of the verses, marked out in red-lead [minium] or any other color, both form the figure and unfold the history and mystery of that same figure. The scholastic poets borrowed this invention — which may appear rather the vanity of men at play than of expositors — from **Rabanus Maurus**, bishop of Mainz, whose poem, elaborated with a like skill of industry, still survives, entitled *On the Praises of the Holy Cross* [*De sanctae crucis laudibus*]. From it we set before you the following example, expressed in the figure of a cross:

[Figured poem in the shape of a cross (carmen figuratum). Each hexameter is split into a left arm-part, a central stripe of letters (printed colored, tracing the cross), and a right arm-part; the whole is read across in the ordinary way, while the central stripe read down the axis, and again from right to left, yields the two hidden verses given below. Transcribed exactly as printed:]

Upper arm of the cross

Left	Center	Right
Arbor, odore potens,	f r o	ndoso vertice nata,
Qua s umma vere sacr	o u f	luit ordine bertas,
Hortu s ditat us, & pa	r c u	i nullus in orbe est,

Left	Center	Right
Floribus & folijs	m i l	leno germine dives,
Omnes excedens alt	a s g	rauitudine syluas,

Cross-beam

Left	Center	Right
Cùm totam piè	magnu · s u e · stit · h	onosq; decusque
Ambit verus h	onor: l a · et us loq	nitur ea voto
Stans homo li	uor ho · c n a · tio · ni	deuegat atra

Lower arm of the cross

Left	Center	Right
Demonis horrendus	r e m	scire laude moveri.
Arbor sola tenens v	a r i	os virtute colores,
Purpureo regis sub	t a c	tu roscida fulgens
A Eternos & radio.st	a n t	in te nam pie vincta
A Edes turrita, ex ho	c d u	dum es nomine beata.

*[The outer hexameters, read straight across (left + center + right), come out — where legible — as e.g.: "Arbor odore potens **fro**ndoso vertice nata" (A tree, mighty in fragrance, born on a leafy crown); "Hortus ditatus, & **par cu**i nullus in orbe est" (An enriched garden, whose equal is nowhere in the world); "Floribus & folijs **mil**leno germine dives" (Rich in flowers and leaves with a thousandfold seed); "Arbor sola tenens **vari**os virtute colores" (A tree alone holding, by its power, colors of many kinds). The lines are contrived to force the letters of the central stripe, so several read stiffly.]*

If you notice, all these verses consist of an equal number of letters; and, reading down through the middle of them, this verse is read:

> ***Forma sacrata crucis venerando fulget amictu.***
>
> *(The sacred form of the cross shines in venerable vesture.)*

And again, while you move from right to left, this other:

> ***Magnus vestit honor, latus loquor hoc nationi.***
>
> *(A great honor clothes it; broadly I speak this to the nation.)*

[→ p201: EXEM(PLVM)…]

[1] The Monorhythmic exposition, by an example. [2] What the Dirhythmic exposition is. [3] Job 14:4. [4] The Isogrammatic exposition is defined. [5] The Simple Isogrammatic is defined. [6] Job 3:3. [7] In each verse of the first distich, 34 letters; in each of the second, 36. [8] What the Figured exposition is.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 184 [printed folio 184]. A worked **Example of a Scholastic Sermon** (Robert, bishop of L'Aquila, on the Wrath of God, Eph 5:6) — with an embedded quaestio "whether there be wrath in God" and a closing jeremiad — then opens **On Scholastic Meditation**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

An Example of a Sermon, or of a Scholastic Discourse

From Robert, bishop of L'Aquila [Roberto, episcopus Aquilanus]. A sermon on the wrath of God, upon that text, "The wrath of God cometh upon the sons of unbelief." Ephesians ch. 5. [1]

The wrath of God cometh upon the sons of unbelief: these are the words of the Doctor of the Gentiles [Paul], originally at Ephesians ch. 5, and in the epistle of the present Lord's day.

I have judged it the most effective remedy for sinners, that they may return to repentance, to set before their face beforehand the terribleness and horror of the wrath of God. For, as Augustine says in the 4th book *On Christian Doctrine*, the merciful, long-suffering of God makes very many unbelievers sin without fear, because they do not reckon God to be the avenger of their sins. [2] We therefore, wishing to provide against this danger, shall in the present sermon make our discourse on the wrath of God; and although to many who have an infected taste such words are grievous, yet to the humble and devout they will seem the medicine of languishing souls. For Augustine says (23, q. 4, ch. *Piety itself*): The physician is troublesome to the raging madman, and the father to the undisciplined son; yet not for that reason is medicine to be denied to the sick, nor discipline to be withdrawn from the son. To this we are called, that we may cry out, and reprove, and detest offenses, and proclaim the dread judgments of God — for by Isaiah, ch. 58, the Lord says: *Cry aloud, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and declare unto my people their crimes* [Isa 58:1]. For the salvation, then, and the correction of sinners we speak securely of the wrath of God: concerning which three principal mysteries are to be contemplated. [3]

The first is called **Contemptibility** [the despising of it]. The second, **Terribleness**. The third, **Nearness**. But let the Virgin Mary first be saluted: *Hail Mary, full of grace*, etc.

The first mystery to be contemplated concerning the wrath of God is called **Contemptibility**. In which it is worth seeing why it is that many, when they hear men speak of the dread wrath of God, do not fear it, but rather, as experience teaches, despise it with laughter. And three principal reasons for this error can be gathered. [4]

The **first** is called [the reason] of foolish thinking. The **second**, of false opinion. The **third**, of long-continued expectation [i.e. delay].

The first reason why the wrath of God is not feared by many is called [that] of foolish thinking: because they suppose that in God there is no wrath. Concerning whom we ask, whether in God there is wrath? [5] Some argue that there is not — because no passion befalls God, but wrath is a certain passion; therefore it does not befall God. And they confirm their error: because every sin is to be removed from God, but wrath is one of the seven capital vices; therefore it is to be removed from God.

Nevertheless, against those who hold thus there are authorities and sayings, whether of Sacred Scripture or of the Gentile and moral philosophers. Whence Exodus 15: *In the multitude of thy glory thou hast put down all our adversaries; thou didst send forth thy wrath, which devoured them* [Exod 15:7]. [6] And in ch. 32, Moses, praying to God, says: *Let thy wrath cease, and be appeasable over the wickedness of thy people* [Exod 32:12]. [7] And 2 Kings 22: *Great is the wrath of the Lord kindled against us* [2 Kings 22:13]. [8] And Deuteronomy ch. 11: *The Lord, being angry, shut up heaven, and the rains descend not* [Deut 11:17], [9] and the rest that follow — divine testimonies of Scripture. And Valerius Maximus, book 1: *For with slow step does the divine wrath proceed to its vengeance, and it compensates the slowness by the gravity of the punishment.* [10] And Ovid, in the *Art of Loving*:

> *An angry god is bent [appeased] by a beseeching voice.*

And Augustine, book 18 *On the City of God*, ch. 12: For Delphic Apollo, musical games were instituted that his wrath might be appeased — the wrath by which they thought the regions of Greece were afflicted with barrenness, because they had not defended his temple, which king Danaus, when he had invaded those same lands, burned in war. And in book 1, as above, ch. 2, it is said of Juno, who was worshipped as a goddess among the Gentiles: For in Virgil, Juno is brought in as hostile to the Trojans, saying to Aeolus, king of the winds, to stir him up against them:

> *A race hateful to me sails the Tyrrhenian sea,*
>
> *carrying Ilium into Italy, and its vanquished household gods.*

thus he. And the same Virgil relates, at the beginning of the 1st book of the Aeneid, that on account of the wrath of Juno Aeneas was made a fugitive with the rest of the Trojans, saying: [11]

> *Arms and the man I sing, who first from the shores of Troy,*
>
> *an exile by fate, came to Italy and the Lavinian*
>
> *shores; much was he tossed both on lands and on the deep,*
>
> *by the force of the gods above, on account of the mindful wrath of savage Juno, etc.*

For the solution, then, of the objections, three things are first to be noted — according to Bonaventure on the 3rd [book] of the Sentences, dist. 33, and Richard [of Middleton] on the 4th, dist. 26, and Thomas [Aquinas], part 1, q. 20: that whenever anything is said of God which in us denotes a passion, it is said of God according to the effect, and not according to the defect of passion. [12] Hatred therefore, love, wrath, and the like, which in us are passions, are said in God according to the effect as regards us: so that He is then said to hate, when He shows us the effect of hatred; then to be angry, when He displays to us the effect of wrath. But God Himself remains stable, without passion — and the rest that follow.

We say therefore that God, who is most merciful, without change of Himself, without passion, without sin, becomes angry when His own justice requires it, often trampling down sinners obstinate in [their] wrath when He shows them the effect of [His] wrath. Hence come wars, pestilences, tempests, hailstorms, barrenness of the earth, famines, earthquakes, terrors from heaven, and great signs. O presumptuous sinners, you have now heard that your opinion is false: for you were saying that God is not angry; and behold, so many proclamations of the Scriptures cry out that the wrath of God is to be feared by all — and not only to be feared, but that it is also most grievous and most near. O, if I could ascend into such a watchtower, from which I might behold all Italy, and all could hear my voice — truly I would cry out: O Italy, weep! O Italy,

fear! O Italy, beware, lest on account of thy obstinacy the wrath of God rage against thee! He Himself has called thee for many years; He has endowed thee with ampler benefits; He has sent to thee His preachers; He has terrified thee with signs and prodigies; thou hast felt earthquakes, pestilences, and the barren state of the seasons; God has threatened thee. Thus surely He did this, that He might lead thee to repentance — and thou art made harder day by day in [thy] sins; and, persevering in malice, now everywhere public usury is practiced, all things are defiled with the filthiest vices of the flesh and with shameful Sodomy; the pride of pomps has now seized all cities and lands; blasphemy, perjuries against God, lies, injustices, violences, oppressions of the poor, and the like superabound. O comely Italy, O region full of riches! Do not despise God, do not exasperate His majesty. I exhort therefore all peoples that they cease from their evil way, lest perchance, if they persevere in it, the wrath and indignation of God suddenly come upon them — from which may He Himself free us, who is blessed and praiseworthy through the infinite ages of ages. Amen.

On Scholastic Meditation

Of scholastic Meditation there are two kinds: the **Lowly** [Plain] and the **Sublime**. [13] The **Lowly**, which for simple and humble read[ers] [→ p202: -ers…]

[1] Ephesians 5:6. [2] Some sin, reckoning that God is not the avenger of their sins. [3] Isaiah 58:1. [4] For three causes the wrath of God is despised. [5] Whether there be wrath in God. [6] Exodus 15:7. [7] Exodus 32:12. [8] 2 Kings 22 [Vulgate 4 Kings 22:13]. [9] Deuteronomy 11:17. [10] God compensates the slowness of vengeance by the gravity of the punishment. [11] Virgil, Aeneid, book 1. [12] Of God it is said according to the effect, not according to the defect of passion — which in us denotes a passion. [13] Of scholastic meditation there are two kinds.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 185 [printed folio 185]. **On Scholastic Meditation** (the Lowly and the Sublime kinds), with a worked **Lowly-meditation example** from Ludolph the Carthusian on the flight into Egypt; Sixtus then notes the ancient rhetorical expositors (esp. Philo). Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

[continuing *On Scholastic Meditation*, from p201]

…read[ers] it is the more accommodated: it is occupied chiefly about the historical contemplation of the matter, setting before the eyes the things said and done in the past as if they were present; and, that it may make a greater impression on the mind, it represents to the imagination of the reader not only those things which are written in the divine letters and which certainly happened, but also those things which, according to the variety of places, persons, and times, could have happened concerning the matters narrated in the Holy Scriptures. Yet those who use this form of meditating advise that their thoughts be not so taken as things undoubtedly asserted and firmly defined, but as the pious and devout contemplations of the meditating mind.

But the **Sublime** kind of meditation, which is also called **Mystical Theology**, [1] and is known only to those who have been worn [practiced] in Scholastic theology, is occupied almost always in the anagogical explanation of the Scriptures. It contains certain abstruse and sublime thoughts, drawn from the inmost recesses of Scholastic theology and expressed in scholastic language — by which those men are chiefly moved, and are excited to admiration and love of the divine goodness, who have been consumed in scholastic studies by long exercise. Of both kinds the examples are these. [2]

An Example of a Lowly Meditation

From the Meditations on the Life of Christ *of Ludolph the Carthusian [Ludolphus/Landulphus Carthusianus], upon the words of Matthew, ch. 2.*

He withdrew into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod, etc. [Matt 2:14–15]

They went, therefore — Mary and Joseph, with the child — to a certain city of Egypt which is called Heliopolis; and there, renting some little house, they dwelt for seven years as strangers and pilgrims, poor and needy. But here there occurs a beautiful, pious, and very compassionate meditation. For whence, and

how, did they live for so long a time? Did they beg? But it is read of the Lady [Mary] that with distaff and needle she sought for herself the necessaries by [her] thread. She sewed, then, and spun — the Lady of the world, the lover of poverty. In every way these greatly loved poverty, and kept faith with it perfectly unto death. But did she go about through the houses asking for cloth, and other things on which she might work? For this had to become known through the neighborhood; otherwise she would have sat idle from such works, because those women could not divine [guess her need]. But also, when Jesus began to be five years old, or thereabouts — did not He too carry His mother's errands, seeking for her those things on which she could work? For she had no other squire [attendant]. And did He not carry back the finished works, asking on His mother's behalf the payment and the price? Was not the boy Jesus, the Son of the most high God, made to blush at such things — and the mother too, in sending Him? But what if sometimes, when He had delivered the work and asked the price, some proud, quarrelsome, and talkative woman answered insultingly, took the finished work, drove Him out without payment, and so He returned home empty? O how many and how great are the injuries done to strangers — which the Lord came not to avoid, but to undergo! What also, if sometimes, returning home and suffering hunger, after the manner of children He asked for bread, and the mother had nothing whence to give it? Were not her inward parts shaken at these and similar such things? She consoled her son with words, and provided by work as she could, and perhaps sometimes withheld from her own food to reserve it for the son. And if it was necessary to seek food from the work of the hands, what shall we say of clothing? What of the utensils — namely beds, and other things needful within the house? Did she have double sets? did she have superfluous ones? did she have curious [fancy] ones? These are against poverty; and even if she could have had them, she, the lover of poverty, would not have wished them. But did the Lady, in sewing or doing other works, make curious [fancy] works after the manner of certain women? Far be it — for this is dangerous, and a very great fault. Behold, then, now the Lady, busy in her labors and works — spinning, cutting, sewing, weaving — how she does them faithfully and humbly, with diligence, and nonetheless keeps the governance over her son and her house, and, according to her power, always attends to vigils and prayers, and to have compassion on Him with all her affection. And consider that she, the Lady of the kingdom, did not have the kingdom of God altogether for free. But holy Joseph too, the carpenter [worker in wood], himself works something in the craft of wood.

Whence, since matter for compassion presents itself, at last, when you have spent some delay with them, ask leave to depart; and, having received a blessing — first from the boy Jesus, then from the mother, afterward from Joseph, with knees bent — with tears and great compassion bid them farewell: for like exiles from their fatherland without any cause, and banished men, they remain to sojourn there for seven years, destined to live in the sweat of their brow, etc.

These things Ludolph [takes] from St. Bonaventure, who in his book of *Meditations on the Life of Christ*, ch. 14, admonishing the reader not to despise the humility of meditations of this kind, thus writes: **These things, and things like these, in this place concerning the exile of the boy Jesus you can meditate; and become a little one with the little one Jesus, nor lightly esteem such humble things, and to meditate about Him in things which seem childish. For they seem to give devotion, to increase love, to kindle fervor, to induce compassion, to confer purity and simplicity, to nourish and preserve the vigor of humility and poverty, to make familiarity and conformity, and to lift up hope. For to ascend to sublime things we are not able; but that which is foolish of God is wiser than men, and that which is weak, is mightier [1 Cor 1:25]. The meditation of such things seems also to take away pride, to enervate cupidity, and to confound curiosity. You see how many good things come thence? Be therefore, as I said, a little one with the little one, that you may grow with Him as He grows, and follow Him whithersoever He goes, and gaze upon His face always.** Thus he.

The ancient expositors seem not to have shrunk from this form of explaining — especially those more eloquent ones, whose chief care was to bring in a clearer and more delightful elucidation of the divine

scripture, [feigning], according to the laws of the Rhetoricians, certain sayings or deeds which — according to the diversity of the characters described in the sacred letters — might seem able to have been said or done. Among these, Philo the Jew, wonderfully delighted with the composition of this kind of explanation, very often fashioned little speeches of various kinds, put forth in the person of those whose virtues or vices he especially strove to express. Of these we have decided to set down one here for the sake of example, that from the comparison of it it may appear what likeness, and what difference, there is between the artifice of the ancient Rhetoricians and of the recent scholastics.

[→ p203: EXEM(PLVM)…]

[1] What Mystical Theology is. [2] Matthew 2:14, 15.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 186 [printed folio 186]. A **Rhetorical meditation** from Philo (Jacob's lament, Gen 37) and a **Sublime meditation** from Denis the Carthusian on "I am who I am" (Exod 3:14); then opens the last method, **Method 24 — Pandesia**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

An Example of a Rhetorical Meditation

From the book of Philo the Jew, On the Life of the Civil Man, *upon that [text] of Genesis 37: They took Joseph's tunic; which when the father had seen, he said: "It is my son's tunic; a most wicked beast hath devoured him"; and, rending his garments, he mourned for a long time.* [Gen 37:31–33] [1]

But when it was brought to the father — not what was true (that the son had been sold), but that fabrication about his being consumed by beasts — the news struck his ears, and at the same time the spectacle struck his eyes; for the tunic had been brought torn, and foully bloodied. Troubled with grief, he was struck dumb for a long space of time, not even able to lift his head, overwhelmed by so great a calamity. At last, suddenly bursting into tears which poured out as from a fountain, he beat his breast and, tearing his face, rending his garments [cried]: Not so much do I grieve for thy death, my son, as for the loss of a tomb. For if a tomb had befallen thee in thine own land, and consolation were not lacking to me, I would dutifully have sat by thee, sick, before death; I would have bestowed the last kisses on thee, dying; I would have closed thine eyes; I would have bathed thee, dead, with tears; I would have borne thee out magnificently; I would have omitted nothing of the just funeral rites. And even if thou hadst died abroad, I would have said to myself: The debt of nature has been paid, grieve not. The living have their own fatherlands; of the dead, all the earth is a tomb; all men are of brief span — for he who was most long-lived, how little time did he live, if you compare it to eternity? Or, if thou wert altogether slain by violence and treachery, it would have been a lighter thing to be destroyed by the hands of men who at least, pitying the dead, would have covered him with earth and entombed the corpse — or, [even] had they been most cruel, what more could they have done than to cast him out unburied? Whom soon some passing traveler, mindful of the common nature and touched by mercy, would have buried. But now, as it is reported, thou hast fed the savage and carnivorous beasts, and hast glutted them with my [own] bowels. Hitherto I have drained many unlooked-for labors; in these miseries I am abundantly practiced — wandering, sojourning, serving for hire, bearing hard commands, harassed even to the peril of life by those from whom I least ought [to have suffered it]. Many things I have seen, many I have heard, many grievous things I have suffered, by which, schooled to patience, I have endured. But nothing is more intolerable than the present chance, which has overturned and cast down all the strength of my mind: for what mourning can be greater, or more miserable? The boy's garment has been brought to the father — of him[self] not a limb, not a fragment, not even the least remnant: the beasts have devoured the whole; nothing is left to be carried to the tomb; nor have I even received a garment, save that at the sight of it the memory of grief may break out afresh, that never can forgetfulness of so great a calamity creep in. Thus did he bewail his lot.

An Example of a Sublime Meditation

On that saying of Exodus, ch. 3, "I am who I am," from the meditations of Denis the Carthusian [Dionysius Carthusianus]. [2]

O Being [Ens], in every genus of beings the first and the supreme — uncreated Being, uncaused, fountal Being, in the highest degree simple, most sincere [pure], formally infinite, and totally perfect: to Thee alone truly, fully, and properly does it belong to *be* in a perpetual and unfailing eternity. Whence, to Moses asking what Thy name was, Thou rightly didst answer, **I AM WHO I AM.** Truly, O superblessed, O infinite and uncircumscribed Being, Thy being — like an immense sea flowing into itself — comprehends in itself most eminently all the perfection and eminence of every being; and to all beings it grants to each its own being and existence. Thou, O most superglorious fountal Being, dost so subsist, pure in Thy purity and immense simplicity, that nothing of the imperfect is mingled to Thee: Thou art [Thy] being, and the same is [Thy] essence, nor is there any difference of the two in Thee. Thou who art ideal Being, subsisting through Thyself, first, one, and altogether simple. So great is the excellence of Thy most-praiseworthy being that created essence, compared with it, is as though it were utterly nothing and empty, and our subsistence is as a most vain shadow that passes away. Thou who art always the same Thyself, O final Being, into whom all beings are finally resolved — [beings] led by Thee from non-being to being — fulfill the imperfect [portion] of our entity, take from us the non-being of our defects, pour into us the true being of Thy grace: that after this mortal being shall have been laid aside by us, we may rest in the beatific object of Thine essence — to whom [be] praise and glory. Amen.

On Pandesia. Method 24.

Pandesia, or the Pandesian Method, [3] is the broadest and most copious elucidation of the divine scripture — gathering, either from all or from the principal Methods of exposition, the more powerful and the best of each into one most-enriched body of explanation, not without keen judgment: in which nothing is omitted that could contribute to a whole, perspicuous, and most-rich knowledge, examination, proof, and adornment of the matter to be explained — [resources] summoned from everywhere, out of every variety of tongues, disciplines, and arts, with their riches and ornaments, to illustrate, adorn, and amplify the dignity of the matter to be explained. Now we have chosen to call an exposition of this kind **Pandesia**, because it is like a common banquet, prepared with the parts of each publicly contributed, and furnished with so great an abundance and variety of foods of every kind that nothing in it could be desired to fill up the pleasure of all the senses: for such a banquet is called by the Greeks Πανδεσία. There seem in a certain way to have approached the amplitude of this [kind of] explanation those things which St. Augustine, explaining the first three chapters of Genesis, gathered together in ten homilies and in twenty books — overflowing with the most affluent abundance of all divine things. An example of the present Method the ingenious reader will be able to prepare for himself out of all the Methods already described, drawn together into one.

[→ p204: PER…]

[1] Genesis 37:31, 33. [2] Exodus 3:14. [3] What Pandesia is.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 187 [printed folio 187]. The close of Book III: the **Peroration**, then **Sixtus's Judgment on which expositors to prefer** (modeled on Alciato's verse-ranking of the jurists, and answered by Sixtus's own verses). Set full-width. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

Peroration

These things concerning the Methods of explaining the sacred letters — written out by no one before us — we have, after our fashion, comprehended in this third book of the Holy Library. In which, if you should

perhaps find any formulas of explanation set forth superfluously, or explained with superfluous words, or at greater length than you would have wished, in demonstrations and examples — know, friendly reader, that we have expended this kind of labor not only for the learned and practiced, but also for the unlearned, and especially for beginners [tyros], to whom very many things in this kind would be unknown and utterly unheard of, which to you, perhaps, and to others like you, have long since been clearer than the noonday light. Therefore take in good part whatever has been sweated out by us in this matter; and embrace with willing mind at least this our attempt, if not the thing itself, receiving with a cheerful brow the following judgment, which — as the final colophon [coronis] of this book — we append for you concerning the catholic expositors of the divine volumes.

Which Expositors of Divine Scripture the Students of Sacred Letters Ought to Choose Above the Rest, and to Provide for Themselves

The Judgment of Friar Sixtus of Siena

When once I was reading the *Parerga Iuris* [Legal Byways], written by Andrea Alciato, the prince of the jurisconsults of our age, among other things I found his Judgment concerning the greatest interpreters of the civil laws — that is, concerning the usefulness which each one could obtain from the principal expositors of the laws. This he had pronounced in these verses, approved by the assent of all the learned:

In law, compared with the rest, the first

place Bartolus will hold.

For his frequent [use in] cases, the forensic [practitioner]

upholds Baldus.

By no means to be neglected, most of all by beginners,

is the exposition of Castrensis [Paulus de Castro].

The Clashing-Rocks [Symplegades] of opinions the more safely

wilt thou overcome, with Alexander [Tartagni] for [thy] guide.

For [good] order, and by the name of light [clarity],

Jason [de Mayno] is to be consulted by those in haste.

But if anyone add other interpreters to these,

he more truly burdens than honors [them].

Let it be permitted me too — whatever sort I myself may be — by the example of this most illustrious man to pass judgment on the chief interpreters of the divine laws and of the Holy Scriptures: not upon their doctrine (for this I, a manikin of the lowest class, ought not to dare), but upon the fruit which each one can gather, the greater, from their writings. All these things having been weighed with what diligence we could, we think it can rightly be done in this manner:

History, drawn from the Hebrew and Greek fountains,

thou shalt learn, with Jerome for [thy] guide.

Allegories, and the Anagogical [sense], will unlock

Origen [and] Ambrose.

Senses fit for the forming of morals will expound

Chrysostom [and] Gregory.

In doubtful matters, and in places sunk in deep darkness,

Aurelius [Augustine] will bring light.

But the brief and easy exposition of the Lyran [Nicholas of Lyra]

is not to be scorned by the beginner.

[→ p205: Tituli…]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 188 [printed folio 188]. A full-page **synoptic bracket-diagram** of the whole art of exposition (its three parts — Definitive, Inventive, Dispositive — and their subdivisions), rendered here as nested lists. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

The Titles of the Whole Art of Expounding the Sacred Volumes, Explained in the Holy [Third] Book

The art of expounding the sacred volumes has three parts — the Definitive, the Inventive, and the Dispositive. Of which:

- **The Definitive** is that which describes the senses and expositions of divine Scripture. Now, of divine scripture there are:
- **Two senses**, namely:
- **Literal**, which is twofold:
- Proper
- Metaphorical
- **Mystical**, which is threefold:
- Moral
- Allegorical
- Anagogical
- **Two kinds of exposition**, namely:
- **Universal**, which is fourfold:
- Historical
- Moral
- Allegorical
- Anagogical
- **Particular**, which is threefold:
- Elemental
- Physical
- Prophetic
- **The Inventive** is that which teaches to inquire into and to find the senses of divine scripture already described; whose species are:
- Tropical
- Topical
- Chronological
- Physical
- Mathematical
- Ethical

• **The Dispositive**, or Methodical, is that which reduces the found expositions of the senses into various Methods — of which the principal are these ———

Which you see noted on the immediately following page.

[→ p206: Transla(tio) — the list of the 24 Methods]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 189 [printed folio 189]. The synoptic diagram concluded: the Dispositive part's full list of the **24 Methods** with their sub-species, as a nested list. This is the last page of Book III. Running head: LIBER TERTIVS.)*

The Twenty-Four Methods of Exposition

1. **Translation** (Translatio): Tetrapla; Hexapla; Octapla. 2. **Stigmatic** (Stigmatica). 3. **Syllabic** (Syllabica). 4. **Partition** (Partitio): Dividing; Collecting. 5. **Epitome** (Epitome). 6. **Ecloge / Excerpt** (Egloge):

• Mirror (Speculum) / Commonplaces (Loci communes) — [these being] without exposition, [or] with exposition

• Harmony (Harmonia): Literal; Numeral

7. **Notariac** (Notariaca). 8. **Paraphrase** (Paraphrasis): Tighter [more compressed]; Broader [fuller]. 9. **Lexical** (Lexice). 10. **Annotation** (Annotatio): Marginal; Interlinear. 11. **Commentary** (Commentatio). 12. **Sciographic** (Sciographica). 13. **Tabular** (Tabellaria). 14. **Narration** (Enarratio): Homily; Declamation. 15. **Collation** (Collatio): Continuous; Interrupted. 16. **Meditation** (Meditatio). 17. **Poetic** (Poëma): Verse (Carmineum); Prose-Verse (Prosocarmineum). 18. **Epistle** (Epistola). 19. **Inquiry** (Inquisitio): Problem; Question; Disputation. 20. **Accumulation** (Coacervatio): of senses; of commonplaces. 21. **Thematic** (Thematica). 22. **Collection** (Collectanea):

• **Rhapsody** (Rapsodia):

• Hagiographic

• Ecclesiastical: Anonymous; Named (Proonyma)

• Ethnic: Catena; Cento

• **Syllegma**

• **Abbreviation**

23. **Scholastic** (Scholastica):

• **Old** (Vetus)

• **New** (Nova):

• Concordances (Concordantiaria)

• Dictionaries (Dictionaria)

• Histories (Historica)

• Postils (Postillaris)

• Question-books (Quaestionaria)

• Lectures (Lecturalis)

• Compendia (Compendiaria):

• Prose (Prosaica): Universal; Particular — [Particular:] Columnar; Tree (Arborea)

• Metrical (Metrica)

• Metrical (Metrica):

- Verse (Carminea):
- Rhythmic (Rythmica)
- Leonine (Leonina): Monorhythmic; Dirhythmic; Isogrammatic [Equal-letter] — [Isogrammatic:] Simple; Pictured (Picturata)
- Prose-Verse (Prosocarminea)
- Sermon-books (Sermonaria)
- Meditations (Meditativa): Lowly; Sublime

24. **Pandesian** (Pandesiaca).

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK IV

On the Catholic expositors of the divine volumes

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, Book IV

Note on the Latin sources. This English version is drawn from two copies of Sixtus's *Bibliotheca Sancta.* The front matter and pages 6–108 were translated from the 1586 Cologne edition (Maternus Cholinus), which carries few marginal notes; the marginal glosses were then supplied from a second, more heavily annotated copy of the same work. From page 109 onward the translation is made directly from that margin-rich copy. The printed leaf- and page-numbers in both copies are frequently misprinted, so pages are aligned by content and scan sequence rather than by the printed folios.

*(Rich PDF p. 190 [printed folio 190]. The title page and **Preface** of **BOOK IV** —* On the Catholic Expositors of the Divine Volumes, *an alphabetical catalog of biblical expositors — then the catalog's **letter A** begins (the Abbot of Vercelli, Abbo of Fleury, Acacius). Running head: F. SIXTI SENENSIS … BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

F. Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers — On the Catholic Expositors of the Divine Volumes. The Holy Library, Book Four.

Preface

The Third book of our Library set forth the art of expounding the sacred letters, and all the modes of explaining the sacred volumes familiar to the divine expositors. The Fourth book, which we now arrange according to the alphabetical order of the letters, comprehends — of all the Catholic expositors, both extant and not extant, who from the three-hundredth year before Christ down to this day have expounded the divine volumes — their names, surnames, family, dignities [offices], dates, the number and variety of their commentaries, their language, style, kind of exposition, and method of expounding, together with the judgments of illustrious men upon the writings of most of the noble expositors. To these, as by way of appendix, there will follow at the end of the volume a Catalogue of the Hebrew expositors, who explained in Hebrew the Hebrew scriptures of the Old Testament; and likewise a brief admonition concerning the causes of false ascriptions [of titles], and by what conjectures their falsity may be detected.

All which things we have gathered both from the most approved authors of Ecclesiastical History — Eusebius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, Evagrius, Zonaras, and Nicephorus — and from those who published Catalogues of the illustrious writers of the church, among whom we have chiefly followed Jerome, Gennadius, Isidore, Honorius, Sigebert, Notger, and Trithemius. [1] The rest we have supplied as best we could from the various Libraries [catalogs] of Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Greece, which — partly through friends, partly through ourselves, having undertaken many journeys through Italy and Gaul — we have surveyed, not without great labor. [2]

But lest anyone wonder, or impute it to me as a fault, that in this volume I have omitted very many works of various kinds written by Catholic expositors, let him know that this alone was my care: that I should gather only the **exegetical** writings which the Orthodox explainers had expressly destined for the explanation of the holy volumes chiefly — but should omit the rest, which had flowed from them on other occasions and toward other ends, as it were "exoteric." Not indeed that I would defraud those most excellent men of any part of their labors (from whom, being brighter than the light of the Sun, my silence can take nothing away, nor can my speech add anything), but because the plan of the present work admitted only those things which pertain to the interpretative kind of writing. Moreover, we have deferred the censures and corrections which the noble fathers of the church [made] upon the various commentaries of the more illustrious expositors to the next following book, lest the size of the present volume should grow more than is fair — [the present volume] which we now begin from the first letter of the Alphabet.

A

The Abbot of Vercelli [Abbas Vercellensis], whose name I have not yet been able to find — a man (as his Paraphrase on Dionysius the Areopagite shows) of the highest erudition and religion — composed expositions on the Song of Songs of Solomon, of a style not to be despised, in which he insisted chiefly upon the anagogical sense, taking the likeness of the supreme created love which is in the seraphic spirits, to whose sublimity he strove to raise the soul, and in a certain way to transform it into God. John Gerson

mentions this work in the preface of his commentaries on the Song of Songs. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1400.

Abbo of Fleury [Abbo Floriacensis], abbot of the monastery [of Fleury], wrote homilies on the Gospels. He lived in the year 1000.

Acacius — whom, because he was one-eyed, they used to call Μονόφθαλμον, that is, "One-eyed" — bishop of the church of Caesarea in Palestine, disciple of Eusebius bishop of Caesarea and his successor in the bishopric; a man exercised in the divine scriptures, but perverted by the Arian impiety. He flourished so greatly under the Emperor Constantius, that [→ p208: ut in…]

[1] The authors whom the writer follows in this book. [2] The author of the book traveled through Gaul and Italy.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 191 [printed folio 191]. **Book IV**, catalog letter **A**: a run of entries from Acacius of Caesarea through Alan of Lille, each giving the writer's works, style, and dates. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Acacius of Caesarea, continued from p207:]

…that he set up at Rome, in the place of Liberius, Felix the Arian as bishop. He elaborated, upon various passages of Divine Scripture, [a work] of συλλεκτῶν ζητημάτων — that is, a *Volume of Selected Questions* — from which many fragments are preserved in the Greek Catena of explanations on Genesis; and Jerome mentions this work in his epistle to Minerius and Alexander. He also composed seventeen volumes of commentaries on Ecclesiastes. I would not have listed him, had not Jerome done so before me. He flourished in the year of the Lord 350. His acts are written in the fifth book of the Tripartite History.

There are weighty Theologians who deny that this Felix was an Arian — although before his Pontificate he communicated with the Arians, whom, after he was made Pontiff [Pope], he detested, and was therefore killed by them, or at least sent into exile. See Rufinus, book 10 of the History, ch. 22; Theodoret, book 2 of the History, ch. 17; and Sozomen, book 4 of the History, ch. 10 and 14.

Adam Sasbout, of the Order of Minors [Franciscans], who for many years publicly professed the Sacred letters in the University of Louvain, published a succinct exposition on Isaiah, and on all the Pauline epistles, gathered from all the Orthodox fathers, both Greek and Latin, in which he confuted many errors of the heretics. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540. [1]

Adam of Barking [Adamus Barkingensis], an Englishman, a monk of Clairvaux, wrote commentaries on the 4 Gospels. He lived in the year of the Lord 1216.

Adam Marsh [Adamus de Marisco], an Englishman, wrote an *Elucidarium* of Scripture. He flourished in the year 1260.

Adam Wodeham [Adamus Wodeham], of the Order of Minors, disciple of William of Occam, wrote commentaries on the Song of Songs, and a Postil on Ecclesiastes. He died in the year of the Lord 1358.

Adomnán [Adamannus], Presbyter and Abbot of the monks dwelling on the island of Hy [Iona], beyond Britain, wrote to Aldfrid, king of the English, a book on the holy places — most useful for the understanding of the whole scripture — which he gathered from the conversations of Arculf, a bishop of Gaul, who had surveyed all the holy land with his own eyes. He flourished under Justinian the Younger, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 690. This Adomnán, by surname Colodius, was by nation a Scot [Irishman], a man especially learned, from whose writings Bede borrowed not a few things.

Ailred [Adilredus / Aelred], abbot of a certain Cistercian monastery, studious of the Holy scriptures and not ignorant of secular philosophy, wrote many little works for the benefit of his brethren; among the rest, one homily on the boy Jesus at twelve years old, on the second chapter of Luke, which begins, *When Jesus was twelve years old*, and is found among the works of Bernard. He flourished under Henry the Sixth, in the year

of the Lord 1200.

Giles [of Rome] [Aegidius], Archbishop of Bourges, by fatherland a Roman, of the illustrious family Colonna, once Prior General of the Order of Hermits [Augustinians], disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas, a man most learned in the divine scriptures, and in Aristotelian Philosophy second to none in his time, of subtle intellect, scholastic in speech, and — for the constancy of his doctrine — one who obtained the surname of **the Most-Founded** [Doctor Fundatissimus]. He wrote on the sacred letters many excellent explanations, of which are reported:

- On the *Hexameron*, two books, filled with a multitude of scholastic questions, which we have read, printed for the first time at Venice in recent years; their beginning is, *Since [it is] concerning the works of the six days.*
- Likewise, on the Song of Songs, a Scholastic Lecture, distinguished into nineteen lections, which begins, *Let thy voice sound, etc.*, at the head of each book.
- On the Epistle to the Romans, a Lecture of 53 lections. [beginning] *Enoch pleased God.*
- On the Ave Maria, a little work.

He flourished under the Emperor Rudolph [of Habsburg], in the year of the Lord 1280.

Giles Faber [Aegidius Faber], of Brussels, a Carmelite, Doctor of Louvain, wrote Commentaries on Ruth, Job, and on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. He died at Brussels in 1506.

Giles Topiarius [Aegidius Topianus] wrote discourses on the Gospels and epistles which are wont to be set forth during Lent, and on the Gospels and epistles of the whole year. He flourished under the Emperor Ferdinand.

Aelius — see Antonio of Nebrija [Antonius Nebrissensis].

Agathius of Guidiacum [Agathius Guidiacensis, or Guidacenus], royal professor of sacred Theology in the original languages, wrote commentaries on the first twenty-four Psalms of David, in which he especially examines the Hebrew text of the Psalms. The same [author] embraced the Song of Songs in a succinct explanation. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Agrippa, by surname **Castor**, a very learned man, wrote, under Antoninus Pius, against the 24 volumes which the heretic Basilides had composed on the gospel — very eloquent books, in which he most strongly refuted the insane blasphemies of Basilides. He flourished in the year of the Lord 160.

Aidan [Aidanus Auinius], a Scot [Irishman], bishop of Lindisfarne, wrote commentaries on the Scriptures. He died in the year of the Lord 651.

Alalphus, or Alulf of Tournai [Alulphus Tornacensis], a Benedictine monk, gathered from the works of St. Gregory a work of *Excerpts* on the New Testament, which is entitled the **Gregorianum**.

Alan Cope [Alanus Copus], an Englishman, wrote a *Syntaxis of the Gospel History*, in which the deeds of our Lord Jesus Christ are narrated in the order in which they were done. The book was printed at Louvain in 1572. He flourished under Maximilian II, Emperor, and departed from the living at Rome.

Alan of Lille [Alanus Insulensis], a German [of the Low Countries] — orator, poet, Philosopher, and Theologian, the most excellent of all of his time, moderator [head] of the sacred University of Paris, who, on account of his erudition in all things of every kind, earned the surname of **the Universal Doctor** [Doctor Universalis] — left, among the many illustrious monuments of his labors:

- Five books of Commentaries on the whole Pentateuch.
- Likewise, on the Song of Songs, one book, whose beginning is, *Many, for adorning.*

• But also [he embraced] both Testaments in a small compendium, which [is entitled] **The Eye of Sacred Scrip**[ture]… [→ p209: -ture]

[1] The commentaries of this author on all the epistles of St. Paul are not extant.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 192 [printed folio 192]. **Book IV**, catalog letter **A**, continued: entries from Alan of Lille through Alcuin, including a long notice of **Albert the Great**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Alan of Lille, continued from p208:]

…entitled **The Eye of Sacred Scripture**, he touched upon [in brief]; its exordium is, *To the most reverend father and lord.* He flourished under the Emperor Albert, in the year of the Lord 1300.

Alan of Lynn [Alanus de Linna], an Englishman, a Carmelite, wrote *On the Various Sense of Scripture*, 1 book; and *Morals of the Bible* [Moralia Bibliorum], 1 book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1420.

Alan de la Roche [Alanus Rupensis], a German, of the Order of Preachers [Dominicans] — a man learned in the divine scriptures, excellent in sacred declamations, venerable in life and conversation, and a chief lover of the Blessed Mary ever-virgin, and also the restorer and promoter of that confraternity which, under the name of the **Rosary**, is dedicated to the holy virgin — wrote one book on the Song of Songs, in which he most becomingly fitted the individual words of Solomon to the Virgin Mary and to Christ her son, as conversing with each other in turn. He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, and died in the year of the Lord 1474.

Alard of Amsterdam [Alardus Amstelredamus], by nation a Hollander — whose celebrated book of *Sacred Parallels* [Sacrorum similium] survives, gathered from the orthodox fathers, and another, *On the Miracles Wrought through the Venerable Eucharist* — gathered from all the catholic doctors all the tropes, phrases, idioms, and various figures of speech used in the divine scriptures, and arranged them most fittingly into a single volume according to the Alphabetical order. He also expounded Ecclesiastes according to all the topics [loci] of Rudolph Agricola. He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, in 1538.

Albert [son] of John, of Haarlem [Albertus Ioannis Harlemensis], a Carmelite, Doctor of Louvain, wrote a Lecture on Ecclesiasticus, 1 book, and on the first Canonical [epistle] of John, 1 book. He died at Mechlin in the year of the Lord 1496.

Albert Novocampianus wrote a *Biblical Scope* [Scopus Biblicus] of the Old and New Testament, with Annotations embracing the Sum of Christian doctrine; Lazarus Andreas printed it at Cracow in the year of the Lord 1552.

Albert the Great [Albertus Magnus], Archbishop of Regensburg, of the Order of Preachers, by nation a Swabian, from the town of Lauingen — a man of admirable erudition, from whom few things of divine matters, and perhaps none of human, lay hidden, excelling by the sublime powers of his intellect and memory even to a miracle, by far the most learned in divine studies, and the prince of all the philosophers whom all Germany brought forth either before or after him. On account of the exceeding multitude and greatness of his sciences, he obtained before his death the surname of **the Great** [Magni] — which never befell any of the learned. For many years he taught Peripatetic Philosophy and Scholastic Theology in the most flourishing Universities of Paris and Cologne [Agrippina]; in which, among other excellent hearers, he had as his disciple **Thomas Aquinas**, of divine natural gift and most excellent intellect. Then, called — nay, almost unwilling — to the Archbishopric of the Church of Regensburg by the Emperor Rudolph, and drawn thither by the Supreme Pontiff Urban IV, when he had magnificently presided over it for some years, he was recalled again, by the most grateful recollection of his old studies, to the former exercises of letters; and he freely resigned the care of the Church. [1] Having cast off the Episcopal dignity, he returned as a private man to his monastery at Cologne, where he most happily passed what remained of his life — reading, writing,

teaching, and serving God day and night — departing from human affairs in the 81st year of his age; and he was buried in the middle of the choir of his Dominican church, in the reign of the Emperor Rudolph, in the year from the redemption of the world 1280. Of his innumerable works upon the whole of divine scripture, heaped up in the scholastic kind of explanation, I have seen only these, namely:

- On the Twelve Prophets, 12 books. [beginning] *The bones of the twelve Prophets.*
- On Matthew, one book. [beginning] *Take thee a great book.*
- On Mark, one book. [beginning] *Behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah has prevailed.*
- On Luke, one book. [beginning] *Where very many harvests appear.*
- On John, one book. [beginning] *A great eagle of great wings.*
- On *[The angel] was sent* [the Annunciation, Luke 1], one book.
- On the Magnificat, one book.

Albert of Padua [Albertus Patauinus], a Hermit [Augustinian], disciple of Giles of Rome, that most excellent doctor — exquisitely learned in both sacred and profane letters, and most celebrated in the office of preaching — wrote these things, namely:

- Of Commentaries on the Pentateuch, in the scholastic manner, five books, filled with an unpolished medley of sacred authorities.
- On the four Gospels, four books.
- On all the epistles of Paul, fourteen books.
- A huge volume of Lenten sermons on the 42 stations [from Exodus] and on the daily gospels.

He lived in the times of the Emperor Albert, in the year of the Lord 1300.

Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem [Albertus, Patriarcha Hierosolymitanus], a man of admirable sanctity and doctrine, who — by the command of Pope Innocent III of that name — gave to the Carmelite brothers, still dwelling in the holy land, a form and rule of living; he wrote commentaries, not to be despised, on the site and condition of the Holy Land. He flourished under the Emperor Henry VI, in the year of the Lord 1190.

Albert of Siegburg [Albertus Sigebergensis], a monk, [wrote] a Glossary of the Old and New Testament.

Albinus Flaccus, by surname Alcuin [Alcuinus] — monk, deacon, and abbot of the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, by nation an Englishman, a hearer of Bede the Presbyter, a man most celebrated in his time in every kind of the sciences, and the teacher of Charlemagne [Charles the Great] Augustus — wrote on the sacred letters the volumes written below:

- To Sigulf the Presbyter, a brief little commentary on Genesis — of a compiled exposition from the opinions of the fathers, arranged by question and answer in a simple and historical narration; whose beginning is, *To my most beloved brother in Christ, Sigulf.*
- On the fifteen Songs of Degrees — that is, from Psalm 119 to 133 [Vulgate] — of moral annota[tions] [→ p210: -tions]

[1] Albert the Great resigned his bishopric, that he might close his last day in the Order of St. Dominic.

(Rich PDF p. 191 [printed folio 191]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the end of ***Alcuin*** *(his homiliary of 209 homilies), then several* ***Alexanders*** *— of Cappadocia, of Chester, Seton, Wendock, of Villedieu (the* Doctrinale *poet), of Hales ("Fountain of Life"), Neckam — and the* ***Alphonsuses*** *(de Castro, Martinez, Tostatus). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Alcuin, continued from p209:]

…a brief commentary [of moral annotations on the Gradual Psalms], which begins, *They are steps [degrees].*

• On the seven Penitential Psalms, according to the moral sense, succinct, pointed, and wonderfully expressive annotations, whose beginning is, *The Title of the Psalm.*

• On Ecclesiastes, to Ozias and Candidus, one book.

• On the Song of Songs, one book.

• On the gospel of John, seven books of commentaries of succinct and lucid brevity.

• On all the epistles of Paul, fourteen books.

• On the Apocalypse, one book.

He also gathered, and reduced into order at the command of Charlemagne, the homilies of the most excellent doctors of the church on the gospels which throughout the year are read publicly in the churches. And these are: of Augustine 48, of Jerome 6, of Ambrose 10, of Hilary 1, of Fulgentius 2, of Origen 4, of Maximus 17, of Chrysostom 11, of Severian 1, of Leo 21, of Gregory 39, of Bede 48, of Isidore 1 — **the sum of all the homilies, 209.** But those which are inscribed under the title of Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and sometimes Bede are not homilies, but centos of explanations sewn together out of the commentaries of these authors; and in this volume they are numbered among the ancient homilies. He flourished under Charlemagne, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 770.

Aldhelm [Aldelmus], an Englishman, gathered the flowers of both Testaments, 2 books. He flourished in the year of the Lord 709.

Alexander, bishop of Cappadocia and martyr, a man eminent in sanctity and in the erudition of the sacred letters, left among other monuments of his genius a commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, from which Jerome confesses that he derived some things into his own commentaries on the same epistle. In the seventh persecution under Decius — at which time Babylas suffered at Antioch — he was led to Caesarea and shut up in prison; for the confession of Christ he was crowned with martyrdom, in the year of the Lord 255.

Alexander, bishop of Chester [Cestriensis], wrote a Scholastic Postil on all the Psalms, in the year of the Lord 1238.

Alexander Seton, a Scot, wrote on both epistles of St. Peter, on the epistle of St. James, and on chapter 18 of Acts. He lived in the year 1541.

Alexander Wendock, bishop of Chester, wrote a Postil on the Psalter, 1 book; Sermons and Lectures, 2 books. He lived in the year of the Lord 1238.

Alexander of Villedieu [Alexander Villadeus], by fatherland of Dôle, a Franciscan — easily the chief poet of the Leonine verse which was once in esteem, whose work still survives, entitled the *Doctrinale*, once used by boys in the grammar schools for grasping the rudiments of Grammar — composed on the Acts of the Apostles a Scholastic Postil in Leonine hexameters, which begins:

If thou wouldst know the transacted Apostolic deeds,

This Postil shall handle those for thee in verses.

He also wrote, for the convenience of those who wish to commit to memory and retain the sum of the divine volumes, a most brief and compressed little compendium of the whole divine scripture, tightly enclosed in two hundred and twelve hexameter verses, in which the individual words comprehend the individual chapters of the holy books. And that the words of these verses might be more plainly understood, he inscribed over each of them the number of the chapter contained in it, with some interlinear glosses of smaller character beneath, which indicate the meaning of each word — thus [for Genesis 1–7]:

Six. He-forbids. They-sin. Abel. Enoch. And-the-ark-is-made. They-enter.

(glossed: 1 the days; 2 the tree of life; 3 the first parents; 4 [Abel] is slain; 5 [Enoch] is translated; 6 by Noah; 7 into the ark.)

He flourished under Frederick II, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1240.

Alexander [of Hales], from the town of Hales, which is on the island of Britain, a professor of the Franciscan religion, teacher of the cardinal St. Bonaventure, a public doctor of Theology in the University of Paris — who attained in the Scholastic arts and in the knowledge of the divine sciences so great a name and glory that he deserved to be called by the most learned of his time the *Fountain of Life* [1] — besides that noble *Summa* of Theology which he composed at the command of Pope Innocent IV, illustrated both sacred Testaments with various annotations here and there, like little stars, which work he himself entitled a **Postil upon the Whole Bible**. He flourished under Frederick II, in the year of the Lord 1240.

Alexander Neckam [Nechan], an Englishman, wrote a Postil on the Song of Songs, 6 books; on Ecclesiastes, 2 books; on the Proverbs of Solomon, 1 book; and on Ezekiel. In the year of the Lord 1210.

Alphonsus de Castro [à Castro], of Zamora, a Spaniard, of the Order of Minors [Franciscans] — a man of keen intellect and a most fierce enemy of the heretics, against whom he also wrote several volumes — expounded some Psalms, and in particular published on the thirty-first Psalm one book, and likewise on Psalm 50, one book, in the year of the Lord 1546.

Alphonsus Martinez, of Baetica [Andalusia], of the Order of Preachers [Dominicans], published a censure [expurgatory index] of the Bibles under the name of the Holy Inquisition against the heretics, in the year of the Lord 1558.

Alphonsus Tostatus [Alonso Tostado], bishop of Ávila [Abulensis], by nation a Spaniard, from the town of Madrigal — a man the most learned of his time among all the professors of Scholastic Theology in the University of Salamanca, most skilled in the divine scriptures by long and continual exercise, and unwearied (nay, almost adamantine) in constant vigils and in the gravest labors of reading, teaching, and writing — elaborated on both Testaments volumes of immense size; in which, after the simple and historical exposition of the letter, which alone he pursu[ed] [→ p211: -ed]

[1] Alexander of Hales was called the Fountain of Life.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 192 [printed folio 192]. Book IV, catalog letter A, continued: the huge **Alphonsus Tostatus** entry (his commentaries listed by incipit; fl. 1440) and Francisco Fontana's index to them; then **Aloysius Lippomanus**, whose **Catena on Genesis** is described, with its list of source-authors, Greek and Latin. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Alphonsus Tostatus, continued from p210:]

…pursued [alone], he heaped up so many and so great piles of Scholastic disputations that frequently, in the explanation of one single brief chapter, he brought forward above one hundred and seventy Scholastic questions, answering the various opinions upon that same chapter — always inquiring into some new and different difficulty upon each, even the smallest, particle of divine scripture. Of how great a bulk the load of these volumes once was, his commentaries on Matthew are an indication: which, when Peter Ximenes, a Spaniard, bishop of Coria [Cauriensis], his hearer and disciple, attempted to reduce into a small compendium that would contain only a fifth part of them, he yet could not so compress them but that the work abridged by him still remained huge and vast — for it comprises one thousand and twenty pages of the largest folio (which they call Royal), printed in small and tight characters. His other commentaries too, abridged with like zeal by various writers, extend into many and large volumes; of which these alone have come to my knowledge:

- On the five volumes of Moses [the Pentateuch], five books; [beginning] *For it is a most lofty task.*
- On Joshua, one book; *Of the Sacred Scriptures.*
- On Judges, one book; *This book which we…*

- On Ruth, one book; *Here begins the book of Ruth.*
- On the [books of] Kings, four books; *Of temporal events.*
- On Paralipomenon [Chronicles], two books; *A great [part] now having been run through.*
- On Matthew, twenty-five books; *The ancients being for the most part explained.*

He flourished in the times of the Council of Basel and of Pope Eugene IV, in the year of the Lord 1440.

Francisco Fontana [Franciscus Fontanus], born in the town of Llerena [Erena] in Spain, a canon of Alcalá [Complutensis], published an Index to all the aforesaid works [of Tostatus], contained in two large volumes, in which he most laboriously embraced everything pertaining either to Sacred Scripture or to the various erudition of man.

Aloysius Lippomanus [Luigi Lippomano], a Venetian, bishop first of Modon [Methone] and afterward of Verona — from boyhood instructed in all the best arts, and throughout his whole life engaged in the assiduous reading of the doctors of the church, both Greek and Latin — gathered, among many indefatigable labors of his genius, upon the whole book of Genesis a huge and most-enriched volume of explanations. In which, emulating the zeal of St. Thomas Aquinas, he wove together — for the convenience of those who have neither leisure nor means to turn over the countless and immense volumes of the fathers — a **catena** of expositions on the book of Genesis, drawn from authors both Latin and Greek, both ancient and more recent, succeeding one another according to the order of time, with his own not-to-be-despised annotations also inserted. He arranged the whole medley of the work in a most fitting order in this manner: First he set the explanations of the fathers which help toward understanding the obscure senses of the letter, the Hebrew and Greek copies being brought forward together with the Chaldaic [Targum] edition. Then, under the name of one mystical explanation, he gathered whatever pertains to the other three senses of divine scripture — namely the Allegorical, the Tropological, and the Anagogical — omitting, however, those long digressions by which the fathers are wont to wander off, whether to the disputation of difficult matters or to the instruction of morals, lest the volume, growing to an immense size, should breed weariness in the readers. He also cited everywhere not only the names of the authors from whom he gathered the opinions and words of the exposition, but faithfully noted the books, and the individual chapters of the books — with certain exceptions, whose opinions he took from the Greek catena of the Vatican Library, in which, the titles of the books being omitted, only the sayings of the ancient authors are read, with their names prefixed. He also happily completed the same labor upon the book of Exodus, promising likewise that he would elaborate with similar zeal upon the whole of divine scripture. He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, distinguished in the Council of Trent; and he died under Ferdinand I, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1559. The beginning of the work is, *Gloss: The author of this book is Moses.* And the names of the authors whose expositions are contained in it are these:

The Greeks: Philo the Jew; Melito bishop of Sardis; Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis; Irenaeus; Origen; Hippolytus of Rome; Theodorus; Eusebius bishop of Caesarea; Eusebius of Emesa; Eustathius bishop of Antioch; Acacius; Serapion; Didymus; Philo the bishop; Apollinaris of Laodicea; Ephrem; Basil; Gregory Nazianzen; Gregory of Nyssa.

The Latins: Zeno bishop of Verona; Hilary; Ambrose; Jerome; Augustine; Eucherius; Pope Leo; Prosper of Aquitaine; Pope Gregory I; Isidore bishop of Seville; Junilius; Bede; Strabo [Walafrid]; Albinus, who is also Alcuin; Rabanus; Pope Nicholas; Bernard; Hugh of St. Victor; Rupert of Deutz.

[→ p212: Oratia…]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 193 [printed folio 193]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the end of the **Lippomanus** entry — the author-lists of his Genesis, Exodus, and (newly published, 1586) Psalter catenae — then Aelred of Rievaulx, Alvarus of Cahors, Álvaro Gómez, Amandus of Zierikzee, and three Ambroses, ending with **Ambrosius***

***Catharinus** (Sixtus's own first teacher). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[The author-lists of Lippomanus's catenae, continued from p211 — Genesis catena:]

The Greeks (continued): Isidore of Pelusium; Epiphanius; Diodorus; Theophilus bishop of Alexandria; Theodore of Mopsuestia; John Chrysostom; John Cassian; John of Damascus; Severian of Gabala; Cyril; Theodoret; Gennadius; Isidore the abbot; an uncertain Greek author; the Greek Gloss.

The Latins (continued): Gratian; the Master of the Sentences [Peter Lombard]; Bonaventure; Thomas Aquinas; the Ordinary Gloss; the Interlinear Gloss; Cajetan; the Author of the Catena.

The expositions of the doctors — and their names — which are contained in the **Catena of Exodus**, are these:

The Greeks: Dionysius the Areopagite; Irenaeus bishop of Lyons; Antony the abbot; Athanasius; Irenaeus of Antioch; Euthymius Zigabenus; another Dionysius; Severus bishop of Antioch; another Severus; Oecumenius; the Sixth Synod.

The Latins: Cyprian; Maximus bishop of Turin; Hesychius; Gilbert; Pope Sixtus; Gilbert the Hollander; Guerric abbot of Igny.

In this very year 1586, in which this work is being printed, Aloysius's **Catena on the Psalter** came out for the first time, connected from more or less seventy ecclesiastical authors, both Greek and Latin.

Aelred of Rievaulx [Alredus Rievallis], an Englishman, a Cistercian monk, wrote on the 13th chapter of Isaiah, upon *The Burden of Babylon*, thirty-three Latin homilies, in the year of the Lord 1164.

Alvarus of Cahors [Alvardus de Cadurco], a Dominican, of Toulouse, wrote a Postil on the Apocalypse, 1 book; on the seven Penitential Psalms, 1 book.

Álvaro Gómez [Alvarus Gomes], a Spaniard, a man not unlearned, rendered the Proverbs of Solomon in verse.

Amandus of Zierikzee [Amandus Zierixiensis], a Zeelander, of the Order of Minors of the Observance [Observant Franciscans], wrote: on the Weeks of Daniel, 1 book; a Commentary on Genesis, 1 book; a history of the Lord's Passion, 1 book; on the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, one book; on Ecclesiastes, 1 book; expositions on Job. He died in the year 1534.

Ambrose of Alexandria [Ambrosius Alexandrinus], a hearer and disciple of Didymus of Alexandria, whose are the books against Apollinaris; under Theodosius Augustus, in the year 400, he published very praiseworthy commentaries on the book of Job.

Ambrose Autpert [Ambrosius Ansbertus], a monk and presbyter of the Benedictine order, a man exquisitely learned in the divine letters, and elegant and sweet in speech, wrote — under Arnulf Augustus — an explanation on the Psalter, one book; on the Song of Songs, one book; on the Apocalypse, ten books (printed at Cologne in the year 1536). He flourished under the Emperor Arnulf, in the year of the Lord … [blank].

Ambrosius Catharinus Politus [Ambrogio Catarino Politi], first bishop of Minori, and afterward archbishop of Conza [Compsa], by nation a Tuscan, by fatherland a Sienese — my fellow-citizen, and my first teacher in the divine scriptures — a man strong in the powers of intellect, excelling in the riches of the disciplines, and mighty in eloquence both Tuscan and Latin. Having left the public school of Imperial [civil] Law — in which, among many illustrious hearers of his teaching, he had also Julius III, the Supreme Pontiff, as a disciple — he dedicated himself to Christ, entering the sacred order of St. Dominic; in which, persevering day and night in the study of the divine and sacred letters with the highest holiness of life, and fighting most valiantly, as in an arena, against all the heresies of our time, he was raised by Pope Julius to the care of a bishopric, and destined for the burden of the Cardinalate, which death snatched from him. He

therefore, among many most noble works which — already an old man — he elaborated with the greatest industry upon the holy scriptures, left us most learned commentaries on all the Epistles of St. Paul; in which this was his chief care, that he might explain to the utmost the true sense of the Apostle, and at the same time show that no one fights more with the heretics of our age than Paul — whom they most impudently make out to be the champion of their heresies. Moved by this occasion, he resolved many difficult and arduous difficulties of our religion arising from the sentences of Paul. Among others, he attempts to crush with a great mass of many arguments that opinion concerning the "mass of perdition" (that it is left in its everlasting miseries, from the sole good-pleasure of God, without any consideration of works), as we shall explain more fully in the sixth volume, in the censures upon the epistles of Paul. The work begins, *Before our most holy Lord Julius III, Supreme Pontiff. That so many things, with [those] of the ancients, etc.*

- He also wrote, on all the Catholic [general] Epistles, briefer commentaries, whose beginning is, *Of a most corrupt time.*
- On the first five chapters of Genesis, clear and learned commentaries of an explanation according to the letter.
- On the Apocalypse, according to the letter, one book.
- On the authors and authority of the books of sacred scripture, one book.

[→ p213: MORI…]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 194 [printed folio 194]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the death of Catharinus (†1552), then the major entry on **St. Ambrose of Milan** — Theodosius's praise, his style and method, and his Genesis works (Hexaemeron, On Human Dignity, On Paradise, On Cain and Abel), with a philological note that the Hexaemeron is really sermons. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Ambrosius Catharinus, continued from p212:]

He dies in the year of the Lord 1552.

Ambrose [Ambrosius], bishop of Milan, by fatherland a Roman, first governor of Liguria and Insubria, and then divinely attaining the bishopric of the Church of Milan, so excelled among the bishops of his time in stability of faith, integrity of morals, and admirableness of erudition, that the Emperor Theodosius, moved by the loftiness of his virtues, publicly cried out in the great church of the city of Constantinople: Ἀμβρόσιον οἶδα μόνον ἐπίσκοπον ἀξίως καλούμενον — that is, *I know one Ambrose, who alone is worthily called a Bishop.* Augustine writes that so great was the authority of his Christian doctrine that not even by his enemies could anything be found in his writings to be reprehended. He expounded almost all the divine scriptures with the highest praise, following in that labor Philo the Jew, Hippolytus, Apollinaris, both Eusebiuses, and Basil, but most of all Origen — with whose discourses, as Jerome testifies in the Epistle to Pammachius and Marcella, almost all his books are full; whence also (as Ambrose himself said of Origen) he appears far better in the old than in the new testament.

Now the kind of his exposition is varied, but insisting chiefly on the mystical senses, yet so that meanwhile the sense of the letter is not altogether neglected. His manner of speaking, as the variety of matters seems to demand, is varied, but everywhere pouring forth a lucid and perspicuous river of eloquence, as Augustine says — who also, in the fourth volume of *On Christian Doctrine*, brings forward from Ambrose's works certain most beautiful examples of the threefold Ambrosian style, that is, the plain, the moderate, and the grand; from which he shows that Ambrose spoke of humble things plainly, of middling things moderately, and of great things sublimely, according to the diversity and dignity of the matters. Yet he loved, with a peculiar and natural affection, a grave and pointed abundance of brief sentences, delighting wonderfully in a discourse distinguished sometimes by numerous commas and clauses, and painted with little flowers.

But his writings pertaining to the exposition of divine scripture are distinguished into four orders — namely, into **Books, Commentaries, Treatises, and Epistles**. [1] In the Books, in which he frequently embraces the method of Thematic exposition in imitation of Philo, the continuity of the historical context being passed over, he follows an interrupted order of explanation; and, summarily touching the chapters of the histories, he explains them in various and separate volumes of diverse arguments and titles. Whose number, arguments, and titles are these:

• On the **first chapter of Genesis**, the *Hexaemeron*, or *On the Work of the Six Days* — six books, or rather sermons to the people. Concerning which Jerome, writing to Pammachius and Oceanus, says: *Our holy Ambrose so compiled the Hexaemeron of Origen that he rather followed the opinions of Hippolytus and of Basil.* Which opinion of Jerome the exposition of Ambrose openly confirms: for it is indeed nothing else than that very Hexaemeron of Basil translated into Latin, with the same opinions and words everywhere (though the order of certain words and sentences is transposed), and with some little digressions added — whether from Hippolytus and Origen, or from another, or perhaps of his own. In translating and imitating which work Ambrose was so diligent that he did not even omit a certain artful lapse of memory which Basil, in the 8th homily of the Hexaemeron, had rhetorically feigned, pretending that in the middle of the discourse he was deserted by his memory.

These sermons — I know not who first transformed them into books and cut them up into many chapters (for both Bede, in his little work on the seasons, and Junilius, in the preface of the Hexaemeron, cite them under the name of books) — are nevertheless not books, but sermons delivered to the people and taken down by the hearers. Which their titles in the most ancient manuscripts indicate, and the little prefaces themselves demonstrate, being composed to prepare the minds of the hearers; likewise the perorations ending in doxologies, contrary to Ambrose's custom, who was not wont to end any of his [proper] books thus. But also those words which are found about the middle of the fifth sermon (or fifth book), chapter twelve, more evidently prove that Ambrose spoke these things in a discourse, and that while speaking, feigning a lapse of memory, he purposely fell silent for a little while, in imitation of Basil the Great, who in the narration of the same passage had artfully feigned himself deserted by his memory. For the Notary who was then taking down the words of the speaker, the course of the writing being interrupted, inserted this clause of his own, saying: *And when he had here been silent for a little while, taking up his discourse again, he said:* "The necessary disputation concerning the nature of things had escaped us, most beloved brethren, and a discourse of this kind had flown away from us with the birds themselves, etc." Which words that first transformer of the sermons — though the ancient copies everywhere protested, and the very sense of the matter resisted — inaptly enough accommodated to the very person of Ambrose, in this manner: *And when I had here been silent for a little while, taking up my discourse again, I say:* "It had escaped us, etc."

• There is also, on the same first chapter of Genesis, one book *On Human Dignity*, expounding that passage, *Let us make man*, and at the same time explaining the dignity of the human condition, both by reason of the image and by reason of the likeness.

• On the **second and third chapters of Genesis**, one book *On Paradise*: in which it is investigated what Paradise is, where it is, and of what sort; and concerning the things which befell the first parents in it, the discourse is elegant, but chiefly allegorical, certain most beautiful allegories being taken from the book of Allegories of Philo the Jew. [2]

• On the **fourth chapter of Genesis**, two books *On Cain and Abel*, in which, according to the mystical understanding, he expounds the birth, life, morals, and worship of the two brothers whom Moses described in that chapter. Here too he borrowed some things from the book of Philo the Jew which is entitled *On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel*.

• On the **fifth chapter of Genesis to the eleventh**, [On Noah…] [→ p214: De Noë…]

[1] Ambrose's writings are distributed into four orders. [2] The argument of St. Ambrose's book On Paradise.

*(Rich PDF p. 195 [printed folio 195]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the catalogue of **St. Ambrose's** scriptural works — his Genesis treatises (On Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, the Patriarchs' blessings), his letter-treatises on Old-Testament passages (Exodus through Micah), and eight sermons on Matthew. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[St. Ambrose's works, continued from p213:]

• *On Noah and the Ark*, one book: in which he narrates the life, morals, and deeds of the holy man Noah, and also the loftiness of his mind and the events of his times, expounding in the allegorical sense the history of nearly six chapters — namely, from the end of the fifth chapter to the end of the tenth.

• On Genesis chapters 12 to 18, two books *On the Patriarch Abraham*, which he composed in imitation of Xenophon and of Philo. For Xenophon — a fellow-disciple of Plato and a hearer of Socrates — in that book which he entitled Κύρου παιδίαν [the Cyropaedia, "the Education of Cyrus"], under the feigned person of Cyrus king of the Persians, described the discipline of a just and wise king from the inmost bosom of philosophy. Emulating him, Philo the Jew wrote a book on the patriarch Abraham, showing him to have been the image and pattern of a wise man perfected through contemplation, whence the whole institution of a wise life was to be sought. [1] Ambrose followed both in these two books, in which, under the narration of the whole life and deeds of Abraham, he expresses for us the image of the moral, and truly active, man. These two volumes contain the History of Genesis from the beginning of the twelfth chapter to the middle of the eighteenth.

• On Genesis chapter 21, two books *On Isaac and the Soul*: in the former of which, taking occasion from what is related of the birth of Isaac and his betrothal with Rebecca (chapters 21 and 24), he discourses, according to the allegorical and anagogical understanding, of the love between Christ the Bridegroom (prefigured in Isaac) and the soul the Bride (designated in Rebecca). In the second book, taking occasion from what he had foretold of the soul in the former, he treats *of the good of death* [2], which joins the soul to its Bridegroom Christ, to live for ever.

• On Genesis chapters 27 to 35, two books *On Jacob and the Happy Life*: in which, briefly running through Moses' narration (spread over nine chapters), he shows that the beatitude of the wise man is not only not lost, but can even be acquired, in the greatest perils of life [3] — by the example of blessed Jacob, to whom, living in exile, persecution, and servitude, nothing was lacking of what pertains to beatitude.

• On Genesis chapters 37 to 49, one book *On the Patriarch Joseph*: in which, discoursing with allegorical and anagogical explanation on the whole history of Joseph (twelve chapters in Moses), he sets before us in Joseph the example of many virtues, but chiefly of chastity. [4]

• On Genesis chapter 49, one book *On the Blessings of the Patriarchs*, containing the mystical explanation of Jacob's blessing toward his sons.

He also wrote, besides these books, three epistles on various passages of Genesis: the first, to Horontianus, *On the Division of the Works of the Six Days*, beginning *The division*; the second, to the same, *On Man Produced after the Beasts*, beginning *That thou art moved*; the third, *On Paradise*, to Sabinus, beginning *The Hexaemeron being read*.

Likewise, letter-treatises on other passages:

• On Exodus 8, *On those things which the Egyptians abominate*, to Irenaeus, one epistle.

• On Exodus 12, *On the celebration of the Passover*, to the Bishops of Aemilia, one epistle.

• On Exodus 24, *On the Blood of the Victim divided in two ways*, to Simplicianus, one epistle.

• On Exodus 30, *On the Meaning of the Didrachma*, to Justus, one epistle.

• On Exodus 32, *On the Golden Calf*, to Romulus, one epistle.

• On Leviticus 10, *On Moses approving the counsel of Aaron*, to Simplicianus, one epistle.

• On Numbers 23, *On the Words of God to Balaam*, to Chromatius, one epistle.

• On Deuteronomy 28, *On the Brazen Heaven and the Iron Earth*, to Romulus, one epistle.

• On Deuteronomy 32, *On Woman, that she should not wear Man's garment*, to Irenaeus, one epistle.

• On 2 Kings [2 Samuel] chapter 21, one book *On the Apology of David*, piously excusing David's adultery [5] and most beautifully expounding the fiftieth Psalm.

• On 3 Kings [1 Kings] chapter 21, one book *On Naboth*, against the unjust murder of Naboth and the insatiable avarice that was its cause.

• On the History of Tobias, against usurers, one book.

• On Job, *On the Complaint* [De interpellatione], three books, containing the exposition of the complaints by which Job everywhere throughout the volume expostulates with God.

• On the Psalter, eleven books are cited by Trithemius, seen neither by him nor by me. There now survive sixteen Treatises on sixteen Psalms, one on each — namely, on the first, and on Psalms 21, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 61, 109; likewise, on Psalm 118, twenty-two Treatises.

• On the 30th chapter of Proverbs, one book *On the Three Problems* most difficult to know, entitled *On Solomon*.

• On Isaiah, one book of commentaries, cited by St. Augustine in the second book *Against Julian* and in the fourth book *Against the Two Epistles of the Pelagians*.

• On Jeremiah 17, *On the Crying Partridge*, to Irenaeus, one epistle.

• On that passage of Micah 5, *And thou, Bethlehem, land of Judah*, to Horontianus, one epistle.

And these are the works of Ambrose which we have on the Old Testament; but those which are extant on the New are these — from various passages of Matthew, eight sermons, that is:

• On Matthew ch. 4, *On the Fasting of Christ*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 7, *On the Pearl*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 8, *On the Foxes that have Holes*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 14, *On Peter walking upon the Waters*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 18, *On him who shall be greater in the kingdom of heaven*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 19, *On the Camel passing through the Eye of a Needle*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 22, *On rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's*, one sermon.

• On Matthew 27, *On Judas the Traitor*, one sermon.

• On Mark, a volume of commentaries, lost by the fault of the times, from which Bede [borrowed] many things [→ p215: he took to himself…]

[1] Abraham was the image and pattern of a wise man perfected through contemplation. [2] The good of death is explained by St. Ambrose. [3] Beatitude can be acquired even in the greatest perils of life. [4] Joseph was the example of many virtues, but chiefly of chastity. [5] Ambrose piously excuses the adultery of David.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 196 [printed folio 196]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the rest of **St. Ambrose** (his Luke commentary, defended by Acca's letter to Bede, and his gospel sermons), then **Ammonius of Alexandria** (Origen's teacher; the Monotessaron gospel-harmony), **Amphilochius of Iconium**, and **Anastasius the Sinaite**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[St. Ambrose, continued from p214:]

…he [Bede] testifies that he copied out for himself.

On the Gospel of Luke, eleven books of commentaries of an interrupted exposition, succinctly arranged according to the mystical understanding. Concerning these, Rufinus, in the second book of his Invectives, reports that Jerome — in the preface to Origen's homilies on Luke, and in a certain epistle of which he himself had a copy — wrote that the author of these commentaries "played with words and dozed in the senses." Which I would rather believe to have been fabricated by Rufinus out of hatred of Jerome, than that such a judgment was uttered by Jerome concerning the learned commentaries of a most erudite man. Concerning these, Acca, bishop of Hexham [Cantabrigiensis], writes to Bede the Venerable, presbyter, thus: [1] *There are certain things in the exposition of the blessed Ambrose on Luke, at once so eloquent and so lofty (which I doubt not that your holiness also has seen), that they can be understood only by the more learned; but by the rude or fastidious readers (of whom in the present age you will find many), on account of the difficulty of attaining what is eloquently said, or of grasping what is lofty, they are not even to be sought as too exalted, nor to be scrutinized as if too strong [for them].* And the most learned father Augustine gave no small judgment [of it], who, writing to Paulina, the servant of God, *On seeing God*, thought that he should use no testimonies more than those of blessed Ambrose taken from this work; and he judged that they should not only be set down simply, but also expounded — so much so that out of a very few little sentences of that commentator he made, by treating them, no small volume. Yet some things St. Ambrose passed over in this work undiscussed, which to him, as a man of the highest erudition, seemed plain and not worth inquiry. Thus far Acca.

There are those who think that this work was not divided into books by the author himself, but written in a continuous series; but that they are mistaken is clear from the writings of Augustine, who in the first book *Against Pelagius and Celestius*, ch. 44, cites by name the second, sixth, and tenth book of Ambrose on Luke; [2] and the Sixth Synod also, in the 10th action, cites the authority of Ambrose by number from the sixth book of the commentaries on Luke.

There survive also, after these commentaries, seven sermons on the same gospel, namely:

- On the sixth chapter of Luke, *On the healing of the withered hand*, one sermon, translated almost word for word from St. Basil's discourse on the same passage.
- On Luke 12, *On the man whose field brought forth abundant fruits*, one sermon.
- On Luke 13, *On the grain of mustard seed*, one sermon.
- On the same chapter, *On the leaven*, one sermon.
- On Luke 17, *On the lightning flashing from East to West*, one sermon.
- On Luke 23, *On the thief*, one sermon.
- *On the denial of Peter*, one sermon.
- *On the burial of the Lord*, one sermon.
- On John 4, *On the Samaritan woman*, one sermon.
- On John 9, *On the man born blind*, to Bellicius, one epistle.
- On John 19, *On Christ accused before Pilate*, one sermon.
- On that passage of John 20, *Touch me not*, one sermon.

On all the epistles of Paul, 14 books — brief indeed in words, but weighty in the weight of their sentences.

There are also carried about, under the name of Ambrose, commentaries on the Apocalypse, recently printed at Paris; but, besides that the diversity of style manifestly protests against it, there are also many opinions of Gregory scattered throughout the whole work, which show it not to be Ambrose's; and the author himself, in the explanation of chapter 17, openly confesses that he wrote after the Roman Empire had been occupied by the Lombards [3] — which happened more than two hundred years after Ambrose. The work begins, *The blessed John the Apostle.*

Ambrose flourished under Theodosius the Great, about the year of the Lord 380; and Paulinus, bishop of Nola, wrote his life.

Ammonius of Alexandria, the teacher of Origen Adamantius in Philosophy [4] — an eloquent man, most learned in the secular disciplines, famous in the times of the Emperor Alexander Severus — composed, among many monuments of his genius, an elegant work *On the Harmony of Moses and Jesus*, in which he gathered all the passages of the old and new law that are conformable to one another. He also made a volume which he entitled the **Gospel Harmony**, or **Monotessaron** (that is, *One out of Four*), in which, as by a certain chain [catena], out of the four incomplete histories of the gospels he wove together one whole and perfect history, whose beginning is, *In the beginning was the Word.* Him Porphyry falsely accuses, in the third book against the Christians, of having become a Gentile from a Christian — whereas it is established that he persevered a Christian to the very end of his life. [5] Volaterranus, in the 13th book of the *Anthropology*, reports from Suidas that an ass — the most stupid of all animals — was a hearer of his teaching. [6] He flourished under Alexander [Severus], son of Mamaea, in the year of the Lord 220.

Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium — who read to Jerome a book published by him *On the Holy Spirit*, in the times of the Emperor Theodosius, that is, in the year of the Lord 390 — wrote several learned and eloquent homilies, of which I have found these cited in Theodoret's Dialogues [entitled] *Polymorphus*:

- On that passage of Matthew 20 [read 26], *Let this cup pass from me*, one homily.
- On the sinful woman who anointed the Lord's feet, and the Pharisee, from Luke 7, one homily.
- On that passage of John 5, *The Son cannot do anything of himself*, one homily.
- On that of John 14, *The Father is greater than I*, one homily.
- On that, *He who hears my word, and believes him [that sent me]*, one homily.

Anastasius, bishop of Antioch — who, because he lived the contemplative life on Mount Sinai and there subdued the sense of the flesh, obtained the surname of **the Sinaite** — left many lucubrations, of which Nicephorus reports that he read a learned book on the sixth Psalm, which he published at the beginning of the fasts [Lent]. He flourished under Maurice Augustus, and died under the Emperor Phocas, being cut down in the city of Antioch by the Jews, who, a sedition being stirred up against the Christians, [slew] this most blessed bis[hop] [→ p216: -hop…]

[1] Acca's judgment on St. Ambrose's commentary on the gospel of St. Luke. [2] The same Augustine also cites other books of Ambrose on Luke. [3] The Roman Empire was occupied by the Lombards more than 200 years after Ambrose. [4] Ammonius was the teacher of Origen in Philosophy. [5] Ammonius was a Christian. [6] An ass was a hearer of the teaching of Ammonius.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 197 [printed folio 197]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the death of Anastasius the Sinaite, then a run of **Andrews** (of Caesarea on the Apocalypse, of Crete, of Jerusalem, of St Victor…), **Angelomus** of Luxeuil, **Anselm of Laon** (the Interlinear Gloss), and **Anselm of Canterbury**. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Anastasius the Sinaite, continued from p215:]

…this most blessed bishop, thrown down from his throne, and a rope being tied to his feet, dragged through the city, they afflicted with a foul death. For his private parts, cut off with a sword while he was being dragged, they cast into his mouth; and afterward they gave him over to the fire like a certain holocaust — a man illustrious in wisdom and virtue — in the year of the Lord 600. His Greek works are preserved at Rome in the Palatine Library.

Anastasius, bishop of Antioch, the successor in the bishopric of Anastasius the Sinaite, venerable in life and doctrine, published on the Hexaemeron twelve Greek sermons, adorned with most elegant allegories, which are preserved in the most flourishing Academy [Library] of Venice. He flourished in the year of the Lord

610.

Andrew Biglia [Andreas Bilius] of Milan, of the Order of Hermits [Augustinian], a Philosopher and Theologian learned in Greek and Latin, left on the Hexaemeron a remarkable commentary, which — together with his other most learned works, not yet printed — is kept in the Marciana Library at Milan. [1] He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 1434.

Andrew, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, by nation a Greek, elaborated in Greek eloquence a remarkable work on the Apocalypse, which he most aptly divided into 24 parts or discourses, and these into 72 chapters — for the number 24, thrice repeated, produces 72. He took the number 24 on account of the 24 elders named in the Apocalypse, who are the sign of those who pleased God well from the beginning of the world to the consummation; and he tripled this number in the chapters not inconsiderately, but because those who pleased God had a tripartite substance [hypostasis] — namely soul, body, and spirit — to delineate the appropriation of the omnipotent Trinity. He flourished, as I think, a thousand years ago.

Andrew, bishop of Crete, wrote several Greek sermons, of which the sermon on Lazarus (four days dead) is celebrated.

Andrew, bishop of Jerusalem, wrote in Greek, on the annunciation of the Virgin Mother of God and the salutation (from the first chapter of Luke), a most brilliant oration, which begins, *Today is present the joy of all.*

Andreas Gallus, of the Order of Preachers, wrote on the four books of Kings a scholastic Postil, whose authority Lyra, in the tenth chapter of 1 Kings [1 Samuel], having brought it forward, refutes.

Andreas Placus wrote an interpretation, or dictionary, of the more difficult Greek, Hebrew, and other foreign words which are found in the sacred letters.

Andrew of St Victor [Andreas Victorius], an Englishman, disciple of Hugh of St Victor, wrote Commentaries on the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Paralipomenon [Chronicles], Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Joel. He flourished 1150.

Angelomus, a monk of Luxeuil, of the Order of St. Benedict, a man endowed with a noble genius in the divine scriptures, at the command of Drogo bishop of Metz (son of the Emperor Charlemagne), gathered from the commentaries of the ancient fathers a pious and learned work — namely, on the four books of Kings, four books of *Stromata* [Patchwork], whose beginning is, *Twenty-two*; likewise, for the Emperor Lothair, son of the Emperor Louis, a Stromatic explanation on the Song of Songs of the same kind, whose beginning is, *Before the imperial glory*. He flourished in the year of the Lord 830.

Angelus of Camerino, an Italian, of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine, wrote 4 books on the Gospels and 14 books on the Epistles of St. Paul. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1340.

Angelo Canini [Angelus Caninius] of Anghiari published a historical narration of some passages of the New Testament. He flourished under the Emperor Ferdinand.

Anselm of Laon [Anselmus Laudunensis], a Frenchman, surnamed **the Scholastic** — learned by continual study in the divine scriptures and the volumes of the sacred doctors, and not moderately instructed in all the disciplines, sharp in intellect, concise in speech, and an imitator of a certain Laconic brevity — expounded the books of both testaments, in a new and unusual manner of explanation, with certain very brief little annotations of the fathers: which, written in very small characters, he most artfully fitted between the very lines of the scriptures (written in larger letters), with no less curious than useful industry; and this labor — to distinguish it from the Gloss of Strabo, which is wont to be written in the margins of the sacred manuscripts — he called the **Interlinear Gloss**. He flourished under the Emperor Henry IV, in the year of the Lord 1110. He also wrote one book of commentaries on the Psalter.

Anselm of Canterbury [Anselmus Cantuariensis], bishop in England, formerly abbot of the monastery of Bec, of the Benedictine order, disciple of Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury — a man nobly cultivated in both divine and human disciplines, of a wonderfully simple and pure, but not unpleasant, style — left, among his other monuments, the volumes written below:

- On the Heptateuch (that is, on the first seven volumes of divine scripture), 7 books.
- On the Hexaemeron, one book, cited by Trithemius.
- On the Song of Songs, one book, which begins, *In the beginnings of books the reasons are to be stated.*
- On various passages of the Gospels, very many homilies.
- On Paul the Apostle, commentaries, whose beginning is, *About to speak, with the Lord's help, on the epistles of Paul the Apostle.* (These we have found in old copies ascribed to Hervaeus the Monk.)

He flourished under the Emperor Henry III [IV], in the year of the Lord 1080; Eadmer, an English monk, wrote his life. Anselm's commentaries on Matthew were printed at Antwerp by Jan Grave [Ioannes Granius] in 1551, and all his works were published at Cologne by Maternus Cholinus in 1573.

Anselm, bishop of Lucca, a man distinguished by the sanctity of his morals and by his erudition in divine and human matters, an indefatigable fellow-laborer of Pope Gregory VII (of Sovana), and against Gilbert the Antipope [→ p217: he from…]

[1] He [Andrew Biglia] also wrote 4 books of expositions on the Gospels.

(Rich PDF p. 198 [printed folio 198]. Book IV, catalog letter A: Anselm of Lucca and of Mantua, the Antiochus/Antipater group, and a long run of ***Antonius*** *entries (Antoninus of Florence, Guevara's* Monte Calvario, *Rampegollo's* Figurae Bibliae, *and others), ending at Apion. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Anselm of Lucca, continued from p216:]

…against Gilbert the Antipope, subordinated to him by force by the Emperor Henry IV, a most fierce champion [of Gregory VII], he published on all the Psalms of David one book, and on the prophet Jeremiah a second book of explanation. He flourished under Henry III [IV], in the year of the Lord 1080.

Anselm, bishop of Mantua, famous for sanctity and erudition, at the exhortation of the most illustrious lady Matilda [of Tuscany], briefly and clearly expounded the Psalter from the beginning of the book to the versicle of Psalm 117 [118], *We have blessed you out of the house of the Lord*; he also pursued the Lamentations of Jeremiah with like zeal. He dies in the year of the Lord 1086, in the thirteenth year of his bishopric, and was buried at Mantua in the church of St. Peter.

Anselm, of the Order of Minors, described the holy land and the city of Jerusalem. The book was printed at Cracow in the year 1514.

Antiochus, bishop of the city of Ptolemais, a man of rare genius, of the highest erudition and eloquence — to whom Anianus, the most ancient translator of John Chrysostom, ascribes a pleasing pomp of speaking — left, among other monuments of his noble genius, on the ninth chapter of John, *On the Illumination of the Man Born Blind*, a most brilliant oration, full of the compunction of fear, of God, and of humility. He flourished under the Augusti Theodosius and Arcadius, in the year of the Lord 390.

Antiochus the Monk, a Greek, very learned in the divine scriptures, gathered a remarkable work, distinguished into sixty-three sermons, which he entitled the **Pandects**, comprising the expositions of various most excellent fathers on the Decalogue, together with the refutations of all the heresies which have arisen against the Decalogue. At what time he flourished I have not yet found.

Antipater, bishop of Bostra — who composed a refutation of the Apology for Origen written by Eusebius — published several homilies, among others one on the ninth chapter of Matthew, on the woman suffering from an issue of blood, whose beginning is, *That the calling of the Jews.* It is cited in the Second Nicene Synod, action four.

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, of the Order of Preachers, a writer of many works, patched together on the first chapter of Luke (on the annunciation, the Angelic salutation, and the Canticle of Mary) a volume of vast prolixity, disposed in scholastic method and style, and afterward placed it at the end of the last part of his *Summa*. He also published, on the history of the two disciples going to Emmaus, a *Trialogue*, in which — Christ (in the garb of a wayfarer), Cleopas, and Amaon speaking with one another — all the prophecies, oracles, and presages are declared which were written in the old testament concerning the life, death, and resurrection of CHRIST. The work begins, *Beginning from Moses.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1460.

Antonio of Bitonto [Antonius Bitontinus], a Minorite [Franciscan], gathered from Nicholas of Lyra a postil on all the lessons of the old and new testament which are recited throughout the whole year, with certain little questions of his own added, not altogether to be cast away.

Antonio Broickwy of Königstein [Antonius Bruichius à Konigstein], guardian of the regular observance of St. Francis at Nijmegen, gathered a brief Gospel **Monotessaron**, taken from the four Evangelists in a most fitting order. And the same wrote on the four gospels four books of narration, in an almost scholastic but somewhat more polished style; and he also published commentaries on some of the epistles of St. Paul, whose beginning is, *The evangelical office, etc.* — intending to do the same on all the rest, had he lived longer. For he dies of a pain in the side, in the year of the Lord 1541.

Antonio de Ghislandis, of Turin, Inquisitor of heretical depravity, of the Order of Preachers, wrote a work of ten thousand little questions on the Gospels of the whole year. Its beginning is, *To the Reverend Lord John Louis.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1490.

Antonio de Guevara, from a Franciscan monk [made] bishop of Mondoñedo, born in the city of Álava in Spain, preacher and chronicler of Charles V Augustus, wrote in the more polished Spanish tongue, on the history of the Lord's Passion gathered from the four gospels, a most learned work, to which he gave the title *Mount Calvary* [Monte Calvario], divided into two volumes. He also composed, on various passages of divine scripture, most elegant colloquies, which — on account of the elegance of the speech and the pointed weight of the sentences — the French, Germans, and Italians (together with his other little works) each translated into their own languages. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Antonio de Honcala, a Spaniard, by fatherland of Langa, a canon of the church of Ávila, piously learned, put forth most elegant commentaries on Genesis, in the year of the Lord 1558.

Antonio Marinari, a Carmelite, wrote *On the Harmony of Jesus Christ and the Prophets*, three books, not unuseful for understanding the prophecies of the prophets. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1541.

Antonio de Nebrija [Antonius Nebrissensis], from Nebrija, a noble town in Baetica [Andalusia], published annotations on certain somewhat-obscure passages of both the old and new testament.

Antonio Pucci [Antonius Puccius], a Florentine, Cardinal of the title of the Four Crowned Saints, Grand Penitentiary, wrote on the words of consecration (taken from the four evangelists) fourteen homilies no less learned than pious, whose beginning is, *Since to each is attributed by nature.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1548.

Antonio Rampegollo [Antonius Rampegolus], a Genoese, a Hermit [Augustinian], by profession a Scholastic, wrote for the young students of his order in the monastery at Naples, on various passages of the old testament, a rude little work, in which — expounding almost all the sacred histories morally in a

well-worn eloquence — he accommodated each to each of the moral virtues. The title of the work is the **Figures of the Bible** [Figurae Bibliae], and its beginning, *To religious men in Christ.* He flourished in the Council of Constance, disputing against the Hussite heretics, under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 1418.

Apion, a professor of Greek eloquence, and a lover of the sacred letters, under the Emperor Severus [→ p218: -or…]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 199 [printed folio 199]. Book IV, catalog letter A: **Apollinaris the Elder** of Laodicea — who, when Julian the Apostate banned Christian classical education, recast almost all of Scripture in Homeric, Pindaric, and tragic verse — and **Apollinaris the Younger**, the heresiarch (his 30 books against Porphyry, and the errors charged against him). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Apion, continued from p217:]

…under the Emperor Severus, in the year of the Lord 200, wrote on the Hexaemeron six treatises — learned indeed, but in some things departing a little from the right rule of faith.

Apollinaris the Elder, having attained the dignity of the presbyterate in the church of Laodicea in Syria, a doctor of Greek letters and a professor of the art of Grammar, was by family an Alexandrian. He first taught at Berytus [Beirut], then migrated to Laodicea; and there, having married a wife, he had a son Apollinaris, afterward bishop of the same Church. With whom he lived many years, being forbidden the holy communion by Theodore, bishop of Laodicea, and by George his successor — whether because he was unwilling to agree with them (who taught the Son of God to be *homoiousion* [of like substance], and not *homoousion* [of the same substance]), or because he was joined by too great familiarity with Epiphanius the Sophist, whose name was suspect to the Christians and hateful to the bishops.

When therefore Julian the Apostate had brought in a law by which he forbade the Christians all the Greek disciplines and institutions [1] — affirming that it was not fitting that they should take utility from these teachings, which they [the pagans] handed down as fables, and which they [the Christians] attacked with weapons sought thence — Apollinaris rendered almost the whole old and new testament, most elegantly, in various kinds of verse, so that the boys, learning those instead of the Greek disciplines, might attain skill both in the Greek tongue and in verse. And his sacred poems are reported by name to have been these:

- From the beginning of the world to the reign of Saul, twenty-four books of heroic [epic] verse, each inscribed with each of the twenty-four letters of the alphabet, after the Homeric fashion.
- From the death of Saul to the end of the old testament, twenty books of various histories, elaborated partly in Lyric meter after the form of Pindar, partly after the manner of the comedies of Menander and the tragedies of Euripides.
- Of the cyclic lessons — that is, of those which throughout the circle of the year are read in the church from both testaments — two books, disposed with every variety of verse.
- Of the Paraphrase on the Psalter, one book, which, recently printed in hexameter verse, thus begins: ἄλβιος [ὃς] τοῦ οὐ πεπόρευται δυσσεβέων ἐνὶ βουλῇ — that is, *Happy is he who has not gone into the counsel of the impious* [Ps 1:1].

These poems the Christians used in place of Homer and the other poets, until the Emperor Jovian established a law that the Christians should be imbued with the letters of the gentiles, so that they might the more easily overcome the errors of the gentiles, using against them their own weapons. [2] Sozomen, in the fifth book of his History, brought forth a judgment on the labors of Apollinaris in these words: *Apollinaris, in a short time, composed lucubrations very equal to the ancient Greeks in number, virtue, character of writing, and arrangement; and — unless men honored antiquity, and believed pleasing the things that are in use — the*

works of Apollinaris would (as I think) have been esteemed equal to the ancients. He flourished in the year of the Lord 360.

Apollinaris the Younger, reader of the divine scriptures of the Church of Laodicea in Syria, and afterward bishop, son of Apollinaris the Elder (presbyter of the same Church), from his early age was most nobly instructed in the oratorical arts (of which he was afterward a professor) by Epiphanius, the most illustrious Sophist of his age — on account of whose intimate acquaintance he was for a long time forbidden the fellowship of the faithful by the two Episcopal predecessors of his church, namely Theodore and Gregory. But when the Emperor Julian had prohibited to Christians the studies of Greek letters, he, leaving Epiphanius, gave himself wholly to the sacred letters; in which, when by the acuteness of his genius and by assiduous exercise he had in a short time greatly advanced, he first reduced the Evangelical and Apostolic doctrines into the form of dialogues, after the example of Plato, among the Greeks — by this art eluding the craft of the emperor. Then, attempting greater things, he published so great a multitude of volumes for the Christian faith, that St. Basil rightly said of him that Apollinaris had filled the whole world with his books.

Jerome, his disciple in the divine letters, testifies that he wrote on almost all the holy books commentaries not indeed to be despised, but constrained with so great brevity that he noted down rather certain little notes of exposition than expositions themselves. For thus Jerome says: *He expounded all things so as to run over the whole, and with certain points and intervals — nay, with great compendia — to fly past the spaces of a long road, so that he seems to have gathered not so much commentaries as indexes of chapters.* Whence, on account of the excessive brevity — touching the sense rather than explaining it — he could not lead the reader to a perfect understanding. Which he himself also acknowledging, when he was now older, at the request of his friends, gave somewhat fuller commentaries on some of the Prophets than those which, as a young man, he had briefly written on the same Prophets.

He also wrote against the insane Porphyry thirty books, superior in the judgment of all to his other works. Among which he composed a great volume — that is, the twenty-sixth book — for the defense of the book of Daniel, against which Porphyry had written the twelfth book of the fifteen books against the holy Christian scriptures which he had published. [3] He followed in his expositions sometimes the version of Symmachus, sometimes a certain edition compiled by himself out of all the editions; concerning which Jerome, in the second book against Rufinus, says: *Apollinaris, with a good intention indeed, but not according to knowledge, attempted to sew together the patches of all the translations into one garment, and to weave the coherence of scripture not by the rule of truth, but by his own judgment.* And again, in the commentaries on the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, Jerome says: *The Laodicean, having followed the interpretation of Symmachus, can please neither the Jews nor the Christians — since he is both far from the Hebrews, and disdains to follow the interpretation of the Seventy.*

Apollinaris was also accused, by many writers of no contemptible name, of having been in the error of the Millenarians [Chiliasts]; of having introduced into the Trinity a "great, greater, greatest" — calling, namely, the Spirit "great," the Son "greater," and the Father "greatest"; and likewise of not thinking rightly of the incarnation of Christ, supposing that He brought His flesh from heaven, and lacked a rational [soul] [→ p219: -tional…]

[1] Julian the Apostate forbade the Christians to read profane [pagan] writings. [2] A law was passed by the Emperor Jovian, that the Christians should be imbued with the letters of the gentiles. Sozomen, book 5 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 17. [3] Porphyry wrote 15 books against the Christians.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 200 [printed folio 200]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the close of **Apollinaris the Younger**, then **Aquila** of Sinope (the hyper-literal Greek translator, with his Genesis 1:1) and **Arator** (who versified Acts and recited it before Pope Vigilius), plus Aponius, Apringius, Archangelo Favorino, Arethas, Aribo, and Aristobulus. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Apollinaris the Younger, continued from p218:]

…lacked a rational soul, the divinity supplying the office of the rational part. But since very many most weighty authors — among whom Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, most hostile to his name — relate that he overthrew, in many volumes, the Arians, the Eunomians, the Origenists, and many other sects of heretics, [1] it is credible that these heresies were devised by his disciples, who, to gain credit for them, imposed them upon their master — heresies which they themselves (as Epiphanius testifies in the third book of the *Panarion*) had neither learned nor heard from him. He flourished under Gratian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 380.

Aponius, a man most eloquent in the sacred letters, wrote on the Song of Songs (according to the Septuagint edition), to Armenius the Presbyter, six books, in which he most exactly described, in the allegorical sense, the nuptials of Christ and the Church. These Lucas, abbot of Mont-Saint-Corneille, contracted into an epitome; and Angelomus the Monk also, in his *Stromata on the Song of Songs*, plucked very many passages from these, the author's name not being concealed. The beginning of the work is, *By that great example of beatitude.* He flourished under the Emperor Louis, in the year of our salvation 810.

Apringius [Aprigius], a Spaniard, bishop of the city of Pax [Beja] in Spain — exactly learned in the secular disciplines, eminent in eloquence, and the most skilled of his age in all the holy scriptures, and in the explanation of the divine volumes second to none of the ancient fathers — published, under Justinian Augustus, about the year of the Lord 530, most learned and most elegant commentaries on the Song of Songs and on the Apocalypse.

Aquila, disciple of Rabbi Akiba, the second Greek interpreter [translator] of the divine volumes — careful and diligent, by nation a Pontic, by fatherland of Sinope, a man most skilled in both branches of mathematics [astronomy/astrology], and on that account dear to Hadrian Augustus, by whom he was even appointed overseer of the works for building up the city of Jerusalem (destroyed by Titus). This man, I say, when — the city being restored — the disciples of the Apostles were preaching the Gospel in it, believed in Christ and was baptized. But when, too intent on the casters-of-nativities, he daily marked out the positions of nativities, the horoscope of those being born having been inspected; and when, rebuked for this by the fathers, he did not desist but rather opposed himself to them insultingly — he was driven from the church by them. Which ignominy, bearing it more grievously and vexingly than can be said, he renounced Christianity, is made a proselyte, and is circumcised among the Jews; [2] and, having quickly been taught the Hebrew tongue, he translated the divine scriptures into Greek word for word — attacking the translation of the Seventy-two interpreters, that he might render otherwise certain testimonies concerning Christ brought forth in the scriptures and translated by them, and thus avenge the confusion he had received. His edition, as Jerome (at the beginning of the *Hebrew Questions*) and Severian, bishop of Gabala (in the exordium of the Hexaemeron), noted, had this beginning: ἐν κεφαλίδι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν· ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν κενότης, καὶ οὐδέν — that is, *In the chapter-heading [or in the sum] God made heaven and earth; but the earth was emptiness, and nothing* [Aquila's rendering of Gen 1:1–2].

He flourished, as Epiphanius writes, under Hadrian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 120. But as Jerome supposes (in the third commentary on Isaiah), he flourished many years before the last Jewish captivity, and was a disciple of Rabbi Akiba, who lived before Christ.

Arator, subdeacon [and] Cardinal of the holy Roman Church, a distinguished poet, under the Emperor Justinian, in the year of the Lord 540, wrote in most elegant verses two books of the *Apostolic History*, in which, in hexameter verse, he sang whatever Luke the Evangelist wrote in prose in the Acts of the Apostles — with innumerable and elegant flowers of allegories intermingled in his work, which the venerable presbyter Bede, gathering into one, used to adorn his own commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles. When Arator himself had offered the volume of these books to Pope Vigilius, before the confession [tomb] of St.

Peter, on the 7th before the Ides of April [April 7], in a circle of many Bishops, he was ordered by the Pontiff to recite it aloud before all. But when the time of the hour had now passed, Pope Vigilius handed the codex to Surgentius, the venerable primicerius, to be placed in the archive, that he might finish the reading of it at the appointed time. All earnestly demanding that the book be read publicly before all, from the beginning — the Pontiff assenting — within the Church of St. Peter in Chains [ad Vincula], in a great throng of all the most learned, Arator himself reciting with distinct words, both books were heard four times over — since in one day scarcely the half of one book could be read, on account of the constant repetitions which the hearers demanded with auspicious and frequent acclamations. The beginning of the work is: *As Judaea, polluted with the blood of its own crime…* He flourished in the year of the Lord 560.

Archangelo Favorino [Archangelus Faorinus] published Denis the Carthusian's *Adunation* [Gathering] of the matters contained here and there in the various passages of the Epistles of St. Paul. The book was printed at Venice in the year of the Lord 1569.

Arethas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, gathered a certain brief explanation on the Apocalypse, which he reduced into order out of the divinely-instituted commentaries of the most blessed Andrew, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. Its beginning is, *It is to be known, that the whole, etc.* This work was made Latin [translated] by John Henten [Ioannes Hentenius], a Hieronymite — afterward a Dominican, whom I heard teaching Theology in the University of Louvain in the year of the Lord 1565.

Aribo, Archbishop of Mainz, the 19th after St. Boniface the martyr, a man most illustrious in the study of the divine law — at whose command a Provincial synod was gathered at Seligenstadt in Germany, under Conrad the Younger Augustus — wrote one book on the 15 Psalms of Degrees. He flourished under the Emperor Conrad the Younger, in the year of the Lord 1031.

Aristobulus the Elder, by nation a Jew, from Paneas, a city of Phoenicia (which is called Caesarea of Palestine, or Caesarea Philippi) — disciple of Agathobulus the Jew, a most wise man (who himself also wrote on the Pentateuch) — a man of singular learning [→ p220: doctrine…]

[1] Apollinaris overthrew many heresies. [2] Aquila, having renounced Christianity, becomes a proselyte of the Jews.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 220 [printed folio 201]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the close of **Aristobulus the Elder**, then **Aristobulus the Younger** (tutor of Ptolemy Philometor, the addressee of the letter prefixed to 2 Maccabees), **Arlottus** (his Concordance of both Testaments), **Armandus Bellovisus**, and the opening of the long **Arnobius** entry (the two Arnobii distinguished). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Aristobulus the Elder, continued from p219:]

…renowned in doctrine and sanctity, was one of those seventy elders who were sent by Eleazar, the pontiff of Jerusalem, to Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second king of Egypt, to translate the Hebrew books of the divine law into the Greek tongue; and he answered many things, out of the traditions of Moses, to the king who proposed and inquired of them. He therefore published, in the Greek tongue, five books of *Questions on the Pentateuch* addressed to Ptolemy Philadelphus — of which Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, made mention in his book *On the Pasch*, from which Eusebius, in the seventh book of the Ecclesiastical History, brings forward a long testimony, embracing the words of Aristobulus. He flourished in the 124th Olympiad, that is, in the year 350 before the coming of Christ.

Aristobulus the Younger [Aristobulus Iunior], by nation a Jew, of the race of the priests, tutor of Ptolemy Philometor the sixth king of Egypt, a philosopher by profession, a Peripatetic by sect, but above all things imbued from his tender years with the knowledge of the holy scriptures, wrote — in polished Greek eloquence, to Ptolemy Philometor the king his pupil — commentaries on the Pentateuch of Moses, most excellent in doctrine and in eloquence, in which he showed that the whole Peripatetic philosophy had been

drawn from the Mosaic law.[1] Clement makes mention of these in the fifth book of the *Stromata*, and Eusebius in the eighth book of the *Preparation for the Gospel*, and in the *Chronicles*. There is extant, addressed to this Aristobulus, a letter prefixed at the beginning of the second book of Maccabees, which the senate and the people of Jerusalem transmitted to him in these words: *The people who are in Jerusalem and in Judea, and the senate, and Judas, to Aristobulus, teacher of King Ptolemy, who is of the stock of the anointed priests, and to those Jews who are in Egypt, greeting and health. Concerning the great things, etc.* [2 Maccabees 1:10]. He flourished under the same Ptolemy Philometor in the 151st Olympiad, that is, in the year 215 before Christ was born.

Arlottus [Arlotto], Minister General of the Order of Minors, by nation a Tuscan, a man eminently learned and a keen disputant, compiled a book inscribed *Concordances of the Old and New Testament*, in which he fitted together, in becoming order, the testimonies of both Testaments mutually consonant with one another. He flourished under Adolph the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1290.

Armandus Bellovisus [Armand de Beauvoir], a Dominican, whose work on the difficult terms both of philosophy and of theology is extant, wrote a scholastic postil on the Psalms.

Arnobius the African [Arnobius Afer], who under Diocletian Augustus, in Sicca, a city of Africa, taught rhetoric most flourishingly, and among the other youths whom he trained in declamation had as a pupil Lactantius Firmianus, a man of great and excellent genius and eloquence.[2] When, while still a pagan, he was called to the faith of Christ by hidden inspirations, and in a certain way compelled to belief, he demanded of the bishops of Africa the sacrament of regeneration; and when they rejected him — fearing lest the man, swollen with secular eloquence, might wish to make a mockery of the Christian religion which he had always assailed — he offered them, as an argument of his sincerity, most excellent volumes of disputations against his former religion, as hostages of his faith.

From which auspicious pledge, being received into the church, he is said afterward to have left behind some lucubrations upon the divine scriptures, from among which Trithemius reckons commentaries on the Psalter — of which, however, Jerome, in indicating Arnobius's works, makes no mention. There exist certain small and very brief commentaries on all the psalms according to the tropological and allegorical sense, which Erasmus of Rotterdam issued in print with the Frobenian types, together with a preface of a certain Arnobius written to Laurentius and Rusticus, bishops, a dedicatory epistle being added, in which he contends by many arguments that the work is, beyond any controversy, that of the famous rhetorician Arnobius. But the unpolished style and speech, teeming with countless solecisms and barbarisms, openly proves that its author differs from that Arnobius — of whom we now have seven most eloquent books *Against the Nations*[3] — more than heaven differs from earth. Which [seven books], although Jerome, writing to Paulinus, reprehends as being uneven in speech, and excessive, and confused without any division of the whole work, he nevertheless confesses to be otherwise most brilliant and happily elaborated by a most flourishing rhetorician.

Nor does that which Erasmus brings forward to excuse the diversity of style much satisfy me — namely, that Arnobius purposely wished, in these commentaries, to lower himself to the speech of the lowest of the common people, so that, all pomp of eloquence being laid aside, he might declare himself a Christian with his whole heart before those who could not be persuaded that he professed the Christian religion with a sincere mind. Which, although I would not deny that it could have been done, yet the diversity of the times most evidently shows the distinction between the two Arnobii. For that this Arnobius, the interpreter of the psalms, was long after the other Arnobius, can easily be detected from the exposition of psalm 109, in which Photinus, the restorer of the Ebionite heresy, is refuted by name. But it cannot be that Arnobius — who had Lactantius, still a young man under the emperor Diocletian, that is, around the year of the Lord 290, as a pupil — could have heard of the heresy of Photinus: who, as is gathered from the fifth book of the *Tripartite History* and from Jerome both in the catalog and in the chronicles, began to teach the impiety of his dogma in

the year of the Lord 358[4] — that is, in the 30th year after Crispus Caesar, son of Constantine the Great, was slain, whose youth Lactantius Firmianus, in his extreme old age, instructed as tutor.[5]

To this is added also a conjecture, in my judgment indeed not to be disapproved: that in the explication of psalm 108, and 117, he assails as heretical the opinion of those who profess that God from eternity predestined some to blessing and reprobated others to cursing. But it is agreed, from the two epistles of Prosper and Hilary to Augustine, that this assertion arose so much under Augustine's own times that not a few most holy men throughout Africa and Gaul complained that no one ever among the ecclesiastical fathers had held those things which Augustine preached — no less newly than uselessly — concerning the eternal discretion of the predestined and the reprobate, made by God. Yet this work, whosesoever it be, appears (for Hierony■ [→ p221: -mus…]

[1] Peripatetic philosophy was drawn from the books of Moses. [2] Lactantius was Arnobius's pupil in the study of eloquence. [3] Jerome testifies, in the epistle to Magnus, that Arnobius wrote only seven books *Against the Nations*. The one that is now appended after the seven, and titled "the eighth," is a dialogue on the same subject, but not a part of the same body, nor a book of the same work. [4] Photinus began to teach his heresy in the year of the Lord 358. [5] Lactantius was the tutor of Crispus Caesar, son of Constantine the Great.

(Rich PDF p. 221 [printed folio 202]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the close of ***Arnobius*** *(Sixtus's argument that the Psalm-commentary ascribed to him is by a later, African Arnobius of Augustine's day), then the* ***Arnolds*** *(of Austria, Haldrenius of Wesel, of Wesel),* ***Arnulphus****,* ***Ascensius****,* ***Astensis****, the two* ***Asterii*** *(of Amasea; of Scythopolis, the Arian psalm-expositor), and the opening of the long* ***Athanasius*** *entry. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Arnobius, continued from p220:]

…■mus does not enumerate it among the monuments of Arnobius) to be very ancient: for Bede the Presbyter, in his commentaries on the Psalms, uses its testimonies, marked beforehand with the title of ARNOBIUS.[1] And, if anything is to be granted to suspicions and conjectures, we can conjecture that its author — who, in the exposition of Psalm 105, places himself among the priests — was an African, and lived in Africa in Augustine's age, and dedicated his work to Laurentius and Rusticus, African bishops, whose names are set down in the preface of that same work. For indeed in the Council of Carthage I find that, together with Augustine, there took part a certain Rusticus, a bishop in Africa, and Laurentius, bishop of Icosium, legate of the province of Mauretania. And in these commentaries I find certain expressions everywhere in use among the Africans in Augustine's times — as in the exposition of Psalm 131, where it is read, *But upon him shall my sanctification flourish [floriet]*. Which expression *Floriet* Augustine writes to have been in his age in the mouth of the peoples, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter thirteen, in which place, discoursing on the faults of speech, he says: *THAT ALSO which we cannot now take from the mouth of the singing peoples — Upon him shall my sanctification flourish [floriet] — detracts nothing indeed from the sense; yet a more skilled hearer would prefer this to be corrected, so that it be said not* Floriet *but* Florebit [both = "shall flourish," floriet being the vulgar form]; *nor does anything impede the correction, except the custom of the singers.* And in the explanation of Psalm 138, explaining that verse, *My bone [os] was not hidden*, he says: *SINCE indeed my bone is not hidden from thee, that is, my* ossum. Which word Augustine affirms to have been commonly corrupted among his own people, in the enarration of the same psalm, saying: *He says his* os *[bone], which is commonly called* ossum, *and in Latin is called* os; *but let us rather say* ossum. *For it is better that the grammarians reprehend us than that the peoples not understand.* These few things concerning Arnobius's commentaries on the psalms, which we had to say, we have said.

There are also carried about, under the name of Arnobius the African, certain little mystical annotations of no great moment upon various — but few — passages of the gospels, whose beginning is, *In the beginning was the Word*, printed at Cologne by Quentel: concerning which I leave to each his own judgment entire. Arnobius flourished under Diocletian up to Constantine the Great, around the year of the Lord 300.

Arnold of Austria [Arnoldus de Austria], a Carmelite, wrote Sermons and Questions on Scripture, in the year of the Lord 1400.

Arnold Haldrenius of Wesel [Arnoldus Haldrenius Vesaliensis], Canon of the Cathedral church of Cologne, a man conspicuous for singular holiness of life and for exact knowledge of sacred Scripture, most skilled also in the three tongues, namely Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, likewise strong in verse and in prose, published a little book on the ten precepts of the decalogue, which begins, *If thou wilt enter into life.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

Arnold of Wesel [Arnoldus Vesaluensis] wrote an exegesis of the decalogue, in the year 1542.

Arnulphus, an English preacher, wrote *On the Works of the Six Days*, one book; likewise homilies and other sermons. He lived in the year of the Lord 1126.

Ascensius, of the Order of Minors, a theologian not obscure, made a Postil on the Apocalypse.

Astensis [of Asti] wrote sermons on the Sunday gospels from Easter up to Advent.

Asterius, bishop of Amasea, a man of sincere piety and great erudition, wrote on Luke chapter 16, one sermon on the rich man and Lazarus, cited in the sixth session of the second Synod of Nicaea.

Asterius of Scythopolis [Asterius Scythopolitanus], the fourth of the Greek expounders of all the psalms. A follower of the Arian faction — whom I would not put in the catalog, unless Jerome before me had done so — under the reign of Constantius Augustus he composed many volumes on the sacred Scriptures, which were most studiously read by the men of his party. But among the rest he wrote most learned commentaries on the Psalter, whose fragments are still preserved in the Greek Catena of the Psalms, his name being prefixed. He gave also brief little commentaries on the four gospels, and on all the epistles of Paul. He flourished in the year 380.

Athanasius, nineteenth bishop of the city of Alexandria, of exceptional sanctity and erudition, a most vigorous champion of the Catholic faith, for whose defense — having endured many snares of the Arians — he fled to Constantius Augustus into Gaul; whence, returned with letters, and again put to flight after his death, he lay hidden until the reign of Jovian [printed "Jovinian"]; by whom, the governance of his church being restored to him, he dies in the year of the Lord 370,[2] having left to posterity many monuments of his distinguished genius, of which those pertaining to the divine scriptures are these.

A *Synopsis of the whole of divine Scripture*, that is, a *Conspectus* [Contuitus]: in which he embraced most briefly the arguments, inscriptions, beginnings, authority, and authors of all the books of both testaments. Its beginning is, *All our Scripture, we who are Christians.*

Of *Questions from the Old and New Testament, to Antiochus the prince*, one book, containing 162 questions. Its beginning is, *Whence it can be declared.* Which, however, does not seem to be Athanasius's: I suspect it was collected out of various writings of the fathers by some studious person, who in the fourth question alleges the mystical Theology of Dionysius — unknown, as I judge, to the age of Athanasius — and in question 33 cites Athanasius himself, and brings forth from him a differing opinion.

Commentaries on the Psalter of David.

Likewise, upon the Psalter of David, to Marcellinus, an Isagogic little book *On the Titles and Force of the Psalms*: in which, from the conference of a certain industrious old man, he teaches most briefly what utility each one can obtain from the settled reading of each particular psalm. Its beginning is, *I praise thy will in Christ.* Cassiodorus makes mention of this work in his prologue, and at the end of his commentaries on the psalms, saying: *A witness is the magnificent discourse of Bishop Athanasius, who, examining the virtues of the psalms with searching truth, proves that all things are there which are contained within the compass of the whole of sacred Scripture.*

In [→ p222: -IN…]

[1] The author's judgment concerning the commentaries on the Psalms that are here and there ascribed to Arnobius. [2] Athanasius dies in the year of the Lord 370.

*(Rich PDF p. 222 [printed folio 203]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the list of **Athanasius's** exegetical works and **Photius's** assessment of him; then **Augustine of Ancona** (his New-Testament commentaries and catenae), **Augustine of Ascoli**, **Augustine Leo**, and **Agostino Giustiniani** of Nebbio — the polyglot **Octapla** in five tongues. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Athanasius, continued from p221:]

Commentaries on Ecclesiastes of Solomon.

Commentaries on the Song of Songs.

On that passage from Leviticus chapter 9, *And Moses said to Aaron, Approach to the altar, and make a holocaust for thy sin, and for the expiation of thy house* — one sermon, which begins, *Behold for thee in this place.*

On that passage of Matthew 11, *All things are delivered to me by my Father* — against Eusebius and his followers, one book; [beginning] *Not understanding this.*

On that passage of Matthew 12, *Jesus passed through the corn, and his disciples followed, plucking the ears* — one homily; [beginning] *On the Sabbath day.*

On that passage of Matthew 12, *Whosoever shall speak a word against the Holy Spirit* — On the sin against the Holy Spirit, one book.

On that passage of Matthew 20 [read 21], *Go into the village that is over against you* — one sermon, which appears to be a fragment of some commentary, and begins, *Because those things which are upon the earth.*

On that passage of Matthew 27, *And they came to the place which is called Golgotha*, up to *Truly this was the Son of God* — a most eloquent sermon *On the Passion of the Lord*; [beginning] *That which has now been recited, etc.*

On Luke chapter 1, a homily *On the Lord's Annunciation*, concerning the most holy Mother of God [Deipara], beginning, *The sacred things of the sacred.*

Athanasius is also cited by St. Thomas in the book *Against the Errors of the Greeks* — in the case [theca], or volume, upon John.

Photius, Archbishop of Constantinople, writes thus concerning the writings and manner of teaching of Athanasius, to his brother Tarasius:[1]

> *Athanasius, in his sermons, is everywhere clear in expression, and brief, and simple, yet acute, and lofty, and altogether vehement in his argumentations; and in these there is such abundance that it is admirable. But of logical methods he uses nothing thinly, nothing childishly (like boys and the untaught), but employs them philosophically and magnificently. He is well fortified with the testimonies and demonstrations of the Scriptures for conquering [his adversary] — and above all that discourse which was delivered on the humanity of the Word of God; and the five volumes of books against Arius, which are a trophy over every heresy, but especially over the Arian. And if anyone should say that Gregory the Theologian and the divine Basil, drawing as from a certain fountain out of his book, poured forth those beautiful and most lucid rivers of their own discourse against error, he would not go, as I judge, far from the likelihood [of the truth]. There have also been written by him commentaries on Ecclesiastes, and on the Song of Songs, and likewise on the Psalter, and elsewhere in many places; yet in grace and ornament there truly excel his sermons against Apollinaris, and his epistles — as many as contain the apology for his exile.*

Gregory the Theologian celebrated the life of Athanasius in a brilliant oration.

Augustine of Ancona [Augustinus Anconas, Augustinus Triumphus], of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine, a man learned in the divine scriptures and most practiced in Scholastic Theology and in the sacrosanct decrees of the pontiffs, wrote — with postillating zeal, upon the whole New Testament — the below-written books of commentaries, namely:

On Matthew, one book. On Mark, one book. On Luke, one book. On John, one book. On the Acts of the Apostles, one book. On the Acts of the Apostles, again, a catena from the explanations of the fathers, with insertions of his own throughout the opportune places, questions being proposed and solved in the Scholastic manner. On all the epistles of Paul, 14 books. On all Paul's epistles, a catena from the expositions of the fathers. On the Canonical epistles, 7 books. On the Canonical epistles, a catena from the explanations of the fathers. On the Apocalypse, one book. On the Apocalypse, a catena from the explanations of the fathers.

He wrote also, on the first chapter of Luke, upon *He was sent* [Luke 1:26], a useful treatise. Likewise, upon the Canticle of the Virgin [the Magnificat], another treatise, in which he prosecuted the words of the Canticle with a threefold exposition; but in both he discoursed copiously about the most sacred incarnation of the divine Word, and about the praises of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

He flourished under Louis IV of Bavaria and Pope John XXII — to whom he dedicated his work *On the Power of the Pope* — in the year of the Lord 1330.

Augustine of Ascoli [Augustinus de Esculo], of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine, wrote *Lectures on the whole of Scripture*. He lived in the year of the Lord 1330.

Augustine Leo [Augustinus Leo], a hermit monk, wrote Sermons on the Lord's Prayer and on the Angelic Salutation.

Augustine of Nebbio [Augustinus Nebiensis; Agostino Giustiniani], bishop in the island of Corsica, by fatherland a Genoese, of the illustrious family of the Giustiniani, a most observant professor of the Order of Preachers, a Theologian sincerely learned, and most skilled in all the tongues that are dispersed throughout the whole world. By a new and vast enterprise, the first of all men, he reduced both instruments of the sacred law [both Testaments] — in five principal tongues, Hebrew, Chaldean, Greek, Latin, and Arabic — into one body, entitled the *Octapla*, with such artifice that on each single page he arranged eight columns, in which all the aforesaid tongues, expressed in their own characters, corresponding to one another in as many lines and as many words, might be seen at one and the same glance, in this order, namely:

In the first little column he set the Hebrew edition. In the second, a Latin interpretation corresponding to the Hebrew word for word. In the third, the common and Vulgate Latin edition. In the fourth, the Greek. In the fifth, the Arabic. In the sixth, the Targum — that is, the Chaldean paraphrase, written indeed in the Chaldean speech, but in Hebrew letters. In the seventh, a Latin translation corresponding to the Chaldean. In the eighth, certain very brief little scholia, or annotations, scattered and interspersed at intervals, by which he especially refuted the errors of the Jews.

Of this so illustrious a work I have deserved to see only two volumes: namely, from the Old Testament, an Octaple upon the whole Psalter, [dedicated] to Leo X, Supreme Pontiff, printed with types (whose beginning is, *I know, most kind Father*); and, from the New Testament, an Octaple upon the whole four gospels, [written] by the author's own hand, with ink and [→ p223: red-lead (minio)…]

[1] The judgment of Photius concerning Athanasius.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 223 [printed folio 204]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the close of **Agostino Giustiniani** (his Octapla; †1530 at sea), **Augustine the Roman**, two entries for **Agostino Steuco** of Gubbio (the Vatican librarian), **Avitus** of Vienne (his hexameter poems on Genesis and Exodus), and the opening of the long*

***Aurelius Augustine** of Hippo entry. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Agostino Giustiniani of Nebbio, continued from p222:]

…and described with red-lead [minium]: whose beginning is, *A salutary and great fruit, and increase of usefulness.*

This most learned man flourished under Leo X, Supreme Pontiff, being distinguished at Rome in the Lateran Council; and he dies, consumed by a storm at sea, in the year of our salvation 1530, while he was sailing to Corsica for the administration of his church.

Augustine the Roman [Augustinus Romanus], Prior General of the whole Order of Hermits, most learned in Scholastic Theology, a subtle disputant, and practiced in the divine scriptures, published, in scholastic style, 14 books of commentaries on the epistles of Paul, and one book on the Apocalypse. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1410.

Augustine of Gubbio [Augustinus Eugubinus; Agostino Steuco], bishop of Chisamos [Kissamos], by fatherland of Gubbio, prefect of the Apostolic library in the Vatican, distinguished in every kind of wisdom, whose most celebrated work *On the Perennial Philosophy* is extant, composed upon the Pentateuch of Moses elegant and succinct annotations, most diligently explaining the phrases of the Greek and Hebrew tongue, and the idioms contained in the Mosaic books: whose beginning is, *With all labor and study.* And he strives, throughout this whole work, so to defend the Latin edition of St. Jerome that he may show there was no translation of the Old Testament, either among the Greeks or among the Latins, better than Jerome's, more elegant, more lucid, and even more Latin; in which, if anything either faulty is found, or dissonant from the Hebrew truth, or added, or subtracted, he demonstrates that all this is either of no moment, or has befallen through the fault of the copyists.

The same man illustrated the first two chapters of Genesis with a most eloquent explanation, which he entitled, by the Greek word, *Cosmopoeia*, that is, *The Fabric of the World*; its beginning is, *There are two things.* Likewise he wrote most eloquent and most learned commentaries on all the Davidic psalms, digested copiously and diligently according to the historical and mystical sense. The opening of the work is, *Since, of all the sacred letters.* He flourished under Charles V Augustus, in the year of the Lord 1540.

Augustine Steuchus of Gubbio [the same Agostino Steuco] wrote Annotations on the Pentateuch; an interpretation on Psalm 18 and 138; a *Cosmopoeia* on the first three chapters of Genesis; enarrations on several Psalms and on the book of Job; and *Hebraic Expressions* [Locutiones Hebraicae]. He flourished at Rome under Paul III, Supreme Pontiff.

Avitus [Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus], by forename Alcimus, of Vienne, bishop in Gaul; most copiously instructed in the secular disciplines, a most distinguished rhetorician and poet, conspicuous for holiness of life and for knowledge of the sacred volumes. He wrote, in the Latin tongue and in hexameter verses:

On the first chapter of Genesis, *On the Origin of the World*, one book. On the Flood of the world, on the 6th chapter of Genesis, one book. On the Crossing of the Red Sea, on the 13th [read 14th] chapter of Exodus, one book.

He flourished under the Emperor Zeno, in the year of the Lord 500. There are said to be six books of the same author, composed in heroic verse on Genesis and Exodus, extant at Vienna in the library of Wolfgang Lazius.

Aurelius Augustine [of Hippo], bishop of Hippo, by nation an African, by fatherland of Tagaste — a man above all mortals who were before him and after him up to now; endowed with an admirable sharpness of genius, instructed in all the liberal disciplines, most fully imbued with the Platonic philosophy, not ignorant of the Aristotelian doctrine, by far the most learned of all in the divine Scriptures, and in their explanation

sublime with an incomparable subtlety beyond what can be told. He surpassed all the writers of the Latin Church in the labor of writing and in the multitude of his lucubrations, having published more than one thousand and thirty volumes of every kind of discipline:[1] of which he composed expressly, upon all the books of divine scripture here and there, very many exegetical writings of diverse kinds — that is, explanatory writings — which he himself, in the preface of his *Retractations*, divided into three parts, that is, into Epistles, Tractates, and Books.

In the Epistles he satisfied friends who consulted him about various difficulties of divine scripture. In the Tractates — under whose number are comprehended homilies, or sermons, and other enarrations of the divine volumes to the people — he discoursed publicly on the sacred letters, before the assembly, with his own voice. But the Books he, in the Retractations, divided into four orders, namely into Annotations, Questions, Disputations, and Continuous expositions. In the books of Annotations, passing over many things, he touched here and there only a few — cursorily, briefly, and lightly — which pertain to the understanding of the words and of the letter. In the books of Questions he proposes for inquiry, and resolves, various doubts from diverse passages of the scriptures. In the books of Disputations he most strongly defends some part of divine scripture that has been assailed by the calumnies of heretics. In the books of Continuous explanation he explains anew some parts of both testaments, in a continuous course of exposition, according to the varied understanding both of the letter and of the spirit.

And all these things Augustine attests, at the end of the Retractations, to have been produced by him in three ways, namely by dictating, by speaking, and by writing. Of the kind of Spoken works are the Tractates delivered to the people — to hear which, as Posidonius is witness, the heretics themselves also, together with the catholics, moved by the sanctity and erudition of the man, used to run together with vast eagerness from all Africa, bringing with them notaries who would take down and write out what was caught from his mouth. Of the number of the Dictated works are many epistles, and very many Tractates to the common people, and also some books. Of the order of the Written works are the books of Continuous exposition, the books of Questions, and of Disputations: which, with greater diligence and skill applied, he himself wrote more accurately.

Nor do I think this ought to be passed over in this place: that he himself, in the reading of his little works, wished the readers to observe, namely, the variety and the fourfold order of the times in which it befell them to be written.[2] For he wrote some things when he was a Catechumen, in■ [→ p224: -flated (inflatus) with secular letters…]

[1] Augustine published more than 1030 volumes. [2] St. Augustine warns the reader to observe the fourfold variety of the times in which he composed his works.

(Rich PDF p. 224 [printed folio 205]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *of Hippo entry continues — the fourfold chronology of his works, his style (his preference for the Italic version; "I prefer that the grammarians reprehend me…"), his commonplaces, and the beginning of the list of his exegetical works:* On Christian Doctrine, *and the anti-Manichaean Disputations (against Adimantus, against Faustus, against an unnamed adversary of the Law and Prophets). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p223:]

…■flated with the habit of secular letters; others he composed when first he was baptized, and still raw and a novice in the sacred letters; others he wrote when made a presbyter, more erudite and learned; and others, finally, when raised to the episcopate — by far the most learned of all. This distinction of the times Augustine therefore judged should be observed, so that from the consideration of it the readers might notice how he himself, after the manner of learners, gradually advanced by writing;[1] and thus they would the more easily pardon him if they should find anything erroneous in his earlier writings, and would take refuge in his

last lucubrations as in the more erudite and firmer decrees of the author.

Besides these, he published also many other exoteric writings, in which — in passing, and as though doing something else — he explained, on various occasions, very many things here and there about the divine letters. Omitting these, I have collected only the exegetical works, and those that were composed by him of set purpose in the explanation and defense of the sacred volumes. The rest, if anyone desires to know, let him read the two books of the *Retractations*, in which Augustine reviewed and retracted the greater part of his labors.

His manner of teaching, in all the aforesaid works, always and everywhere savors of the same author; yet in the Books he is more erudite, acute, and — by the subtlety of sublime matters — more recondite than in the Tractates: so much so that Jerome, in a certain epistle, does not fear to call him the most obscure expositor of the scriptures.[2] He abounds, moreover, in a most copious supply of questions, disputations, argumentations, and reasonings; and, above all the ecclesiastical writers, he flows forth with the testimonies and sentences of divine scripture, like a great river overflowing with the winter's snow. In the Tractates the style is somewhat more sparing, and more open, and better accommodated to allegorical and moral explanations: in which Augustine, on account of the ears of the unskilled multitude, often lowers himself even to barbarism, frequently having that saying in his mouth, *I prefer that the grammarians reprehend me, rather than that the peoples not understand*[3] — choosing rather to be understood in barbarisms, even with the grammarians condemning them, than to abandon his hearers in the midst of eloquence. But he uses, in all his explanations, the translation of divine scripture of his own times, which was called the Italic;[4] for he himself, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, prefers it above the rest, as much for its fidelity of words as for its perspicuity of sentences, to the Latin editions.

His commonplaces, most peculiar to him — and with which above all his exegetical volumes are filled — are these: on the Holy Trinity, Foreknowledge, Election, Predestination, Vocation, Justification, Reprobation, Hardening; on Grace and free will; on Faith and works; on Gifts and merits; on Original Sin; and on other dogmas like these — with moral topics occasionally interspersed, which are in use among all the enarrators.

The kind of his oration and diction is most fruitful and most exuberant, most rich and most copious — not to say excessive — redounding with an affluence of diverse matters, and, with periods drawn out to length, mixedly and indiscriminately rolling and snatching along with itself very many things at once, wandering with digressions, excursions, and roundabout ways; [a style] which requires an ingenious, attentive, mindful, and patient reader — whom, lest he be wearied by the tedium of prolixity, he is wont to refresh with certain Punic [African] witticisms, playing very often with similarly-advancing and similarly-falling clauses, and with other not-unpleasant figures of the rhetoricians, which soften the long and intricate journey of a prolix reading. Let these things, concerning the kind of his lucubrations, the manner of teaching, and the character of speech usual to Augustine, be said sufficiently. But those works which he elaborated upon the individual and the universal parts of both testaments are these.

Upon the whole body of divine Scripture: *On Christian Doctrine*, four books; in which, for the instruction of him who is to be an expositor of holy scripture, he hands down the precepts of reading, understanding, and interpreting the sacred letters — showing by the aid of which tongues and arts, and by the reading of which authors, and by what rules he has need who inquires into the senses of the Scriptures; and what modes of narrating and expounding the expositor of the sacred volumes ought to have. The work begins, *There are certain precepts.*

Upon both Testaments: thirty-six books of Disputations against the heretics who blaspheme the Old Testament and accuse the New of falsification. Of these, while he was still a presbyter, he wrote one against Adimantus, a disciple of Manichaeus — who had put out a destructive volume against the ancient testament, setting forth in it, by antithesis, many testimonies from both testaments as though contrary to one another;

wishing, namely, by this craft to persuade that the whole Old Testament fights hostilely with the New, and is therefore to be cast away by Christians. This machination Augustine overthrew in this book, the passages of both scriptures which seemed to disagree among themselves being reduced to true concord. The work begins, *Concerning that which is written.*

Then, having been made a bishop, he published thirty-three books of Disputations against Faustus, bishop of the Manichees[5] — who, having published an impious volume against all the divine letters, strove above all to demonstrate two things: first, that the whole Old Testament was framed, for the deception of the human race, by the worst demon, and afterwards augmented by the Jews themselves with obscene and impious narrations; then, that all the scriptures of the New Instrument had been falsified by certain Semi-Jews, who — in order to win credit for the Old Testament — deceitfully inserted the testimonies of Moses and the prophets into the Evangelical books. These impious blasphemies Augustine most strongly confuted in these thirty-three books. Their beginning is, *There was a certain Faustus.*

The same [Augustine], in his episcopate, composed the remaining two books of Disputations, against a certain unnamed Manichee who had put out a book against the Law and the Prophets. And since he did not know his name, he entitled the work *Against an Adversary of the Law and the Prophets.* Its beginning is, *The book which you sent.* He wrote likewise on [→ p225: Gene(sis)…]

[1] Augustine advanced by writing. [2] Augustine was, to Jerome, the most obscure expositor of the scriptures. [3] A distinguished saying of St. Augustine. [4] St. Augustine used the Italic translation of the Scriptures. [5] St. Augustine refuted the blasphemies of Faustus the Manichee.

(Rich PDF p. 225 [printed folio 206]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *entry continues — his Books of Questions on both Testaments, the* Mirror of the Scriptures*, the (disputed)* On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture*; then his works on particular parts: the* Locutions *and* Questions *on the Heptateuch, and the great cluster on Genesis (the fifteen books of continuous exposition — against the Manichees, the unfinished* On Genesis according to the Letter*, and the twelve-book* On Genesis according to the Letter*; Confessions 11–13; the dialogue of 75 Questions; and 21 Genesis sermons). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p224:]

…the kind of Questions.

Upon both Testaments, here and there, six books; namely, from the whole Old Testament, two scattered books, of which the first begins, *What is God?*, and the second thus, *Against those who deny*. Upon the whole New Testament, two books, of which the former begins, *God certainly is perfect*, and the other, *Why [things were] done and said.* Likewise, from both testaments mixedly, 2 books; of these, one begins, *You have heard what he attests*, and the other, *What is [made] to the image.* To these books a seventh also can be added, which is entitled *Of Eighty-three Questions*, thus beginning, *Every truth.*

He collected also, upon both testaments, a volume which he entitled the *Mirror of the Scriptures* [Speculum Scripturarum], gathering into it, according to the order of the divine books, all things that are found in the sacred letters for the forming of morals. The opening of the work runs thus, *Who is ignorant.* There are also carried about, under the title of Augustine, upon the whole Scripture, three books *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* [De mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae], embracing the individual wondrous events narrated in both testaments, with brief elucidations according to the letter occasionally added, and little questions — yet resolved by no fixed determination. These Thomas Aquinas, in the 43rd question of the third part, denies to be a work of Augustine's;[1] which indeed begins thus, *Since, of Almighty God.* And these are the works of Augustine which pertain to the whole body of holy scripture. But those which regard the particular parts of divine scripture, now receive.

Upon the Heptateuch, after receiving the episcopate, he wrote seven books of Annotations, which he marked beforehand with the title *Of Expressions* [Locutionum], for this reason: that in them he had annotated the expressions, idioms, and phrases of the Greek and Hebrew scripture which occur here and there in the first seven books of the old testament. The work begins, *The expressions of the scriptures.* The same [work] he wrote, having been raised to the episcopate.

Upon the Heptateuch, seven books of Questions: in which, passing over the first three chapters of Genesis (elsewhere most copiously expounded by himself), he discoursed various questions upon the remaining chapters of the seven volumes, more with the zeal of inquiring than with the mind of deciding. The work begins, *Since with the scriptures, etc.*

He labored also upon the first three chapters of Genesis — that is, from the beginning of the book up to the ejection of the first parents from Paradise — [producing] fifteen books of continuous exposition. Namely: when he was in Africa, shortly after receiving the sacrament of baptism, [he wrote] on Genesis according to allegory, against the Manichees (assailants of the Mosaic history), two books; in which, since he did not yet dare to explain the secrets of natural and divine things, hidden in the Mosaic words, according to the letter and the propriety of history, he followed the allegorical sense, as being then easier for him. The work begins, *If the Manichees should choose.*

Then, having been made a presbyter, he composed *On Genesis according to the Letter, unfinished*, one book — wishing to try how much he could avail by his genius in the historical kind of explaining, the most difficult of all.[2] But when, scarcely and with difficulty, he had reached, by historical explanation, that sentence, *Let us make man*, he sank under so great a mass of the burden, and rested from the labor which he could not sustain, abandoning the book unfinished: whose opening is, *On the obscure [matters] of natural things.*

At last, after his elevation to the episcopate, being made bolder, he wrote upon the first three chapters of Genesis, *On Genesis according to the Letter*, twelve books. In which, although he himself confesses that more things were sought by him than found, and of those found fewer confirmed, and [many] left, as it were, still to be more diligently investigated, in the open: yet there is in them so great a treasure of all the arts, disciplines, and sciences, that it easily appears that nothing more erudite or more sublime, in the exposition of these three chapters, has come forth either before or after Augustine's times — nor perhaps will come forth hereafter, in future times. But it pleased Augustine to determine nothing in this work about natural things with fixed assertion, lest he should give occasion to the pagan wise men of mocking the sacred letters, and should shut the way of believing to the unbelievers — who, when they saw some of our enarrators of Genesis gravely erring in these works of nature (which had already been shown, by the most learned men, with most certain experience and demonstration), and, what is more shameful, confirming their errors with the testimonies of divine Scripture, used to deride our Writers and Scriptures as unlearned, absurd, and false, judging also that the rest, which are contained in them concerning the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of the Son of God, had been written with a like vanity. Therefore, lest Augustine should be a ruin to those men, he preferred to weave the present work by prudently inquiring rather than by rashly defining. Its beginning is, *All divine Scripture.*

The same [Augustine], as he himself recounts in the second book of the Retractations, wrote again upon the first chapter of Genesis, three Books — which he inserted into the Books of Confessions published by him; and among them [the Confessions] they are the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth.

There is also carried about a book, or dialogue, *Of 75 Questions*, under the title of Augustine, in which, Orosius and Augustine conversing, various passages from the first twelve chapters of Genesis are explained. Besides these there are extant:

Upon various passages of Genesis, homilies, or tractates, or sermons — 21, namely:

On Genesis chapter one, six Tractates or Sermons, cited by Trithemius, but not yet seen by me. Likewise, on the beginning of the first chapter, one sermon, which is among the sermons *On the Season* [de tempore], no. 133. On Genesis 2, on the tree of knowledge, one tractate, which begins, *We read in Genesis.* On Genesis 6, on the Cataclysm [the Flood], one sermon, which is *On the Season*, no. 69. On Genesis 12, on Abraham, one sermon, which is *On the Season*, no. 51. On Genesis 15, on the three-year-old heifer, sermon 1, *On the Season*, no. 54. On Genesis 18, on the three men seen by Abraham, sermon 1, *On the Season*, no. 70.

On [→ p226…]

[1] St. Thomas denies that the books *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* are St. Augustine's. [2] The historical kind of explaining is the most difficult of all.

(Rich PDF p. 226 [printed folio 207]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *entry continues its inventory of his exegetical works — the remaining Genesis sermons; the sermons on Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua; the Judges sermons; the Kings material (the broken-off* Questions*, the five* Questions to Simplicianus*, and ten sermons on Kings passages); Tobit and Judith; the* Annotations on Job *(with the self-critical passage from the Retractations); and the opening of the* Enarrations on the Psalter. *Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p225 — Genesis sermons, continued:]

On Genesis 19, on Lot and his daughters, homily 1, which is [of … — a word left blank in the print], no. 5. On Genesis 19, on the things which are figured in Lot and his wife, sermon 1, which is *To the Hermits*, no. 34. On Genesis 22, on the temptation of Abraham, sermon 1, *de tempore* [On the Season], no. 72. On Genesis 22, on the immolation of Isaac, two sermons, which are *de tempore*, nos. 71 and 73. On Genesis 25, on the conception of Rebecca, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 68. On Genesis 28, on Jacob's ladder, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 79. On Genesis 37, on the dream of Joseph, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 81. On Genesis 39, on Joseph and his mistress, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 83. On Genesis 42, on Jacob — from whom it was hidden that Joseph was in Egypt — sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 82.

There remains, finally, upon Genesis 49, a small little commentary on the blessings of the patriarchs, published in dialogue, under the title of Augustine, which begins, *How is it to be understood.* It is thought to have been collected by some studious person out of the book of Jerome's Questions on Genesis. After these are held [these]:

Upon Exodus, eleven sermons, namely: On the first chapter, on the death of Joseph and the multiplication of the sons of Israel, one sermon, *de tempore*, no. 84. On the same chapter, on the straw of the Egyptians, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 85. On Exodus 2, on the nativity of Moses, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 86. On Exodus 3, on the appearance of the Lord in the bush, sermon 1, which is from those added to the tenth tome, no. 18. On the same, on the words of God, *I am who I am*, tractate 1, which is held in tome 9. On Exodus 4, on the hardening of Pharaoh, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 88. On Exodus 7, on the ten plagues of Egypt, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 87. On Exodus 14, on Pharaoh, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 89. On Exodus 15, on the journey of three days, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 90. On the same, on the bitter water and the manna, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 91. On Exodus 31, on the sons of Israel, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 97.

Upon Numbers, six sermons, namely: On chapter 13, on the spies and the cluster [of grapes], sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 100. On Numbers 14, on the people that died in the desert, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 102. On Numbers 16, on the censers, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 98. On Numbers 17, on the rod of Aaron, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 99. On Numbers 21, on the bronze serpent, one sermon, *de tempore*, no. 101. On Numbers 22, on Balaam, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 103.

Upon Joshua, the first chapter: That, by the just judgment of God, the sons of Israel received the land of promise, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 105. On Joshua 6, on Rahab and the overthrow of Jericho, sermon 1, *de*

tempore, no. 106.

Upon the book of Judges, chapter six, on Gideon, two sermons: one, which is *de tempore*, no. 108; the other among the homilies …. [a reference left blank in the print]. On Judges 14, on Samson, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 107.

Upon [the books of] Kings, Augustine attempted a volume of Questions, after the likeness of those which he had written on the Heptateuch; but, not having advanced much further in the work — since he was called to other matters that pressed more urgently — he broke off the labor. The second book of the Retractations makes mention of this work, which is now wanting.

He wrote also another book, to Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, *On the Solution of Five Questions from the Books of Kings*, namely: On the 1st book of Kings, chapter 10, on the spirit of the Lord leaping upon Saul, question 1. On 1 Kings 15, on the repentance of God, that he had made Saul king, question 1. On 1 Kings 28, on Samuel called back from the dead through the Pythoness [the witch of Endor], question 1. On 2 Kings 7, on David entering and sitting before the Lord, question 1. On 3 Kings 17, on Elijah expostulating with God, that he had slain the widow's son, question 1.

Likewise, upon various passages of Kings, 10 sermons, that is: On 1 Kings 17, on David and Goliath, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 196. On the same, on David's single combat, sermon 1, which is in book 50, homily one. On 3 Kings 3, on Solomon's judgment concerning the two harlots, one sermon, *de tempore*, no. 200. On 3 Kings 19, on Elijah, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 201. On 4 Kings 2, on Elisha mocked by the boys, two sermons, which are *de tempore*, nos. 204 and 206. On 4 Kings 5, on Naaman the Syrian, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 207. On the same, on Elisha and Gehazi, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 208. On 4 Kings 6, on Elisha and the axe fallen into the stream, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 210. On the same, on the famine of Samaria, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 211.

Upon Tobit, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 226. Upon Judith, two sermons, which are *de tempore*, nos. 228 and 229.

Upon Job, when he was a bishop, he collected a volume of Annotations; concerning which he himself, in the second book of the Retractations, speaks thus:

> *A book, whose title is Annotations on Job — whether it is to be reckoned mine, or rather theirs who, as they were able or willing, reduced them (written on the margins of the codex) into one body, I could not easily say. For they are agreeable to very few who understand them, while it is inevitable that many, not understanding, are offended: because not even the very words which are expounded are, in many places, so written out that it may appear what is being expounded. Then, upon the brevity of the sentences there followed so great an obscurity that the reader can scarcely bear it — one who must needs pass over very many things not understood. Finally, I found the work itself so full of errors in our codices that I could not correct it; nor would I wish it to be said to have been published by me — except that I know the brethren have it, by whose zeal it cannot be denied [to others].*

The work begins, *And great works.*

Upon the Psalter, Tractates (or Enarrations) of continuous and entire exposition, 205,[1] [→ p227: which…]

[1] The Enarrations of St. Augustine on the Psalms are 205 [in number].

(Rich PDF p. 227 [printed folio 208]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *entry continues — the character of the* Enarrations on the Psalms *(and Jerome's censure of them); a catalog of nineteen further sermons on Psalm verses; sermons on Proverbs, Wisdom, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel; then, with the Old Testament done, the New:* On the Harmony of the Evangelists, *and the threefold treatment of Matthew (the* Sermon on the Mount, *the* Evangelical Questions, *and the homilies). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p226 — the Psalter Enarrations:]

…which — partly as a presbyter, partly as a bishop, up to the end of his life — he enarrated before the assembly, no order being kept, treating now this psalm, now that.[1] These tractates, pious and benevolent hearers, collected from his mouth, digested into a whole and ordered body, such as we now have. The kind of exposition is everywhere allegorical and moral, touching but little on the literal understanding: stricter and more accurate in the first several psalms, in the later ones more diffuse, and running out into long digressions. Jerome, in his epistles to Augustine, seems to censure these commentaries as too obscure,[2] and in some places also as differing from the right line, and from his own [Jerome's] mind, and from that of all the Greek expositors. I suspect that Jerome missed, in these enarrations, an explication of the Psalms according to the purity of the Hebrew truth and the opinion of the Greek expositors. But since Augustine was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue,[3] and was not so instructed in Greek letters that he could unroll the Greek commentaries with a free hand, it was necessary that he often — out of a poverty of literal understanding — bend aside, from the true and proper sense of the letter, to wrested allegories. The work begins, *All scripture.*

Besides these Tractates, there are extant also another nineteen sermons upon various verses of the Psalms, of which the catalog is this: On the first Psalm entire, one sermon, which is held in the book of Questions on the Old Testament, question 110. On Psalm 9, upon *To thee is the poor man left*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 110. On Psalm 16 [read 26], upon *Wait for the Lord, do manfully*, one sermon, among the 50 homilies, no. 11. On the whole of Psalm 21, an epistle to Honoratus, which is no. 120. On the whole of Psalm 23, one sermon, held in the book of Questions on the Old Testament, question 111. On Psalm 33, upon *Who is the man that desireth life?*, one sermon, which is of the 50 homilies, the first. On Psalm 40, on the beginning of the same psalm, one sermon, which is among the 50 homilies the thirty-ninth. On Psalm 45, upon *Be still and see that I am God*, one sermon, *de tempore*, no. 251. On Psalm 49, upon *God shall come manifestly*, two sermons: one *de tempore*, no. 220; the other, no. 28, in the book of 50 homilies. Likewise on Psalm 49, upon *Sitting, thou didst speak against thy brother*, one sermon, which is among the 50 homilies the second. On Psalm 50, one sermon, held in the book of Questions on the Old Testament, question 112. On Psalm 67, upon *As smoke faileth*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 109. On Psalm 83, upon *My heart and my flesh*, one sermon, among the 50 homilies the thirty-third. On Psalm 94, upon *Come, let us adore*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 11. On Psalm 97, upon *Sing and make melody on the harp*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 221. On Psalm 117, on the first verse of the psalm, sermon 1, among the 50 homilies, no. 36. On Psalm 117, upon *This is the day which the Lord hath made*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 136. On Psalm 118, upon *Goodness and discipline and knowledge*, sermon 1, among the 50 homilies the fourth. On Psalm 118, upon *Direct my steps*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 12.

Upon Proverbs, chapter 13, upon *There are that count themselves rich*, sermon 1, *de tempore*. On Proverbs 31, on the valiant woman, 2 sermons, *de tempore*, nos. 217 and 218. On that of Wisdom 7, *[She] is the brightness of eternal light*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 190. On Isaiah 11, upon *The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him*, one sermon, *On the Saints*, no. 7. On Isaiah 53, upon *He shall grow up as a tender plant before him*, sermon 1, among the 50 homilies, no. 36. On Isaiah 58, upon *Cry, cease not*, sermon 1, among the 50 homilies, no. 7. On Isaiah 58, upon *Break thy bread to the hungry*, sermon 1, among the 50 homilies, no. 17. On Ezekiel chapter 34, two books: one on the shepherds, in which the former part of this chapter is expounded; the other on the sheep, in which the latter part is explained. The work begins, *Our hope.* On Daniel 3, on the three boys, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 240. On Daniel 13, on Susanna, two sermons, which are *de tempore*, nos. 118 and 242.

Thus far reach the things which Augustine wrote upon the Old Testament; now follow those which he composed upon the New.

Upon the four Gospels: *On the Harmony of the Evangelists*, four books — which, having been made a Bishop, he wrote against certain rash calumniators who accused the writers of the four Gospels with the mark

of ignorance and of falsehood, [charging] that they had said many things dissonant among themselves, conflicting, and destructive of one another; but he showed that the Evangelists were in nothing discordant, neither among themselves, nor with their own selves. The work begins, *Among all.*

Upon Matthew, he brought a threefold kind of exposition, that is, the Questionary, the Continuous, and the Homiletic.

In the Continuous kind, while he was still a presbyter, he wrote *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, upon the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters, two books — showing that in that same sermon are contained all the precepts which pertain to the forming of the Christian man's life. The work begins, *The sermon which.*

In the Questionary kind, being now a bishop, he collected one book of *Evangelical Questions*, not according to the order of the evangelical chapters, but according to the occasions of those who consulted him with such questions; which afterward, when he was revising the book, he reduced into order, numbers being added, lest the reader should be offended by the tedium of a disturbed order. But the carelessness of the copyists again confused the order, the former part of the book being torn away and cast to the end of the volume of Questions from the gospel according to Luke. The work begins, *It is not so written.*

In the Homiletic kind, he left homilies, or sermons delivered to the people, 43, namely: On Matthew chapter 2, on the coming of the Magi, sermon, which is *On the Saints*, the ninth. On the same [→ p228…]

[1] [These enarrations were] collected by his own hearers, as he was making [these] words to the people. [2] Jerome censures St. Augustine's Enarrations on the Psalms as too obscure. [3] Augustine was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.

(Rich PDF p. 228 [printed folio 209]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *entry continues its catalog of his gospel homilies — the sermons on Matthew (chs. 2–25), then Mark, then the book of* Questions on Luke *and twenty-six sermons on Luke passages, closing with the opening of his Tractates on John. The abbreviations:* de verbis Domini *[On the Words of the Lord],* de tempore *[On the Season],* de sanctis *[On the Saints], "of the 50 homilies," and "from those added to the tenth tome." Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p227 — the homilies on Matthew:]

On the same [Matthew 2], on the slaughter of the infants, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 10. On Matthew 3, upon *I ought to be baptized by thee*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 63. On Matthew 4, upon *Do penance*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*. On Matthew 5, on the beatitude of the poor, sermon 1, which is from those added to the tenth tome, the fourteenth. On the same, upon *You have heard that it was said to them of old*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 59. On the same, upon *Love your enemies*, sermon 2, *de tempore*, no. 170. On the same, upon *Let your light shine*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 2. On the same, upon *Whosoever shall say to his brother, Racha*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, the fourth. On Matthew 6, upon *Let not thy left hand know*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 10. On the same, on the Lord's Prayer, 3 sermons, which are *de tempore*, nos. 126 and 182, and, among the 50 homilies, the forty-second. On Matthew 7, upon that, *He that shall do and teach*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 3. On Matthew 7, upon *Ask and you shall receive*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 5. On the same, upon *Judge not, and you shall not be judged*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 202. On the same, on the parable of the Tares, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 39.

On Matthew 8, on the Centurion's servant, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 6. On the same, upon *Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou shalt go*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 7. On Matthew 11, upon *I confess to thee, Father*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 8. On the same, upon *Come to me, all [you]*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 9. On the same, upon *Among those born of women*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 44. On Matthew 12, on the word against the Holy Spirit, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 11. On the same, upon *Either make the tree good*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 12. On Matthew 14, on Peter walking upon the waters, two sermons, which are *de verbis Domini*, nos. 13 and 14. On Matthew 15, on the Canaanite woman, one sermon, *de tempore*, no. 74. On Matthew 17, on the demoniac, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 230. On

Matthew 18, on fraternal correction, two sermons, which are *de verbis Domini*, nos. 15 and 16.

On Matthew 19, upon *If thou wilt enter into life*, two sermons, *de tempore*, no. 205, [and] *de verbis Domini*, no. 17. On the same, upon *If thou wilt be perfect*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 233. On Matthew 20, on the two blind men, two sermons, *de tempore*, no. 52, [and] *de verbis Domini*, no. 18. On Matthew 22, on the tribute of Caesar, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 19. On the same, upon *Thou shalt love thy neighbor*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 38. On the same, upon *Whose son do they say Christ is*, two sermons, *de tempore*, nos. 234 and 235. On Matthew 24, upon *Woe to them that are with child*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 30. On the same, upon *Of that day no one knoweth*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 21. On Matthew 15 [read 25], on the ten virgins, sermon 3, *de verbis Domini*, nos. 22 and 23, and in the book of 83 Questions, question 59. On the same, upon *Come, ye blessed of my Father*, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 38.

Upon Mark, chapter eight, on the hungry crowd following Christ, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 209. On Mark 16, on the two disciples to whom Christ appeared in another form, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 146. On the same, on the Eleven disciples reclining [at table], sermon 1, from those added to the tenth tome, no. 5.

Upon Luke, being a bishop, he wrote one book of Questions, in the same order in which he had before written the Questions on Matthew. Its beginning is, *Because Zacharias.* Likewise, from various passages of Luke, 26 sermons, namely: On Luke chapter 2 [read 1], upon *He was sent* [the Annunciation], sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 18. On the same, upon the *Magnificat*, sermon 1, from those added to the ninth tome, the last. On Luke 2, upon *Son, why hast thou done so to us*, sermon 1, from those added to the tenth tome, no. 2. On Luke 6, upon *Forgive, and you shall be forgiven,* sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 29. On Luke 7, on the sinful woman, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 23. On Luke 10, upon *He that despiseth you, despiseth me*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 24. On the same, on Mary and Martha, two sermons, *de verbis Domini*, nos. 26 and 27. On the same, on him who fell among robbers, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 37. On Luke 11, upon *Lord, teach us to pray*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 28 — which is entirely transcribed from the fourth chapter of the fifth book of St. Ambrose's *On the Sacraments*. On Luke 12, upon *Which of you shall have a friend* [Luke 11:5], sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 29. On the same, on the Pharisees washing the outside of the dish [Luke 11:39], sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 30. On the same, on the rich man having a fruitful field, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 58. On Luke 13, on the fig tree, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 31. On the same, upon *If they are few that are saved*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 32. On the same, on the grain of mustard seed, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 34. On Luke 14, on the great supper, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 33. On Luke 15, on the prodigal son, two sermons, which are *de verbis Domini*, no. 34, and *To the Hermits*, no. 27. On Luke 16, on the mammon of iniquity, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 35. On the same, on the rich man and Lazarus, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 25. On Luke 17 [read 18], on the unjust judge, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 36. On Luke 21, upon *A hair of your head*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 14. On Luke 23, on the cross and the thief, sermon 1, *de tempore*. On Luke 24, on the disciples going to Emmaus, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 140. On the same, on Jesus standing in the midst of the disciples, sermon 1, from those added to the tenth tome, no. 4.

Upon the Gospel of John, he published Tracta■ [→ p229: -tes…]

(Rich PDF p. 229 [printed folio 210]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the ***Aurelius Augustine*** *entry continues — his 124 Tractates on John and the 42 sermons on John passages; four sermons on the Acts of the Apostles; and his works on Romans (the interpolated* Exposition of certain propositions*, the unfinished* Begun Exposition *on the salutation alone, ten sermons on Romans passages, the book* On Predestination and Grace*, and the Question* On the Cause of Election and Reprobation, to Simplicianus*). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p228 — the Tractates on John:]

…■tes, 124, written down from the mouth of the speaker by notaries, of a continuous exposition — from the beginning of the Gospel, namely, up to the end. Of this work no mention is made in the books of the Retractations, because it is of the number of the Spoken works,[1] as are also the enarrations on the psalms. Its beginning is, *Divine scripture, to all.* He had also, besides these tractates, upon the same gospel, 42 sermons, namely:

On John chapter 1, upon *In the beginning was the Word*, two sermons, which are *de tempore*, no. 134, and *de verbis Domini*, no. 38. On the same, upon *He was in the world*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 39. On the same, upon *When thou wast under the fig tree*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 40. On John 2, on the water changed into wine, two sermons, which are *de verbis Domini*, no. 41, and *de tempore*, no. 41. On John 5, on the sick man, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 42. On the same, upon *If I bear witness of myself*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 43. On the same, upon *As the Father raiseth up the dead*, two sermons, *de verbis Domini*, no. 44, and of the 50 homilies, no. 22. On the same, upon *Search the scriptures*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 45. On the same, upon *The Son of man cannot do anything of himself*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 32. On the same, upon *The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 64. On the same, upon *He that eateth my flesh*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 46. On John 8, on the adulteress, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 47. On the same, upon *If you continue in my word*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 48. On John 9, on the man born blind, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 43. On John 10, on the shepherd, and the hireling, and the thief, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 49. On the same, on the Good Shepherd, one sermon, *de verbis Domini*, no. 50. On the same, upon *I and the Father are one*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 51. On John 11, on Lazarus, two sermons, *de verbis Domini*, no. 51, and *de tempore*, no. 104. On the same, upon *He that believeth in me, believeth in him that sent me*, sermon 1. On John 12, upon *He that loveth his life*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 37. On John 13, on the Lord's Supper, sermon 1, *To the Hermits*, no. 28. On John 14, upon *I am the way*, three sermons, *de verbis Domini*, nos. 54 and 55, and of the 50 homilies, no. 34. On the same, upon *The things which I speak, I speak not of myself*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 56. On the same, upon *My peace I give unto you*, two sermons, *de verbis Domini*, no. 57, and from those added to the tenth tome, the last. On the same, upon *Let not your heart be troubled*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 58. On John 15, upon *You are my friends*, two sermons. On the same, upon *He riseth from supper* [John 13:4], sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 127. On the same, upon *I am the vine*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 59. On John 16, upon *It is expedient for you that I go*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 60. On the same, upon *He shall convince the world of sin*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 61. On John 19, on Joseph asking Pilate [for the body], sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 132. On the same, on the sepulchre of the Lord, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 133. On John 20, on Magdalene weeping at the monument, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 152. On John 21, on the manifestation of Christ at the sea of Tiberias, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 148. On the same, upon *Peter, lovest thou me*, sermon 1, *de verbis Domini*, no. 62. On the same, upon *Lovest thou me more than these*, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 24.

Upon the Acts of the Apostles, he brought forth four sermons, namely: On Acts 3, on the going up of Peter and John into the temple, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 29. On Acts 4, upon *No one possessed anything of his own*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 27. On Acts 9, on the conversion of Paul, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 14. On Acts 10, on the ecstasy of mind in Peter, sermon 1, *de sanctis*, no. 45.

Upon the Epistle to the Romans, he dictated two books: one of an interpolated exposition upon various passages of that epistle here and there — while he was still a presbyter at Carthage, where, when the epistle was being read among his intimates, and he himself, being questioned by them, answered, this book was taken down by the questioners out of responses of that kind; which begins, *These are the senses.* But the other book he undertook as of a continuous exposition; yet, when he had consumed one whole book upon the salutation of the epistle alone,[2] deterred by the magnitude and labor of the work to come, he desisted from what he had begun, and left only this book — which he had made the first of the whole work — under the

title *Of the Begun [Unfinished] Exposition* [Inchoatae expositionis]. Its beginning is, *In the epistle which, etc.*

To these he added, upon various sentences of the same epistle, ten sermons, namely: On Romans 7, upon *When we were in the flesh*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 4. On the same, upon *The law worketh sin*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 5. On the same, upon *Therefore I myself serve*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 6. On the same, upon *Not the good that I will*, two sermons, *de tempore*, nos. 43 and 45. On the same, upon *I am delighted with the law of God*, sermon 1, *de tempore*, no. 47. On Romans 8, upon *If God be for us, who is against us?*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 16. On the same, upon *I speak a human thing because of the infirmity*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 17. On the same, upon *By hope we are saved*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 25. On Romans 9, upon *I will have mercy on whom I will*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 22.

On the same, upon *On whom he will, he hath mercy*, one book *On Predestination and Grace*, beginning, *Since in the sacred [scriptures]*. On the same, upon *For Rebecca also*, up to that, *Unless the Lord of Sabaoth*, one Question, *On the Cause of Election and Reprobation, to Simplicianus.*

On [→ p230…]

[1] Why Augustine, in the books of the Retractations, made no mention of the Tractates on the Gospel of John [namely, because they are reckoned among his "Spoken" works]. [2] St. Augustine wrote one book upon the salutation alone of the Epistle to the Romans.

*(Rich PDF p. 230 [printed folio 211]. Book IV, catalog letter A: the close of the vast **Aurelius Augustine** entry — his works on the Pauline epistles (Corinthians through Timothy), the Catholic epistles (James, Peter, John) and the Apocalypse; then the concluding note on those who anthologized him (Peter of Tripoli, Bede, Bartholomew of Urbino), his biographers, and his death at Hippo under the Vandal siege (AD 430). The entry for **Aurelius Cassiodorus** then opens. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Aurelius Augustine, continued from p229 — the Pauline epistles:]

Upon the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 6, upon *Know you not that your bodies*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 18. On 1 Corinthians 7, upon that, *To them that are married, not I, but the Lord, command*, two books, to Pollentius, showing that those who have made a divorce ought to remain unmarried; the work begins, *The first question.* On 1 Corinthians 9, upon *So I fight, not as one beating the air*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 21. On 1 Corinthians 10, upon *Let no temptation take hold of you but such as is human*, sermon 1. On 1 Corinthians 12, how we ought to love one another by the example of the members, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 15. On 2 Corinthians 3, upon *The letter killeth, the spirit quickeneth*, [there is] *On the Spirit and the Letter*, to Marcellinus, one book, beginning, *The little works being read.* On 2 Corinthians 5, upon *All must be made manifest before the tribunal of God*, two sermons, which are *On the Words of the Apostle*, nos. 19 and 20. On the same, upon *We are ambassadors for Christ*, sermon 1, which is of the 50 homilies, no. 49.

Upon the epistle to the Galatians, while he was still a presbyter, he composed one book of a continuous and succinct exposition, beginning, *The cause for which.* On the 2nd chapter to the Galatians, when he was a bishop, he wrote — on Peter being reprehended by Paul — two epistles to Jerome, of which one begins, *Never equally*, the other, *I give thanks.* On Galatians 3, upon *If a law had been given which could justify*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 13. On Galatians 5, upon *Walk in the spirit*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 3. On Galatians 6, upon *Bear ye one another's burdens*, two sermons, which are *On the Words of the Apostle*, nos. 23 and 24. On the same, upon *God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross*, sermon 1, which is from those added to the tenth tome, no. 15.

Upon the epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 3, upon *That you may be able to comprehend what is the breadth*, sermon 1, which is of the 50 homilies, no. 3. On the same, upon *I ask that I be not weakened*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 7. On Ephesians 4, upon *Putting away malice*, sermon 1, which is

de tempore, no. 221. On Ephesians 5, upon *See how you walk circumspectly*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 26. On Ephesians 6, upon *Peace to the brethren, and charity*, sermon 1, which is of the 50 homilies, no. 17.

Upon the epistle to the Philippians, chapter three, upon *We are not circumcised*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 5. On the same, upon *According to the justice which is of the law*, sermon 1, which is *de tempore*, no. 221.

Upon the first [read: second] epistle to the Thessalonians, [chapter] 3, upon *He that will not work, let him not eat* [2 Thessalonians 3:10], [there is] *On the Work of Monks*, to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, one book, in which it is discussed whether monks who neglect Paul's precept ought to be compelled to labor; its beginning is, *At thy command, holy brother Aurelius.* On 1 Thessalonians 4, upon *I would not have you sorrow concerning them that sleep*, sermon 1, which is *On the Words of the Lord*, no. 34.

Upon the first epistle to Timothy, [chapter] 1, upon *A faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation*, three sermons, which are *On the Words of the Apostle*, nos. 8, 9, and 10. On 1 Timothy 6, [upon] *That the root of all evils is covetousness*, one sermon, which is of the 50 homilies, no. 8. On the 2nd epistle to Timothy, [chapter] 3, upon *All that will live godly in Christ*, [there is] *On the Conflict of the Vices*, one book — in which it is shown that, without the persecution of the vices, no one can be saved; and it begins, *The apostolic voice.* Some think it is not Augustine's. On 2 Timothy 4, upon *Preach the word, be instant in season*, sermon 1, which is of the 50 homilies, no. 5.

Upon the epistle of James, being a bishop, he dictated one book of Annotations, collected by the diligence of his hearers, which begins, *To the twelve tribes.* On James 2, upon *Whosoever shall offend in one [point]*, [there is] one epistle to Jerome, which is among his epistles no. 29. On James 5, upon *Swear not*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 30. On the same, upon *Confess [your sins] one to another*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 12.

Upon the epistle of 1 Peter, chapter two, upon *Laying aside all malice*, sermon 1, of the 50 homilies, no. 20. On 1 Peter 3, on Christ preaching to the spirits that were in prison, [there is] one epistle to Evodius, which is [epistle] no. 99. On 2 Peter 1, on the voice brought from heaven, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 29.

Upon the epistle of 1 John, from the beginning — namely, up to the middle of the last chapter — 10 tractates, published to the people during the eight days of the paschal feast. The work begins, *Your sanctity remembers.* On 1 John 1, upon *If we say that we have no sin*, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 31. On 1 John 4, on not believing every spirit, sermon 1, *On the Words of the Apostle*, no. 32.

Upon the Apocalypse, being a bishop, he wrote one book of Annotations according to the anagogical [sense]; which someone (I know not who) cut up into eighteen homilies, with some words added before and after — in which homilies are wont to begin and end — perhaps that he might, thus divided, present them the more conveniently to be read in church on certain days of the year. But it is not likely that Augustine spoke to the people so briefly about matters so obscure. The work begins, *In the reading of the Revelation.*

Thus far the exegetical writings of Augustine; out of which — and out of other exoteric works of the same author — various authors collected diverse volumes of explanations upon the divine scriptures.[1] Of whose number is Peter of Tripoli, who (as Cassiodorus testifies) collected expositions upon all the epistles of Paul. Bede also, after him, did the same upon the whole of Paul, and upon the first epistle of John. Lastly, Bartholomew of Urbino, an Augustinian, gathered — upon the whole body of the Bible — two Tomes of explanations out of the sayings of Augustine. Concerning his life and writings there wrote Posidonius, bishop of Calama, and Jacobus, archbishop of Genoa. Blessed Augustine dies in the city of Hippo, while it was being besieged by the Vandals, in the times of Theodosius the Younger, in the year of the Lord 430.[2]

Aurelius Cassiodorus, a most illustrious man, master of the epistles of Theodoric king of Italy, senator and consul of the city of Rome, when — having left the world[3] — [→ p231…]

[1] Authors who collected explanations upon the sacred Scriptures out of the books of St. Augustine. [2] At what time Augustine departed from this life. [3] Cassiodorus, from a Roman consul, became a monk.

*(Rich PDF p. 231 [printed folio 212]. Book IV, catalog: the close of letter A — **Cassiodorus** (his Psalter commentary, Institutions, and other works) and **Prudentius** (his Dittochaeon and Genesis commentaries) — then the **letter B** section opens with **Basil the Great** of Caesarea. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Aurelius Cassiodorus, continued from p230:]

…when — having left the world — he had been made a monk, and abbot of the monastery at Ravenna, turning all the secular disciplines, and especially eloquence, to the service of Christ, he interpreted many things concerning the divine scriptures. But among the rest, far more excellent is the book of the Psalms, in the explanation of which he compressed, with a compendious and elegant brevity, whatever St. Augustine had poured forth in his tractates on the Psalms with a most copious enarration — interspersing also, of his own, not-to-be-despised annotations, definitions, propositions, and several axioms from grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, music, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and other disciplines; with which, as with stars and gems, he adorns the bright texture of his work: brief little prefaces being fitted, in rhetorical manner, to each psalm, in which — setting forth the argument, and the division of the psalm into its parts — he briefly explains what is contained in each part of the psalm. Then, in the enarration itself, artfully connecting together the words and verses of the psalm with a certain necessary sequence of order, he applies himself chiefly to the anagogical explanation, referring all things to Christ, the end of all. Finally, at the end of each psalm, he appends a brief epilogue of the things said by him; in which, mingling something ethical with the anagogy, he inflames the mind of the reader. The work begins, *Once driven back in the city of Ravenna.*

He wrote likewise *On the Institution of Divine Readings*, two books, most useful to those approaching the sacred studies; whose beginning is, *Since the studies of secular [men].*

Likewise, a compendium of the whole of divine scripture, which he entitled the *Memorial of the Scriptures.*

Upon the Song of Songs, commentaries, beginning, *Solomon, inspired.*

Upon the Acts of the Apostles, a succinct exposition.

Upon all the Catholic epistles, Annotations.

Upon the Apocalypse, a commentary, to which he gave the title *Complexions on the Apocalypse.*

He also delineated a shadow-drawing [sciography] of the Mosaic tabernacle, according to the exemplar described by Moses in the 26th chapter of Exodus; whose picture Bede testifies that he saw, in the 2nd book *On the Tabernacle of Moses.* He flourished under the Justins, the elder and the younger, and dies in the 97th year of his age, in the year of the Lord 576.

Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, a man of consular rank, by nation a Spaniard, a Palatine soldier from the city of Caesaraugusta [Zaragoza], and Consul of Massilia [Marseilles], the most celebrated poet of his time, and adorned with the variety of all the disciplines. When for fifty-seven years he had served worldly vanities, at last, leaving these in his old age, he dedicated himself wholly to the study of the divine scriptures — in which he wrote many things in verse; but among the rest a volume of hexameter verse, entitled *Dittochaeon* (ΔΙΤΤΟΧΑΙΟΝ) for this reason: that in it, out of all the histories of the Old and New Testament, he had prepared as it were a twofold food (for διττός [dittos] means "twofold," and ὀχή [och■] "food"). I have read a certain fragment of his work, whose beginning is, *Eve was a dove.* He published also, after the manner of

the Greeks, upon the first three chapters of Genesis — that is, from the beginning of the book, up to the prevarication of Adam and his expulsion from paradise — commentaries famous as much for their style as for their sense. He flourished under Gratian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 380; whose life Aldus Manutius briefly collected out of his works.

B

Basil, bishop of Caesarea of the Cappadocians, by fact and by surname the Great — whom the common consent of the Greek fathers affirms never to have erred in any sentence or in any word[1] — sprung from Helenopontus, a town of Pontus, of noble parents, Basil a priest and Emmelia; brother of two bishops, that is, of Gregory of Nyssa and of Peter of Sebaste;[2] joined in the closest intimacy with Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom. This man, in expounding the divine Scriptures, just as he supremely loved lucid interpretations of the historical sense — interspersed with certain moral, and likewise ardent, little exhortations — so was he vehemently delighted to adorn his expositions with all the ornaments of secular literature; which he displayed especially in those nine most celebrated homilies on the *Hexaemeron.* These he illustrated with so admirable a care of elaborate diction, and with such majesty of oration, that the most eloquent and most learned Gregory the Theologian not undeservedly said[3] that Basil's oration surpasses all the discourses of men as much as the divine voice surpasses human voices. With such riches also of all the disciplines and of the good arts — drawn chiefly from the midst of the Peripatetic philosophy — he enriched those homilies, as also his other explanations, so that he was rightly called the philosopher of the Christians, and the most Christian of philosophers.[4] But how much the venerable antiquity of the fathers esteemed this divine work, the *Hexaemeron*, is shown, among others, by Gregory of Nazianzus (surnamed the Theologian), Gregory of Nyssa, and Ambrose — most learned and most holy men — of whom the first, in his *Monody* [funeral oration], speaks thus:

> *The great Basil — than whom no one has expounded the sacred volumes more eloquently, more truly, or more richly — wrote a Hexaemeron, in which he discourses divinely on the beginning of things; which, as often as I read it, I so confirm myself in the love, the charity, and the knowledge of the Creator, that by nothing am I more moved or delighted.*

Subscribing to whom, Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, in the preface of the *Hexaemeron* published by himself, speaks thus:

> *Those who have read that divine commentary of our father Basil upon the great Moses admire it no less than the things which were written by Moses himself — and rightly, in my opinion. For what relation the ear of corn has with the grain (which both comes forth from it, and is [that grain] — or rather, since that very grain is contained in it, yet the ear differs from it in magnitude, and in beauty, and in form of variety) — the same relation you may say [Basil's commentary] has with the discourse of the great [→ p232: Moses…]*

[1] Basil, of the Greek fathers, never erred in any sentence or word. [2] Basil's brothers were Gregory of Nyssa and Peter of Sebaste, bishops. [3] Gregory of Nazianzus's judgment concerning Basil. [4] Basil is rightly called the philosopher of the Christians, and the most Christian of philosophers.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 232 [printed folio 213]. Book IV, letter B: the close of the **Basil the Great** entry (Gregory of Nyssa's and Ambrose's esteem for the Hexaemeron; the catalog of Basil's Psalm-homilies and other works; his death and biographers); then **Bartholomew of Bologna**, **Bartholomew the Little**, and **Bartholomew of Urbino** (whose Augustine-anthology was plagiarized by John Gast); and the opening of the long **Bede the Venerable** entry. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Basil the Great, continued from p231 — Gregory of Nyssa's preface, concluded:]

> *…the discourse of the great Moses, which were elaborated by the great Basil with a more accurate zeal. For the things which Moses embraced in few words, our doctor [Basil] so augmented and heaped up with sublime philosophy that he made, not an ear of corn, but a tree — after the likeness of the grain of mustard seed, which is compared to the kingdom of heaven.*

Thus far Gregory. And Ambrose held this same work in so great esteem that he translated that [Hexaemeron], turned from the Greek — the whole, and with the same sentences and words — into a Hexaemeron composed by himself.[1] A certain Eustathius — eloquent and learned in both [tongues], as Junilius the African, or Bede, testifies in the preface of his commentaries on Genesis — first made this work Latin for Syncletia, his own sister; which begins thus in Greek: Πρέπουσα ἀρχὴ ᾧ περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου συστάσεως — that is, *A fitting beginning for him who is about to speak of the constitution of the world.*

He wrote also, after the Hexaemeron, very many homilies upon the whole Psalter, of which there now survive only seventeen, delivered upon sixteen Psalms, that is: On Psalm 1, 7, 14, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37, 44, 45, 48, 49, 59, 61, 114, and 115.

He wrote likewise on Paradise, on the 3rd chapter of Genesis, one homily. Likewise, *On the Restraining of the Thoughts of the Mind*, one homily upon that which is read among us at Deuteronomy 15, *Beware lest perhaps [a wicked thought] creep in, etc.*; and according to the edition of the Seventy it has πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ, that is, *Take heed to thyself.* This homily some, led by a false opinion, attribute to Zeno, bishop of Verona, and write it among his sermons.

On the beginning of Proverbs, one homily.

He published also, upon the whole of Isaiah, according to the literal sense, an enarration of most succinct brevity, clear and elegant; which I hear was lately turned into Latin by I know not whom. I myself have read it only in Greek, and it begins thus: Εὔξασθε μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν φυγὴν ὑμῶν χειμῶνος ἢ σαββάτῳ — that is, *Pray that your flight be not in winter, or on the Sabbath.* Testimonies from this work are cited by John Damascene, in the third book against the Iconomachs [Iconoclasts], and by Oecumenius, in his commentary on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 3.

He had also, upon that passage of Luke 12, on the rich man whose field brought forth abundant fruits, one homily. Likewise, on that of Luke 18, *Sell all that thou hast*, to the rich, one homily. Likewise, on the beginning of the Gospel of John, one homily. Again, on the Samaritan woman, on John 4, to Flavian, one book. On that passage of 1 Thessalonians 5, *Rejoice always*, one homily.

Basil dies in the times of the emperors Valens and Valentinian, in the year of the Lord 380, when he had presided over his church for eight years; and he was borne to the sepulchre of his ancestors, where his grandfather (a martyr) and his father (a priest) had been buried under the Emperor Maximian.[2] Four divine Bishops wrote his life in a most eloquent style: Gregory, prelate of the church of Nyssa; Amphilochius of Iconium; Gregory, prelate of the church of Nazianzus; and Helladius, bishop of Caesarea, Basil's disciple and successor in the episcopate. Of these, Gregory of Nyssa added two sermons to Basil's *Hexaemeron*, to supply those things which Basil, prevented by death, could not complete concerning the formation of man. These [two sermons] Dionysius Exiguus, an ancient Roman author, made Latin, beginning thus, *By the paying-off of an old debt.*

Bartholomew of Bologna [Barptolemaeus Bononiensis], of the Order of Preachers, imbued with Scholastic Theology, wrote a Postil on the Gospel of Luke, which begins, *Thou shalt make four circles.* Likewise, upon all the Canonical Epistles, a Postil, beginning, *In the sixth [chapter] of Joshua the Lord commanded.*

Bartholomew the Little [Barptolemaeus Parvus], of the Order of Preachers, applied a postil upon Luke, whose beginning is, *The oblation of the just fattens the altar.*

Bartholomew of Urbino [Barptolemaeus], Bishop and citizen of Urbino, by profession a Hermit [of St. Augustine], a man plainly learned and of singular memory, holding in memory almost all the volumes of St. Augustine, wove together — out of various sentences and passages of the divine Augustine — a huge work, divided into two Tomes, in the explanation of the whole of divine scripture. Which work a certain John Gast lately usurped to himself impudently enough, the name of the true author being deleted, and, in its place, his own name being set on the front of the volume; and — what is more grievous — with certain passages of the same work transposed, truncated, and wrested toward the heresy of the Lutherans, he contaminated the most useful and most pious labor of the Catholic author, and branded it with the suspicion of heresy.[3] He flourished under Rupert, King of the Romans, in the year of the Lord 1410; dear above all to Pope Clement V.

Bede the Venerable, presbyter and monk, by nation a Briton, by race an Anglo-Saxon, by fatherland a Cantabrigian; when he was still a little boy, and had not yet completed the seventh year of his tender age, he entered the monastery of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul — which is situated in England, at the mouth of the river Wear, in the place called Ingirium [Jarrow] — in which, under the care first of Benedict [Biscop], and afterward of Ceolfrid, abbots of that monastery, being imbued with the monastic institutions, and instructed in the erudition of the sciences of every kind, in a very short time — and, what is more wonderful, amid the constant exercises of monastic discipline, and a continual care of praying, singing psalms, and reading in the temple day and night — he so profited that he came forth a grammarian no less skilled in Greek than in Latin, a poet, rhetorician, historian, astronomer, arithmetician, chronographer, cosmographer, Philosopher, and Theologian: so admirable in those times that among the more learned of that age a proverb was said of him — that *a man, born in the farthest corner of the world, had encompassed the whole world with his genius.*

He, therefore, in the thirtieth year of his age, having been ordained presbyter by Bishop John, at the exhortation of Acca, bishop of York, and of many brethren, undertook to write — upon the whole sacrosanct Scripture — diverse volumes of explanations, distinguished into four orders,[4] namely into Rhapsodies, Questions, Homilies, and Commentaries. In the Rhapsodies (or *Stromata*, or Collectanea) he gathered together expositions more mystical than historical, out of the most approved sentences of the Doctors of the Church, [→ p233: the sayings…]

[1] Ambrose translated St. Basil's work on the Hexaemeron into the Latin tongue. [2] St. Basil's grandfather was a martyr, and his father was a priest. [3] The impudent deed of Gast the heretic. [4] Bede's writings on the sacred Scriptures are distinguished into four orders.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 233 [printed folio 214]. Book IV, letter B: the **Bede the Venerable** entry continues — his method in the Rhapsodies, his temperate style, why he is called "Venerable," his death (AD 734, on Ascension day), and then the catalog of his exegetical works from Genesis through Proverbs (each with its incipit). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Bede the Venerable, continued from p232:]

…and the sayings [of the Doctors], collected here and there interruptedly and interpolatedly, with some things also inserted of his own after the imitation of their sense, where it was opportune — so that the various sermons and periods of the Fathers might either cohere more fitly among themselves, or be rendered briefer and more illustrious. And, lest he should seem to steal the sayings of his elders and to compose them as if his own, he had resolved to interpose the names of the Doctors throughout each passage, and to show by name what was said by which Author; but, since this appeared to him too laborious, he set only the first syllables of the names in the margins, over against each sentence — which afterward, through the ignorance or the carelessness of the copyists, perished from all the exemplars.

In the Commentaries, Questions, and Homilies — in which he more frequently uses both his own speech and his own sense — he has a style neither wholly inelegant, nor curious of affected elegance, but temperate;[1] which neither by a multitude of words breeds distaste, nor by a scarcity begets obscurity, but runs with a brief facility most agreeably.

His works, while he was yet living and always writing new ones, were held in so great esteem that, by the ordinance of the Bishops of Britain, they were read publicly in the churches. And since, in the reading of his Homilies, they prefixed his name after the manner of the author — [namely] "of the venerable Bede the presbyter" — not being able, while he lived, to proclaim him otherwise, the title once attributed from the beginning has held even to the present day: so that Bede is rather called "Venerable" than "Saint."[2] For to call him, while living, otherwise — although he was illustrious for holiness of life — was not lawful. This holy man dies under the Emperor Leo, in the sixty-second year of his age, that is, in the year 734 from the birth of Christ, on the day on which the memory of the Lord's Ascension is celebrated.

The number and the arguments of Bede's exegetical works — of which he himself reviewed a part at the end of his English history — is this:

Upon the first three chapters of Genesis (that is, from the beginning up to the ejection of the first parents from paradise), two books of Collectanea out of Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine, addressed to Acca the Bishop; of which the former begins, *On the beginning of the book of Genesis.* These certain printers have wrongly ascribed to Junilius the African. — Upon the same first three chapters again, one book of Collectanea, beginning, *That chapter.* — Upon the first twenty-four chapters of Genesis, four books, beginning: *The head of all the books is.* — Upon the whole book of Genesis, one book of Collectanea, whose beginning is, *In the beginning indeed of time.* — Upon Genesis, one book of Questions: *First of all, my teacher, it is necessary for me to inquire.*

Upon Exodus, one book of Collectanea: *By this sentence Esdras…* — Upon Exodus, from the twenty-fourth chapter up to the thirtieth, *On the Tabernacle, and its vessels, and the vestments of the priests,* three books; whose opening is, *About to speak, with the Lord's help.* — Upon Exodus, one book of Questions: *Certain mysteries.*

Upon Leviticus, one book of Collectanea: *He is wont to be questioned by some.* — Upon Leviticus, one book of Questions: *In the opening of Leviticus, four kinds.*

Upon Numbers, one book of Collectanea: *In the opening of Numbers.* — Upon Numbers, one book of Questions: *The first question arises for us.*

Upon Deuteronomy, one book of Collectanea: *It is indeed to be known.* — Upon Deuteronomy, one book of Questions: *Deuteronomy according to the faith.*

Upon Joshua [Jesus Nave], one book of Questions: *After the death, therefore, of Moses.*

Upon Judges, one book of Questions: *The history of the Judges.*

Upon Ruth, one book of Questions: *Let us now see concerning Ruth.*

Upon Samuel, four books of Commentaries of allegorical explanation, addressed to Acca: *Whatsoever things are written.*

Upon the fifth and sixth chapter of the third book of Kings, *On the Temple of Solomon,* one book: *The way of election exhorts us.* — Upon the four books of Kings, four books of Questions: *After the book of Judges.* — Upon the four books of Kings again, one book of thirty Questions, addressed to Nothelm: *What concerning the book of Kings.*

Upon Paralipomenon [Chronicles], two books, cited by Trithemius.

Upon Esdras, three books of allegorical exposition, addressed to Acca: *An excellent interpreter of the sacred things.*

Upon Tobit, one book of allegorical explanation: *The book of the holy shepherd Tobias.*

Upon Job, addressed to Nectarius the bishop, three books of commentaries. — Upon Job he is reported to have applied exegeses, of which, however, Trithemius nowhere makes mention in his Catalogue. John Herwagen the printer inserted, in place of these, among Bede's works, three books of explanations on Job, addressed to Nectarius, beginning, *At thy exhortation.* But Bede himself, in his little book *On the reckoning of ounces*, confesses these to be the work of Philip the presbyter.

Upon the Psalter, a most copious volume of commentaries, whose beginning is, *Since, by the help of Him without whom every action is nothing.* — Upon Psalm 52, a broader commentary, beginning, *When several clerics.* — Upon the Psalter, from the Hebrew verity, one book of Meditations, in which are excerpted all the verses and sentences pertaining to prayer, with some little prayers inserted, so that the mind of the one praying, aroused and instructed by David's words, may the more easily and ardently be raised up to God.

Upon the Proverbs of Solomon, three books of explanation, both historical and allegorical; which certain persons, inserting into the works of Jerome, marked beforehand with the false title of Jerome — although they [→ p234: them…]

[1] What manner of style Bede's was. [2] Why Bede is rather called "Venerable" than "Saint."

(Rich PDF p. 234 [printed folio 215]. Book IV, letter B: the close of the ***Bede the Venerable*** *works-catalog (Proverbs through the Apocalypse;* On Schemes and Tropes, On the Holy Places, On the Times, *the homiliary; and Hector Boece's report on Bede's birthplace); then* ***Bellator*** *(his books on Wisdom) and the opening of* ***Benedict Arias Montanus*** *of Seville (the Antwerp Polyglot and its Apparatus). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Bede the Venerable, continued from p233 — the Proverbs commentary:]

…them it plainly appears to be Bede the presbyter's, and collected by him out of the commentaries of the ancient fathers — of which, in the explanation of the 21st chapter, are cited by name: Gregory, in his evangelical homilies, and in the exposition of the sixth and 21st chapter; [and] Augustine, in the exposition of the 30th chapter; [and] Jerome. The beginning of these is, *The Greek parable.*

Upon Ecclesiastes, one book, cited by Trithemius.

Upon the Song of Songs, seven books of mystical explanation; in the first of which are refuted the errors of Julian [of Eclanum], bishop in Campania — a man indeed most eloquent, and next to the eloquence of Cicero, but an asserter of the Pelagian doctrine, who had put out most eloquent commentaries on this book, in which, disputing against the grace of God, he taught that we can, by the choice of free will, do the good things which we will (although by the help of God's grace we may accomplish them more easily) — just as travelers are able to make the journey, and indeed on foot, but, without doubt, with less labor when the horses on which they may be carried are present. In the five following books the exposition of the whole Canticle is completed. In the seventh and last book is gathered a brief explanation of the Canticle out of those things which St. Gregory, throughout all his little works, discoursed here and there concerning this volume — which the author himself, leaving untouched in the preceding six books, had reserved for the last, as it were for the crown of the whole work. The work begins, *About to write, grace helping.*

Upon all the Prophets, both greater and lesser, 18 books; that is, on Isaiah two books, on Jeremiah two books, on Ezekiel one book, on Daniel one book, on the twelve Minor Prophets twelve books.

Upon the Gospel of Matthew, four books of Annotations: *For it is the custom of the Scriptures.* — Upon the Gospel of Mark, literally and mystically, addressed to Acca the Bishop, four books, which begin: *In the exposition of the Gospel according to Mark.* — Upon the Gospel of Luke, according to the literal and allegorical sense, commentaries addressed to Acca the Bishop, six books: *It is wonderfully true, and truly wonderful.* — Upon the Gospel of John, one book of Annotations: *This is John the Evangelist.*

Upon the Acts of the Apostles, historically and mystically, addressed to Acca the Bishop, one book: *I have received very frequent [letters].* — Upon the Acts of the Apostles, one book of Retractations: *We know [him to be] an excellent doctor.* — Upon the Acts of the Apostles, one book of six Questions: *What does that indicate.*

Upon all the Epistles of Paul, 14 books of Collectanea, which he collected out of all the works of St. Augustine, the same sentences and words being heaped together into one; their beginning is, *Paul the Apostle, who [was] with [the name] Saul.* — There are those who think that these collectanea (which are now carried about under the name of Bede, in a rather confused order and with an ill-adapted exposition) are not those which Bede himself put together, but those which a certain Bartholomew of Urbino, an Augustinian, author of the work called the *Milleloquium of Augustine*, somehow patched together. And there are those who attribute the work itself to Florus the Monk.

Upon all the Catholic Epistles, 7 books; of which the fourth, which is on the epistle of John, addressed to Acca the Bishop, was excerpted from the homilies of Augustine upon the same epistle. The beginning of the whole work is, *Paul said of this to James.*

Upon the Apocalypse of John, addressed to Eusebius, three books of mystical explanation, excerpted from the commentaries which Tyconius the African, a most learned man, had published on that book: *To my most beloved brother Eusebius.*

On the Interpretation of both the Hebrew and the Greek words which are contained in both Testaments, one book, digested in alphabetical order: *Is he apprehending… — On the Schemes and Tropes of Sacred Scripture*, one book, necessary for understanding the phrases of the celestial tongue, which begins, *It is sometimes wont in the Scriptures.* In it, against the Greeks — who glory that they were the inventors of the tropes — he shows that no such tropes, schemes, and figures are found in the writings of the Greeks which had not, long before, been in use in the sacred letters.[1]

On the Places of the Holy Land which are contained in the divine letters, one book, abridged from the work of Adamnan the presbyter: *The site of the city of Jerusalem. — On the Times*, one book, most useful for understanding the computation of the times of divine scripture: *On the nature of things, and of the times.*

Upon the Lections which are read from both testaments throughout the circle of the year, ninety-eight sermons: namely, seventy *de tempore* [On the Season], and forty-eight *de sanctis* [On the Saints]. Yet you should know that very many of these are not homilies or sermons, but shreds of expositions, torn by an uncertain author out of Bede's commentaries, and placed in a volume of sermons.

Hector Boece, in the 9th book of the *History of the Scots*, writes that Italy contends with Albion [Britain] concerning Bede's cradle — the Italians asserting that he was born and died at Genoa, and that his sepulchre is held in honor in that same city. But from Bede's own writings, says Boece, it is established that he lived as a youth in Italy, but as an old man in Northumbria, and chiefly in the monastery called Melrose, which is in Scotland.

Bellator, presbyter of an uncertain church, illustrious in the erudition of secular literature and of the sacred volumes, is said to have written many commentaries upon the holy scriptures; of which the most praised are seven books upon the Wisdom of Solomon. He lived in the times of the Emperor Louis, in the year of the Lord 840.

Benedict Arias Montanus of Seville [Hispalensis] wrote commentaries on the twelve Minor Prophets; likewise elucidations on the four Gospels and on the Acts of the Apostles. He also presided over the edition of the Bibles which were printed at Antwerp at the expense of Philip, the Catholic King; and in the last tome, in the *Sacred Apparatus*, he added seven books: *On the Hebrew Idioms*, *On the Secret Speech*, *On the Action or Vesture*, *On the Sacred Weights and Measures*, *On the Sacred Structures*, *On the Ages and Times*, [and] the Psalter of David in Latin ver■ [→ p235: -verse…]

[1] No tropes are in the writings of the Greeks that are not found first in the sacred letters.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 235 [printed folio 216]. Book IV, letter B: the close of **Arias Montanus**; **Benedict Pereira** (Sixtus's own teacher at Rome), the two **Benedict Stendal** entries; the long **Bernard of Clairvaux** entry (his exegetical sermons and the great 86-sermon Song of Songs, completed by Gilbert of Hoyland); then **Bernard de Trilia**, **Bernard of Amboise**, **Bernardino Gadolo**, and the opening of **Bernardino of Siena**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Benedict Arias Montanus, continued from p234:]

…rendered [the Psalter of David] in Latin verse.

Benedict Pereira [Pererius] of Valencia, of the Society of Jesus, a man of distinguished erudition and learning, taught for many years in the Roman College of the Society of Jesus, first philosophy, then Theology. In the year 1589 from the birth of the Lord — but in the 53rd year of the age of Benedict himself — he published seven books of Commentaries on Genesis; having, three years before, put forth sixteen [books] on Daniel the Prophet, and thirteen years before, 15 books on Philosophy. He lives (praise be to God) and teaches Theology at Rome. Him I had at Rome as my teacher in Scholastic Theology, in the year of the Lord 1568 and 1569. *[Later-edition addition: Pereira's seven-book Genesis commentary appeared in 1589, twenty years after Sixtus's death in 1569, so a later editor expanded this entry — although the first-person note about studying under Pereira at Rome in 1568–69 is Sixtus's own.]*

Benedict Stendal [Stendel], a German, wrote upon Genesis one book, upon Numbers one book, upon Deuteronomy one book.

Benedict Stendal, a German, from Halle, a town of Saxony, most learned in the divine scriptures, and nobly instructed in secular philosophy, who taught Theology for many years with the highest praise in the gymnasium of Erfurt, illustrious in life and doctrine, published certain little works of no contemptible reading; of which there are extant, upon the five books of Moses, five books of *Scholastic Explanations.* He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, in the year 1470.

Bernard, first Abbot of the monastery of Clairvaux in the diocese of Langres, of the Cistercian order, by nation a Burgundian, by fatherland of Fontaines; most excellent in holiness of life and in distinguished erudition — so from infancy did he drink in the sacred letters, and retained them in memory throughout his whole age, that as often as he attempted either to speak or to write anything, so often was he compelled to burst forth into the words and sentences of the holy scriptures. Whence also all his writings — which can be called nothing else than centos of the divine volumes[1] — are on every side interwoven with the sentences of the Old and New Testament, as with gem-like emblems, and these so conveniently and aptly inserted that they might be believed to have been born there. His manner of teaching is almost always occupied in investigating the mystical senses, and in forming morals. His speech, everywhere sweet and ardent, so delights and ardently enflames, that from his most delightful tongue milk and honey of words seem to flow, and from his most ardent breast the burnings of fiery affections seem to break forth. His exegetical monuments upon the divine letters are these:

Upon the first chapter of Genesis, on the sleep of Adam, one sermon. On 1 Kings 17, on David's single combat, sermon 1. On 3 Kings 19, on the flight of Elijah, sermon 1. On 4 Kings 5, on Naaman the Syrian, sermon 1. On the beginning of Psalm 183 [so printed; there is no such psalm], sermon 1. On Psalm 84, two sermons. On Psalm 90, seventeen sermons. On Psalm 132, sermon 1. On the Song of Songs, from various passages, 8 sermons. On Isaiah chapter 6, on the vision of him sitting upon the throne, 5 sermons. On Isaiah 7, on the words of Isaiah to Ahaz, sermon 1. On Isaiah 9, on the wonderful name of the child, sermon 1. On Isaiah 12, sermon 1. On Matthew 5, on the seven beatitudes, sermon 1. On Matthew 6, on the Lord's Prayer, two sermons. On Matthew 15, on the seven loaves, sermon 1. On Mark chapter 16, two sermons. On Luke 1, on the Lord's Annunciation, 4 sermons. On the Angelic Salutation, from the same chapter, two sermons. On Luke chapter 10, on Martha and Magdalene, sermon 1. On the steward of iniquity, on Luke chapter 16, one tractate — which some believe to be of another author. On Luke 24, on the two disciples going to Emmaus, sermon 1. On that of John 10 [read 8], *He that is of God heareth the words of God*, sermon 1. On 2 Thessalonians 5 [so printed; 2 Thessalonians has only three chapters], on prayer, petition, supplication, and thanksgiving, sermon 1. On Apocalypse 7, on the seven seals, sermon 1. On Apocalypse 12, on the woman clothed with the sun, sermon 1.

There is extant, besides these, a distinguished work of this Author, which all the learned prefer to his other labors — that is, upon the first three chapters of the Song of Songs, of mystical and continuous explanation, eighty-six sermons, which, in the last year of his life, he poured forth before his monks, for the solace of their daily labor, with living voice and from the depth of his heart; in which he expressed with such eloquence the power and sublimity of divine charity, that it appears he felt in himself all the affections, motions, and even the goads of heavenly love, by the living experience of his own spirit. And since, prevented by death, he could not explain the remaining chapters of this book, Gilbert of Holland [Hoyland], a Cistercian, an imitator of Bernard's style and spirit, attempted to complete it — publishing, from that place of the third chapter, *In my bed by night I sought* [Song 3:1], where the Author himself had ended, up to that place of the fifth chapter, *My beloved is white and ruddy* [Song 5:10], forty-eight sermons. But as he was attempting to advance further in explaining, death took him from among men — as if indignant that he should dare to continue again, and bring to an end, the labor of Bernard interrupted by himself. Bernard dies in the 63rd year of his age, and in the year 1153 from the birth of our Savior. His life William, Abbot of St. Thierry, began to write; but Arnold, abbot of Bonneval, completed it, and digested it into four books.

Bernard de Trilia [de Trylia], a Spaniard, a Dominican, wrote Postils upon Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Psalms; and Questions on the Song of Songs, on the Gospel of John, and on the Apocalypse.

Bernard of Amboise [de Ambasia], Provincial of the Carmelites of Toulouse, wrote on the epistle of St. James, one book, and on the Canonical epistle of John, one book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1364.

Bernardino Gadolo [Galdolus] of Brescia, a Camaldolese abbot, a man exceedingly learned in good letters, in Philosophy, and in Canon Law, wrote upon all the books of the Bible a distinguished work of annotations. He flourished under Maximilian I, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1496.

Bernardino [of Siena], by nation a Tuscan, by fatherland of Siena, of the Order of Minors, a man illustrious for holiness of life and for the glory of miracles, the restorer of his falling religion [order], and author of the Observ■ [→ p236: -ance…]

[1] St. Bernard's writings are centos of the divine volumes.

(Rich PDF p. 236 [printed folio 217]. Book IV, letter B: the close of ***Bernardino of Siena****; the three* ***Bertrands*** *(of Milan, of Toulouse, de la Tour); Cardinal* ***Bessarion****; the long* ***Bonaventure*** *entry (the* Collationes on the Hexaemeron, *the* Meditations on the Life of Christ, *the metrical Bible-compendium; his death at Lyons);* ***Bonaventure of Padua****;* ***Bonino Mombrizio****;* ***Bruno*** *the Carthusian founder; and the*

opening of ***Bruno, archbishop of Cologne****. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Bernardino of Siena, continued from p235:]

…of the most observant congregation, wrote — in the Scholastic manner, but in a speech more open and simple — one book upon the Apocalypse, whose beginning is, *Blessed is he that readeth the words of this book.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1440.

Bertrand of Milan, a Carmelite Minorite, wrote one book of Sermons on the gospels. He flourished in the year 1325.

Bertrand Parayte of Toulouse, an Augustinian, wrote on the Acts of the Apostles, one book; on the Canonical epistles, 14 books; on the Apocalypse, one book. He lived in 1370.

Bertrand de la Tour [de Turro], a nobleman, composed Lenten sermons; likewise, three volumes of expositions and sermons upon the epistles and the Prophecies throughout the whole year.

Bessarion, Patriarch of Constantinople, by nation a Greek, a most eminent Cardinal of the Roman Church, surnamed the Nicene, a man in every respect most learned, a Philosopher, and a most excellent orator in Greek and Latin, among his many distinguished works left, upon that passage from the 21st chapter of John, *So I will have him to remain*, one book. He dies on an embassy to France, in the year of the Lord 1473.

Bonaventure, who was also called by the Greek word *Eutychius*, Bishop of Albano, by nation a Tuscan, from the town of Bagnoregio, the eighth Minister General of the Order of Minors; on account of his exceptional erudition in divine things taken by Gregory X, Supreme Pontiff, into the college of cardinals; he so joined a holiness of life and integrity of morals with the highest knowledge of Scholastic Theology and Philosophy, that that most excellent man Alexander of Hales, his teacher, was wont often to say of him[1] that it seemed to him that Adam had not sinned in Bonaventure. This man, among many most pious little works — which, kindled with divine love, he composed with most ardent words and most lofty senses, for the illuminating of minds and the enflaming of the wills of readers — dictated also a noble work upon the Hexaemeron, in the scholastic kind of diction; to which the title is *On the Luminaries of the Church*, or *On the Illuminations*, or *On the Five Visions* — for this reason, because in it are especially expounded those five visions of God, comprehended in that sentence of Moses, *God saw that it was good, etc.*,[2] repeated five times in the beginning of Genesis. The beginning of the work is, *In the midst of the church he opened his mouth, etc.* And the whole work is divided into twenty-three sermons, most full of tropological senses, ardent sentences, and abstruse mysteries of Scholastic and mystical Theology.

He wrote likewise a Scholastic Postil on the one hundred and eighteenth Psalm, beginning, *Alleluia, praise, glory.* — Upon the Gospel of Luke, a Scholastic Postil, which begins, *The spirit of the Lord.* — Upon John, a Postil, which begins, *In the beginning.*

He published also one book of *Meditations on the Life of Christ*; in which, with a style indeed rude and unpolished, but effective and most penetrating to the heart, he reduced the four gospels into one history, with some meditations of his own inserted — in which, for arousing and enflaming the affections of the reader, he narrates the deeds of Christ according to certain imaginary representations, not only as the things themselves happened, but as they could also have happened, or have come to pass. Wherefore, when in the course of this work it is read, "Thus the Lord Jesus said" or "did" — if that cannot be proved from the evangelical narrative itself, it is to be understood no otherwise than devout meditation requires; that is, just as if it were said, "Meditate with pious mind that Jesus either said and did these things, or could have said and done them." The work begins, *Among other proclamations of the virtues and praises.*

There is also carried about a little book of the same author, introductory to the reading of the Bibles, marked with the title *The Beginning of Sacred Scripture*, whose opening is, *The Lord showed me a great river.* — He left likewise a metrical scholastic compendium of both Testaments, in iambic dimeter verses, by the free and

loosened law of the syllables; which he so arranged that each quatrain contains the sum of one chapter. Its beginning is, *The world is made in the beginning.*

He dies, the empire being vacant, under Gregory X, in the Council of Lyons, in the year of the Lord 1283 [read 1274]; buried in the church of the Minorites at Lyons, and reckoned among the saints by Sixtus IV, Supreme Pontiff. His life was copiously described by Octavianus Martinianus of Suessa, advocate of the most sacred consistory.

Bonaventure of Padua, Prior General of the Hermits, presbyter cardinal of the title of St. Cecilia, published a scholastic Sermon-book on the Gospels of the whole year, which begins, *The desired of all nations shall come.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1320.

Bonino Mombrizio [Boninus Mombritius] of Milan gathered from the four Evangelists, in hexameter verse, [the history] of the Lord's Passion, [dedicated] to Sixtus IV, Supreme Pontiff — six books, whose beginning is, *I who too youthfully consumed my first years.*

Bruno, first founder and institutor of the Carthusian order, by nation a German, from Cologne, once a Canon of the church of Reims, and in the University of Paris a public master and distinguished doctor. By a certain marvelous event of a dead man — who, amid his funeral obsequies, three times cried out with a loud voice that he had been condemned by the just judgment of God — being converted to penance, he left the world and withdrew into the desert of the Chartreuse [Cartusia Celesiensis; near Grenoble], and there established an exceedingly arduous purpose of monastic discipline, giving himself to continual prayers and to assiduous studies of the divine scriptures; in which he also left many books of no contemptible exposition, but especially pious and brief commentaries on the Psalter, written in a bare and simple speech, of which such is the opening, *The Psalter is a certain musical instrument.* Likewise, upon all the epistles of Paul, 14 books, whose beginning is, *Paul had not yet come to Rome.* He flourished in the year of our salvation 1081.

Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne, published on the four gospels commentaries not to be neglected, whose beginning is, *After the Pentateuch of Moses, that we might join new things to the old.* They are extant in the Library of the Preachers at Bologna. The same author also testifies that he wrote upon the Pentateuch. [→ p237: **Bruno**…]

[1] The distinguished judgment of Alexander of Hales concerning St. Bonaventure. [2] Genesis 1 [the words *God saw that it was good*].

*(Rich PDF p. 237 [printed folio 218]. Book IV: the close of letter B — three more **Brunos** (of Würzburg, of Querfurt, of Segni) and **Burchard** — then the **letter C** section opens: **Gaius Marius Victorinus**, **Callistus of Piacenza**, **Candidus**, **Charles de Bovelles**, and two anonymous Greek **Catenae** preserved at Genoa (one on Job, one on the whole body of the Gospels), each with its list of excerpted Fathers and its Greek incipits. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter B, continued from p236:]

Bruno of Würzburg [Herbipolensis], Bishop of Eastern Franconia, by nation a German, cousin of Conrad Augustus the Second of that name, most celebrated for holiness and erudition, gathered — out of the explanations of the orthodox fathers — a concise and elegant commentary upon all the Psalms, whose beginning is, *We forge no new things, but renew the old.* He dies under the Emperor Henry II [read III], in the year of the Lord 1045.

Bruno, Archbishop of the Ruthenians, a monk of Cassino, born and educated in Italy, of singular doctrine and renowned for the glory of martyrdom, left some immortal monuments of his noble genius; of which there are extant two books of commentaries on Genesis. This man, when he was preaching the gospel in Prussia with the highest ardor of faith, was crowned with martyrdom by the Prussians, and fell, in the year of the Lord 1010.

Bruno, Bishop of Siena in Tuscany, wrote upon the Apocalypse, with an explanation not to be despised, which begins, *The Apocalypse of John has as many sacraments [as it has words]. In these few words, blessed Jerome.*

Burchard [Burgardus], of the Order of Preachers, left a book *On the Site of the Holy Land*, useful for the topography of the sacred volumes.

C

Gaius Marius Victorinus [Caius Marius Victorinus], an African, the most excellent rhetorician of his time, and, on account of the excellence of his art, deserving a statue in the forum of Trajan; besides those three books which he wrote against Arius in the dialectical manner — very obscure, and scarcely accessible to the most learned — he published commentaries on the Apostle [Paul]; but, since he was occupied in the erudition of secular letters, he was ignorant of the holy scriptures. Whence he could not, however eloquent, discourse well of things which he did not know; but he also sang, in hexameter verse, the combat of the Maccabean mother and of her seven sons, whose beginning is, *Antiochus of old was king, the richest of Syria.* Much concerning his laudable conversion to Christ Augustine relates in the eighth book of the Confessions, chapter 2. He flourished at Rome under the emperor Constantius, teaching Rhetoric, around the year of the Lord 360.

Callistus of Piacenza [Placentinus], a Lateran canon of St. Augustine, a learned and pious man, and in his time among the foremost of the Italian preachers, published commentaries on the Prophet Haggai, explained by himself before the assembly; likewise commentaries on John, and Lenten enarrations on the Gospels; to which he added a small volume on the places of Palestine which the divine letters contain, with a geographical map added, so that it might represent to the eyes a picture of the whole work, described by himself. He published also a chronicon-work upon the four gospels, after the manner of a diary [ephemeris], in which he gathered a diligent computation of the times and days in which the Lord Jesus journeyed in the world — noting the years and days on which each of the things were done which Christ did and spoke, and especially from the baptism up to the ascension. The work begins thus, *Since to the Christian profession.…* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Candidus, in the reigns of the Emperors Commodus and Severus, around the two-hundredth year of our salvation, published most beautiful tractates on the Hexaemeron.

Charles de Bovelles [Carolus Bovillus], of Beauvais [Beromandius], of Amiens [Samarobrinus], a theologian, mathematician, and distinguished philosopher, wrote on the one hundred and sixteenth Psalm, *On the Praise of the Nations*, one book; likewise on the one hundred and seventeenth Psalm, *On the Praise of Jerusalem*, one book. He wrote also on Psalm 79 and 147, and on the Lord's Prayer, in the year of the Lord 1520.

Catena — a Greek [chain] of explanations upon the whole book of Job, without the author's name, written by hand on parchments and arranged in a most becoming order, extant at Genoa in the Sauli Library, collected out of nineteen orthodox Greek fathers, whose names are these:

> *Alexander of Cappadocia, Apollinaris, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, Didymus, Dionysius, Ephrem, Evagrius, Gregory the Theologian, Julius, Julian, Isidore, Methodius, Nilus, Olympiodorus, Polychronius, Severus, Severianus.*

The beginning of its work has these words: Ὑπόθεσις μὲν ἡμῖν καὶ σκοπὸς τοῦ ἔργου, ἡ τῆς βίβλου τοῦ πολυάθλου Ἰὼβ ἀνάπτυξις — that is, *Our proposal indeed, and the scope of the present work, is to unfold the book of the excellent warrior [much-contending] Job.*

Catena — a Greek [chain] upon the whole body of the Gospels, is held at Genoa in the Library of Angelo Giustiniani the Minorite, written on most ancient parchments, and collected by an uncertain author out of divers Greek fathers, whose names are these:

> *Origen, Victor the Presbyter, Isidore of Pelusium, Eusebius of Caesarea, Titus of Bostra, Basil, Chrysostom, Severus, Cyril.*

And the openings of the exposition upon each Evangelist are these:

Upon Matthew: Εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστι λόγος περιέχων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγελίαν πραγμάτων, κατὰ τὸ εὔλογον — that is, *The Gospel is a discourse containing the announcement of good things, according to that which is consonant with reason.*

Upon Mark: Πολλῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον, καὶ εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην συνταξάντων — that is, *Since many have composed commentaries upon the Gospel according to Matthew, and according to John.*

Upon Luke: Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ πολ■ [→ p238: -λοί (many)…] — that is, *For just as in the old [Testament] many…*

(Rich PDF p. 238 [printed folio 219; the leaf misprints "201"]. Book IV, letter C: the close of the Gospel ***Catena*** *incipits; a* ***Catena*** *on Paul's epistles;* ***Catina the Syrian***, ***Caesarius***, ***Coelius Pannonius***, ***Coelius Sedulius*** *(the Paschal poet),* ***Caedmon***, *and a run of* ***Claudii*** *— of Auxerre, of Classe, d'Espence, Guilliaud, the Scot disciple of Bede, de Monte Martyrum, Seyssel — closing with* ***Christopher Clavius***. *Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[The Gospel Catena, continued from p237 — the Luke incipit:]

…■λοὶ προφητείαν ἐπηγγέλλοντο — that is, *As in the old people indeed many announced Prophecy.*

Upon John: Οὗτος ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς πατρίδος μὲν ἦν — that is, *This Evangelist was indeed of a fatherland, etc.*

Catena — of Explanations upon all the epistles of Paul, without the author's name, lately found, is preserved in the illustrious Academy of the Venetians.

Catina the Syrian [Catina Syrus], surnamed λεπτός — that is, *Acute and ingenious* — published a brief disputation on the first chapter of Ezekiel; whom Jerome mentions in the first book of his commentary on Ezekiel, relating summarily his exposition upon the vision of the wheels and of the living creatures.

Caesarius, a Cistercian monk, wrote sermons on the festal gospels: [incipit] *A cluster of Cyprus, beloved.* In the year of the Lord 1220.

Coelius Pannonius [Coelius of Pannonia], a student of the sacred volumes, wrote Collectanea upon the Apocalypse not to be repented of, whose beginning is, *In many, and by no doubtful, ways of old.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Coelius Sedulius, a presbyter, by nation a Scot [Irish], from his early youth a disciple of Hildebert, Archbishop of the Scots; who — like another Apollonius of Tyana, searching out fleeing wisdom throughout the whole world — traversed Britain, Spain, Gaul, Italy, Greece, and Asia with a wonderful ardor of learning; and at last, illustrious at Rome in divine and human doctrines, flourished under Theodosius Augustus, excelling in verse and in prose. He wrote four books *Of Divine Marvels* [the *Carmen Paschale*], in which he briefly compressed, in hexameter verse, all the miracles of both testaments. The beginning of the work is, *While the gentiles study the figments of their own poet.* He left also commentaries — or, if you prefer, annotations — upon all the epistles of Paul, in prose, 14 books, collected out of Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, cited by name; whose beginning is, *It is to be known that, in this proem.* He dies under Theodosius the Younger, in the year of the Lord 450.

Caedmon [Cedmonus], a simple monk, a poet by no means to be despised, around the year of the Lord six hundred and seventy, published poems upon almost all the histories of the Bible.

Claudius of Auxerre [Altisiodorensis], most skilled in scholastic Theology, wrote commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, which it has not befallen me to read.

Claudius, Abbot of the city of Classe [near Ravenna], a disciple of St. Gregory the Pope, gathered many things — on the Heptateuch, on the books of Kings, on Proverbs, on the Song of Songs, and on the Prophets, from Pope Gregory discoursing (though not in the same sense) — and reduced them into commentaries; which St. Gregory mentions in his epistle to John, subdeacon of Ravenna. He flourished in the year of the Lord 600.

Claudius Espencaeus [Claude d'Espence], a Frenchman, Doctor of Paris, wrote a Commentary on the First epistle to Timothy, and on the epistle to Titus. He died in the reign of Charles IX, King of France. *[Later-edition addition: Espence died in 1571, after Sixtus's death in 1569, so the notice of his death was added by a later editor.]*

Claudius Guilliaud [Claude Guilliaud], by fatherland of Beauvais, provost at the distinguished church of the Aedui [Autun], and canon-preacher, a man most studious of the divine scriptures, wrote, upon all the Epistles of St. Paul, commentaries which he called *Collations* — a work indeed erudite, brief, elegant, and very necessary; in which he touched, with a lucid and open brevity, the explanations of almost all the best and most select doctors, both ancient and more recent, in this order: First, he diligently explains the individual sentences of each chapter of the epistle; which done, immediately (before he approaches the following chapter) he recalls to concord the passages of the preceding chapter which seem in appearance to conflict. Finally, he explains certain words and obscurer phrases of the chapter already expounded, his own definitions being applied. He wrote also, by the same method of explanation, commentaries on the Gospel of John, whose beginning is, *John, about to speak*; and likewise, upon all the Catholic Epistles, commentaries, which begin, *The state of the epistle.* He flourished under Charles V, in the year of the Lord 1540. The work begins, *Among all the epistles.*

Claudius, by nation a Scot, a Benedictine monk, a disciple of Bede the Venerable, a colleague of Albinus [Alcuin] the Levite, most studious of the divine scripture, and not ignorant of secular learning, conspicuous as much in prose speech as in verse, published, in a succinct and simple style: Upon the Pentateuch of Moses, five books of commentaries. Upon Joshua, one book. Upon Judges, one book. Upon Ruth, one book. Upon Matthew, one book. He flourished under Charlemagne Augustus, in the year of the Lord 800.

Claudius de Monte Martyrum, a Frenchman, a Carmelite doctor, a Theologian of Paris, published succinct enarrations on the Apocalypse, addressed to John, Cardinal du Bellay. Of these, this is the beginning, *The Apocalypse — [it] is to be understood, this is.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Claudius Seyssel [Seisellus], a Savoyard, Bishop of Marseilles, and afterward Archbishop of Turin, wrote in an elegant style, upon the first three chapters of Luke, *On the Threefold State of the Wayfarer*, addressed to Leo X — a huge volume, divided into many tractates; in which, following especially the moral explanation, in the first chapter of the Gospel he describes the state of the penitents under the person of Elizabeth and Zechariah; in the second, under the birth of the forerunner, the state of those perfecting their life toward the type of the Redeemer; in the third, he treats allegorically and mystically of the state of the perfect. The work begins, *A great and memorable thing.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1490.

There was also another Claudius, bishop of Turin, condemned by the church, who wrote against the cult of sacred images.

Christopher Clavius of Bamberg [Bambergensis], of the Society of Jesus, a man exceedingly well-deserving of the Mathematical sciences, was of great help in restoring the Gregorian Calendar — which

he afterward strenuously vindicated from the cavils of a certain German Heretic. He lives at Rome, and has already written many things in Mathematics, and (as we hope) has recalled that most noble discipline, [long] neglected, to its former splendor. He was formerly my teacher in this study. *[Later-edition addition: the Gregorian Calendar reform (1582) and its defense postdate Sixtus's death in 1569; this entry, with its first-person "my teacher," was supplied by a later editor.]* [→ p239: **Clement**…]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 239 [printed folio 220; the leaf misprints "202"]. Book IV, letter C: **Clement of Alexandria** (teacher of Origen), **Clement Araneus** of Ragusa, **Clement of Rome**, **Columbanus** of Luxeuil, **Conrad of Halberstadt** (the Concordance-maker, with Sixtus's own preface to it), **Constantine of Antioch**, **Cornelius Magnanus** (whose three biblical epics Sixtus heard read aloud), and the opening of **Cornelius Musso** of Bitonto. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter C, continued from p238:]

Clement, by forename Titus Flavius, presbyter of the church of Alexandria, disciple of Pantaenus the Stoic philosopher and martyr, and after his death his successor in the school, teacher of Origen Adamantius,[1] wrote distinguished volumes full of erudition and eloquence, as much on secular literature as on the sacred scriptures; among which, besides the rest, is reported [the work] Ὑποτυπώσεων — that is, eight books *Of Outlines [Informations]* — in which, as Eusebius writes in the 6th book of the Ecclesiastical History, he explained the whole of divine Scripture alike with compendious dissertations, not even passing over those [books] which by some are called Apocrypha. The same Clement, in the first book of his *Stromata*, promised that he would write on Genesis; which he is affirmed by some afterward to have performed, brilliantly and completely, upon the whole book — to which [affirmation] I neither add my credence nor rashly break it. He flourished in the times of Severus and of Antoninus his son, in the year of the Lord 200.

Clement Araneus [of Ragusa], of the Order of Preachers, a nursling and inhabitant of the province of Dalmatia, a Theologian not ignoble in scholastic exercise, and most eloquent in his own tongue in declamations, published — after the manner of a scholastic lecture — an exposition on the epistle of Paul to the Romans, with various questions inserted, and their solutions, together with some disputations, by which he most powerfully confuted especially the Lutheran heretics. The beginning of the work is, *Paul the Apostle*. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1546.

Clement, Bishop at Rome after Peter and Linus, wrote upon the sacrosanct Scriptures of both Testaments a work worthy of all veneration, *On the words of the Lord which seem to be contrary to themselves, and are not, and what is the resolution of these.* Of which labor Clement himself makes mention in the third volume of the *Recognitions.* See above, in the second book, under Clement.

Columbanus, first founder and Abbot of the monastery of Luxeuil, by nation a Scot [Irish], a man of exceptional sanctity, merit, and doctrine, father of many thousands of monks, and founder of several monasteries, a distinguished sower of the divine word; coming out of Ireland, in the times of the Emperor Maurice, into Gaul and Germany — like of old a prince of the Druids — he propagated the divine worship far and wide, and increased the multitude of monasteries. This man, while he was still younger, expended great zeal as much on profane as on sacred letters, and wrote many things in an elegant style; but especially one book of commentaries upon the whole Psalter. He dies under the Emperor Maurice, in the year of the Lord 598.

Conrad of Halberstadt [Halberstadius], by nation a German, of the Order of Preachers, a public professor of Theology, and so exercised and worn in the divine scriptures that he held the whole Old and New Testament in memory, composed — in imitation of Hugh [of St. Cher], Cardinal of the title of St. Sabina, and with a like labor — Concordances of the whole Bible; in which he added, according to the order of the alphabet, not only the declinable words (which Hugh had done before), but also all the indeclinable parts of

speech; the passages being marked not only by the books, and by the chapters of the books, but also by the lines of the chapters, so that any word sought whatsoever might most easily and suddenly be found. We once gave to this work, at the request of friends, a brief little commentary, entitled *On the Use and Utility of the Concordances of the sacred Bible*, demonstrating in it by what wit a prudent declaimer may avail, from this single work — even without any commentaries of the sacred expositors — to open and explain to himself, no less easily than copiously, the phrases, senses, and manifold understandings of almost any passage of the scriptures set before him; and likewise by what way he may be able, in the many themes of declamations, to procure the divisions of the things to be narrated, the definitions, causes, parts, effects, like and unlike passages, the reconciliations of unlike and seemingly-conflicting passages, and, finally, the most abundant furniture of an entire sermon. The same Conrad wrote also on Job a scholastic Postil, which begins, *Even unto the time I have endured.* He flourished under Adolph the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1290.

Constantine, a presbyter of Antioch, a disciple of St. John Chrysostom — for whose sake also he suffered many persecutions from Porphyry, a presbyter of the church of Antioch — collected out of the works of the same Chrysostom an exposition on the epistle to the Hebrews, digested into 33 homilies; of which the first, which is more the argument of the work than a homily, begins, *Writing to the Romans, etc.*

Cornelius Magnanus, born under a happy star for the singing of sacred poems, read to me three volumes of heroic verse, most gracefully elaborated by himself: The First, on the life of Joseph, from the beginning of the 37th chapter of Genesis up to the fiftieth, digested in two books; whose opening is, *Again we dip our lips in the ethereal fountains of the muses.* The Second, on David's single combat, in chapter 17 of the first book of Kings; whose beginning is, *The invincible strength of the boy, increased by heavenly commands.* The Third, whose title is *Juditha*, explaining the history of Judith the widow; which begins, *Let others sing of arrayed battle-lines of arms, and the horrid wars of Mars.* He still lives, in the year of the Lord 1566, at Genoa, with the most distinguished man Battista Grimaldi, renowned for nobility, riches, and virtues.

Cornelius Musso [Cornelio Musso], Bishop of Bitonto, by fatherland of Piacenza, of the Order of Minors, a man endowed with an incomparable felicity of genius, excelling in all disciplines both divine and human, illustrious for the probity of his life and morals, was so begotten by nature herself for the exercising of the powers of eloquence that, from his very first boyhood — that is, from the twelfth year of his age — he undertook the public office of sacred declamations, with so great admiration, applause, and desire of hearing of all the cities of Italy, that to the boy's sermons — as to unaccustomed spectacles of miracles — innumerable throngs of the peoples would gather. Then, as his age increased, being augmented with happier increments of eloquence, erudition, and grace, and raised through the various grades of honors to the dignity of the Episcopate, he transmitted to posterity many immortal monuments of his labors; of which there are extant most brilliant Sermons, published in the Tuscan tongue, [→ p240…]

[1] Clement of Alexandria was the teacher of Origen. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 6, chapter 5.

(Rich PDF p. 240 [printed folio 221]. Book IV, letter C: the conclusion of ***Cornelius Musso*** *of Bitonto, then* ***Cosmas Indicopleustes***, ***Christian Druthmar***, ***Christian Ischyrius*** *of Jülich,* ***Christopher Marcellus*** *of Corfu,* ***Christopher of Nolham***, ***Chromatius*** *of Aquileia, two* ***Constantines*** *(of Seville),* ***Cornelius Jansenius*** *of Ghent (whom Sixtus heard at Louvain), and the opening of* ***Cyprian*** *of Carthage. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter C, continued from p239:]

published[1] in the Tuscan tongue, [worthy] to be compared with the sermons of Gregory the Great, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and the rest of the Fathers of Greece for their majesty of doctrine and eloquence. But among these that one most excels which is titled *On the Benefit* [*De beneficio*], upon that sentence from the Gospel of John, *So God loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son* [John 3:16]; in which he so

poured out all the powers of his genius, erudition, and eloquence, that nothing more learned, nor more eloquent, could either be said or thought up in that kind. He had also in the Council of Trent an eloquent sermon in the Tuscan tongue, *On the persecutions and victories of the Church*, upon the forty-fifth Psalm, for the expedition of Charles V the Emperor against the Lutheran heretics — whom Caesar himself routed at the Elbe, a river of Germany, in a marvelous battle, in the year of the Lord 1546.

He flourished, illustrious, in the Council of Trent, and still lives up to the present year 1566. His erudition and eloquence Bernardino Tomitano, philosopher of the Academy of Padua, celebrated with an illustrious panegyric — though some learned men, notwithstanding, marked his sermons with the fault of a disordered composition, of a tiresome prolixity, of a juvenile affectation, and of vain ostentation: among these Girolamo [Hieronymus], Bishop of Verona, a declaimer famous in our age and of a more compressed and sinewy eloquence, had been accustomed to compare the author of them to a peddler of trifling wares, displaying the whole furniture of all his merchandise set out for show at the fairs. *[Later-edition addition — not in our 1586 primary:]* In the year of the Lord 1588, there were printed at Venice commentaries of the same Cornelius on the epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

Cosmas Indicopleustes [Cosmas Indicoplensis] composed prolegomena, or Greek prefaces, on the Psalter, which are kept at Rome in the Vatican.

Christian, who is also [called] Druthmar, by nation an Aquitanian, presbyter of Corbie and monk of St. Benedict, learned in Greek and Latin and most learned in the sacred scriptures, published — for the monks of the monasteries of Stavelot and Malmedy, which lie under one abbot in the diocese of Liège — brief commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew, written in an open and simple style; in whose preface he promised that he would write also upon the other Evangelists, which he is said also to have done. The beginning of the work is, *This title the Evangelist did not make.* He is said to have flourished in the year of the Lord 850.

Christian Ischyrius, of Jülich [Iuliacensis], composed an ecphrasis [paraphrase] on the seven penitential Psalms, and likewise on all the Psalms which are read through the Canonical Hours in praise of Mary, and also on those Psalms which the Roman church chants in the vigils of the dead. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1536.

Christopher Marcellus, a Venetian, Archbishop of Corfu [Corcyra], left upon Psalm 13, *How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me* [Ps 13:1], a commentary worthy of a pastor of the church, which begins, *David the great Prophet.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1520.

Christopher of Nolham [Nolhamensis], a Dominican, wrote four books of Postils on the Gospels; on all the epistles of Paul, 14 books; and on the Canonical [catholic] epistles, 7 books.

Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, Roman by fatherland, a man most illustrious in piety and erudition — whom Jerome, in the preface to Paralipomenon [Chronicles], calls the holiest and most learned of the bishops of his time (which is rarely found) — published commentaries on Matthew notable for erudition and piety; out of which I have read the following fragments, namely:

On Matthew chapter 3, upon that text, *Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness* [Matt 3:15], which begins, *Wherefore the Lord answering.*

On the fifth chapter of Matthew entire, and a fragment on part of the sixth chapter: whose beginning is, *But seeing, he says* [Matt 5:1].

Likewise, on the eight beatitudes in the fifth chapter of Matthew, an elegant homily, whose beginning is, *The gathering gives us, brethren.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 410, under Theodosius.

Constantine, a doctor of Theology, wrote in Spanish an exposition on the first Psalm, distributed into six sermons, printed at Antwerp in the year 1556.

Constantine Fontius [Ponce de la Fuente], a Canon in the cathedral church of Seville, wrote 6 sermons on Psalm 1, and commentaries on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and on the book of Job.

Cornelius Jansenius [Jansen], first Bishop of Ghent, wrote commentaries on Ecclesiasticus; a book *On the Harmony of the Evangelists*; commentaries on his own Harmony and on the whole Gospel history; Paraphrases on all the Psalms, with their arguments and annotations; likewise Paraphrases on those Canticles of the Old Testament which ecclesiastical use observes on the several weekdays; and likewise commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon. Him I heard at Louvain, in the year of the Lord 1565, in the Schools of the Theologians, expounding the Proverbs of Solomon.

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, African by nation, before he received the faith taught rhetoric gloriously; but, at the persuasion of the presbyter Caecilius (from whom also he got his surname), being converted to Christ, he distributed all his substance to the poor, and after no long time, being elected to the presbyterate and then to the Bishopric of Carthage, wrote many most pious little works, of a most elegant phrasing and next neighbor to Ciceronian brilliance, for the edification of the church. In which — as Jerome says, writing to Paulinus — he moved along gentle and placid, after the manner of a most pure fountain. Of their number is reported an explanation, of holy and graceful brevity, on the Lord's Prayer [the Dominical Prayer], whose beginning is, *The Gospel precepts.* From which St. Augustine brought forth testimonies concerning original sin against Pelagius, in book 4 to Boniface, against the two epistles of the Pelagians chapter 9, and in book 2 against Julian chapter 1. Lactantius, in the 5th book of the Divine Institutes, describing Cyprian's eloquence,[2] uses these words: *One therefore stood forth as chief and renowned, Cyprian, who had sought for himself great glory from the profession of the oratorical art, and wrote very many things wonderful in their kind. For he was of a genius facile, copious, sweet, and — which is the greatest virtue of speech — clear: so that you could not discern whether he were more ornate in speaking, or readier in explaining, or [→ p241]*

[→ p241: "an potentior…" — whether more powerful in persuading]

[1] Cornelius Musso, *Prediche* (sermons in Italian). The sermon *De beneficio* is on John 3:16. [2] Lactantius's judgment concerning Cyprian (*Divine Institutes*, book 5).

---

*(Rich PDF p. 241 [printed folio 222]. Book IV, letter C: the conclusion of **Cyprian** of Carthage, a Cistercian **Cyprian**, and the long entry on **Cyril of Alexandria** — his allegorical work on the Pentateuch (the catalog of its numbered sermons on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, procured by Sixtus from the Greek library of Angelo Giustiniani), his letter to Bishop Acacius on the scapegoat, a note on the pseudo-Cyrilline Leviticus commentaries (really Origen's homilies), and the opening of his work on Isaiah. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter C, continued from p240:]

...or whether any man was more powerful in persuading. He flourished in the year of the Lord 240.

Cyprian, a Cistercian monk, left commentaries on Matthew, on Job, and on Psalms 51 and 79.

Cyril, Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, nephew (by a brother) of Theophilus, Bishop of the same city, renowned for sharpness of genius, subtlety of judgment, variety of erudition, ease of teaching, and abundance of discourse, and conspicuous for sincere piety, left upon the divine letters various and almost innumerable labors of the interpretive kind — that is, homilies exceedingly elegant (which formerly, as Gennadius reports, the Bishops of Greece used to commit to memory for declaiming) — likewise epistles, commentaries, and disputations. Of all these, only the below-written have come to my knowledge, namely:

An **Allegorical work on the Pentateuch**, whose title and argument is, *That throughout all the scripture of Moses the mystery of Christ is signified.* But the sermons — or booklets, or distinctions, or rather the titles, by which the whole work is divided — are these:

• *That in all the scripture of Moses a mystery concerning Christ is found* — the Preface, beginning Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, that is, *Search the scriptures* [John 5:39].

• On the first chapter of Genesis, On the formation of Adam, sermon 1, beginning, *That most sacred Paul.*

• On Genesis 6, On Noah and the Ark, sermon 2.

• On Genesis 9, On the nakedness of Noah, sermon 3.

• On Genesis 11, On the tower and its building, sermon 4.

• On Genesis 14, On Abraham and Melchizedek, sermon 3 [read 5].

• On Genesis 15, On Abraham and the promise made to him in Isaac, sermon 6.

• On Genesis 22, On the sacrifice of Abraham and Isaac, sermon 7.

• On Genesis 24, On Isaac and Rebecca, sermon 8.

• On Genesis 25, On Esau and Jacob, prefiguring the two peoples, sermon 9.

• On Genesis 27 up to 35, On the persecution of Esau, sermon 10.

• On Genesis 30 and 31, On the things done between Jacob and Laban, sermon 11.

• On Genesis 32, On Jacob sending messengers to Esau, sermon 12.

• On Genesis 32, On the nocturnal wrestling of Jacob, sermon 13.

• On Genesis 39 [read 37], On Joseph feeding his father's sheep with his brethren, sermon 14.

• On Genesis 38, On Judah and Tamar, sermon 15.

• On Genesis 39 [read 37], On Joseph sold to the Ishmaelites, sermon 16.

• On Genesis 48, On the blessing of the sons of Joseph, sermon 17.

• On Genesis 49, On the blessings of the Patriarchs, sermon 18.

These sermons, written in Greek, Ambrose of Milan showed to us — a monk of Monte Cassino, a man most skilled in both tongues, who is shortly to publish them, turned into Latin by himself. But the sermons subjoined, on the remaining volumes of the Pentateuch, we saw written in a most ancient Greek codex, which was supplied to us by Angelo Giustiniani the Chian [of Chios], a Minorite, a distinguished Theologian, who lately, out of the ruins of Greece, gathered together — with much money and labor — a Library furnished with the monuments of the most ancient fathers of the Eastern Church, and brought it with him into Italy, as a certain sacred treasure. The titles of the sermons run thus:

• On Exodus chapter 4, On the three signs shown to Moses by God, sermon 19.

• On Exodus 12, On the sacrifice of the lamb, sermon 20.

• On Exodus 13, On the consecration of the firstborn, sermon 21.

• On Exodus 25 [read 15], On the water of Marah, sermon 22.

• On Exodus 16, On the Manna and the quails, sermon 23.

• On Exodus 17, On the rock struck in Rephidim, sermon 24.

• On Exodus 19, On the inaccessible mountain, and Israel encamped beside it, sermon 25.

• On Exodus 24, On the ascent of Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, sermon 26.

• On Exodus 32, On the making of the calf, sermon 27.

• On Exodus 34, On the veil upon the face of Moses, sermon 28.

• On Leviticus 1, That the passion of Christ is salutary, sermon 29.

• On the same [Leviticus 1], That we shall be everywhere partakers of the mystical benediction, holy and sacred, sermon 30.

• On Leviticus 14, On the cleansing of leprosy, sermon 31.

• On Leviticus 16, On the synagogue of the Jews, which fell through unbelief, sermon 32.

• On the same [Leviticus 16], That Aaron does not always enter into the Holy of Holies, sermon 33.

• On the book of Numbers chapter 13, On the spies of the land of promise, sermon 34.

• On Numbers 14, On Christ, and the synagogue of the Jews, and the murmuring of the people, sermon 35.

• On Numbers 15, That Christ became for us the bread of life, and on the firstfruits, sermon 36.

• On Numbers 19, On the red heifer, sermon 37.

• On Numbers 21, On the bronze serpent, sermon 39.

• On Deuteronomy chapter 20, On those sent to war, sermon 38. *[The sermon numbers 38 and 39 stand thus in the print, transposed — the serpent (Num 21) numbered 39, and those sent to war (Deut 20) numbered 38.]*

• On Deuteronomy 21, On the captive woman whose nails are to be pared, sermon 40.

• On Deuteronomy 22, On the ox fallen into a pit, sermon 41.

• On Deuteronomy 27, On the stones to be set up across the Jordan, sermon 42.

• On Deuteronomy 31, On the appointment and election of Joshua, sermon 43.

He also wrote, upon the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, concerning the *Apopompaeus* — that is, the *scapegoat* [the emissary goat] — one Epistle to Bishop Acacius, which begins, *Having read the things which by your holiness [were sent]*.

There are also carried about under Cyril's name sixteen books of commentaries on Leviticus, printed too impudently by the printers of our times; since they are neither commentaries, nor Cyril's work, but sixteen extemporary homilies of Origen, delivered to the people — in which Origen often excuses himself that, constrained by shortness of time, he cannot dwell upon the explanation of individual words, after the manner of those who write commentaries at leisure, and that he therefore touches on very few things, aiming more at the edification of his hearers than at the exposition of the scriptures. And it appears that these homilies are Origen's, as much from the likeness of the style as of the doctrines.

He likewise composed on Isaiah five [→ p242]

[→ p242: "-que…" — completing *quinque*, "five books"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 242 [printed folio 223]. Book IV: the conclusion of **Cyril of Alexandria** (his works on Isaiah, the minor prophets, Matthew, Luke, John, Hebrews, and against Julian; †at the Council of Ephesus) and **Cyril of Jerusalem** (the eighteen Catecheses and five Mystagogic sermons). Then letter **D** opens: **Damiano Maraffi** the Florentine, **Defensor** (the* Book of Sparks*), and **Didymus the Blind** of Alexandria. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter C, continued from p241:]

...he likewise composed on Isaiah five books, divided in the same order into various sermons, or sections, whose beginning is, *Obscure always is the speech of the holy Prophets.*

He also dictated on Daniel, on Hosea, and on Habakkuk very many homilies, which are kept in the Vatican Library.

He wrote besides, on the whole Gospel of Matthew, several books, or volumes, of an entire and continuous explanation; out of whose eleventh and twelfth volumes testimonies are cited in the sixth synod of Constantinople, and in the second synod of Nicaea.

There are extant, in the *Golden Chain* [Catena Aurea] of St. Thomas on Luke, very many fragments of explanations on that same Gospel, marked under the name of Cyril; in which the repetitions, transitions, connexions, epilogues, and other things of that kind seem to indicate that Cyril wrote either commentaries or homilies on Luke.

Likewise, on the Gospel of John, twelve books, with many disputations against the Arians and other heretics inserted throughout the whole work here and there. Of these books the four middle ones — namely the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth — being lost through the injury of the times, Josse Clichtove [Iudocus Clictoveus] supplied, gathered out of Chrysostom and other fathers.

After these he published also commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews: of which I have found great and prolix fragments, marked under Cyril's name — partly in Theodoret, in the dialogue which is entitled INCONFVSVS [The Unconfounded], partly in Theodore the Greek Monk, in the book whose title is ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀεὶ γεννᾷ, that is, *That the Father always begets.*

He wrote, finally, for the defense of both Testaments, ten books of disputations against the Emperor Julian, who, in seven published volumes, had assailed the sacrosanct scriptures.

Cyril flourished [was illustrious] in the Council of Ephesus, over which, by the command of Pope Celestine, he presided in the year of the Lord 432.

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, a most illustrious asserter and champion of Catholic and Apostolic doctrine, wrote upon various passages of the divine scripture very many homilies and sermons; of which there now survive eighteen catechetical orations to the illuminati [the newly-enlightened], which Jerome asserts were composed by the author in his youth. The preface of these begins thus: *Already there is the odor of blessedness in you.* There survive likewise, of the same [Cyril], upon some sentences of scripture, five Mystagogic sermons, in which he discourses clearly on Baptism, Chrism, and the Eucharist. These, with the foregoing, John Grodecius turned from Greek into Latin. He flourished under the emperor Theodosius, in whose time he held his Bishopric — from which he had often been driven — unshaken for eight years. He dies about the year of the Lord 380.

D

Damiano Maraffi [Damianus Maraffus], a Florentine, compiled two books, in which he set forth the chief histories of the Old and New Testament with most elegant pictures, drawn by the hand of Albrecht Dürer, a German, a most excellent painter; with Tuscan octastichs [eight-line stanzas] added to each, explaining the meaning of every picture. He flourished in the year of the saving incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ 1554.

Defensor, a learned, pious, and ancient Theologian, for the gratification of his fosterer Ursinus, culled out of all sacred scripture certain common passages [commonplaces] of various moral arguments, adding also the sentences of the most ancient fathers, which he found to be conformable to the aforesaid passages of the scriptures. And he entitled his work *The Sparks of Holy Scripture* [Scintillae Scripturae Sanctae], whose beginning is, *Reader, whoever you are.* At what time he flourished is uncertain.

Didymus of Alexandria [Didymus the Blind], an admirable man, flourishing in erudition of every kind. When he was quite young, and had learned the first elements of grammar, he fell into a disease of the eyes, by which he was so badly affected that he lost the keenness of sight. But God furnished him, in place of bodily eyes, with spiritual ones: for even blind he grasped Rhetoric, and, advancing to Philosophical studies, learned Dialectic in a certain astonishing manner, and stored up in his mind Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, and the rest of the disciplines of the philosophers. Nay more, he held most exactly the divine oracles of the Old and New Testament, and expounded Origen's *Periarchon* [On First Principles], and published

commentaries upon it, in which he contended that the things which are in it are well written. To him Antony the Great, the monk, having met with him at Alexandria, said: *Let nothing, O Didymus, trouble you at the loss of your bodily eyes: for you are deprived of such eyes as even flies and gnats can see with; but rejoice that you have eyes with which the angels see, and God is contemplated, and His light is apprehended.*

Alluding to which saying, St. Jerome — Didymus's disciple in the sacred letters — in the epistle to Paulinus [says]: *My Didymus, having the eyes of the bride from the Song of Songs, and those lights which Jesus commanded to be lifted up upon the whitening cornfields [John 4:35], looks far higher, and restores to us the ancient custom, so that, being a seer, he is also called a Prophet. Surely, he who reads him will recognize the thefts of the Latins, and will despise the rivulets when he has begun to draw from the fountains. He is unskilled in speech, but not in knowledge, expressing an Apostolic man by his very style, as much by the light of the sense as by the simplicity of the words.*

This man, therefore, dictated many and noble commentaries through notaries [shorthand-writers]: whose whole ἐξήγησις [exegesis], to use Jerome's word, was allegorical, and scarcely touching a few points of the history [the literal narrative]. Of which number the most notable are:

- Of commentaries on Job, three books.
- On the Psalter, one book.
- On Isaiah, from the beginning of the 40th chapter to the end, eighteen volumes.
- To Jerome the Presbyter, on Hosea, three books.
- To the same, on Zechariah, five books.
- On Matthew, one book.
- On John, one book.
- On the epistles of Paul, fourteen books.
- On the Catholic epistles, seven books.

He flourished under Theodosius the Great, in the year of the Lord 390.

Diego [→ p243]

[→ p243: "DIEGVS…"]

(Rich PDF p. 243 [printed folio 224]. Book IV, letter D: ***Diego de Deza*** *of Seville (his Gospel-harmony),* ***Diodorus of Tarsus*** *(Chrysostom's teacher, with the testimonia of Theodoret, Sozomen, and Nicephorus on his literal method),* ***Dionysius the Great*** *of Alexandria (who wrote against Nepos and against Irenaeus),* ***Denis the Carthusian*** *(the vast commentator on the whole Bible), and a run of* ***Dominics*** *— Buchi of Kotor, Grenier of Toulouse, Leoni of Venice, Mancini, and Nani Mirabelli (the* Polyanthea*). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter D, continued from p242:]

Diego de Deza [Diegus Deza], Archbishop of Seville, born at Toro, a noble town of Castile in Spain, of the Order of Preachers, in all Spain the supreme censor in matters of faith [Inquisitor General], who built at Seville the notable college of the Dominicans; among the other monuments of his genius, he left a Gospel Monotessaron [gospel-harmony], illustrated with most beautiful commentaries, which is now kept in the Library of the same college, in a great volume, written in elegant characters. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1500.

Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, the teacher of John Chrysostom in the sacred letters, formerly a presbyter of the church of Antioch, illustrious no less for sanctity than for knowledge of the sacred letters; having attained the meaning of Eusebius of Emesa and the understanding of the scriptures, which he had taken to himself as a

model — yet he could not imitate his eloquence, on account of his ignorance of secular literature. He therefore, as Suidas relates on the authority of Theodore the historian, wrote upon the divine scriptures the below-written volumes:

- On the Pentateuch, five books.
- On the books of Kings, on Paralipomenon [Chronicles], on the Psalter, on Proverbs, on Ecclesiastes, on the Song of Songs, on the Prophets — commentaries greatly to be approved.
- Likewise on the four Gospels, on Paul, on the Acts of the Apostles, and on the Epistle of John the Evangelist, noble commentaries.
- Likewise, on the distinction between Theory [Theoria] and Allegory in the holy Scriptures, one book.

Theodoret, in book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 3, making mention of him, writes thus: *Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, wrote many books; and because he was intent upon the bare letter of the divine scriptures, he overturned their higher meanings.* And this same thing Sozomen attributes to him, in book 8 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 2, saying: *I have heard that Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, left behind him many books of his commentaries, and that he expounded the sacred scriptures according to the letter, the theoria being neglected.* Nicephorus also, in the 13th volume of his History, adds these things:[1] *Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, left many books of his writings on both Testaments: in which he was occupied only with the exposition of the letter itself, declining the more abstruse and sublime sense of Scripture and the speculations of contemplations; in which matter also his disciple John Chrysostom especially followed him.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 360.

Dionysius, the 13th Bishop of the city of Alexandria, once a hearer of Origen, imbued with all the disciplines, sacred as well as profane; while he was still a presbyter, he held the public school under Heraclas, and acquired great glory for his learning — although he consented to the doctrine of Cyprian and of the African synod concerning the rebaptizing of heretics. This man, then, wrote learned commentaries on Ecclesiastes; of which Procopius of Gaza makes mention in his explanation of the third chapter of Genesis. He wrote likewise a narration upon the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, which Jerome mentions in the epistle to Pammachius. Likewise, against Nepos, a Chiliast Bishop, who from the Apocalypse of John falsely maintained a reign of a thousand years, two books, in which he disputed most diligently and most piously concerning all these things which are contained in the revelation of John. He wrote likewise against Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, who expounded the Apocalypse of John carnally, one book:[2] which Jerome mentions in the preface to the 18th book of his commentaries on Isaiah. He dies in the twelfth year of Gallienus, that is, about the year of the Lord 270.

Dionysius Leuwis [Denis the Carthusian, of Rijkel], a German, from the town of Rijkel, of the Carthusian institute, professor in the noble monastery of Roermond, a man of the highest erudition and sanctity, so fervently and so assiduously devoted in spirit to contemplation and prayer that it is a marvel that a man, abstracted by continual meditation on divine things, could write so great and various a number of volumes as we now have in print. This man illustrated all the books of both Testaments with most pious and most clear commentaries, and, according to the threefold sense of divine scripture — and especially the literal — explained them briefly and most openly, following the custom of the scholastic expositors, yet in a somewhat more polished style, and midway between the ancient fathers and the more recent followers of the schools. He cites by name not only the ancient authors, but also the scholastics themselves — Hugh [of St. Cher], Bonaventure, Thomas [Aquinas], Lyra [Nicholas of Lyra], and others of the same profession — out of whose rhapsodies he gathered his own explanations, omitting their tiresome divisions and subdivisions. But the number of his commentaries, together with their openings (beginning, in the scholastic manner, from various sentences of the scriptures), you have in Trithemius. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1472.

Dominic Buchi [Buchius] of Kotor [Catharensis], of the Order of Preachers, a scholastic Theologian, published an exposition on the seven penitential Psalms, with pious little prayers added to each, which he entitled *A most elegant Etymum upon the seven Psalms.* The work begins, *Heavenly Manna.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

Dominic Grenier [Greniae] of Toulouse, a Dominican, Bishop of Pamiers [Appaniensis], wrote on the Pentateuch, 5 books, and on the historical books of the Bibles, 6 books.

Dominic Leoni [Leonus], a Venetian, a scholastic by profession, whose many volumes are kept in manuscript in the Dominican Library of Bologna, wrote a Postil on Luke, which begins, *Of the super-ineffable Prince.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1368.

Dominic Mancini [Mancinus], a not ignoble poet, put forth in Hexameter verses one book, On the Passion of the Lord, gathered from the four Gospels, which begins, *Not the praises of men, nor, etc.* In the year of the Lord 1494.

Dominic Nani Mirabelli [Nanus Mirabellius], a citizen of Alba, doctor of arts, whose work is extant, entitled POLYANTHEA, in the year 1470, compiled a Monotessaron of the gospels, or a Harmony from the four Gospels; in which work, together with the gospel sentences, he wove in all the authorities and sentences of the gentile philosophers, poets, and orators which seemed to agree with the several passages of the Gospels, the names of the authors whose sentences they were being appended. This work is kept [→ p244]

[→ p244: "con…"]

[1] Nicephorus, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 13, chapter 2. [2] Dionysius wrote against St. Irenaeus.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 244 [printed folio 225]. Book IV: the conclusion of **Dominic Nani Mirabelli** (the roster of pagan authors woven into his gospel-Harmony), **Dominic Soto** (on Romans), **Dorotheus of Tyre** (his Synopsis), and **Dracontius**. Then letter **E** opens: **Eckhart** [Eccardus], **Eckbert of Schönau**, **Edward Lee** (against Erasmus), **Hegesippus** [Egesippus], **Einhard** [Einardus], and the long entry on **Epiphanius of Salamis** (the* Panarion, On Weights and Measures, On Gems, Lives of the Prophets, *and the anti-Marcion book on Luke). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter D, continued from p243:]

...kept at Genoa, in the Library of the Preachers' monastery of the Castle. And the names of the authors from which he wove the Harmony are these — the Seven Sages of Greece, [and]:

Seneca, Ovid, the oracles of the Sibyls, Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Zeno, Plato, Aristotle, Aesop, Apuleius, Muhammad, Isocrates, Cicero [Tullius]; Homer, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Plautus, Juvenal, Persius, Claudian, Lucan, Lucretius, Pliny, Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, Valerius Maximus; [and] the author of the work himself.

Dominic Soto [Dominicus Soto], a Spaniard, of Segovia by fatherland, of the Order of Preachers, confessor to the Imperial Majesty, a supreme Theologian, Philosopher, and orator, wrote, in the year of the Lord 1548, commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, greatly to be approved for erudition, style, and especially method: in which he first most clearly elucidates the literal senses; then, having briefly proposed and resolved all the controversies of both the ancients and the more recent [writers] upon this epistle, he applies himself, with all the efficacy of speech he can, to affecting and stirring up souls. The opening of the work is, *I can by no means further deny [dissemble].*

Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, who under Julian Augustus, the deserter of the Christian religion, suffered martyrdom, compiled a Synopsis of all holy scripture — that is, a Conspectus [Contuitus] — in which he embraced most briefly the arguments of all the books of both Testaments. He flourished in the year of the

Lord 360.

Dracontius, a presbyter, a Spaniard, wrote an exposition on the Hexaemeron of the creation of the world in heroic verses: of which Honorius of Autun [Augustodunensis] makes mention in his catalogue.

E

Eckhart [Eccardus], a German, a Dominican, in Peripatetic Philosophy the chief of all the learned men of his age, and most excellent in the knowledge of divine things, of a sharp and subtle genius — some of whose scholastic propositions, on account of the obscurity, ambiguity, and novelty of the terms, were hissed out [rejected] by the Academies of the Theologians — wrote, in the scholastic manner, on Genesis, on Exodus, on the Song of Songs, on the Wisdom of Solomon, on John, on the Lord's Prayer, [and] on the festal Gospels of the whole year. He flourished under Henry VII the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1310.

Eckbert [Eckebertus], a Benedictine, the second Abbot of the monastery of St. Florinus, German by nation, brother of Blessed Elisabeth the virgin, abbess of Schönau, wrote little works of not-to-be-despised reading, of which I saw, at the beginning [of the volume], a pious book on the Gospel of John, which begins, *The mysteries of the divine discourse.*

Edward Lee [Edvardus Leus], an Englishman, wrote annotations against the annotations of Erasmus on the New Testament, which were printed at Mainz in the year of the Lord 1520.

Hegesippus [Egesippus], a Jew by race, simple in life and speech, reduced to the form of a Greek History, in a brief and simple style, all the deeds of the kingdom of Jerusalem contained in the four books of Kings, up to the captivity of the Jews; and the destruction of the wall, and the triumphs of Babylon. Of which labor he himself makes mention in the preface to his five books, *On the Destruction of the City of Jerusalem*, which are now extant. He flourished near the Apostolic times, and reached down to Antoninus Pius, in the year of the Lord 160.

Einhard [Einardus, who is also called Eginardus], German by nation, master of the epistles [secretary] of Charlemagne Augustus, afterward a Benedictine monk, admirable for his studies of the disciplines and for most holy morals; imitating Bede, with a like zeal he too abridged the Gallican Psalter, gathering out of it meditations, prayers, and thanksgivings, by which the pious petitioner may pour out his heart before God. He flourished under Charles [Charlemagne] and Louis his son, in the year of the Lord 860.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (which afterward, as Jerome testifies, was called Constantia) — or first of Salamis, and afterward of Constantia, as Suidas holds — bishop of various cities of Cyprus, formerly a hermit and a monk of the solitude of Egypt, a man notable for erudition, and, on account of his skill in five languages, called Πεντάγλωττος [Five-tongued] by Jerome; illustrious for sanctity and miracles; a most keen enemy of the heretics, against whom he also published a notable work, called *Panarium* — that is, *The Medicine-Chest.* He wrote a most useful book for the understanding of many words and characters [signs] which are found both in the Scriptures and in the ancient editions of the interpreters: in which he treats of the weights and measures used in the divine Letters, of the parts of divine Scripture, of its interpreters, and of the accent-marks and characters which are found here and there among the ancient interpreters of sacred scripture. Whose beginning is, *If anyone shall wish to know.*

He wrote likewise περὶ λίθων, that is, *On Stones [Gems]* — especially indeed of those which are mentioned in the sacred Letters — one book, from which Arethas, bishop of Cappadocia, in his Commentaries on the Apocalypse, and Jerome, in his commentaries on the 35th chapter of Isaiah, bring forth testimonies.

He published also *On the Life and Death of all the Prophets*, from Nathan the prophet down to John the Baptist, one book, not useless for understanding the titles, occasions, and arguments of the prophetic volumes. Whose beginning is, *Nathan, about the same times.*

He composed also, on the Gospel of Luke, one little book, entitled *Of the Pavement* [Pavimentum]: in which he confuted all the passages of that gospel corrupted and falsified by Marcion, teaching at the same time certain rules, by whose help, in the sacred volumes, [the passages] of the sincere and catholic Scri[pture] [→ p245]

[→ p245: "Scri…"]

(Rich PDF p. 245 [printed folio 226]. Book IV, letter E: the conclusion of ***Epiphanius of Salamis****;* ***Epiphanius Scholasticus*** *(Cassiodorus's collaborator, and his Psalter-catena);* ***Ephrem the Syrian****;* ***Erhard****;* ***Isaiah of Padua*** *[Esaias];* ***Evagrius of Antioch*** *(first to write the lives of the Fathers); and the long entry on* ***Eucherius of Lyons*** *— his genuine works, Sixtus's judgment that the printed Genesis/Kings commentaries are a later cento from Gregory, Isidore, and Bede (perhaps by Bede himself), and the praise of him quoted from Claudianus Mamertus. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter E, continued from p244:]

...the [passages] of the sincere and catholic Scripture may be detected and distinguished from the adulterated scriptures of the heretics, and confuted. And this *Pavement* he inserted into the first book of his *Panarium*, in heresy 42. He flourished under Theodosius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 390.

Epiphanius, surnamed Scholasticus, Greek by nation and language (by whose help Cassiodorus, a Roman consul and a monk, put together the Tripartite History out of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, the Greek authors), collected into one chain [catena] of explanations the more notable expositions of the most excellent fathers pertaining to the Psalter: whose beginning is ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΥ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΕΙΑΣ, Μακαριότητες μὲν κατὰ φύσιν ἅπαντες ὀρεγόμεθα — "OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA: *We all indeed by nature desire states of blessedness.*" And the names of the authors, whose expositions are contained in this work, are these: Origen, Athanasius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Basil of Cappadocia, Asterius of Scythopolis, Theodore of Antioch; Theodore of Antioch, Didymus, Apollinaris, Theodoret, Cyril, Hesychius. *[Theodore of Antioch stands both at the foot of the first column and at the head of the second — so printed.]* He flourished in the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 150.

Ephrem the Syrian [Ephrem Syrus], deacon and monk, published very many sermons — first in the Syriac, and then in the Greek language — upon various passages of divine scripture; of which I have read, on Matthew 17, one homily On the Transfiguration of the Lord, beginning, *The joys of the regions of the harvest.*

Erhard [Erhardus], a Benedictine monk, a man (so far as appears from his fragments, which are read in the compendium of allegories of Tilmann) piously learned, of subtle genius, and pleasing in eloquence, wrote on the Pentateuch of Moses five books of commentaries of not-to-be-despised reading. He lived in the year of the Lord 1050.

Isaiah of Padua [Esaias Patauinus], an Augustinian canon, brought up in the monastery of the Charity at Venice, composed commentaries in the Italian tongue on the Song of Songs of Solomon, in the year of the Lord 1480.

Evagrius, bishop of Antioch, formerly a monk and disciple of Blessed Macarius the Egyptian, a man skilled in Greek and Latin eloquence, so preserved in his Episcopate the abstinence and austerity of his former life that he was held for a miracle: this man first committed to writing the lives of the holy fathers,[1] and wrote various things also upon the sacred letters — of which number are most beautiful commentaries on the

Proverbs of Solomon. He flourished under Gratian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 380.

Eucherius, bishop of the church of Lyons, Gaul by nation, a man notable among those who flourished in the glory of piety, erudition, and eloquence, left many monuments of his illustrious genius upon the sacred letters, written in the Latin tongue and most flourishingly adorned with elegant words and pointed sentences; of which Gennadius reviewed a little work, *On various and obscure chapters of divine Scripture, to Salonius and Veranius (brothers, and afterward Bishops)*, divided into two little books. To which Isidore added, on Genesis, and on the books of Kings — [dedicated] to the same Salonius and Veranius, now bishops — a prolix and most learned volume. For which works, indeed, there came out formerly from the Froben press, and lately from the Roman printing-house of Paulus Manutius, under Eucherius's name: on Genesis, three books of a discontinuous and interrupted exposition of commentaries; on the four books of Kings, four books of an explanation of the same kind; and one book of Spiritual Formulae, useful for understanding the holy scriptures.

Although I confess these to be learned and most worthy to be read, yet I would not dare to affirm that they are Eucherius's, but rather of some uncertain and more recent compiler, who gathered the work here and there, after the manner of centos, out of the sayings of the Latin fathers — especially from whole sentences of Gregory, Isidore, Bede, and other authors, whom Eucherius preceded by almost two hundred years. For he lived — as he testifies in the epistle to Valerianus — contemporary with Petronius, bishop of Bologna, in the year from the founding of the City 1185, that is, in the year 427 from the redemption of the world.

But if, in so great a crowd of writers, one may divine who heaped this medley of explanations into a pile, I suspect that he was an Englishman, and perhaps even Bede himself, whose especial zeal it was to gather collectanea out of the writings of the ancient teachers — but most of all of Gregory the Pope, whose name is found cited more than once in this work; as, for example, in the first book of the exposition on the book of Kings, toward whose end the reader is referred to the reading of the Morals of Blessed Pope Gregory; and in the third volume of the same explanation, at the twenty-second chapter — in which place, indeed, the author in a way hints that he lived in Britain not long after the times of Gregory, writing thus: *In our recent times, Blessed Pope Gregory, strengthened with evangelical eloquence, ruled the Roman church; and the most reverend fathers Augustine, Paulinus, and the rest of their companions, at his bidding, came into Britain, etc.* To this conjecture another is added: that a great part of those things which are contained in these commentaries on Kings is read in the same words in the volume of Bede's Questions upon the books of Kings. I could also, for the surer confirmation of this our judgment, subjoin here an index of the innumerable passages which — both in these [commentaries] of the Spiritual Formulae, and in the commentaries on Genesis and Kings — have been transferred out of Bede and Gregory: but these, consulting brevity, I pass over, thinking I have done enough if I have pointed out to my readers that these things are so.

Eucherius also published, upon various passages of divine scripture, most celebrated sermons; from which the most learned man Claudianus [Mamertus], bishop of Vienne, his contemporary, taking testimony in his books *On the State of the Soul*, briefly embraced his praise in these words: *By no means would I pass over Eucherius, known to me now living by his doctrine and by present disputations face to face — [a man] who, namely, of green age yet mature in mind, spurning the earth, longing for heaven, humble in spirit, ardent in merit, and likewise most subtle of genius, full of knowledge, flowing in eloquence, by far the greatest of the great Pontiffs of his age, having published, for the benefit of the fai[th] [→ p246]*

[→ p246: "-dei…" — completing *fidei*, "of the faith"]

[1] Evagrius was the first who committed to writing the lives of the holy Fathers.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 246 [printed folio 227]. Book IV, letter E: the close of the praise of **Eucherius**; the Empress **Eudocia** (her Homeric cento of Scripture, and the legend of the apple and Paulinus); **Eulalius** of Cynopolis*

(his prose-verse Song of Songs); and the opening of the great entry on ***Eusebius of Caesarea*** *— his intimacy with Pamphilus, Constantine's praise of him, Sixtus's defense of his orthodoxy against the charge of Arianism (the confusion with Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the Nicene "Homoousios" controversy with Eustathius of Antioch), and the beginning of the catalog of his works. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter E, continued from p245:]

...of the faith, many continuous volumes of various works; and he also preached to the people many noble sermons upon the state of the soul.

Eudocia, a most illustrious woman, daughter of Leo [Leontius] the Athenian philosopher,[1] wife of Theodosius the Younger Augustus, notable for the exceptional endowments of body and mind, a perpetual cultivator of the Christian religion, zealous of the sacred volumes, and, in the glory of the poetic art, foremost among all the poets of her time, gathered — briefly and summarily, in imitation of Proba, that illustrious woman — out of the Greek verses of Homer, with admirable industry, very many histories of the Old and New Testament, preserving the measure of the feet and the majesty of the Homeric verse: which work, reduced into a compendium, she entitled Ὁμηρόκεντρα, that is, HOMEROCENTONES [Homeric centos].

Yet John Zonaras, a Greek author, asserts that a certain learned patrician man first compiled this work, and afterward left it imperfect and undigested; but that Eudocia at last completed it and reduced it into order — as the Greek inscription, prefixed to the work in heroic verses, declares.

The same author also relates that Eudocia, when at first — on account of her singular chastity and excellent beauty — she was most dear to her husband, fell innocently into his bitter hatred for such a cause as this. An apple, offered to him of unusual size, the Emperor, wondering at it, sent to his wife; she gave it to Paulinus, a learned man, and for that reason familiar to her. He, ignorant of the matter, offers it to the Emperor as a marvelous thing; whereupon he, having recognized it and hidden it, asks his wife where the apple sent to her may be. She, fearing lest her husband suspect that which he already suspected, answered that she had eaten it. But when he pressed more sharply, she affirms with an oath that she had already eaten it. Then the Emperor, moved with anger, produces the apple: thus she, caught in a manifest lie, the husband's suspicion is confirmed. But Paulinus, though innocent, is put to death. Eudocia, when she perceived that she was hated, asks leave to depart to Jerusalem. Having set out thither with great wealth, she both built churches and gave much to the monasteries of the poor of that place. Returning thence after her husband's death, she went back there again; and there she died, not without a great reputation for sanctity, in the reign of Marcian Augustus, in the year of our salvation 460.

St. Jerome, in a certain epistle to Paulinus, writes that he had read Homerocentones and Virgiliocentones, but whose, he does not himself indicate. Isidore of Seville reports that a certain Pomponius, a noble poet, with a like zeal, put together many things out of Virgilian verses. Aldus Manutius printed a very ancient volume of Ὁμηρόκεντρα, without the author's name: whose beginning is Κέκλυτε μυρία φῦλα περικτιόνων ἀνθρώπων, that is, *Hear, ye countless tribes of the men dwelling round about.*

Eulalius, bishop of Cynopolis, a man nobly learned in the sacred eloquences, and — according to the interpretation of his name — speaking excellently, no less excelling in prose than in verse, wrote on the Song of Songs a prose-verse exposition — that is, composed with verses mingled with loose [prose] speech — whose beginning is:

Ὃς μόνος εἰς αἰῶνα καὶ ἐξ αἰῶνος ἐτέχθης, Χριστέ,

that is, *O Christ, who alone both ever art and ever hast been.* He flourished in the Council of Constantinople, in the year of the Lord 670.

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine (which was formerly called the Tower of Strato), surnamed Pamphilus himself, on account of his most close intimacy with Pamphilus the martyr; a disciple of Dorotheus

the Eunuch, a most learned man; and, together with Pamphilus, a most diligent investigator of the divine Library; so illustrious among all the bishops of his age for his skill in the secular disciplines and his exercise in the divine Letters, that he deserved to be celebrated by the most noble elogium of the Emperor Constantine.[2] For he was often accustomed to say of him: that Eusebius was happy, who was worthy of the Episcopate not of one city, but of almost the whole world.

Yet there were not lacking those who wrote that he was an asserter of the Arian heresy and a corrupter of the Nicene synod — whether deceived by the similarity of the name and dignity, which he had in common with [the other] Eusebius, bishop first of Berytus in Palestine, and afterward of Nicomedia in Bithynia, the standard-bearer of the Arians; or led to believe it because Eusebius of Caesarea, in the Council of Nicaea, was unwilling to assent to the word Ὁμοούσιος [Homoousios, "consubstantial"] proposed [by the fathers], except after a long inquiry and examination of the term. Which was done by him not maliciously, but rather out of a sincere zeal for piety. For since many of the bishops wished the word Homoousios to be received, as excluding the multitude of gods which Arius had introduced, but very many bishops sharply turned away from that same word, as introducing the dogma of Sabellius (who held that there was one person of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) — and since, on account of this diversity of opinions, Eusebius long hesitated to which party he should join himself: Eustathius, bishop of Antioch (who afterward, being accused by Cyrus, bishop of Beroea, was deposed), tore him with revilings as though a favorer of Arius and a defiler of the Nicene faith. Eusebius, on the contrary, [maintained] that he neither favored Arius nor corrupted the Nicene faith, but that Eustathius was introducing the perfidy of Sabellius. At last, when it had been declared by the fathers that by this word Homoousios the distinction of the persons — which were of the same nature and essence — was not taken away, he subscribed to the decree of the Homoousians, and, by the command of the fathers, drew up the Symbol of the Nicene faith, which is now chanted in the Church; and, since he was most zealous of the divine Books, he composed many volumes toward their elucidation, following in these Origen, whose admirer and diligent imitator he was. Of these, the ones which pertain to the understanding of the whole divine scripture are these:

A translation into the Greek language of all the books of the Old Testament which are in the Canon of the Hebrews: which Socrates mentions in book 1 of his History, and Sozomen in book 2.

On Hebrew Places, one book: in which he gathered together the names of all the mountains, forests, rivers, cities, towns, villages, and other places named in the sacred Letters, and arranged them according to the order of the letters [alphabetically], [→ p247]

[→ p247: "posuit…" — completing *disposuit*, "arranged"]

[1] Eudocia the Empress was the daughter of Leo [Leontius] the Athenian philosopher. [2] Constantine the Great praised Eusebius.

(Rich PDF p. 247 [printed folio 228]. Book IV, letter E: the catalog of the works of ***Eusebius of Caesarea*** *— the Onomasticon/Topography of the Holy Land, the* Eclogae, *the Psalter commentary (edited by Eusebius of Vercelli), the Isaiah commentary (with Jerome's two critical notices), the thirty books against Porphyry defending Daniel, the* Praeparatio *and* Demonstratio Evangelica, *the* Gospel Discrepancies, *the* Evangelical Canons *to Carpianus, and the Corinthians commentary — his floruit c. 320; then the opening of* ***Eusebius of Emesa*** *(the Philosopher). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter E, continued from p246:]

...[arranged], and expounded. Which work, ill translated by an unskilled interpreter, Jerome made into Latin again, cutting out some things which he judged not sufficiently worthy of memory, and adding a preface to the work, which begins, *Eusebius, who by blessed Pamphilus...*

Of the Topography of the Holy Land [ΤΟΠΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ τῆς ἁγίας γῆς], that is, *A Description of the Places of the Holy Land*, one book: in which he depicted, in a geographical map, the division of the twelve tribes with their several towns, and the whole structure of the city of Jerusalem and of its Temple, with a brief explanation added, which set forth the several parts of the whole picture. Jerome mentions this work in the aforesaid preface.

On the Doctrine of the Ancient Men, one book: in which he interpreted innumerable things concerning the life, fortitude, piety, and prudence of the ancient Patriarchs — partly historically, partly allegorically, and tropologically. He himself mentions this work in the seventh book of the *Preparation of the Gospel*, chapter 3.

Of *Eclogae* [Selections], or *Collectanea of divine Scripture*, one book: in which, at the command of Constantine Augustus (who supplied all the costs), he gathered out of the sacred letters especially those passages and sentences which he thought most suited to the edification and use of the Church, and had them multiplied in fifty copies, of the best parchments, by craftsmen skilled in most elegant writing. Theodoret makes mention of these codices in book 1 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 16; and Eusebius himself in book 4 of the Life of Constantine.

On the whole *Psalter*, most learned commentaries according to the literal and mystical understanding, and especially the meanings of Origen: which Eusebius Sardus [the Sardinian], bishop of Vercelli, having cut out some things which seemed insufficiently sound, presented in Latin for the Western Church to read.

On *Isaiah the prophet*, books of commentaries according to the historical explanation — as Jerome notes in the preface to his first commentary on Isaiah — fifteen; or, as the same reckons in the book On Illustrious Men, twenty books. Concerning which the same Jerome, in the preface to the fifth commentary on Isaiah, says: *Eusebius, promising by his title a historical exposition, sometimes forgets his purpose, and cuts down the allegorical sowings of Origen*; and again, in chapter 18 of the same commentary, he adds these words: *Eusebius, promising by his title a historical interpretation, wanders off into various senses: when I read his books, I found something far other than what he promised in his index. For wherever the history failed him, he passed over to allegory; and so he joins together things separate, that I marvel at him — joining, by a new fabric of speech, stone and iron into one body.*

On both *Testaments, assailed by Porphyry in fifteen books, thirty volumes*: out of which he wrote three books — namely the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth — for the defense of the whole prophecy of Daniel; against which Porphyry had dictated his twelfth, of the fifteen books which he had put forth against the divine scriptures. Jerome [mentions this] in the preface to his commentary on Daniel.

Of the *Evangelical Preparation*, fifteen books: in which, although he brings no exposition of the divine volumes, yet he instructs and forms the Gentiles who were to read the evangelical writings, as it were with certain first rudiments.

Of the *Evangelical Demonstration*, twenty books: in which, chiefly for the sake of the Jews, he demonstrated that nothing is written in the gospel which was not, in the law and the prophets, foretold many ages before. On which occasion he clearly expounds all the scriptures which, in the whole Old Testament, speak of Christ.

Περὶ τῆς τῶν εὐαγγελίων διαφωνίας, that is, *On the Dissonance of the Gospels*, one book: in which he brought all the passages of the Gospels which seem to conflict in appearance to a stable concord. A fragment of this work — *On the controversy over the time of the Lord's resurrection, between Matthew and Mark* — Ambrose of Milan, a monk of Cassino, lately translated into Latin.

Of the *Evangelical Canons*, one book:[1] in which, provoked by the zeal of Ammonius of Alexandria (who had gathered one [gospel] out of the four gospels), he wrote — of a like subject, but by a different method — to Carpianus, ten Canons, for knowing wherein the Evangelists have said either things similar among

themselves, or each severally his own proper things. Which work Jerome made into Latin. Its beginning is, *Eusebius to Carpianus his brother.*

On the *first Epistle to the Corinthians, commentaries*: which Jerome mentions in the epistle to Pammachius, which begins, *Of Christian modesty.*

He flourished under Constantine the Great and Constantius, about the year of the Lord 320. His life was committed to writing by Acacius, his successor in the episcopate, and by Eusebius, bishop of Emesa. And Socrates, in book 2 of his History, wove an apology for his doctrine out of his own works.

Eusebius, bishop of Emesa, surnamed the Philosopher, sprung of noble parents at Edessa in Mesopotamia, and from his youth imbued with the sacred letters, then instructed also in the Greek disciplines at Edessa, afterward withdrew to Antioch, to Euphronius, bishop of the same city: by whom, when he was being urged to the priesthood, he fled to Alexandria, and there learned philosophy. Returning thence to Antioch, he remained with Placitus [Flacillus] the bishop, the successor of Euphronius, until, by Eusebius bishop of Constantinople, he was ordained bishop of Alexandria in the place of Athanasius, still living and in exile; which dignity, when he had refused it (fearing the hatred of the Alexandrians, by whom Athanasius was singularly loved), he was sent to the bishopric of the Emesenes. And when they disagreed at his ordination, accusing him that he had practiced mathematics [astrology], he took to flight, and went off to Laodicea, to Gregory, the bishop of that city: who restored him at Antioch, and again had him conducted to Emesa by Placitus and Narcissus. There, being again accused that he held with Sabellius, a little after he was restored as innocent; but at last, when the Emperor Constantine [read Constantius] set out against the barbarians, he was taken along, and there, among the Persians, miracles were done by his hands.

[→ p248: "Is…" — This man…]

[1] You have the method of these Canons, and an example, above in Book 3.

(Rich PDF p. 248 [printed folio 229]. Book IV, letter E: the close of ***Eusebius of Emesa*** *(his Genesis commentaries, the "Sabech" note, and death under Constantius, 350);* ***Eusebius of Vercelli*** *(the anecdote of his outwitting the Arian subscription, and his Latin Psalter from Eusebius of Caesarea);* ***Eustathius of Antioch****;* ***Euthalius the Deacon*** *(his Pauline compendium);* ***Euthalius of Rhodes*** *(a Greek concordance); and* ***Euthymius Zigabenus*** *(his catena of the Fathers, whom Philip Sauli first Latined) — with the roster of the twenty-four Fathers used in the Vatican Pentateuch-catena. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter E, continued from p247:]

This man, therefore, when he had diligently and accurately searched the divine Books — with Eusebius of Caesarea and Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, as his guides — published many commentaries upon them according to the sense of the letter, but especially on Genesis; in which he discussed not only the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, but also the Syriac edition. There still survive, in the Greek Catena, fragments of these commentaries, of which Jerome also makes mention in the *Hebrew Questions*, censuring their author because, in expounding that [text] from the 22nd chapter of Genesis, *There was a ram in the thicket Sabech* [Gen 22:13], he interpreted by "Sabech" the he-goat, which, with horns erect, is raised aloft to crop the foliage.

He wrote also, on the Epistle to the Galatians, ten books of commentaries, and on the Gospels homilies — brief indeed, but very many. His style, so far as we can conjecture from the fragments which survive in the Catenae of the Greek explanations, and in the Dialogues of Theodoret, displays the same elegance which Jerome attributes to him, writing thus in the book On Illustrious Men: *Eusebius, bishop of Emesa, of an elegant and rhetorical genius, composed innumerable books, and such as pertain to the applause of the people; and, having followed rather the history, he is most zealously read by those who wish to declaim.*

There came out in recent years, under the name of Eusebius of Emesa, Homilies on the Gospels of the whole year, printed at Paris: yet it appears that these are rhapsodies, [made] by a Latin writer and patched together out of the Latin fathers. The style smacks either of Bede, or of Rabanus [Maurus], or of some other not unlike them both. He dies under Constantius Augustus, buried at Antioch, in the year of the Lord 350.

Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, a Sardinian by nation, formerly a lector of the city of Rome. When he wished to free his son Dionysius (who afterward was illustrious by martyrdom) from the hands of the Arians — who had so deceived his simplicity that they even retained the pledge of his subscription — he feigned himself to be an Arian. And when they demanded from him a written bond, as it were a hostage of his faith, he, having received the book in which the names of the Arians were written, promptly ascribed his own name; and, immediately turning to them, said that this pleased him which pleased them, but that he was gravely moved because they had set his son Dionysius before himself in the subscribing. "For you," he said, "who say that the Son of God cannot be equal to God the Father, why have you preferred [my] son to me?" Moved by which reasoning, they immediately erased Dionysius's autograph, granting the prior place of subscription to Eusebius. But he, chiding and mocking them, said: "Neither do I pollute myself with your crimes, nor do I permit my son to share [them] with you." And saying this, at the same time he drew his son away by the hand and led him off with him.

For which cause he was banished by the Emperor Constantius, a favorer of the Arians, to Scythopolis, and thence to Cappadocia; and at last, under the Emperor Julian, he returned to his own Church: and there he published commentaries on the whole Psalter, which he gathered from the commentaries of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (translated by himself into Latin), passing over many things which seemed to incline to the Arian heresy. He died under Valens and Valentinian, the Augusti, crowned with martyrdom, in the year of the Lord 380. St. Ambrose wrote his encomium in two sermons.

Eustachius, or **Eustathius**, bishop of Antioch, illustrious in the great Nicene synod, who fought vehemently against Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, for the word Homoousios, and, being accused by Cyrus, bishop of Beroea, was a little after deposed from the episcopate; he wrote most learned commentaries on the Psalter, out of which Theodoret, in the dialogues *Immutable* and *Impassible*, cites testimonies against the heretics from the exposition of Psalm 15 and 92. He wrote also, on that [text] from the 8th chapter of Proverbs, *The Lord possessed me, etc.* [Prov 8:22], one book, cited by Theodoret in the aforesaid dialogues. He flourished in the year of the Lord 340.

Euthalius, a deacon of an uncertain church, Greek by nation, a pious and learned man, described in the Greek tongue a very brief compendium: in which he most strictly compressed the life and martyrdom, and especially the journeying of Paul, and the places and cities which that most illustrious Apostle of Christ traversed. Which is most conducive to the understanding of the book of the Acts of the Apostles. The work begins, *Paul the Apostle.*

Euthalius of Rhodes, a monk of St. Basil, compiled in the Greek tongue a work of Concordances of the whole Bible, in imitation of Hugh [of St. Cher, "Eugo Carensis"], in the year of the Lord 1300.

Euthymius Zigabenus, a monk of St. Basil, a diligent expositor of the scriptures, gathered — out of the writings of the ancient Fathers, and especially of Chrysostom, whom he often cites by name — elegant, succinct, and openly learned Commentaries: in which, according to the various editions, he followed the fourfold sense, and among these especially the literal, the most difficult of all. The beginning of the work is [in Greek], that is, *The author of this present book, indeed...* These commentaries the excellent and most learned man Philip Sauli, bishop of Brugnato, first of all made into Latin.

He is also believed to be the author of the Greek Catena which, written, is kept in the Vatican library: in which, from the sayings of the holy Greek fathers arranged alternately, the five books of Moses are most fully explained. By whose help Aloysius [Luigi] Lippomano, bishop of Verona, made use [of it] in the text of

his own Catena on Genesis and Exodus. And the names of the Authors, from whose sentences the work was collected, are these:

Philo Judaeus, Origen, Hippolytus, Basil, Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen], Eusebius of Emesa, Isidore of Pelusium, Eustathius, Gennadius, Theophilus, Serapion, Diodorus Charterius [of Tarsus]; Apollinaris, Acacius, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyril, Severian, Ephrem, Gregory of Nyssa, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, [and] Philo the bishop [of Carpasia].

The beginning of the [catena] work is: Θεοδωρήτου εἰς τὰ ἄπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς, that is, *Theodoret, on the difficulties [ambiguous places] of the divi[ne scripture]* [→ p249]

[→ p249: "diui…" — completing *divinae*, "of the divine [scripture]"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 249 [printed folio 230]. Book IV: the close of **Euthymius Zigabenus** (Alexius, 1180; his Pauline commentary Latined by John Henten) and **Ezekiel the Tragedian** (the Greek drama Ἐξαγωγή, cited by Clement). Then letter **F** opens: **Flavian of Constantinople** (who excommunicated Eutyches), **Felix of Prato**, **Fortunatianus of Aquileia** (who broke Pope Liberius), **Francis Bonade**, **Francis Foreiro** (the Trent censor, whose Vulgate-confirming work Sixtus calls a "Cornucopia"), **Francis Giorgio** (the* De harmonia mundi*), **Francis Gothus** (a metrical Bible-compendium), **Francis Maronis of Meyronnes**, **Francis of Osuna**, **Francis Ortiz**, and the opening of **Petrarch** — with two entries (Feuardent, Lucas of Bruges) flagged below as later-edition insertions. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter E, continued from p248:]

...*of the divine scripture.* He flourished under Alexius the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1180.

The commentaries of Euthymius on the Epistles of St. Paul, John Henten of Nechlin [Hentenius] turned into the Latin tongue — who from a Hieronymite became a Dominican. The same Euthymius wrote on the Evangelists and on all the Psalms.

Ezekiel, a poet of Jewish tragedies, wrote a dramatic work in Greek verses, entitled Ἐξαγωγή, that is, THE LEADING-OUT: in which he elegantly sang the upbringing of Moses, and the leading-out of the people from Egypt accomplished by his power. Clement of Alexandria mentions this work in the first [book] of the Stromata, citing from it nearly fifty verses. He flourished in the year 40 before Christ.

F

Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, to whom blessed Pope Leo wrote many epistles, a man indeed learned, and a strenuous champion of catholic truth, who excommunicated Eutyches — a presbyter and archimandrite, holding impiously concerning the humanity of Christ — and suffered many injuries from the heretics; he wrote in the Greek tongue commentaries on the Gospel of John, whose authority is cited by Theodore, a Greek monk, in the book whose title is, *That the Father always begets, and the Son indeed is always begotten.* He wrote also, on various passages of the Gospels, very many homilies, some of which are cited by Theodoret in the *Polymorphus* [the Multiform]. He flourished under Marcian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 454.

Felix (or, as others write, Felix), a Tuscan by nation, of Prato by fatherland [Felix Pratensis], of the Order of Preachers, notable for his study and solid erudition of the three tongues, translated the Psalter from the Hebrew truth into Latin in the year of the Lord 1520. Matthew Aurogallus mentions this translation in his book On Hebrew Names.

Fortunatianus, an African by nation, bishop of Aquileia, whom Jerome reckons in the catalogue of illustrious men, in the reign of Constantine [read Constantius] wrote — with the titles arranged — brief commentaries on the Gospels, in a rustic style; and in this he is held detestable, that he was the first to solicit Liberius, bishop of the city of Rome, as he was going into exile for the faith, and broke him, and compelled him to the subscription of heresy, in the year of the Lord 330.

Francis Bonade [Bonadus], a presbyter of Angély [Angeria], of Saintes, an Aquitanian, expounded the Psalter in an elegiac paraphrase. Pursuing also the epistles of Paul with a like zeal, he thus began: *Paul, by the love of Christ, the holy Apostle of the fostering world.*

[Later-edition addition — not in Sixtus's 1566/1586 text: Francis Feuardent's commentary on Ruth appeared in 1582, after Sixtus's death (1569).] **Francis Feuardent** [Feuardentius], of the Order of Minors, a Parisian Theologian, wrote a Commentary on the book of Ruth.

Francis Foreiro [Forerius], of the Order of Preachers, a Portuguese by nation, of Lisbon by fatherland, a Theologian and philosopher, notable for the highest erudition, preacher to the king of Portugal, most skilled in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew tongues, and plainly worthy — whom, on account of his manifold knowledge of all things, the sacrosanct Council of Trent, together with very many most learned men, chose for the review of the whole Christian library. He translated again, word for word, out of the Hebrew truth the books of Job, of David, of Solomon, and of all the prophets, with this aim: that he might confirm the authority of the Vulgate edition, and show that its author had most aptly expressed sense from sense. Then indeed he explained the same books with most lucid commentaries: in which, opening the true and genuine sense of the letter, he unfolds with the highest zeal and most exact diligence the several particles, words, and vowel-points of the Hebrew scripture, and so elucidated the peculiar idioms of the holy tongue, and so illustrated the most obscure passages of the prophets, that no work in this kind of writing has ever come to light which could more justly be called a Cornucopia [Horn of Plenty]. He still lives, up to the year of human salvation 1566, celebrated for doctrine and integrity of morals, and perseveres day and night in the holy explanation of the divine volumes.

Francis Giorgio [Georgius], a Venetian, of the Order of Minors of the regular observance, whose notable work *On the Harmony of the World* is extant — a man devoted to Platonic philosophy, most zealous of the sacred letters, and imbued with the various reading of many Authors — published, on certain more select Places of the whole divine Scripture, eight books of *Problems*, learned indeed, but, on account of certain Platonic and Talmudic opinions with which they are here and there besprinkled, worthy of grave and diligent censure. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1510.

Francis Gothus [the Goth], of the Order of Minors, professor of Theology, compiled a Biblical compendium, touching each chapter of the divine books with four iambic dimeters apiece, the measure of feet and syllables being nevertheless neglected: which thus begins —

GENESIS, CHAPTER 1.

Before aught is made, light is brought forth;

Dividing the waters, He gathers them;

Adornment is added by [His] deeds;

Adam brought forth, He subjects [all to him].

[Later-edition addition — not in Sixtus's 1566/1586 text: Francis Lucas of Bruges published his Notationes in sacra Biblia *in 1580, after Sixtus's death.]* **Francis Lucas of Bruges** [Lucas Brugensis], Licentiate of Sacred Theology, wrote annotations on the sacred Bible.

Francis Maronis [of Meyronnes], a Minorite, a disciple of John Duns Scotus, most excellent in scholastic erudition, and in the divine scriptures most illustrious in his time, among the other works of his doctrine published Postils of annotations on the whole sacred Scripture, worthy of memory. He flourished under Louis IV the Bavarian, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1320.

Francis of Osuna [ab Obsunna], a Baetican [Andalusian], of the Order of Minors, wrote upon *Missus est* [the Annunciation, Luke 1:26] one book, and sermons on the gospels of the whole year. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

Francis Ortiz [Ortizius], of the Order of Minors, a Spaniard, wrote a most praised exposition of the fiftieth Psalm, in the year of the Lord 1540.

Francis Petrarch [Petrarcha], a Tuscan by nation, a man most learned on every side, the first restorer of the Latin tongue (already for many ages extinct),[1] the father of Tuscan poetry, and without any controversy its chief; among the Latins too [→ p250]

[→ p250: "quoque…"]

[1] Petrarch was the restorer of the Latin tongue.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 250 [printed folio 231]. Book IV, letter F: the close of **Petrarch** (his penitential-Psalm paraphrases; †1374), then a run of **Francises** — **Puteanus** (a Golden Chain on the psalms), **Miletanus**, **Ruiz** (334 exegetical rules), **Titelmans** of Hasselt (paraphrases on much of Scripture; †a Capuchin), **Toledo** the Jesuit (whose lectures Sixtus attended at Rome — his works flagged below as a later-edition insertion), **Visdomini** of Ferrara (the stammerer who became a second Demosthenes and revived patristic preaching among the Italians; still living 1566, aged 56), and **Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros** (the Complutensian Polyglot dedicated to Leo X, with the description of its layout). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter F, continued from p249:]

...among the Latin poets too a not ignoble one, and, for the excellence of his Latin verse, on the Roman Capitol he obtained the laurel crown by the public favor of all Italy: among many other monuments of his most noble genius, he left on the seven penitential Psalms very brief paraphrases, most aptly composed after the manner of prayers, whose beginning is, *Lord God, Father of mercies.* He dies under Charles IV, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1374.

Francis Puteanus [del Pozzo], the thirty-third Prior of the Charterhouse, a most excellent doctor of both laws, and exercised in the sacred Scriptures, composed — in imitation of St. Thomas Aquinas — a Golden Chain [Aurea Catena] upon the psalms: in which he gathered, with the greatest diligence and marvelous art, the explanations of the fathers of the Latin church on the Psalter, with their names also added. The beginning of the work is, *Lyra. This psalm is composed.* He flourished under Charles V Augustus, in the year of the Lord 1534.

Francis Miletanus, professor of Theology, wrote a commentary on Psalm 18, beginning *Of this psalm*, in the year of the Lord 1500.

Francis Ruiz [Ruizius], a Spaniard, from Valladolid [Vallis Oletana], of the Benedictine order, Abbot of San Facundo [Sahagún], gathered 334 rules — which contribute very much to the understanding of the whole divine scripture — out of all the fathers, both Greek and Latin, the sentences and words of those fathers being nothing changed; and he illustrated them with brief explanations, culled here and there out of the same fathers, in the year of the Lord 1546.

Francis Titelmans of Hasselt [Hassellensis], the illustrious moderator of the Academy of the philosophers at Louvain, having left the world, betook himself to the institute of St. Francis: in which, assiduously attending

to the divine Scriptures, he elaborated very many most pious and most learned treatises on the divine scriptures — of which there are extant, in paraphrastic form, elucidations on Job, on the Psalter, on the Canticles, on Matthew, on John, on all the epistles of Paul, and on all the Catholic epistles, together with Annotations on the more difficult passages of those books annexed. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530. He died a Capuchin.

[Later-edition addition — not in Sixtus's 1566 text: this entry describes works and events after Sixtus's death (1569) — Toledo's John commentary (1588), his more than twenty years as papal preacher (to c. 1590), and Pius V named "of good memory" (Pius V died 1572).] **Francis Toledo** [Toletus] of Cordoba, of the Society of Jesus, a most noble Theologian; after he had, for many years and with great praise, taught Philosophy and Theology in the Roman College of the same Society, being chosen by Pius V of good memory, Supreme Pontiff, for the office of preacher in the pontifical palace, he bore this burden for more than twenty years with great fruit to his hearers: he published most excellent commentaries on the Gospel of John, and, as we hope, will shortly publish many other things. At Rome I gave him my attention for some years in Scholastic Theology.

Francis Visdomini [Visdominus] of Ferrara, of the Order of Minors, moderator of the most celebrated Academy of Bologna among the Franciscans, a man of most upright life, of sublime genius, of the highest erudition and eloquence, a declaimer of sacred sermons famous throughout all Italy, and, like a second Demosthenes, made a most excellent orator against and quite in spite of nature. For, since his tongue and voice were so interrupted by a certain natural and perpetual impediment, and stopped him as he spoke, that in private conversations he was compelled, gasping, to repeat over and over the first syllables of words — yet nevertheless he tames and overcomes the malignity of his reluctant nature by the strongest vigor of his lungs and by the most powerful effort of all his spirits, so that it is a miracle how a man (stammering in tongue, and in familiar meeting scarcely uttering words in a lowered voice) could, in public declamations, speak with a most ready voice and a most fluent tongue, most exactly and most gracefully; and — what is more marvelous — run on, in a most rapid course of speech, from the exordium to the end of the sermon with an unfaltering tongue, always with the same impetus of action and ardor of spirit, and always with the same greatness and strength of voice, snatching and rolling along with him the minds of his hearers, like a most rapid torrent swollen with the winter snows.

This man, therefore, was the first among the Italians to recall to light that ancient manner of preaching, once used in the Church of God by Basil the Great, Gregory the Great, and Chrysostom, and the rest of the most eloquent fathers, and afterward for many ages extinct: having published, in the Latin and Tuscan tongue, on almost all the books of divine scripture, sermons most learned and most eloquent, according to the literal and tropological understanding. He flourished under Charles V Augustus, in the Council of Trent, illustrious for many disputations against the heretics: and he still lives at Rome, up to the present year 1566, daily declaiming, reading, and writing, with the greatest fruit and admiration of the Roman people, being fifty-six years old.

Francis Ximénez, of Cisneros [Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros], a Spaniard by nation, of the Order of Minors, cardinal-presbyter of the Holy Roman Church of the title of St. Balbina, Archbishop of Toledo, Arch-chancellor of the Spains, published — dedicated to Pope Leo X — the whole Old and New Testament in manifold tongues, that is, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin, printed at immense cost, labor, and vigils, with the greatest diligence, by the University of Alcalá [Complutum] in Spain — men most learned in the knowledge of the tongues having been summoned to this work from every part of the world, and the most corrected and most ancient copies procured (taken from the Vatican and Medicean libraries, or transmitted by the senate of the Venetians, or sought out from elsewhere), no reckoning being had of costs or labors. The arrangement of this so great work is as follows:

The Pentateuch has a threefold edition, namely the Hebrew, the Chaldaic, and the Greek of the LXX interpreters. To which are joined three Latin editions, namely: the Latin of Jerome, answering to the Hebrew truth; another Latin answers to the Chaldaic, word for word, elaborated by men most skilled in that tongue; and to the Greek of the LXX interpreters corresponds an interlinear Latin translation. The Hagiographa and the prophetic books were printed in a double tongue, Hebrew and Greek, with two other Latin translations corresponding to them. But the Chaldaic was rightly omitted, because in the other books — except in the Pentateuch — it is corrupted in some places, and [full] of mere fables and Thal[mudic matter] [→ p251]

[→ p251: "Thal…" — completing *Thalmudicis*, "Talmudic [matters]"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 251 [printed folio 232]. Book IV, letter F: the close of **Cisneros**'s Complutensian Polyglot (the accentless Greek New Testament, the guiding apex-marks, the trilingual dictionary; Cisneros fl. 1510 under Maximilian); **Francis of Zamora**, **Francis Zichem** (the Seven Words from the Cross), **Friedrich Nausea** of Vienna (the Decalogue and Tobit), **Friedrich the Venetian**, and **Fulgentius of Ruspe** (†500 under the Vandal persecution). Then letter **G** opens: **Gabriel Bruno** (a biblical index later abused by Pellican and Estienne), **Gabriel Brebia** of Milan, **Geoffrey of Clairvaux**, **Walter Disse**, **Walter of Maguelone**, and **Geoffrey of Auxerre** (Abelard's hearer turned Bernard's disciple). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter F, continued from p250:]

...the trifles of the Talmudists, and altogether unworthy to be inserted among the sacred codices. But the books which are outside the canon of the Hebrews, which the church reads for edification, have only the Greek text, but with a double translation — namely, that of Jerome, and another, interlinear, word for word.

But the New Testament has the Greek text with Jerome's version, written only in bare letters, without any marks of tones [accents] or breathings, in imitation of the most ancient Greeks:[1] whom the most ancient poems of Callimachus and the Sibylline verses, and the most ancient fragments of marbles [inscriptions], show to have written without these accents and apices of the letters. For, since the whole New Testament was written in Greek, the author wished to retain in it the ancient antiquity and majesty of that tongue untouched, and to publish it after the image of the ancient scriptures: lest to the authority of so holy a thing, and to its venerable majesty, any detriment should seem to be brought by added and novel matters. But, lest any doubt should be able to occur to anyone — namely, on which syllable the accent ought to be placed — he added only a simple apex in the polysyllabic words; and this indeed not as a Greek accent, but as a little note and sign, by which the reader might be guided, lest he should sometimes slip in the pronunciation or modulation of the words.

He added, in the last place, at the end of the whole work, a most copious dictionary of Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek words: in which not only are contained the simple interpretations of words, both primitive and derivative; but — what was the most laborious thing of all — there is continuously subjoined, with very many concordances added, in how many places in the Old Testament each Hebrew word, on account of the fecundity of that tongue, multiplies its significations.

These most noble copies, which are commonly called the Complutensian, were completed under Leo X, Supreme Pontiff, and published throughout the whole Christian world with the highest praise: and from their authority many codices afterward — both Hebrew and Greek and Latin — were restored to soundness. He [Cisneros] flourished under Maximilian the Emperor, in the year of our salvation 1510.

Francis of Zamora, a Spaniard, Minister General of the whole Order of Minors, wrote on each verse of Psalm 50 one apiece of most beautiful homilies, 25 in number.

Francis Zichem [Zichenius], a Franciscan, Guardian of the monastery at Mechelen, wrote on the seven words which Christ uttered from the cross a brief and pious explanation, delivered as a sermon. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1556.

Friedrich Nausea [Blancicampianus], bishop of Vienna in Austria, an excellent doctor of sacred Theology and of both laws, preacher and counselor of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, wrote on the 20th chapter of Exodus, concerning the Decalogue, one book; also on Tobit two books of commentaries — brief, elegant, and exceedingly useful for the instruction of morals — the first of which begins, *Who [dwells] not in houses in one part.* Likewise he composed a paraphrase on Matthew and John, and homilies on the Gospels of the whole year. He flourished under Charles V, in the year of the Lord 1540.

Friedrich the Venetian [Fridericus Venetus] gave commentaries on the Apocalypse, written in the Italian tongue, in the year of the Lord 1500.

Fulgentius of Ruspe, a bishop in Africa, of Carthage by fatherland, an emulator of the erudition and style of Augustine, wrote on various Places of divine Scripture a notable volume of sermons, of which two are found in the Homiliary of Albinus [Alcuin]. He dies on the island of Circina [Kerkennah], worn out with many cares, in the year of the Lord 500, in the times of the Emperor Anastasius — having previously endured exile, and many other most grievous hardships, from the Vandals, who upheld the heresy of the Arians.

G

Gabriel Bruno [Brunus], a Venetian, professor of the Franciscan family, minister of the province of the Holy Land, arranged an Alphabetical Table out of the several books and chapters of both the New and the Old Testament: in which, with the greatest care and diligence, he indicated in what book and chapter all the histories and sentences may be found. Which table — augmented with new additions many years afterward by Conrad Pellican and Robert Stephanus [Estienne] — they published as great and most copious indices of the Bible, likely to bring great convenience to the students of the divine volumes, had they not inserted into them many and various testimonies of the scriptures, maliciously and violently wrested to the defense of their own heresies. He flourished under Pope Alexander VI, in the year of the Lord 1496.

Gabriel Brebia of Milan, a monk, wrote — to Gregory of Milan, a monk of St. Peter in Gessate — a little commentary, or rather an epitome of annotations, which he gathered according to the letter out of Jerome and Lyra [Nicholas of Lyra]: with pious prayers to God added at the foot of each psalm, accommodated to the sense and scope of the several psalms to which they are prefixed. He flourished in the year 1490.

Geoffrey of Clairvaux [Galfridus Clarevallensis], of the Cistercian order, wrote upon the Song of Songs one book.

Walter Disse [Galterus Disseus], an Englishman by nation, a Carmelite, a man of sincere piety and doctrine, and also an illustrious preacher, wrote on some of the first psalms of the Psalter, 1 book. He flourished under Wenceslaus the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1390.

Walter of Maguelone [Galterius, Magolensis Episcopus], from Lille [Insulae], a town of Flanders, a man learned by long exercise in the divine Letters, and not wholly without the secular disciplines, wrote — at the request of the clerics of his Church — one book of a scholastic exposition on the whole Psalter. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1230.

Geoffrey of Auxerre [Ganfredus Antisiodorensis], a Cistercian monk, formerly a hearer of Peter Abelard; but, lest he should also become an imitator of his error, he betook himself to the teaching of St. Bernard of Clairvaux: trained under whose discipline, [he wrote works] of not to be de-[spised] [→ p252]

[→ p252: "temnen…" — completing *contemnendae*, "not to be despised"]

[1] The Greeks of old wrote without accents.

(Rich PDF p. 252 [printed folio 233]. Book IV, letter G: ***Geoffrey of Auxerre***, ***Garicus***, ***George of Trebizond*** *(on John 21:22, to Sixtus IV),* ***George Witzel***, *two* ***Gennadii*** *(of Constantinople and of Marseilles),* ***George Eder***, *four* ***Gerards*** *(of Briançon, Lorich, Mathisius, of Bergamo, Morinck, the Carthusian),* ***Germanus*** *of Auxerre,* ***Gilbert Génébrard*** *(flagged below as a later-edition insertion),* ***Gilbert de la Porrée*** *(reproved by St. Bernard, recanted at Reims),* ***Gilbert of Paris***, ***Gilbert of Hoyland*** *(who finished Bernard's 86 Song-of-Songs sermons with 48 more),* ***Giselbert the Englishman***, ***Gymnasius***, ***Gilbert Crispin of Westminster*** *(Anselm's disciple), and* ***Godfrey Tilmann****. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter G, continued from p251:]

...published little works of not to be despised reading: of which one book on the Apocalypse of John is reported. He flourished under Frederick I the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1160.

Garicus, a doctor of the Paris school, wrote a scholastic Postil on Ecclesiastes: from which Vincent Bandelli, in his book On the Conception, brings forth testimonies.

George of Trebizond [Trapezuntius], Greek by nation, a most learned man, wrote — to Sixtus [Xystus IV], Supreme Pontiff — a brief little commentary on the exposition of that text of the Gospel of John, chapter 21, *So I will that he remain, until I come* [John 21:22]: in which he shows that blessed John the Evangelist is not yet dead. Its beginning is, *Lately, most beloved Father.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1470.

George Witzel [Wicelius], German by nation, a man of various erudition, most skilled in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongue, of excellent genius, and eloquent in speech, wrote very many things, both in Latin and in his own German idiom. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Gennadius, pontiff of the church of Constantinople, a man polished in tongue and sharp in genius, and excellent in declaiming homilies, was so rich from the reading of the ancients that he expounded the prophet Daniel entire, commenting word for word. He dies, while Leo the elder held the empire, in the year of the Lord 460.

Gennadius, a presbyter of the church of Marseilles, exercised in both tongues, whose catalogue *On Ecclesiastical Writers* is extant, wrote a treatise on the heresy of the thousand years [millenarianism] upon the book of the Apocalypse: which Honorius mentions in his catalogue. He flourished in the year of the Lord 490.

George Eder [Ederus], doctor of both laws, counselor of the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian II, wrote an *Oeconomia* of the Bible, or of Theological Partitions, 5 books.

Gerard of Briançon [Briansonis], a Minorite of Toulouse, wrote on the seven penitential Psalms, 1 book.

Gerhard Lorich [Lorichius] composed, out of the four evangelists, a Monotessaron of the Passion of Christ, beginning, *The Passion of our Savior.*

Gerard Mathisius of Guelders [Geldriensis] wrote commentaries on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

Gerard [Sanonensis], of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, of Bergamo by fatherland, formerly a public professor of Theology in the University of Paris, marvelously instructed in the knowledge of pontifical law, acute in genius, scholastic in speech, wrote on the Canticles one book, whose beginning is, *The two wings of the Cherubim*; and on the epistle to the Hebrews, one book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1340.

Gerard Morinck [Moringus], a doctor of theology, in the year of the Lord 1533 published, in a cultivated and lucid style, commentaries on Ecclesiastes — partly paraphrastic, partly with a fuller explanation — in which, perpetually abstaining from allegories, he was so engaged in explaining the literal sense that he not unhappily supplies many things which are wanting in the other expositors of this book. The beginning of the volume has these words, *The cause which [moved] the author to this work, etc.*

Gerard of Streda [Stredanus], a Carthusian, German by nation, Prior of the House of the Apostles near Liège, venerable for the conversation of his life and his pious erudition, put forth on the Decalogue one book of explanation. He dies in the year of the Lord 443 *[so printed; but the Carthusian order dates only from 1084, so likely a misprint for 1443]*.

Germanus Brixius [of Auxerre], a canon of Paris, a man learned in both tongues, and piously erudite in Theology, in the year of the Lord 1446 wrote on the epistle of Paul to the Romans most brilliant and learned homilies, 8 in number.

[Later-edition addition — not in Sixtus's 1566 text: this entry names the year 1590 and Génébrard as still living, decades after Sixtus's death (1569).] **Gilbert Génébrard** [Genebrardus], a Parisian Theologian, wrote commentaries on the Psalms; this year, 1590, he is still living; he has written many other things, and, as we hope, will write more.

Gilbert de la Porrée [Porretanus], bishop of Poitiers, Gaul by nation, a man learned in every kind of erudition, both in Greek and in Latin, the author of the work *On the Six Principles* [Liber sex principiorum], which is circulated in Latin and Greek as a supplement to Aristotle's Categories; of a sharp and vehement genius, but obscure in speech on account of the unusual novelty of his terms, and for that reason also noted in certain points of heresy, and reproved by St. Bernard; at the Council of Reims, under Pope Eugenius, he renounced his error.[1] He wrote on the divine scriptures many learned little works, among which not the lowest place is held by his commentaries on the Psalter, on John, and on all the epistles of Paul. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1140.

Gilbert of Paris [Parisiensis], a doctor of the Sorbonne, composed a scholastic Postil on Proverbs, of which Vincent Bandelli makes mention in his treatise On the Conception.

Gilbert [of Hoyland], a monk of the Cistercian order, and abbot of a certain monastery in England, piously learned and sweet in eloquence, in style and spirit so like to Bernard that he seemed to speak with the very same mouth and tongue, wrote on three chapters of the Canticles forty-eight most sweet and most elegant sermons, beginning where Bernard, prevented by death, had ended — that is, from that place of the third chapter, *In my little bed by night I sought* [Song 3:1], up to that place of the fifth chapter, *My beloved is white and ruddy, chosen out of thousands, etc.* [Song 5:10] — to which, when he had arrived by expounding, death forbade him to go further, which took him from among men in the year of the Lord 1200. The work begins, *Various are the affections of lovers.*

Giselbert the Englishman [Anglus] wrote commentaries on Isaiah and on the Song of Songs. He lived in the year 1110.

Gymnasius, an ancient author, wrote commentaries on Exodus, which are cited by Albert the Great in his Summa.

Gilbert [Crispin], provost of the monastery of Westminster in England, of the Order of St. Benedict, a hearer of Anselm of Canterbury, erudite in divine and human letters, and not meanly learned in secular philosophy, in a sufficiently polished style, expounded the book of Canticles with several homilies, and wrote a commentary on Isaiah, dedicated to Blessed Anselm the bishop. He flourished under Henry IV the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1090.

Godfrey Tilmann [Tilmannus], a monk of the Paris Charterhouse, a most diligent investigator of ancient volumes, published in the year of the Lord 1550, out of the ancient monuments of the Carthusian library, a truly golden volume — worthy to be received by all students with great veneration, but without the name of its author or compiler — in which are Alle-[gories] [→ p253]

[→ p253: "goriae…" — completing *Allegoriae*, "Allegories"]

[1] Gilbert de la Porrée sang a recantation [palinode] at the Council of Reims.

*(Rich PDF p. 253 [printed folio 234]. Book IV, letter G: the close of **Godfrey Tilmann**'s anonymous Carthusian anthology (with its roster of thirty-one authors), **Godfrey of Viterbo** (the prose-verse* Pantheon *to Gregory VIII), **Godelbert**, **Gottschalk Hollen** (the* Praeceptorium *on the Decalogue), **Gregory of Rimini**, **Gregory of Corinth**, and the great entries on **Gregory of Nazianzus** ("the Theologian," Jerome's teacher, whose canon-verses Sixtus placed in Book I) and **Gregory Thaumaturgus** (the Wonder-worker, Origen's pupil, whose Ecclesiastes paraphrase the printers wrongly published under Nazianzen's name). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter G, continued from p252:]

...[Alle]gories together, and Tropologies, on the passages of both testaments — the more select ones gathered with the best judgment, and drawn forth with more devoted study, and arranged in the order of the divine volumes — out of the monuments of thirty-one Authors, whose names and surnames, collected in alphabetical order, are these:

Adam of Perseigne [Adam de Persenia], Aelred [Ailredus], Aithardus, Baldwin [Balduinus], Bernard [Bernardus], Bruno, Cassian [Cassianus], a Canticles-commentary without a title [Cantica sine titulo], Drogo, Ernald [Ernaldus], Geoffrey [Galfridus], Gilbert [Gillebertus], Gregory [Gregorius], William of Cailloc [Guilielmus de Cailloc], William of St. Thierry [Gulielmus de S. Theodoro], Hildebert [Hidelbertus]; Hugh of St. Victor [Hugo Victorinus], Hugh of Fouilloy [Hugo de Foilleto], Isaac, Odo of Morimond [Odo de Morim], Odo of Tusculum [Odo Tusculanus], Ottmar Luscinius [Othomarus Luscinius], Peter of Ravenna [Petrus Rauennas], Peter Damian [Petrus Damianus], Peter Lombard [Petrus Lombardus], Peter the Chanter [Petrus Cantor], Radulf [Radulfius], Richard of St. Victor [Richardus Victorinus], Sello, Stephen of Canterbury [Stephanus Cantuariensis], Werricus [Verricus], [and] Richard of St. Victor [Richardus de S. Victore]. The beginning of the work is, *How the first creation of the world is morally enacted in us.*

Godfrey of Viterbo [Godefridus], a presbyter, Italian by nation, of Viterbo by fatherland, a scholastic by profession, wrote — to Pope Gregory VIII — on both Testaments a Prose-Verse work, that is, interwoven with prose and Leonine verse and rhythm according to the custom of the scholastics, whose title is PANTHEON: in which, together with the things contained in the sacred Bibles, he embraced also the foreign histories of the gentiles, beginning the volume in this manner:

> *O you literate men who read me,*
>
> *called as judges over this volume.*

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1185.

Godelbert [Godelbertus], a presbyter, illustrious no less for the sanctity of his life than for knowledge, strong in prose and verse, wrote in heroic verses a most delightful poem: in which he most elegantly sang the histories and allegories from the beginning of the world up to the childbearing of the Virgin. The title of the poem is, *ALLEGORIES OF THE SCRIPTURES, 4 books.* He flourished under Anastasius the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 500.

Gottschalk Hollen [Holem], German by nation, of the Order of the Hermits [Augustinian], a Scholastic by profession, composed on the Decalogue a huge volume of exposition, which is entitled *PRAECEPTORIVM of the Divine Law*: whose beginning is, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments* [Matt 19:17].

Gregory of Rimini [Ariminensis], Prior General of the Hermits of St. Augustine, the subtlest of the scholastics of his order, most celebrated for life and erudition, wrote — in scholastic method and style, following the mind and sense of his father Augustine — on the epistles of Paul, fourteen books, in the year of the Lord 1350.[1]

Gregory, bishop of Corinth, wrote on John chapter 21 [read 20], concerning Thomas touching the Lord when He had risen, a brilliant sermon, which — together with some homilies of his, written in Greek — is kept in the Vatican library.

Gregory, bishop first of Sasima (a mean little town of the Cappadocians), then of Nazianzus in Cappadocia, and at last of Constantinople; who, by all the Greeks, on account of the singular excellence of his authority, was — the first after St. John the Evangelist — distinguished with the surnames of "the Theologian" and "the Great"; a man abounding in the riches both of philosophy and of theology, and, in the loose and pedestrian [prose] oration, the most eloquent of all his time, inasmuch as he had attained the sublime buskin of speaking of Polemon of Laodicea, that most celebrated sophist. This man was joined by the closest intimacy to Basil the Great, and had St. Jerome as a hearer and disciple in the studies of the divine scriptures.[2] He also obtained in the Greek Church so great a weight of authority that whoever should dare to gainsay his testimony would at once be either held a heretic, or noted with the suspicion of heresy.

And he composed all his works — both in prose and in verse — to the number of thirty thousand verses; out of which there are: annotations on the first chapter of Ezekiel; a sermon on the combat [agon] of the Maccabees; likewise, on Matthew 19, *On the question of the Pharisees concerning divorce and repudiation*, one homily, which begins, *Jesus, who [called] the fishermen*; likewise, on the Passion and death of Christ [drawn] from the four evangelists, a Tragedy whose title is ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΠΑΣΧΩΝ [*Christ Suffering*]. He wrote likewise — for the benefit of Christian youth, to whom Julian the Apostate had forbidden all the Greek disciplines — other poems too upon the sacred letters, so that the young, learning these instead of the Greek poets, might acquire skill in the Greek tongue and in verse. Among these is the Canon of the books of divine scripture which the Greek fathers in their age held for canonical, placed by us in the first book of this work. He flourished under Theodosius, in the year of the Lord 390. Gregory, a Cappadocian presbyter, wrote his life.

Gregory, bishop of Neocaesarea in Pontus, surnamed Θαυματουργός, that is, *Wonder-worker* [the doer of marvelous things], a Pontic by nation, formerly called Theodore. A hearer of Origen: while quite young, for the sake of the studies of Greek and Latin letters, he passed from Cappadocia to Berytus, and thence to Caesarea in Palestine, having joined to himself his brother Athenodorus. And when Origen had seen their excellent disposition, he exhorted them to philosophy: in which, gradually introducing the faith of Christ, he made them also his followers. And so, having been instructed by him for five years, they are sent back to their mother. Of whom Theodore, setting out, wrote a *Panegyric of thanksgiving* to Origen, and — a great throng having been convened — recited it, Origen himself being present. He then composed by lamplight a Μετάφρασις [Metaphrasis], or Paraphrase, on Ecclesiastes: of which Suidas says: *Gregory wrote a Metaphrasis on Ecclesiastes — that one indeed most brief, but truly most admirable. Its beginning is, "These things Solomon, son of David the king and Prophet, King among all mortals, [says], etc."* This the impudence of the printers has printed twice — first indeed under the name of its author, then under the name of Gregory of Nazianzus. But Jerome, on the fourth [chapter of] Eccle[siastes] [→ p254]

[→ p254: "Eccle…" — completing *Ecclesiasten*]

[1] The same wrote commentaries on the epistle of St. James. [2] Gregory Nazianzen was St. Jerome's teacher in Theological studies.

(Rich PDF p. 254 [printed folio 235]. Book IV, letter G: the close of ***Gregory Thaumaturgus*** *(Jerome quoting his Ecclesiastes paraphrase; fl. 240); the long entry on* ***Gregory of Nyssa*** *("Father of fathers," Basil's brother — his Hexaemeron, the two sermons* On the Making of Man, *the* Life of Moses, *the Psalter and Beatitudes commentaries, the Philippians commentary; fl. 380);* ***Gregory Olympias*** *(Proverbs and Song of Songs, in the Sauli Library at Genoa); and the opening of* ***Gregory the Great****, Pope Gregory I — whose rivals burned much of his work, and whose threefold method (history, then allegory/anagogy, then the moral sense) Sixtus lays out. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter G, continued from p253:]

...[But Jerome, on the fourth chapter of] Ecclesiastes, upon that clause, *Better is a child and poor, etc.* [Eccl 4:13], bringing forth an exposition of those same words from that [paraphrase] of Gregory of Neocaesarea's Metaphrasis which is now extant, reveals its author in these words: *The holy man Gregory, bishop of Pontus, a hearer of Origen, in his Metaphrasis of Ecclesiastes understood this passage thus: "But I understand a poor and wise young man, better than an old and foolish king: to whom it never came into mind that it is possible for any of those who had been bound to go forth from prison to a kingdom, and finally that he himself in turn should fall from his own unjust power — for it happens sometimes," etc.*, and the rest which follow. He flourished under Alexander [Severus], son of Mammaea, and Gordian, in the year of the Lord 240.

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, whom the Greeks for honor's sake call *Father of fathers*,[1] brother of St. Basil the Great, cultivated in the Academic and Peripatetic disciplines, a man of sinewy and compressed eloquence, at the request of his brother Peter, bishop of Sebaste, wrote on the Hexaemeron one book, beginning, *What doest thou, O man of God?*; in which he set into order and concord those things which, [said] by Moses concerning the creation of the world, seemed at first sight disparate and mutually contrary, showing that Moses was consistent and constant with himself.

He wrote also, on that text, *Let us make man to our image and likeness* [Gen 1:26], *On the Making of Man*, two sermons, to supply those things which Basil had left untouched concerning the formation of man. Of which the first begins, *The payment of an old debt*; the other, *That wise Solomon.* Concerning the plan of both works and the manner of teaching, he himself, at the end of the Hexaemeron, wrote thus:

> *These things, O man of God, we have answered to the questions proposed to us by your prudence, seeking out no cosmetics of speech, no moral allegories, nor passing over unexplored anything of those things which were objected to us; but, the proper signification of the words being preserved, we have followed out by argument the order of nature, and have demonstrated, to the best of our power, that nothing of those things which at first sight seemed contrary is at variance with the others. As for the rest, pertaining to the creation of the world, which were made in the space of six days, we have thought it superfluous to linger, since that sublime voice of our teacher Basil omitted nothing which pertained to that disputation, except the making of man, which we have explained in a proper book — the one we sent to you, O best of men, before this one. But you, and all into whose hands these books shall come, we would ask that in neither of them you think me to oppose the zeal of my teacher: but that, in the former, taking up the argument he left, I added a disputation concerning man to those things which had been elaborated by him in the Hexaemeron; and in this latter, for the sake of those who require order in the monuments of Scripture, I so applied my mind to writing these things, that the force of the words in what is written might be preserved, and the natural continuation might not disagree with the words.*

There is also carried about under his name another book, sufficiently prolix and learned, *On the creation of man*, upon the same text, *Let us make man, etc.*, which begins, *This is the book, says the scripture, of the generation of the heaven* [Gen 2:4].

Likewise, *On the sacrifice of Abraham* in Genesis chapter 22, one book: which Theodoret in the *Immutable* [dialogue], and [John] Damascene in book 3 against the Iconoclasts, cite.

Likewise, *On the narration of the Mosaic life* [the Life of Moses], from Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, one book, in which the perfect form of the Christian life is proposed: which begins, *Just as those who [watch] a contest of horses.*

He also wrote *commentaries on the Psalter,* which are kept, written in Greek, in the Vatican Library.

Likewise, on the fifth chapter of Matthew, *On the seven beatitudes, seven books*, which Liberatus cites in his Breviary on the Nestorian cause, and Theodoret in the *Immutable.*

Likewise, *on the sinful woman from the 7th chapter of Luke, one sermon*, beginning, *No Pharisee.*

He published also *commentaries on the Epistle to the Philippians*, which Cyril brings forth in his book to his brother Euoptius against Theodoret. He flourished under Valentinian and Valens, in the year of the Lord 380. Gregory of Nazianzus wrote his life.

Gregory Olympias [Olympiadas], most illustrious in Greek eloquence, and greatly exercised and learned in the divine letters, published commentaries on the Parables [Proverbs] and on the Song of Songs of Solomon, which have not yet been printed. But they are extant, written in Greek, in the Sauli Library at Genoa.

Gregory, Supreme Pontiff, the first of that name, Roman by fatherland, of a most illustrious family of senators, great-grandson of Pope Felix IV, formerly a monk and a levite [deacon], a man illustrious for sanctity and miracles, notable for erudition, and taught in the explanation of the divine volumes by the illumination of the Holy Spirit (both invisible and visible), expounded almost all the holy Scriptures — partly by homilies, partly by commentaries: the greater sum of which, not yet multiplied into more copies, his most wicked rivals burned immediately after his death,[2] fearing lest the glory of his sanctity and doctrine should come down to posterity in the monuments of his writings.

In his Homilies — and these especially, which he delivered to the people in the midst of the very mysteries of the Mass — he used a brief and succinct elucidation of the divine reading. But on the contrary, in his commentaries, delighting in the accumulated [Coacervatus] kind of explanation, he most abundantly expounded the divine letters with a most copious abundance of senses and speech, almost everywhere observing such a manner and order of expounding:

First of all, having laid the foundation of the history, he discourses, running briefly and by snatches through the context of the letter according to a double edition — namely the old version, which is called the Italic, and the new version of Jerome. Secondly, from the words of the history he draws forth various — indeed most copious — fountains of Allegory and Anagogy (which with him are the same). Thirdly, he inclines the sense of the Allegories to the edification of the church, to the exercise of morality, and diverts the allegorical rivers to irrigate the sowings of the moral virtues; and he speaks with such efficacy concerning the virtues and vices that he seems not only to expound them in words, but in a manner to demonstrate them in visible and palpable forms. He himself, giving the reason for this order, says that, just as in the salvation of the faithful faith is prior to works, so in the explanation of the Scriptures, Allegory (which pertains to faith) ought first to be laid upon the foundations of history, but afterward [the moral sense] above [→ p255]

[→ p255: "supra…" — "above"]

[1] Gregory of Nyssa is called by the Greeks the Father of fathers. [2] The rivals of St. Gregory [the Great] burned a great part of his books.

(Rich PDF p. 255 [printed folio 236]. Book IV, letter G: the entry on ***Gregory the Great*** *continues — his plain style (defended from the Job-preface: he will not bind the heavenly oracle under Donatus's grammar), the note that he never learned Greek, and the catalog of his exegetical works: the seven books on the Heptateuch (burned), six on Kings, the 35-book* Moralia *on Job (written in illness, abridged by Odo of Cluny and Simon of Afflighem), the Penitential Psalms, the Song of Songs, the Ezekiel homilies (delivered during Agilulf's Lombard siege), and the beginning of the catalog of the forty Gospel homilies. Running head:*

BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[Letter G — Gregory the Great, continued from p254:]

...above it, the Moral explanation itself, which treats of the right method of acting. Fourthly, to these three kinds of exposition he adds also a fourth kind, more difficult than the rest, expounding the several testimonies of the scriptures which he himself had taken up in his commentaries for the elucidation and confirmation of the aforesaid explanations.

The kind of words and speech in almost all his writings is continuous and connected, running with certain clauses and members corresponding to one another, and with ὁμοιοτέλευτα — that is, flowing with similarly-terminating sentences — and almost always ending in absolute and perfect periods, yet not affected nor far-fetched, but flowing spontaneously from his former exercise in secular eloquence, without any artifice of careful diction and elaborate texture. Which he himself, not dissembling, excuses in the preface to his commentaries on Job in these words: *I beg that, seeking out the sayings of this work, you do not require in them the leaves of words: for I have scorned to observe that very art of speaking which the teachings of the outer discipline inculcate. For — as the tenor of this preface also declares — I do not shun the clash of metacism, nor do I disdain to keep the confusion of barbarism, the arrangement and the government of the prepositions, and the case-endings: because I strongly judge it unworthy to constrain the words of the heavenly oracle under the rules of Donatus.*[1] Thus he.

There are those who believe that Gregory, besides the things which he expounded in the Latin tongue, composed also many things in the explanation of the holy volumes in the Greek language. But that these are greatly mistaken, Gregory himself shows in his epistle to Eusebius, bishop of Thessalonica, where — accusing the impudence of Andrew the monk, who had forged Greek Homilies inscribed under Gregory's name — he freely professes that he neither published anything in Greek, nor ever learned the Greek language.[2] But the Pastoral volumes of Gregory which now are extant among the Greeks, Anastasius, bishop of Antioch, turned into Greek; just as also Pope Zacharias first gave to Greek ears the four books of the Dialogues, on account of which John Damascene, Euthymius, and the other Greek writers call Gregory, the author of these volumes, "the Dialogist." Thus far concerning the method of the explanations, and the manner of speaking, proper to Gregory: of whom these are the exegetical writings which now survive, and which are wanting:

On the Heptateuch, seven books, which John the Deacon testifies were burned by the envious after the author's death.

On the books of Kings, six volumes of a begun exposition: with which, as Gregory himself asserts, he was the first of all the Latins to attempt a continuous exposition on the books of Kings; of which he took up only the first sixteen chapters of the first book to be expounded, that he might from that labor make trial whether he could go further in explaining; whence he is fuller in the two former books than in the other four. The beginning of the work is, *After the books of Moses and of Joshua son of Nun.*

On Job, to Leander bishop of Seville, 35 books of commentaries [the *Moralia*], published by him while he was tortured with frequent pains of the bowels — the strength of his stomach being broken, and with continuous and slow fevers coming upon him — divine providence so disposing it, that the miseries of a man scourged by God should be expounded by a man scourged by God, so that he might narrate them, experience dictating, more surely, more copiously, more clearly, and more ardently. And so he left the other commentators of this book at as great an interval behind him as, in the knowledge of all things, science joined with experience is superior to science without experience. But how greatly the judgments of the ancient fathers esteemed these truly golden commentaries appears from this: that already, while Gregory was living, the Bishops began to read them publicly through the various churches — which, when he himself had learned of it, he forbade to be done, by letters sent to them, which still survive. This work Odo, abbot of

Cluny, and Simon, a monk of Afflighem, abridged: the latter into ten small books, the former into a slender volume. Gregory likewise composed:

On the seven Psalms which are called Penitential, a brief and moral commentary, following in it Augustine's Enarrations. The work begins, *If that king and prophet.* Likewise he wrote:

On the Song of Songs, a commentary according to the Anagogic and the Ethic [Moral] sense, using a more compressed explanation than in the rest; its beginning is, *Because if to a blind man, etc.* He published also (with notaries taking it down):

On Ezekiel, two books of Homilies to the Roman people — that is, on the first three chapters of Ezekiel, 12 Homilies contained in the first book; and again, on chapter 40, On the vision of the temple to be built in Jerusalem, 10 Homilies contained in the second volume. These he delivered to the people, tossed with the greatest cares of mind, on account of the calamity impending over the City, when Agilulf, king of the Lombards, having already crossed the Po, was hastening to besiege it. The beginning of the work is, *To his most beloved brother Marian, bishop of Ravenna, etc.* Besides, he composed:

On the Evangelical lessons which are read in the sacred mysteries of the Mass, forty Homilies: of which he recited some (dictated by himself beforehand) to the people through a notary, but others he himself pronounced with living voice, notaries taking them from his mouth. These Gregory, having first revised them himself, enclosed in two volumes, and dedicated to Secundinus, bishop of Lauritum. Their catalogue is this:

- On the second chapter of Matthew, On the coming of the Magi, one homily.
- On Matthew 4, On the temptation of Christ, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 4, On the calling of the four Apostles, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 10, On the sending of the 12 Apostles, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 11, On John in chains, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 12, upon that [text], *Behold thy mother*, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 13, On the treasure hidden in the field, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 16, upon that, *If any man will come after me*, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 20, On the vineyard, hom. 1.
- On Matthew 22, On the king making a marriage for his son, one hom.
- On Matthew 25, On the ten virgins.
- On Matthew 25, On the five talents, hom. 1.
- On Mark chapter 16, On the women [going] to the [tomb] [→ p256]

[→ p256: "-mentum…" — completing *monumentum*, "the tomb"]

[1] The words of the heavenly oracle are not to be constrained under the rules of Donatus [the grammarian]. [2] Gregory the Great never learned to speak Greek.

*(Rich PDF p. 256 [printed folio 237]. Book IV, letter G: the rest of the catalog of **Gregory the Great**'s forty Gospel homilies (Mark, Luke, John), the compilers who anthologized him, and his death (†605); then **Gregory Primaticci** of Siena, **Guerric of Igny**, **Werner of Paris** (the* Enucleamenta Bibliae *drawn from Gregory), **Guy of Évreux** (*On the Keys of Divine Scripture*, extending Tyconius's rules), **Guy of Ferrara** (the* Pearl of the Bible *dedicated to Clement V), **Guy of Perpignan** (Guido Terreni), **William of St. Thierry**, **William of Alcono**, **William of Cremona**, **William of Auvergne** (bishop of Paris), and the opening of **William of Aachen**. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter G — Gregory the Great's Gospel homilies, continued from p255:]

- On Mark 16, On the women going to the tomb, hom. 1.
- On the same [Mark 16], On the eleven disciples reclining [at table], hom. 1.
- On Luke chapter 2, On the Edict of Augustus, hom. 1.
- On Luke 3, On the preaching of John, hom. 1.
- On Luke 7, On the penitence of Mary [Magdalene], hom. 1.
- On Luke 8, On the parable of the seed, hom. 1.
- On Luke 10, On the sending of the 72 disciples, hom. 1.
- On Luke 13, On the fig tree, hom. 1.
- On Luke 14, upon that, *Who comes to me, and hates not his father*, hom. 1.
- On Luke 14, On the great Supper, hom. 1.
- On Luke 15, On the hundred sheep, hom. 1.
- On Luke 16, On the rich man and Lazarus, hom. 1.
- On Luke 18, On the blind man, hom. 1.
- On Luke 19, On the weeping of Christ over Jerusalem, hom. 1.
- On Luke 21, On the future wars and seditions, hom. 1.
- On Luke 21, On the signs in the Sun and Moon, hom. 1.
- On Luke 24, On the disciples going to Emmaus, hom. 1.
- On John chapter 1, On the embassy of the Priests to John, hom. 1.
- On John 4, On the son of the Ruler, hom. 1.
- On John 8, upon that, *Which of you shall convict me of sin?*, hom. 1.
- On John 10, On the good shepherd, hom. 1.
- On John 14, upon that, *If any man keep my word*, hom. 1.
- On John 15, On mutual love, hom. 1.
- On John 20, On [Mary] Magdalene coming to the tomb, hom. 1.
- On John 20, On Mary weeping outside the tomb, hom. 1.
- On John 20, On Christ entering to the disciples through closed doors, hom. 1.
- On John 21, On the manifestation of Christ at the sea of Tiberias, hom. 1.

Thus far the exegetical writings of Gregory, from which Paterius (notary of the Holy Roman Church), Bede the Anglo-Saxon, Alulf the monk, Odo the abbot, Simon of Afflighem, Werner of Paris, and very many others, gathered commentaries on almost the whole of divine scripture. Gregory flourished under Maurice Augustus, and dies in the second year of the Emperor Phocas — that is, in the year of the Lord 605 — when he had presided over the Roman pontificate for thirteen years and six months.

Gregory Primaticci [Primaticius] of Siena, of the Order of Preachers, a professor of Theology and of the good arts, arranged a literal exposition on all the epistles of St. Paul, very useful to beginners and the less learned: whose beginning is, *Paul — why he was so called by name*. He lives up to the present year of our salvation 1566.

Guerric of Igny [Guericus], Abbot of Igny, of an easy genius and sweet in eloquence, wrote a work of Sermons on the gospels, *On the Season and on the Saints* through the circle of the year, which he delivered to his brethren, one book, which begins, *We await the Savior*. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1300.

Werner of Paris [Guernerius Parisiensis], Subprior of the monastery of St. Victor at Paris, a man illustrious for the sanctity of his life and pious erudition, gathered and arranged in a most fitting order, out of all the

writings of St. Gregory the Pope, 16 books, *On the allegorical figures of the names and of all things contained in the sacred letters*, which he entitled *ENVCLEAMENTA BIBLIAE* [The Kernels of the Bible] — a work truly worthy to be received with open arms by the students of divine scripture. Its beginning is, *God, sometimes in sacred scripture.* He flourished under Rupert the Bavarian, king of the Romans, in the year of the Lord 1400.

Guy of Évreux [Ebroicensis], of the Order of Preachers, a notable Theologian, and eloquent and fluent in declamations to the people, added to the rules of Tyconius the African certain most fitting teachings, useful for grasping the sense of sacred scripture — showing from the ignorance of what things it often happens that men err in the exposition of sacred doctrine — and to these he gave the title, *ON THE KEYS OF DIVINE SCRIPTURE* [De clavibus divinae scripturae].

Guy, bishop of the Church of Ferrara, of the Order of Preachers, a poet very elegant among the scholastics of his time, and also an excellent handler of the divine letters, among the many works of his genius published — in imitation of Peter Riga, presbyter of Reims — a Scholastic poem, dedicated to Pope Clement the fifth of that name: in which, in hexameter verse, he discoursed on the books of both testaments with a historical and allegorical explanation. Its title is, *THE PEARL OF THE BIBLE* [Margarita Bibliae]; but the beginning is, *A noble beginning.* He flourished under Henry VII the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1130 *[so printed, though the dedicatee Clement V reigned 1305–1314]*.

Guy of Perpignan [Guido Terreni], a Spaniard by nation, the twelfth Prior General of the Carmelites, and afterward bishop of the Churches of Majorca and of Elne, an excellent professor of scholastic Theology, wrote — in imitation of Augustine — *On the Harmony of the Evangelists*, one book, in the year of the Lord 1320.

William, abbot of St. Thierry [sancti Theoderici], briefly elucidated the epistle to the Romans.

William of Alcono, of the Order of Preachers, a master of the Sorbonne Academy at Paris, gathered a scholastic Postil on Ecclesiastes, of which Vincent Bandelli makes mention in his treatise On the Conception.

William of Cremona, the 12th master general of the Hermits of St. Augustine, bishop of Novara [Nouatiensis] and Cardinal of the Roman Church, wrote an exposition on the Gospels, 4 books. He flourished in the year 1340.

William [of Auvergne], bishop of Paris, of Auvergne by fatherland, a man erudite in the divine scriptures, and not ignorant of Aristotelian philosophy, subtle in genius, and scholastic in eloquence, composed commentaries on various many passages of both testaments, by which he transmitted his name to posterity. Of these there survive, of explanation:

- On the Hexaemeron, one book,
- On the Psalter, one book,
- On Proverbs, one book,
- On Ecclesiastes, one book,
- On the Canticles, one book,
- On Matthew, one book.

He flourished under Frederick II the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1230.

William [of Aachen], German by nation, from Aachen [Aquisgranum], formerly a most vigilant preacher of the Metropolitan Church of Basel, illustrious for erudition and [manner of] life, scholastic in eloquence and in his manner of speaking and writing, composed by lamplight one book of exposition on John [→ p257]

[→ p257: "librum…" — completing *librum*, "one book"]

(Rich PDF p. 257 [printed folio 238]. Book IV, letter G concludes: ***William of Aachen****,* ***William Gregory*** *the Scot,* ***William Hamer*** *of Neuss,* ***William of Hirsau****,* ***William Lindanus*** *of Roermond,* ***William of Melitona****,* ***William Pepin*** *(whose fourfold-sense method is described in detail; †in the year of the Sack of Rome), and* ***Gutierre Trejo****. Then letter* ***H*** *opens:* ***Adrian Lametius****, the long entry on* ***Haymo of Halberstadt*** *(Alcuin's disciple, the "spiritual bee," with his works-catalog and incipits),* ***Hector Pinto*** *(on Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Lamentations),* ***Elias de Anibaldi****, and the opening of* ***Henry of Aquila****. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter G, continued from p256:]

...one book, in the year of the Lord 1485.

William Gregory [Gregorius], a Scot by nation, a Theologian of the Paris Academy, wrote scholastic commentaries on David [the Psalms], in the year of the Lord 1517.

William Hamer [Hamerus] of Neuss [Nouesianus], Doctor of sacred theology, of the Order of Preachers, composed learned, useful, and pleasant-to-read commentaries on Genesis, so adorned with the sentences of very many most illustrious authors of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongue (both sacred and profane) that they cannot be read by a fair and candid reader without great fruit and pleasure. Their beginning is, *This world, which by another name [is called] Heaven.* He flourished in the year of salvation 1560.

William, abbot of the monastery of Hirsau in the diocese of Speyer, of the Order of St. Benedict, German by nation — to whom Blessed Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote several epistles — a man most erudite in the divine scriptures, and in secular letters second to none in his time, most holy in life and conversation, wrote *On the correction of the Psalter*, one book: whose beginning is, *If anyone in this necessary [work]*. He flourished under Henry III the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1090.

[Lindanus (bishop of Roermond 1562–1588) was Sixtus's near-contemporary; whether this entry stood in the 1566 text or is a later-edition addition is uncertain — the cited works may postdate 1566.] **William Lindanus** [van der Lindt], bishop of Roermond, a most learned man of our age, wrote Paraphrases on the Davidic Psalms; likewise Meditations on Psalm 118; likewise a declaration of the prophecy of Jeremiah, *Out of the North shall evil break forth* [Jer 1:14].

William of Melitona [Middleton], of the Order of Preachers [read Minors], chancellor of Paris, wrote a Postil on the 12 [minor] Prophets, which is kept at Piacenza in the Library of the Preachers; and likewise on the epistle to the Hebrews, which still survives at Bologna in the Dominican Library, with this beginning, *I will declare thy name.*

William Pepin [Pepinus], professor of sacred Theology, and a nursling and inhabitant of the religious convent of Évreux of the order of Preachers, an eloquent and ardent preacher (whose equal in his times the French tongue did not have), composed on Genesis, on Exodus, and on the seven penitential Psalms a scholastic Lecture according to the fourfold sense of divine scripture — in a rude and uncultivated style indeed, but framed with artful industry, useful to the declaimers of the divine word: in which, first of all, having divided each chapter of the book into three, or four, or more clauses, he explains each of them nakedly and openly according to the history [literal sense]; and, having added at the end of that same historical explanation many not-to-be-despised little questions (which being finished), he narrates the same clause again with three, or four, or sometimes six or eight different moral expositions; and again, after these, he subjoins to the exposition of the same clause three or four allegorical interpretations; which at last he concludes in a single anagogical explanation, referring all things to Christ, as to the end of all things. He wrote also, on the epistles and gospels of the whole year, scholastic Sermons almost innumerable. He died under Charles V, Emperor, in the year of the Sack of Rome, 1527.

Gutierre Trejo [Gutierrus Treius], sprung of Plasencia in Spain, of the Order of Minors, elaborated commentaries on the four gospels in the year 1550.

H

Adrian Lametius [Henencurius], a doctor and Theologian, out of many commentaries of the fathers constructed one work: in which, from the sayings of the ancient authors, he expounded the first twenty-six Psalms in a most beautiful order and most elegantly. The work begins, *Blessed is the man, etc. The opinion of Jerome.* He flourished under Charles V, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1550.

Haymo of Halberstadt [Alberstatensis], the third bishop in Saxony, German by nation, a disciple of Albinus [Alcuin] — who was the teacher of Charlemagne Augustus — formerly a monk of the Benedictine monastery of Fulda, and Abbot of the monastery of Hersfeld of the same order, a man notable for sanctity and erudition, composed commentaries on all the books of both testaments, praiseworthy for their piety, brevity, simplicity of diction, and perspicuity; in which he reduced into a compendium the things which by the ancient interpreters were either written for the learned or spoken to the people more diffusely — with a perspicuity and lucid brevity so great, that they can be read by the busy at small cost of time, and most easily understood by the simple and lightly-lettered. But he was engaged almost always in the allegorical and anagogical senses, which — like a spiritual little bee — he plucked from the gardens and most flowering meadows of all the ancients, that for his readers there might be prepared an abundance of most wholesome honey. The titles and beginnings of his commentaries, which I myself have read, are these:

- On the Psalter, one book. [Begins:] *Hymns are called...*
- On the Song of Songs, one book. [Begins:] *Since of all holy [women]...*
- On Isaiah, one book. [Begins:] *It should be known that, the people being divided...*
- On Ezekiel, one book. [Begins:] *The blessed one says...*
- On the Gospels, two volumes of Homilies. [Begins:] *The Lord conferred...*
- On all the epistles of Paul, 14 books. [Begins:] *From Corinth...*
- On the Apocalypse, 7 books. [Begins:] *We read in Ecclesiastes...*

He dies under Louis Augustus, son of Charlemagne, buried in the church of St. Stephen of Halberstadt, in the year of the Lord 834.

Hector Pinto [Pinctus], a Portuguese, a monk of the Order of St. Jerome, wrote on Isaiah the Prophet polished and cultivated commentaries: in which he diligently examines the Hebrew context of Isaiah together with the Vulgate edition. Theobald Paganus [Payen] printed [them] at Lyons in the year 1561. He published likewise most learned commentaries on the Prophets Ezekiel and Daniel, and on the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

Elias de Anibaldi [degli Annibaldi], a Minorite, master of Theology, wrote a Postil on the Apocalypse.

Henry of Aquila [de Aquila], a German [Alemannus], a Paris Doctor, wrote on the Song of Songs [→ p258]

[→ p258: "-rum…" — completing *Canticorum*, "of Songs"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 258 [printed folio 239]. Book IV, letter H: a long run of **Henrys** — of Auxerre, Arnoldi, of Coesfeld, of Cossey, Esseburne, **Herp** (the mystical* Paradoxa on the Song of Songs, *Latined by Peter Blomevenna), Helmesius, of Hesse the Younger, Kalteisen, and **Henry of Langenstein** (the Vienna theologian who, in years of lecturing, barely reached Genesis chapter 4), Logen, Regius of Paderborn, Sachs, Vinchingam, Urimarius — then **Heraclius** and the **Hermanns** (of Cologne; **Hermann Contractus**, the*

crippled polymath, and his chronicle On the Six Ages of the World*; and Hermann of Petra). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter H, continued from p257:]

...one book. He flourished in the year 1350.

Henry, a monk of the Benedictine monastery of Auxerre, instructed in secular literature, most skilled in the divine Scripture, and an excellent declaimer of his time, wrote, about the year of the Lord 880, very many homilies on various passages of the Gospels, of which 37 are inserted in the Homiliary of Alcuin.

Henry Arnoldi, a Carthusian, a monk of the house of Basel, formerly a notary in the sacred Council of Basel, a man instructed in every kind of letters, wrote in an open and simple style, on the Harmony of the Evangelists concerning the Passion of the Lord, one book, in the year 1440.

Henry of Coesfeld [Consueldius], a German, a Carthusian, Prior of the house of St. Mary near the mount of Blessed Gertrude in Holland, a scholastic by profession, wrote on Exodus, and on the epistle to the Romans. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1410.

Henry of Cossey [Costesay], a Minorite, composed an exposition on the Psalter, one book; [and] a Commentary on the Apocalypse. He died in the year 1336.

Henry Esseburne, a Dominican, wrote on the Parables [Proverbs] of Solomon, 1 book; on Ecclesiastes, 1 book; and Lectures on the Bibles, 1 book. He flourished in the year 1280.

Henry Herp [Harphius], of the Order of Minors of the regular observance, Guardian at Mechelen, a contemplative man, and on every side no less learned than illuminated, wrote on Mystical Theology — both speculative and especially affective (which is obtained not so much by reading as by the exercise of purity and love) — three books, of which he presented the first in the exposition of the Canticles, which is entitled *Mystical Theology*, or *A Soliloquy of the divine love and forms of Christ*, or *Paradoxes on the Song of Songs*: in which, in a broken [disjointed] order, he most brilliantly expounded various sentences of this book with pious affections and flaming words. Peter Blomevenna of Leiden, a Carthusian, translated this work from the German idiom into the Latin tongue. The work begins, *Let him kiss, etc. Tell us, I pray, of whom, by whom, and to whom it is said, "Let him kiss me," etc.*

Henry Helmesius [of Germipolis], of the Order of Minors, a plainly learned and pious man, and preacher of the chief Church of Cologne, wrote — on all the festal Epistles and Gospels — of Homilies in the self-expounding kind, ἑαυτοῦ ἐξηγητικῷ (that is, [Scripture] expounding itself), five volumes, framed with marvelous artifice and erudition out of the mere sentences of divine scripture, in the year of the Lord 1550.

Henry of Hesse the Younger [Hassius Iunior], a Carthusian, Prior of the house of the monks of St. Mary, nobly erudite in the holy Scriptures, not ignorant of secular literature, a scholastic by profession, and by his elegance of speech well fitted for illuminating the understanding and inflaming the affection, wrote on Genesis one book of commentaries, on Exodus one book, on Proverbs one book, on the Apocalypse one book. He flourished under Sigismund the Emperor, [in] 1428.

Henry Kalteisen [Kaltisenus], of Koblenz by fatherland, of the order of Preachers, bishop of the Churches of Nidaros [Trondheim] and of Caesarea, formerly lector of the sacred palace, and before that a preacher [at the convent] of the Holy Cross, and an inquisitor of heretical depravity, a cultivated Theologian and Philosopher, wrote in scholastic eloquence, on the Canticle of Mary [the Magnificat], one book, in the year of the Lord 1460.

Henry of Langenstein [Langesteinus], a German, from Hesse, canon of the Church of Worms, doctor of the Paris Academy under Pope Boniface IX, in the year of our salvation 1400; on account of his singular erudition in Philosophy and Theology, he was summoned — by the public favor of all the learned — to

illustrate the Academy of Vienna, then first founded; and he abounded in so great a copiousness of matter in speaking and writing, that, after the manner of Demosthenes, he had always to think, not what he might add, but what he might take away from his discourse. From which abundance it came about that, having consumed many years in the public exposition of Genesis, he could scarcely reach the fourth chapter of the book — having published as many books of commentaries — being about to make truly an immense work, and one wasteful of much paper, if he had reached the end of Genesis by expounding. He wrote therefore, in the scholastic manner of interpreting: a book of *Prologues on Genesis*; on the first four chapters of Genesis, four books; and on the Song of Songs, one book.

Henry Logen, a Carthusian, Prior of the house near Brussels, wrote explanations on the Psalter.

Henry Regius of Paderborn wrote an *Alphabetical Bible* [Biblia Alphabetica], which the Neuss printer printed, at Cologne, in the year 1535.

Henry Sachs [Sachsius] had three books published, *On the seemingly-contrary passages of both Testaments*, at Cologne, 1540, together with the Commentary of Honorius on the books of Solomon.

Henry Vinchingam [Vinchingan], an Englishman, wrote a scholastic Postil on Isaiah, in the year of the Lord 1447.

Henry Urimarius [of Friemar], a Hermit [Augustinian], German by nation, doctor of the Paris university, illustrious in life and doctrine, wrote on the Decalogue, 1 book; whose beginning is, *Hear, O Israel, the precepts.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1340.

Heraclius, under the empire of Commodus and Severus, in the year of the Lord 200, composed on the Apostle [Paul] fourteen books of commentaries.

Under the name of **Hermann**, Archbishop of Cologne, elector of the Holy Empire, there came forth a most noble explanation of the Decalogue, which is contained in the Compendium of the Council of Cologne, together with an exposition of the Lord's Prayer and of the Creed. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Hermann, called *Contractus* [the Lame] — because he was contracted [crippled] in the limbs of his whole body — a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Gall, a German by nation, son of the Count of Veringen in Swabia, a philosopher, mathematician, and historian, most skilled in Greek, Latin, and Arabic, among his many excellent writings left a notable little work: a chronicle entitled *ON THE SIX AGES OF THE WORLD*, in which, in imitation of Bede, he arranged in a most fitting order all the ages, generations, years, and times contained in the sacred letters. He flourished under Henry II, in the year of the Lord 1040.

Hermann of Petra [Studorpoeus], German by nation, a Carthusian by profession, rector of the house of St. Anne of the nuns of his or-[der] [→ p259]

[→ p259: "-dinis…" — completing *ordinis*, "of the order"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 259 [printed folio 240]. Book IV, letter H: **Hermann of Petra**, **Hermann Schildis**, **Hesychius the Monk** (Hilarion's disciple, and the disputed Greek translation), **Hesychius of Jerusalem** (the presbyter, whose seven books on Leviticus survive); then the **Jeromes — Fracastoro** (the unfinished* Joseph *poem), **of Lwów** (who Englished — rather, Polished — the whole Bible), **ab Oleastro** (on the Pentateuch), **Osório** (flagged below as a later-edition insertion), **of Padua**, and the long entry on **Girolamo Savonarola** (his Florentine prophetic preaching, his burning, and his sermon-catalog). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H, continued from p258:]

...[rector of the house of St. Anne of the nuns of his] order, near Bruges in Flanders, venerable for his life, erudition, and zeal for declaiming, published on the Lord's Prayer, in scholastic style, 50 sermons. He

flourished in the year of the Lord 1428.

Hermann Schildis [Schildius], a Hermit [Augustinian], imbued with philosophy, and perfected by assiduous exercise in the divine letters, wrote in scholastic style on Genesis and on the Song of Songs; likewise, *On the four senses of scripture*, 1 book. He flourished under Louis IV the Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1340.

Hesychius the Monk, and in Palestine the father of many monks, joined by the closest love to Hilarion the most holy hermit — to whom the most blessed Hilarion himself, dying, wrote with his own hand a brief epistle, as it were in place of a testament, leaving to him all his riches, namely the Gospel, and a sackcloth tunic, a cowl, and a little cloak — a man most skilled in the Greek tongue, and an assiduous reader of the divine Scriptures, published a new Greek translation of the whole scripture, partly corrected by himself from the LXX interpreters in the Old Testament, partly restored by his own industry, in the New Testament, to the ancient faith. There are those who attribute this same translation to Hesychius the Jerusalemite presbyter, a most learned man, whom Nicephorus writes to have flourished in the times of Theodosius the Younger. Which does not seem probable to me, since Jerome writes that this Hesychian edition was in use in his time (that is, under the reign of Theodosius the Elder) in all the churches throughout Alexandria and Egypt. And Hesychius [the Monk] flourished under Constantius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 360.

Hesychius, the Jerusalemite presbyter — or, as it is written in the Ordinary Gloss on Leviticus, *bishop of Jerusalem* — a hearer and disciple of Blessed Gregory of Nazianzus the bishop, a man most erudite in the divine scriptures; admonished by the example of his teacher, he is reported to have written on the divine books many little works of explanations: of which there are extant, on the whole of Leviticus, to Eutychianus the deacon, seven books, in which he spiritually interprets the mystical intention of Moses, following an edition so tempered that it agrees with the LXX and does not differ from our Vulgate. He has a certain kind of diction unusual, and rather affected, and abhorrent from the common custom of speaking. The work begins, *To the venerable deacon Eutychianus, the sinner Hesychius, servant of Christ, a presbyter — salvation in Christ.* He wrote also, with a like zeal of explanation, commentaries on Ezekiel, of which he makes mention in the preface to his first book on Leviticus; likewise on the Epistle to the Hebrews. He flourished under Honorius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 400.

Jerome Fracastoro [Girolamo Fracastoro], of Verona, a most noble illustrator of the art of medicine and of poetic study, published, on the last ten chapters of Genesis, a heroic poem *On the life of Joseph*, admirable for the gracefulness of its verse — which indeed he could not complete, being prevented by death, in the year of the Lord 1548.

Jerome of Leopolis [Lwów], from the province of Ruthenia, of the Order of Minors of the regular observance, a preacher and lector of the Metropolitan Church in the city of Cracow (the royal seat of the Polish kingdom), who fought strenuously against the Lutherans even unto death, translated all the books of the Bible into the Polish language. He flourished under Charles V Augustus, in the year of the Lord 1536.

Jerome ab Oleastro [of Azambuja], a Portuguese, of the Order of Preachers, professor of sacred Theology, and inquisitor of heretical depravity at the renowned Lisbon [Ulyssippo], published commentaries on the Pentateuch of Moses according to the edition of Sanctes Pagninus: in which he first most exactly explained the Hebrew truth, then indeed subjoined separately those things which can be fitted to the composition of morals, from the inmost recesses of the letter itself. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1556, in which he also sent forth this very work, printed at Lisbon.

[Later-edition addition — not in Sixtus's 1566 text: Osório died in 1580, and the entry notes he died "in recent years," after Sixtus's own death (1569).] **Jerome Osório** [Jerónimo Osório], a Portuguese, bishop of the Algarve, a most eloquent man, wrote a Paraphrase on Isaiah. In recent years he migrated from this life.

Jerome of Padua [Patavinus], excellent in verse and prose, wrote to Peter Donato, bishop of the city of Padua, *On the Passion of the Lord* — from the four evangelists, in heroic verse — one book, which begins, *Greatest of the heaven-dwellers*, in the year of the Lord 1494.

Jerome Savonarola [Girolamo Savonarola], of Ferrara, of the Order of Preachers, a man of excellent genius, and endowed with an abundance of many sciences, was a declaimer simple indeed and unadorned in speech, but sharp in sense and vehement in action; and in the reputation of sanctity so admirable to all, that the people of the city of Florence — among whom for seven years he delivered sermons in a great and assiduous throng of hearers — thought that he spoke with God, and received from Him the prophecy of future events; and on that account were unwilling that the commonwealth, and the common government of the whole city, should be administered except at his nod. Which things, since they did not sufficiently please some of the leading citizens, effort was made that the magistrates of the city should be created from the number of those who least followed him; [and so] Jerome, not without tumult and the blood of many, was seized, and cast into prison, and condemned to death; a little after, being deprived of his priestly honor [degraded], he was burned alive in the middle of the marketplace, and his ashes — lest, being religiously kept by his own followers (who had already begun to collect them), they should be venerated — were thrown into the flowing Arno. This man, therefore, labored much in the divine scriptures, of which the below-written are reported:

- On the Ark of Noah, in the 6th chapter of Genesis, 10 sermons.
- On the first 6 chapters of Exodus, 14 sermons.
- On the history of Ruth, 5 sermons.
- On the first two chapters of Job, 40 sermons.
- On Ezekiel, 46 sermons.
- On Amos, 40 sermons.
- On Zechariah, 20 sermons.
- On Micah, 30 sermons.
- On Haggai, 5 sermons.
- On the 7 Penitential Psalms, commentaries.
- On Psalm 72, 24 sermons.
- On Psalm 79, an exposition.
- Likewise, on various verses of the Psalms, 20 sermons.
- On the Lord's Prayer, a threefold exposition.
- On the first Canonical [epistle] of John, 19 sermons.

Finally, the day before he was led to death, [→ p260]

[→ p260: "-tem…" — completing *mortem*, "to death"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 260 [printed folio 241, recto]. Book IV, letter H: the close of the **Savonarola** entry (his two prison Meditations, and the sermons of his that Trent restricted), then **Ambrose bishop of Compsa**, **Thomas Neri** (Savonarola's apologist), **Jerome Seripando**, and the opening of the great entry on **St. Jerome of Stridon** — his mastery of tongues, Augustine's testimony, and the fourfold division of his scriptural works. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS / BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H, continued from p259:]

...[the day before he was led to dea]th, he wrote — amid the fearful horrors of the prison and the anguish of the imminent punishment — in Latin speech, Meditations on the 31st Psalm and on the fiftieth, most burning with living words, lively thoughts, and fervor of spirit. The former of these, in which the struggle of hope and

despair is expressed, begins *Sadness has beset me,* etc.; the latter begins *Unhappy man that I am,* etc.

Ambrose, bishop of Compsa [Conza], published a book of many annotations against the aforesaid volumes of Jerome [Savonarola] — out of which volumes the holy Synod of Trent forbade the below-written sermons to be read, until they should come forth corrected by the tribunal of the holy Roman Inquisition:

- On Exodus, sermon 1, beginning *Lord, why are they multiplied.*
- On Exodus, sermon 2, beginning *Since we are set by the Lord.*
- On Exodus, sermon 3, beginning *When Israel went out of Egypt.*
- On Exodus, sermon 6, beginning *The more he oppressed them.*
- On Exodus, sermon 10, beginning *The cry therefore of the children of Israel.*
- On Exodus, sermon 20, beginning *His eyelids question the sons of men.*
- On Ruth, chapter 3, the sermon beginning *And behold, now in the middle of the night the man was afraid.*
- On Job, chapter 5, the sermon beginning *Blessed is the man who is corrected by the Lord.*
- On Ezekiel, sermon 21, beginning *The Lord said, Hear me, pass over through.*
- On Ezekiel, sermon 32, beginning *And after all thy abominations.*
- On Ezekiel, sermon 41, beginning *And the word of the Lord came to me.*
- On Amos, chapter 4, sermon 12, beginning *Hear this word, ye fat cows.*
- On 3 Kings [1 Kings] 18, concerning the fiery experiment [ordeal] of Elijah: an Exhortation delivered to the people in the year of the Lord 1498, on the seventh day of April, when — to explore the truth of the matters foretold by the author [Savonarola] — Dominic of Pescia the Dominican, defender of Jerome [Savonarola], and Julian the Florentine Franciscan, his accuser, were about to enter the burning pyre. The beginning of the sermon is, *Since, besides those things which have been accomplished, prayers, many things still remain to be done.*

Thomas Neri [Tommaso Neri], of the Order of Preachers, a man both pious and learned, recently wrote an Apologetic book in defense of the teaching of this author [Savonarola] — who, being in the forty-sixth year of his age, was slain, namely in the year of human salvation 1498, on the 14th day of June. *[The execution is otherwise dated 23 May 1498; "14 June" as printed.]*

John Francis [Gianfrancesco Pico], prince of Mirandola, wrote his [Savonarola's] life.

Jerome Seripando [Girolamo Seripando] wrote a Commentary on St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians. Rubinus printed it at Venice, 1569.

HIERONYMUS of Stridon [St. Jerome], whom Severus Sulpicius calls rector of the parish of Bethlehem, and whom all the Greeks call the Jerusalemite presbyter — son of Eusebius, from the town of Stridon (which, overthrown by the Goths, was once the border of Dalmatia and Pannonia) — was a man most consummate in every kind of learning. For, by the splendor of his speech and by the strength of eloquence — in which he advanced under Donatus the Grammarian and Victorinus the Rhetor, most illustrious men[1] — he left all the writers of the Latin Church far behind him at a great interval. Of tongues, too, he had so great a skill that he held Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee [Aramaic], and Latin all as equally as his native Dalmatian mother-tongue. But also in the schools of the philosophers he left nothing untouched of Aristotle, Plato, and Zeno — that is, of the Peripatetics, Academics, and Stoics. Furnished with these apparatuses, he betook himself to the studies of the sacred Letters, using in these as teachers Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymus of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nazianzus.[2] Under whom he acquired for himself so great an erudition in divine matters, and such a name for erudition, that in the obscure difficulties of the holy volumes the Roman Pontiff Damasus, the most learned Augustine, Paulinus, Chromatius, Heliodorus, and many others everywhere

throughout Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Palestine, and Greece — most erudite bishops — took refuge in this one man, as in one who, aided by his manifold variety of tongues, had read all the interpreters of divine Scripture: Greeks, Hebrews, and Latins. Which also Augustine, in Book 1 against Julian, openly shows in these words, saying: *The holy presbyter Jerome, learned in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew eloquence, passing from the Western to the Eastern Church, lived in holy places and in sacred letters even to a decrepit age. He read all — or nearly all — who before him had written on ecclesiastical doctrine from either part of the world.*

This admirable man, therefore, produced — besides his exoteric writings, which are many — so many and so great exegetical volumes upon the holy Scriptures, that there is no part, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, on which he did not publish either translations, or annotations, or commentaries, or epistles. For by these four orders [classes] are distinguished all his works that pertain to the understanding of the sacred Volumes. In the first, the order of **translation**, he turned the whole body of Scripture into various tongues. In the second, the order of **annotation**, he illustrated many things from both Testaments, applying here and there brief scholia. In the third, the **epistolary** order, he wrote almost innumerable letters, in which he satisfied the questions of those who, sending letters to him from divers parts of the world, consulted him on the abstruse questions of divine Scripture. In the fourth and last, the **Hyponematic** — that is, the order of **Commentaries** — he expounded the divine Scriptures according to the various editions of the Greeks (but especially the LXX), and according to his own edition, which he had translated from the Hebrew source, to the letter; and, first of all the Latins, he most skillfully investigated and most clearly discussed the historical sense — which, on account of its difficulty, none before him had either touched or fully explained — adding also brief allegorical and tropological explanations, which should be, as it were, the appendices and ornaments of the literal understanding.

Now, of these Commentaries he wrote several with his own hand, and dictated very many through secretaries, with such facility and speed that each [→ p261]

[→ p261: catchword "quaque"; signature X2]

[1] St. Jerome, a disciple of Donatus and Victorinus. [2] In sacred letters St. Jerome had as teachers Apollinaris, Didymus, and Gregory of Nazianzus.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 261 [printed folio 242, verso]. Book IV, letter H, the **St. Jerome** entry continuing: his prodigious dictation and his following of Origen "like a bee"; the Terentian cento by which he defended himself; his habit of suppressing authors' names; the contrast of his ornate versus his plain style, with his plain-diction motto and the "Questions to Damasus" quotation; then the announcement of a double Index of his works, opening the First (undoubted) Index. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H — St. Jerome, continued from p260:]

...each day he would exceed a thousand verses [lines] by dictation. For which cause — as he himself relates about himself in the epistle to Eusebius — many reckoned him rather to be reading others' works than composing his own.

Now Jerome followed, among the other Greek expositors — whose writings he culled after the manner of a bee — chiefly Origen, not indeed as a dogmatist but as an interpreter; out of whose immense volumes he poured almost innumerable things into his own works. On which account, when he was accused by his rivals, he excused himself in many places, but especially in the preface to his second commentary on Micah, where out of Terentian verses he fitted together a cento of this kind for his defense:

> *I warn the fat bulls that have surrounded me, that they be quiet and cease*
>
> *To slander, lest they come to know their own misdeeds.*

For, as to their saying that I plunder the volumes of Origen, and

That it is not fitting that the writings of the ancients be contaminated:

Because they reckon this a vehement reproach,

I count it the greatest praise — since I wish to imitate

Him whom I doubt not to please you, and all the prudent.

For if it be a crime to translate the good sayings of the Greeks, let there be accused

Ennius, Maro [Virgil], Plautus, Caecilius, and Terence,

Tullius [Cicero] too — nay, let our own Hilary be held guilty of theft:

who, upon

The Psalms, turned nearly forty thousand verses of the aforesaid Origen according to their sense —

Whose diligence, of them all, I long to emulate

Rather than the obscure negligence of those men.

Now Jerome, in gathering the explanations of the ancients, is wont very often to report their opinions — and sometimes also some erring and absurd opinions — with the authors' names suppressed (whom, to avoid the reader's tedium, he was accustomed to name once in the prefaces of his books); sometimes omitting too, for modesty's sake, the refutations of those opinions, because he had refuted them most fully elsewhere. Whence it comes that, while he mixes others' matter with his own without distinction, he sometimes seems to accept the errors of others and to pronounce them as the judgment of his own mind. And hence Jerome's detractors have seized what occasion they could to assail him, [saying] that he had bespattered almost all his commentaries with the dogmas of heretics. Meeting whose calumny, Jerome left these things written in his fourth volume on Jeremiah:

> *I am accustomed, in my commentaries and explanations — as is the custom — when setting down the various opinions of interpreters, to mix in speech of this kind: "Some say this, others assert that, several think thus." And for this the wretched Grunnius [Rufinus], and, after many years, the disciple of Jovinian, calumniate me — [saying] that under others' names I set down my own opinions. Which I do for the sake of good will, lest I should seem to tear anyone by name. But my kindness has been turned into calumny against me.*

The **style** of Jerome, in each of these orders [classes of work], is far different from that which he uses in his other works. For in his exoteric little works — whatever they be, whether Paraenetic (which contain instruction for life) or Apologetic (which look to refuting the errors of heretics and the calumnies of the malevolent) — he has a manner of speaking composed of a certain varied and admirable mixture of all things, and adorned with ornaments and pigments culled from every side out of every variety of writers; painted with the colors of the rhetoricians, the subtleties of the dialecticians, the flowerlets of the poets, the maxims of the philosophers, and with allusions of every kind to all the arts and sciences; and variegated with a diversity of foreign words — Greek, that is, Hebrew, and Chaldee [Aramaic] sayings — after the fashion of an emblem (as Ennius says) of mosaic work, and interwoven like a Musaeum-work with many-colored little stones. On the contrary, in his exegetical works, or enarrations of the divine Scripture — all the pomp of secular letters despised — he abstains from every paint of eloquence and from all ambition of the most difficult questions, unwilling (as he himself says), under the occasion of the divine words, to show off his own eloquence and erudition, and in these to hunt praise and admiration from his readers. But everywhere he uses a diction succinct, simple, and open, and words (as he himself says) taken from the crossroads [common speech], repeating in all his commentaries, and in almost every preface of his books, this saying, namely: *Let those who desire rivers of eloquence and elegant declamations not read these things. For this alone is my purpose: to declare the words of divine Scripture; and this alone is my praise, that through me the reader may understand the words of divine Scripture.* Giving the reason of this purpose himself, in the Questions to

Pope Damasus he thus writes:

> *One who disputes about the Scriptures ought not to hunt out the arguments of Aristotle, nor is the rivulet to be drawn from the river of Ciceronian eloquence, nor are the ears to be soothed with the flowerlets of Quintilian and with scholastic declamation. A speech is needful that is pedestrian and like everyday speech, and redolent of no lamplit toil — one that explains the matter, sets forth the sense, makes the obscure plain, not one that puts forth leaves in the composition of words. Let others be eloquent, let them be praised as they will, and weigh out foaming words with puffed-out cheeks: it is enough for me so to speak that I be understood — that, speaking and disputing about the Scriptures, I may imitate the simplicity of the Scriptures.*

And let these few things now be what we have touched, in general, concerning the exegetical works of Jerome. But in particular, those which under his name are reported to have been published on all — or on the several — books of divine Scripture, we shall distinguish by a double Index: in the first of which we shall place the undoubted labors of Jerome; in the second we shall enumerate those writings about which it is greatly doubted among the learned whether they are his.

OF THE EXEGETICAL VOLUMES WHICH ALL AFFIRM, WITHOUT ANY HESITATION, TO BE JEROME'S. THE FIRST INDEX.

On the whole Old Testament, a Translation from the Hebrew verity into the Latin tongue — which, as more excellent than the others, the whole Church of the Latins[1] [→ p262]

[→ p262: catchword "Eccle-" (Ecclesia)]

[1] The translation of the Old Testament which the Latin Church uses.

(Rich PDF p. 262 [printed folio 243, recto]. Book IV, letter H — the First Index of St. Jerome's undoubted works: the Fathers' testimonies to his Latin translation (Augustine, Gregory, Isidore), his speed of translation, his correction of the New Testament with Augustine's letter of thanks, his Dalmatian translation, the Book of Hebrew Names*, the prefatory* Epistolarium*, the* Hebrew Questions*, and the particular questions and letters on Genesis–Kings, then the threefold Psalter (Roman, Gallican, and from the Hebrew). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter H — St. Jerome, the First Index continued from p261:]

...the whole Church of the Latins received,[1] and the very ancient Fathers approved by their own antiquity — but first of all Augustine, in the 18th book of the *City of God*, writing thus: *There was not lacking in our times the presbyter Jerome, a most learned man, and most skilled in the three tongues, who translated the divine Scriptures into Latin not from the Greek but from the Hebrew. Which so great a literary labor of his even the Hebrews confess to be truthful.* Subscribing to him, Gregory in the eleventh book of the *Morals* thus speaks: *The new translation of Jerome is held to have rendered all things for us more truly from the Hebrew speech; therefore whatever is said in it is to be trusted, and it is fitting that our exposition should more subtly search out its words.* Isidore, bishop of Seville, in the second book of the *Etymologies*, adds these things: *Jerome, most skilled in the three tongues, translated the divine Scriptures from Hebrew into Latin eloquence, and eloquently rendered them; whose interpretation is deservedly preferred to the others: for it is more tenacious of the words, and clearer in sense by its perspicuity, and — being a Christian interpretation — truer.* Thus he. Nor is it to be passed over that Jerome corrected the edition of the Seventy interpreters [LXX] — already for many ages before translated into Latin by an uncertain author, and corrupted by the injury of the times — and restored it to the Greek verity,[2] as he himself testifies in the preface to Paralipomenon [Chronicles]. He translated, moreover, with such facility and speed most of the Hebrew volumes of the Old Instrument, that by the labor of three days he made Latin out of Hebrew the three books of Solomon — namely Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs — and turned the book of Tobias from Chaldee [Aramaic] into Latin by the work of a single day.

Besides these, he also carefully corrected the whole New Testament — already by others either badly translated into Latin, or corrupted by the negligence of copyists — and with the utmost care emended it according to the Greek verity. Of which emendation Augustine, in a certain letter to Jerome, brought forth his judgment in these words: *Accordingly we give no small thanks to God for your work, that you have translated the Gospel from Greek into Latin: because in almost all places there is no stumbling, when we have compared the Greek scripture. Whence, if anyone be contentious for the old falsity, he is either taught or refuted by the codices being brought forth and compared; and if some passages very rarely give deserved cause for warning — who is so hard that he would not readily pardon so useful a labor, for which he is not able to render a return of praise?* [printed "non non"] Thus Augustine.

Jerome also translated — as he himself testifies in the epistle to Sophronius — the whole body of the entire divine Scripture into the Dalmatian tongue, for the benefit of the peoples of his own nation;[3] which nation, even to this day, uses the reading of this translation with the utmost veneration.

He also translated, out of Philo and Origen, *On the Interpretation of the Hebrew Names* which are contained in both Testaments — one book, beginning *Philo, a most eloquent man.*

After these labors of translation he wrote an *Epistolary of Prefaces* upon the several volumes of the Bible — one book, whose beginning is *Brother Ambrose.* He wrote also:

Upon all the holy scripture, one book of *Traditions,* or of an inchoate [begun] exposition of *Hebrew Questions* — from the beginning of Genesis even to the end of that same volume. By which work he refuted the errors of those who wrongly brought forth various testimonies from the sacred Letters, thinking that they were so read in the Hebrew codices; showing which words, both in the Greek and in the Latin codices of the blessed Scripture, were superfluous or lacking, each being restored to its truth. He moreover explained in Latin the etymologies of things, of names, and of regions, unknown to the Latins, promising that he would publish, by a similar labor, annotations upon all the Old scripture. Whether he afterward performed this, is unknown to me.

He wrote besides, on Genesis, to Damasus, three questions:

- On Genesis 4, one question, *On the vengeance for the slayer of Cain.*
- On Genesis 15, one question, *On the sons of Abraham who should return from Egypt in the fourth generation.*
- On Genesis 27, question 1, *Why Isaac blessed not the son to whom he wished, but why he blessed the son to whom he did not wish.*
- **Likewise** on Genesis 14, one epistle to Evagrius, *On Melchizedek.*
- On Exodus chapter 39, one epistle, *On the priestly vesture.*
- On chapter 33 of the book of Numbers, *On the 42 encampments of the children of Israel in the desert,* to Fabiola, epistle 1.
- On the same [book], *On the Land of Promise,* to Dardanus, epistle 1.
- On the same, a small booklet *On the Land of Promise,* which he mentions in book 1 on Jeremiah.
- On 3 Kings [1 Kings], *On the Ephod,* to Marcella, one epistle.
- On 4 Kings [2 Kings] 17, *On Ahaz begetting a son when he was eleven years old,* epistle 1, to Vitalis.

Upon the Psalter he set forth epistles, and a threefold variety of translation. The **first**, indeed, when he was at Rome, by order of Pope Damasus — which ought rather to be called a correction than a translation; for he corrected, and in great part emended, the common [Vulgate] edition of the Psalter,[4] contaminated with innumerable faults, following in this the Greek version of the Seventy interpreters. When this, at Damasus's command, had begun to be read and sung in the Roman Church, it was called the **ROMAN PSALTER.**[5] But

when this emendation was again corrupted through the fault of copyists — among whom the error of the old translation prevailed more than the fidelity of the new correction — Jerome, at the urging of Paula and Eustochium, put forth a **second** edition from the Greek version of the Seventy interpreters, in which, by obeli set beside [that is, by horizontal strokes], he marked what among the LXX was superfluous, and, by asterisks (``) likewise inserted, noted what he himself had added from the Hebrew verity. When Damasus had granted this work to be sung in the churches of Gaul, it was called the **GALLICAN PSALTER.**[6] The **third** edition he rendered from the source of the Hebrew verity into Latin eloquence, at the request of Sophronius; by whom, when the Jews — bringing forth testimonies of the psalms — were pressed in disputation, they mockingly answered, almost at every word, that it was not so held in the Hebrew, as he alleged from the Seventy interpreters. This edition, again turned into Greek by Sophronius, no church, so far as I know, has been accustomed to sing. He wrote also, upon the second Psalter version published by him, a boo[klet] [→ p263]

[→ p263: catchword "libel-"; signature X3]

[1] [This translation] is St. Jerome's. [2] St. Jerome corrected the Latin version of the edition of the Seventy interpreters [LXX]. [3] Jerome translated the whole sacred Scripture into the Dalmatian tongue. [4] Jerome corrected the common [Vulgate] edition of the Psalter. [5] Which [Psalter] is called the Roman Psalter. [6] What the Gallican Psalter is.

(Rich PDF p. 263 [printed folio 244, verso]. Book IV, letter H — St. Jerome's First Index continued: the letter to Sunnia and Fretela on the Psalter; Psalter commentaries cited by Gregory and Augustine; epistolary explanations on three Psalms; seven treatises translated from Origen; Ecclesiastes to Paula and Eustochium, with the censure of Rethicius over "Aurum ophaz"; the 63 books on all the Prophets (Jerome the first of the Latins to expound them historically), dictated in old age; then the catalog of the several Prophet-commentaries (Isaiah through Haggai), each with dedicatee and incipit. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[Letter H — St. Jerome, the First Index continued from p262:]

...a boo[klet], or very prolix epistle, to Sunnia and Fretela, showing in what places the edition of the Seventy interpreters differed from the Hebrew verity, and how the corrupted readings in the psalms ought to be restored according to the Hebrew faith [text]; and [displaying] the LXX edition, before rendered by himself into Latin and distinguished with asterisks and obeli.

He is also reported to have written commentaries on the whole Psalter — out of which Gregory, expounding the Psalms that are called Penitential, brings a testimony from the exposition of Psalm 50; and Augustine, from the explanation of Psalm 93, in the Epistle to Fortunatus, bishop of Sicca, brings forth an opinion.

Besides these, he composed epistolary explanations on three Psalms, that is:

- On Psalm 44, one epistle, to the virgin Principia.
- On Psalm 99, epistle 1, to Cyprian.
- On Psalm 126, an epistle, to Marcella.

He also translated, out of the commentaries of Origen upon the Psalms, seven treatises — from the tenth Psalm to the sixteenth Psalm, one treatise for each Psalm. He wrote also:

On Ecclesiastes, to Paula and Eustochium, one book — remarkable for its wondrous brevity and wondrous facility — according to the literal and the spiritual sense; in which, following the authority of no single edition, he rather fitted himself to the custom of the Seventy interpreters, but only in those places which did not much differ from the Hebrew verity; sometimes he also explained the translations of Aquila, and of Symmachus, and of Theodotion. The beginning of the work is, *I remember.* He wrote besides, to Marcella, one epistle, whose beginning is *Lately with Rethicius,* in which he censures Rethicius, bishop of the Aedui

[Autun], because he had wrongly interpreted *Aurum ophaz* [gold of Ophaz], for which, in the fifth chapter, we read *the finest gold*; and he himself declares what it is.[1] After these he published:

Upon all the Prophets, both the greater and the lesser, 63 books of commentaries; in which, according to each edition [Hebrew and LXX], he was the first of all the Latins to undertake and complete a historical and literal exposition upon the several words of the Prophets, from the first to the last[2] — which, on account of the enormous difficulty of the matter, none before him had dared either to begin, or, once begun, to pursue. These foundations being laid, he built upon the history the anagogical and tropological senses, following in these the Greek authors, and most of all his own Origen. He set forth, moreover, with skillful diligence, the several Prophets, in a style succinct and simple, but as easy and open as could be — reckoning this to be his highest praise, if through him all the words of the Prophets should be most clearly explained. He divided his commentaries into many books, so that — the long journey of exposition being separated by fixed stages — he might make easier, divided into parts, the labor of the one dictating, of the one writing, and of the one reading. And he set before the several books certain pointed little prefaces, in which he briefly explains the themes of the explanations and sharply refutes the slanders of his rivals. He dictated these commentaries in extreme old age — not in the same order in which they are read in the Canon, but as he was able, and as he was asked, his secretaries taking down his words — since now, with dimming eyes and trembling fingers, he could no longer bear the labor of writing with his own hand; and moreover with such speed that he scarcely had space for re-reading and correcting. The catalog of these books is this:

• **On Isaiah** the Prophet, 18 books of commentaries, to Eustochium, beginning *Being at length hardly finished in a long time.*

• **Likewise, on Isaiah chapter 6**, on the mystery of the Seraphim, to Pope Damasus (as it is read in the common codices), two epistles — which, however, are not epistles, nor written to Damasus, but one treatise divided by I-know-not-whom into two sections. Of which Jerome, in the third book of his commentaries on Isaiah, thus writes: *Of this vision, about thirty years ago, when I was at Constantinople and was being instructed in the studies of the holy scriptures under that most eloquent man Gregory of Nazianzus, then bishop of that same city,*[3] *I know that I dictated a short and hasty treatise, that I might take a test of my little talent, and obey my friends who bade me. To that booklet, therefore, I refer the reader.*

• **On Jeremiah**, 20 books of commentaries, to Eusebius — which Rabanus [Maurus], in the preface of his commentaries on Jeremiah, and Trithemius, and Cassiodorus cite; but yet of these only six, on thirty-two chapters of this Prophet, could be found. Their beginning is *After the explanation.*

• **Likewise**, he rendered the *Lamentations of Jeremiah* in Latin verse, as he himself testifies in the preface to Jeremiah, which was translated by him.

• **On Ezekiel**, to Eustochium, fourteen books, [beginning] *The eighteen volumes of explanations on Isaiah being finished.*

• **On Daniel**, to Pammachius and Marcella, one book of an interpolated exposition (that is, written by intervals), [beginning] *Against the Prophet Daniel.*

• **On Hosea**, to Pammachius, 3 books, [beginning] *If in the explanations.*

• **On Joel**, to Pammachius, 1 book, [beginning] *The order is not the same.*

• **On Amos**, to Pammachius, 3 books, [beginning] *Amos the Prophet.*

• **On Abdias [Obadiah]**, to Pammachius, 2 books; of which one he wrote in old age, whose beginning is *When I was a little one*; the other he wrote in youth, allegorically, when he did not yet understand the historical sense of the Scriptures — which one perished through the injury of time.

• **On Jonah**, to Chromatius, 1 book, [beginning] *About three years have passed.*

• **On Micah**, to Paula and Eustochium, two books, [beginning] *Micah, on whom now.*

• **On Nahum**, to the same, one book, [beginning] *According to the Seventy interpreters.*

• **On Habakkuk**, to Chromatius, 2 books, [beginning] *First, O Chromatius.*

• **Likewise**, another book of annotations on the same Prophet, [beginning] *The burden which.*

• **On Zephaniah**, to Paula and Eustochium, 1 book, [beginning] *Before I approach Zephaniah.*

• **On Haggai**, to the same, 1 book, [beginning] *In the second year of Darius.*

[→ p264: catchword "In-" (In Zachariam)]

[1] Jerome, epistle 133. I do not know what chapter 5 he means; in Jeremiah 10, verse 9, "Gold of Ophaz" is read. [2] Jerome was the first among the Latin writers to complete a historical exposition upon all the Prophets. [3] St. Jerome confesses that he was a pupil of St. Gregory of Nazianzus in the sacred Scriptures.

(Rich PDF p. 264 [printed folio 245, recto]. Book IV, letter H — the close of St. Jerome's First Index (Zechariah, Malachi; the four books on Matthew; the Matthew/Luke questions to various correspondents; the twofold exposition of Paul — Hypomnematic and Epistolary — with the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, Philemon commentaries and the Pauline questions), then the announcement that these are his undoubted works; the ***Second Index*** *of works of uncertain authorship; and the opening of a section on the disputed Annotations on Kings and Chronicles, with Nicholas of Lyra's judgment. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter H — St. Jerome, the First Index concluded, then the Second Index:]

• **On Zechariah**, to Exuperius of Toulouse, an epistle in 3 books, [beginning] *In the last part now of autumn.*

• **On Malachi**, to Minerius and Alexander, one book — the last of the 12 Prophets.

And these things he composed on the Old Testament; now follow those which he composed on the New Testament.

On Matthew, four books of commentaries, to Eusebius: in which — the authority of the Ancients omitted (whom, for the shortness of time, he had no opportunity either to read or to follow) — he briefly arranged the historical interpretation, sometimes mingling in the flowers of the spiritual understanding, and laying in these the foundations for a future work, which he afterward completed on Matthew more fully and more exactly. He dictated these four books with such speed that, within the space of two weeks — and with the feast of Easter imminent, by which he was chiefly detained in spiritual occupations — he finished the whole work. Its beginning is *That many [have].*

He wrote also certain other things on Matthew, of which we have:

• On Matthew 6, upon that text *Be not solicitous for the morrow,* one epistle to Amandus.

• On Matthew 11, On the disciples whom John sent to Christ, to Algasia, question 1.

• On Matthew 12, upon that text *He shall not break the bruised reed,* to Algasia, question 1.

• On Matthew 16, upon that text *Whoever wishes to come after me,* to Algasia, question 1.

• On Matthew 20 [read 21], upon that text *Hosanna, blessed [is he],* to Damasus, epistle 1.

• On Matthew 21 [read 19], upon that text *If you wish to be perfect,* to Hedibia, question 1.

• On Matthew 24, upon that text *Woe to them that are with child and that give suck,* to Algasia, question 1.

• On Matthew 26, upon that text *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine,* to Hedibia, question 1.

• On Matthew 28, On the time of the Resurrection of Christ, and the things that happened in it, to Hedibia, question 3.

• On Luke chapter 15, On the prodigal son, to Pope Damasus, one epistle, which begins *Of your Beatitude.*

On the Epistles of Paul he brought a twofold kind of exposition, namely the Hypomnematic [commentary-style] and the Epistolary. In the first kind, indeed, he gathered from the explanations of Origen, Victorinus, Didymus of Alexandria, Theodore, and Apollinaris a [commentary] on the Epistle to the Galatians, to Paula and Eustochium, 3 books, of which the first begins *Very few indeed.*

- On the Epistle to the Ephesians, to the same, 3 books — which he testifies he published with such haste that each day he would dictate up to a thousand lines. Their beginning is *A wise man.*
- **He wrote** likewise, in the same style, on the Epistle to Titus, 1 book, beginning *Although they are not.*
- **Likewise**, on the Epistle to Philemon, 1 book, beginning *Those who are unwilling.*

He also composed, on various places of Paul, questions and various epistles, of whose number are:

- On that text Romans 5, *Scarcely for a just man will one die,* to Algasia, one question.
- On that text Romans 7, *Occasion being taken, sin revived,* to Algasia, question 1.
- On that text Romans 9, *I wished to be anathema,* to Algasia, question 1.
- On that text 1 Corinthians 6, *Every sin that a man does is outside the body,* to Amandus, epistle 1.
- On that text 1 Corinthians 8 [read 2], *What are those things which the eye has not seen,* to Marcella.
- On that text 1 Corinthians 15, *He must reign,* to Amandus, question 1.
- Likewise on that text 1 Corinthians 15, *We shall indeed all rise again,* to Minerius and Alexander, epistle 1.
- On that text 2 Corinthians 2, *To some the odor of death, to others the odor of life,* to Hedibia, question 11.
- On chapter 2 of Galatians, *On the pretended dispute of Peter and Paul,* to Augustine, epistle 1.
- On that text Colossians 2, *Let no man beguile you,* to Algasia, question 1.
- On that text 1 Thessalonians 4, *On the rapture of the living to meet the Lord,* to Marcella, question 1.
- On 2 Thessalonians 2, *On the man of sin,* to Algasia, question 1.
- On 1 Timothy 3, *On the conditions [qualifications] of a bishop,* to Oceanus, epistle 1.

And these are the undoubted writings of Jerome; but those which are doubtful are noted in the following Index.

SECOND INDEX OF THE EXEGETICAL VOLUMES. In which, under the uncertain title of Jerome, these are contained:

- **On the three books of Kings** — one book. [beginning] *There was one man.*
- **On the two books of Paralipomenon [Chronicles]** — one book. [beginning] *To Heber were born.*
- **On Job** — one book. [beginning] *Job, who grieving.*
- **On the Psalter** — one book. [beginning] *Lately, when Origen.*
- **On Proverbs** — three books. [beginning] *The parables of Solomon.*
- **On Lamentations** — three books. [beginning] *You have in the lamentations.*
- **On Mark** — one book. [beginning] *Every learned scribe.*
- **On Luke chapter 15, on the prodigal son** — one book. [beginning] *Of all indeed.*
- **On the Acts of the Apostles, on the interpretation of the names** — one book. [beginning] *Aceldama, a field.*
- **On all the epistles of Paul** — 14 books. [beginning] *By your letters.*

Concerning all these, what I myself think — being always ready to acquiesce in a better judgment — I will indicate in a few words.

ON THE ANNOTATIONS ON KINGS AND PARALIPOMENON [CHRONICLES].

The Annotations on the three books of Kings and the two of Paralipomenon, Nicholas of Lyra, in his commentaries on those same volumes, denies to be Jerome's — affirming that their author was a certain neophyte Jew, who from Hebrew fables noted down many things no less fictitious than ridiculous; and this too seems to confirm Lyra's opinion, that [it seems...] [→ p265]

[→ p265: catchword "vide-" (videtur); signature X4]

(Rich PDF p. 265 [printed folio 246, verso]. Book IV, letter H — Sixtus's critical judgments on the doubtful works attributed to St. Jerome: the Annotations on Kings/Chronicles (against Jerome's custom); the Commentary on Job (reckoned spurious, perhaps Bede's, compiled for Bishop Vecterius, with a Faustus of Riez citation); the Commentaries on the Psalter (a monk's centos, with the Cynomia *and Ps 86 "le-Ziyyon" disputes); the Commentaries on Proverbs (citing Gregory and Augustine — the table-distich — assigned by Trithemius to Bede); and the Commentaries on Lamentations (a cento gathered by Rabanus Maurus). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H — St. Jerome, judgments on the doubtful works, continued from p264:]

...[it seems] confirmed, in that Jerome, in the Annotations which he wrote on Genesis, everywhere brings forth Hebrew and Greek testimonies of the divine scripture, expressed in Hebrew and Greek words, weighing everywhere the various translations of the different interpreters — of which things you will find no mention in these annotations [on Kings and Chronicles].

ON THE COMMENTARY ON JOB.

The Commentary on Job — which the author, as appears from the end of the volume, compiled for the sake of Bishop Vecterius — is for that reason reckoned supposititious [spurious], because it follows neither the edition of the Seventy interpreters nor the Hebrew verity, nor cites any of the old expositors, but treats only mystical senses, the understanding of the letter being entirely omitted: all which things are far removed from Jerome's custom. It may be conjectured (if indeed anything is to be attributed to conjectures of this kind) that this work is by Bede the presbyter, as being an Englishman writing to an Englishman. For that Vecterius held a bishopric among the English, and lived in Bede's times, that Chronicle-volume testifies which is commonly called the *English Chronicle*. Yet it must not be denied that most things in these commentaries are borrowed from the writings of Jerome. For — to omit the rest — Faustus, bishop of Gaul, about the year 430 from the birth of Christ, at the beginning of his book *On Creatures* cited a testimony from a certain treatise of Jerome, which is now had here word for word at the end of the explanation of the twenty-fifth chapter in Job.

ON THE COMMENTARIES ON THE PSALTER.

The Commentaries of Annotations on the Psalms, arranged by intervals, give many indications of not being Jerome's. First, because this author, the historical sense set aside, dwells only in allegorical and tropological expositions, using no variety of editions. Then, he has none of that Greek and Hebrew erudition which Jerome is wont to bring into all his exegetical works. He wrote also many things diametrically opposed to Jerome's opinions — as in the interpretation of Psalm 77, where he says *Cynomia* [κυνόμυια] is the dog-fly, Jerome protesting against it in the epistle to Sunnia and Fretela. On Psalm 86 he notes that, according to the Hebrew verity, it ought to be read *Shall a man say of Sion*, against Jerome's translation, who, according to what is in the Hebrew — לציון *le-Ziyyon* — translated *To Sion shall a man say*. Psalm 89, which Jerome

ascribed to Moses, [this author] contends is not Moses'. As, in the explanation of Psalm 13, that testimony of Paul in the third chapter of the epistle to the Romans — which Jerome shows to be borrowed from Isaiah — [this author] asserts to be taken from Deuteronomy. To these is added, that — teeming everywhere with the ineptitude of speech, with battologies [vain repetitions] and solecisms — [this work] recoils both from the Jeronymian phrase and from his manner of writing, and often runs off into the formulas of homilies and sermons, repeating even to the point of nausea certain inept little exhortations, among which are these: *Why do I say all this? Do you wish to know what this is? And see what he says.* It is evident, from the exposition of Psalms 89, 111, and 115, that the author of the work was a monk, who was accustomed to speak, before the monks standing by, to the measure of the appointed hour, with rhapsodies brought here and there from the commentaries of various doctors, and especially of Jerome — as one may see in the enarration of Psalm 93, into which is inserted, word for word, a fragment of the Jeronymian exposition cited by Augustine in the epistle to Fortunatus, bishop of Sicca; and in the exposition of Psalm 50, where are reported the words of Jerome alleged by St. Gregory in the explanation of the fourth penitential Psalm. There are those who think the commentaries are Jerome's, but contaminated by an uncertain impostor with countless trifles and nonsense.

ON THE COMMENTARIES ON THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

The three books of commentaries on Proverbs are denied to have been Jerome's — both because of the dissimilarity of the sentences and of the eloquence, and because in them Gregory and Augustine are cited more than once. For a testimony of Augustine, from the book *On Lying* to Consentius, is adduced in the explanation of the sixth chapter; and again, in the explanation of the twentieth chapter, is cited a distich of the same [Augustine], from the *Sermons to the Hermits*, that is:

> *If anyone loves, by his words, to gnaw the life of the absent,*
>
> *let him know this table is forbidden to him.*

And in the exposition of the 21st chapter he cites the blessed Pope Gregory in the homilies of the gospel; and in the annotations on the 30th chapter he alleges by name an opinion of St. Jerome himself, from the commentaries on Jeremiah. Trithemius attributes these commentaries to Bede, by whose title also, in the most ancient copies, they are inscribed.

ON THE COMMENTARIES ON THE THRENI [LAMENTATIONS].

In the Commentaries on the Threni [Lamentations] — besides certain prefaces to Eusebius, gathered partly from the Epistle of Jerome on the interpretation of the Hebrew Alphabet, to Paula Urbica, partly from others of his writings — there is nothing that breathes the Jeronymian genius. For, besides that there is in them no trace either of Greek or of Hebrew understanding, the very structure of the speech — everywhere unequal — plainly cries out that this work is nothing else than a hotchpotch of centos, heaped together by a zealous collector out of the sayings of various different authors, and especially out of the opinions of Gregory, and even out of whole chapters. Nor do I fear to affirm that the gatherer of this heap was Rabanus Maurus, in whose works, printed at Basel, these three books are found. These the printers, that they might publish them more plausibly as Jerome's writings — enlarged into a greater bulk, and for greater [→ p266]

[→ p266: catchword "maio-" (maiorem)]

(Rich PDF p. 266 [printed folio 247, recto]. Book IV, letter H — the remaining doubtful works ascribed to St. Jerome (the Commentaries on Mark; the Prodigal Son; the Annotations on Acts; the Commentaries on Paul, judged Pelagian), Trithemius's further attributions, and the conclusion of the great St. Jerome entry (his death, c. 422, and his life written by Eusebius of Cremona); then two new Jerome-headwords: ***Girolamo***

Trevisan, bishop of Verona *(†1562), and* ***Jerome Varlenius Sylvius*** *of Utrecht. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter H — St. Jerome, doubtful works concluded, then new entries:]

...and might sell them at a greater price, inserted them into the volumes of Jerome — some lines being cut from the beginning of Rabanus's preface, so that the imposture might the less be detected by blind buyers.

ON THE COMMENTARIES ON MARK.

The Commentaries of Mystical explanation on Mark recoil from Jerome's style more than fire from water. That these are the work of a man who knew not much Latin, and even less Greek and Hebrew, the barbarism of the speech is proof, and the inept interpretation of foreign words: an example of which you have in the exposition of chapter 14, where the author noted that the word *Pascha* signifies in Latin "passing over" [transitus], but *Phase* "immolation," and that *Nardus pistica* is equivalent to "Mystical." But in the same place he affirms that Mary, who anointed the head of Christ in her own house, was that sinful woman who, in the house of the Pharisee, washed His feet with her tears. And in chapter 15 he writes that the ram was sacrificed for Isaac by Abraham on Mount Calvary — of which opinions Jerome disapproves the former in his chapter on Matthew 26, and the latter in the epistle to Marcella, affirming that the same sacrifice of the ram was offered on Mount Moriah. Again, in the explanation of chapter 15, he inserts certain verses on the figure of the cross, torn out in mutilated fashion from the fourth book of the poems of Sedulius[1] — who, it is agreed, was some years later than Jerome.

ON THE PRODIGAL SON.

That this treatise too is not Jerome's — if it were little clear from the character of the speech — this also could prove: that it is not likely that Jerome, who had written the exposition of this parable to Damasus, should again, with his opinion changed, have published another treatise with a contrary sense of explanation; and that all the printers have printed this very [treatise] among the homilies of John Chrysostom — although it is not Chrysostom's either, but of an uncertain writer, as we have noted in the censures of his works.

ON THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

And this little book of Annotations too a certain zealous man gathered out of St. Jerome — whose name, and whose book *On the Interpretation of the Names,* he cited at the end of the volume. It is credible that the collector was Bede, in whose works this same booklet still survives.

ON THE COMMENTARIES ON PAUL.

The Annotations on the thirteen Epistles of Paul — although on their front they display a little preface of Jerome writing to Heliodorus — yet the diversity of style and the difference of doctrines show that they are not his. Ambrose, archbishop of Compsa [Conza], asserts that the writer of the work was Pelagius, because in the exposition of the eighth and ninth chapters of the epistle to the Romans he teaches that eternal predestination is [made] from the merits of the elect foreseen by the divine foreknowledge. But I, to pronounce freely what I think, do not at all doubt that the author, whoever he was, labored under the Pelagian plague — as can most plainly be detected from the annotations on the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, where, expounding that text *Without the law sin was dead,* he thinks those to be mad who believe that Adam's sin has been derived into us by the propagation [inheritance] from our parents, affirming that the same sin was transmitted to posterity not by propagation but by example only. From which it is sufficiently clear that Jerome, the most bitter enemy of the Pelagian dogma, was not the author of this work. There are also certain other things asserted in these commentaries, not lacking the suspicion of heresy, which we —

together with the aforesaid errors — have noted in the following volume. Yet I am not of the opinion of Ambrose my teacher, so as to judge these commentaries to be Pelagius's own: for Pelagius, as Augustine testifies in the third book *On the Baptism of Little Ones*, in the very brief explanations which he published on the epistle to the Romans, used such modesty that he set forth the argument against original sin not under his own person but under another's — which Augustine, in the same place, transcribed word for word and reviews.

Besides these, Trithemius asserts that Jerome wrote on the four gospels according to the anagogy, 4 books, whose beginning is *First it must be asked*; likewise on the Canonical [Catholic] epistles, 7 books; and on the Apocalypse, 4 books. Concerning which I have nothing certain to affirm, except that Jerome, in the preface to the commentaries of Victorinus to Anatolius, promised that he would write on the Apocalypse.

There are also found, in the homiliary of Albinus [Alcuin], and in the breviaries of the divine offices, some homilies under the title of Jerome — which, however, are not homilies, but fragments of explanations, excerpted from various of his commentaries.

These, then, are the exegetical writings of Jerome, who, after countless labors of his studies, dies under the emperors Honorius and Theodosius, in the 61st year of his age, about the year of our salvation 422.[2] His life, it is believed, Eusebius of Cremona, his disciple, committed to the monuments of letters.

Jerome [Girolamo Trevisan], bishop of Verona, a Venetian by fatherland, of the noble Trevisan family, of the Order of Preachers, most celebrated throughout all Italy in sacred preaching, showed me an explanation on the Epistle to the Hebrews, published by himself, of singular erudition and judgment. He dies in the year of the Lord 1562.

Jerome Varlenius Sylvius [Hieronymus Varlenius], professor of sacred letters at Utrecht among the Johannites [Knights of St. John], composed three books of commentaries on all the Davidic Psalms, in which — bringing forward the various editions of the old interpreters — he elucidated the more obscure passages. Their beginning is *Before [I begin] the enarration.* He flou[rished] [→ p267]

[→ p267: catchword "Cla-" (Claruit)]

[1] Sedulius was some years later than St. Jerome. [2] Jerome dies about the year of the Lord 422.

(Rich PDF p. 267 [printed folio 248, verso]. Book IV, letter H: the close of Jerome Varlenius (fl. 1550); ***Girolamo Vida of Cremona, bishop of Alba*** *(the* Christiad*, quoted from its proem; still living 1566);* ***Hilary of Arles*** *(†440); the long entry on* ***Hilary of Poitiers*** *(his Job and Psalter works from Origen, the* De Trinitate*, Matthew in 33 canons, his Arian exile, †370, verse-life by Fortunatus);* ***Hildegard of Bingen*** *(†1180); and the opening of* ***Hippolytus****. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H, continued from p266:]

...[He flou]rished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Jerome Vida [Girolamo Vida] of Cremona, from a canon regular of the Lateran [made] bishop of Alba, a poet an incomparable imitator of the Virgilian song, was almost the first of all the Latin poets to sing — most happily — the life, death, resurrection, and other deeds of our Savior, gathered out of the four gospels, with a sublimity of song next to the Virgilian majesty. Which he himself, no inept judge of his own [work], indicated modestly enough in these verses:

> *I myself have led the Muses — a work attempted by many before —*
>
> *from the Aonian summit to the waves of Jordan,*
>
> *and through the Palestinian glades I take my stand upon the heights*

of the Idumaean mount.

and, after a few lines:

There was no way; sheer cliffs and rough rocks,

and briars covered all with their thickness.

I myself, shaking the strong two-edged axe with both hands,

drive a broad path, the shadows of the shrubs giving way.

And now an entrance is granted, and one may go by an open road.

I hope too that it will come to pass, that the road which we ourselves hammer out,

one day some man, dearer to the gods and to the Muses themselves,

will carry to something better, and polish more lavishly with art;

and the way which now by our first labor is opened,

he will more smoothly pave with cut marble.

For me it will be enough to have shown a specimen of illustrious toil.

This most learned man, therefore, gathered out of the four gospels six books of a *Christiad*, whose beginning is: *You who fill the sea, who fill the heaven, who fill the lands with your divine power.* He still lives, up to the present year 1566.

Hilary [Hilary of Arles], bishop of Arles — to whom, as the chief parent of the desert-solitude, Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, published a book *In Praise of the Desert* — a man versed in the divine scriptures and eloquent enough in speech, whose merits of sanctity the Catholic Church proclaims. He was of such piety toward the poor that, all his goods being cheerfully distributed for their uses, he was thereafter called, and was, the father of the poor. He wrote, among other things, to Pope Leo, in heroic verse, the history of Genesis very briefly — namely from the beginning to the seventh chapter. Its beginning is: *We have obeyed your admonitions, following your sweet commands.* He dies in the year of the Lord 440.

Hilary [Hilary of Poitiers], bishop of Poitiers [Pictavium] in Aquitanian Gaul, a man illustrious in erudition, sanctity, and miracles — whom Jerome, for his distinguished eloquence, calls the trumpet of the Roman tongue, and the Rhône of Latin eloquence — worked out, on the divine Scriptures, many most praiseworthy little works of Mystical explanation: that is, treatises on Job, or very many homilies, which Jerome, in the epistle against Vigilantius, testifies to have been gathered from Origen. From these Augustine, in the second book against Julian, brings forth testimonies against the heresy of the Pelagians.

He wrote also commentaries on the Psalter according to the LXX edition; of which Jerome relates that he read [Hilary's commentaries] on the first and second Psalm, and on Psalm 51 up to 62, and from 118 to the last. Beyond these I have myself read also other commentaries on seven Psalms — that is, from 62 to 70 — printed in type. There are those who assert that he published treatises on the entire body of the Psalter, and that it survives in Spain. But however it be, Jerome, writing against Rufinus, affirms that Hilary translated this explanation of the Psalms from the commentaries of Origen on the Psalter — from which he rendered, in the same sense, up to forty thousand lines, with a few things of his own interposed. And since he himself was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, and had scarcely received some thin breath of Greek letters, he used the help of Heliodorus the presbyter, his very close friend, learned in Greek — asking of him the things he could not understand in reading Origen. But since Heliodorus was destitute of the Hebrew tongue, and was sometimes deceived by the ambiguous signification of Greek words, this was the cause that Hilary, following his error, in some places of the Psalms twisted his expositions far from the pure and genuine sense of the letter toward allegorical and anagogical senses. His style, both in the Psalter and in the Matthew commentaries, is — without any affectation of art — compressed, solid, sometimes rather obscure, but foreign to all swelling and

pride. Although Jerome seemed to think otherwise: who, writing to Paulinus, says: *Hilary is lifted up on the Gallican buskin, and, when he is adorned with the flowers of Greece, is sometimes wrapped up in long periods, and on that account is far from the reading of the simpler brethren.* Which words of Jerome are certainly to be referred to the twelve books *On the Trinity*, in which (as the same Jerome writes in the epistle to Magnus the orator) he imitated the twelve books of Quintilian, both in style and in number. The beginning of the work is *That the opinions of very many are diverse*, etc.

He also published commentaries on the Song of Songs, which, however, Jerome confesses that he does not know.

Besides, he divided the gospel of Matthew into 33 Canons; and, following the order of this division, he discussed almost the whole evangelist with a succinct but erudite and solid explanation, delighting more in the allegorical than in the literal sense. The beginning of the work is *The step which Matthew*, etc.

Much this incomparable Bishop endured from the Arians. For, banished to Phrygia by the decree of the Synod of Béziers [Biterrae] — through Saturninus, bishop of Arles — he suffered a hard exile for four years with a constant mind; from which, having returned, he dies at Poitiers, Valentinian and Valens reigning, in the year of the Lord 370. **Fortunatianus** [Venantius Fortunatus], bishop of Poitiers, wrote his life in hexameter verse, in the year of the Lord 570.

Hildegard [Hildegard of Bingen], abbess of the monastery of St. Rupert of the town of Bingen, in the diocese of Mainz, of the Order of Benedict, a virgin of most holy conversation, and from her childhood illustrious for divine revelations and approved by miracles, wrote in Latin speech on the Gospels of the whole year — of which Trithemius reckons fifty-eight homilies. She dies in the year of the Lord 1180. The life of this venerable virgin, Theodoric Teuco [Dietrich], a Benedictine abbot, comprised in four volumes, in the year of the Lord 1200.

Hippolytus — as Jerome writes — bishop of an uncertain city; or, as Gela[sius] [→ p268]

[→ p268: catchword "lasius" (Gelasius)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 268 [printed folio 249, recto]. Book IV, letter H: the **Hippolytus** entry (bishop of Portus/Arabia; the wealthy "taskmaster" Ambrose who spurred both him and Origen; his work-list; fl. 220; the "two Hippoluti" question); **Honorius of Autun** (fl. 1120); **Hubert Leonard, bishop of Darién**; **Ubertino da Casale** (the* On the Seven States of the Church*); and the long entry on **Hugh of St-Cher** (first Dominican cardinal; his fourfold-sense commentaries; and the first* Concordances of the Bible*). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter H, continued from p267:]

...[or, as Ge]lasius the Pope first testifies in the book against Eutyches, [Hippolytus was] bishop of the metropolis of the Arabs — or, as Zonaras relates, bishop of the Roman Port [Portus] and a martyr — a man most learned in the divine scriptures, and (as far as appears from his fragments) most studious of allegories. He wrote many, and almost incredible, Greek volumes upon the sacred scriptures: so that that Ambrose, whom Jerome calls Ἐργοδιώκτην [ergodioktes], that is, *One who urges on the work* [a taskmaster], exhorted, and in a manner impelled, Origen to write commentaries on the sacred letters after the imitation of Hippolytus — furnishing him with papers, parchments, seven secretaries and as many girls most swift in writing, and an equal number of copyists, at his own expense, and demanding of him a new work every day. Whence it came about that these two most famous men, in a certain generous contest, strove with all their might, each to surpass the other in the publishing of books. Hippolytus, then, wrote:

- On Genesis, complete commentaries: of which Jerome, in Question 3 to Damasus, cites a testimony from the exposition of chapter 27.

• Likewise, on the *Hexaemeron,* separately, one book.

• On Exodus, one book.

• On Numbers, one book.

• On the beginning of the book of Kings, sermon 1 — cited by Theodoret in the *Polymorphus* [*Eranistes*].

• Treatises on the Psalter, out of which Theodoret in the *Polymorphus* places fragments from the exposition of Psalm 2, 22, and 23.

• On the Proverbs of Solomon, one book.

• On Ecclesiastes, one book.

• On the Song of Songs, one book.

• On a part of Ezekiel, one book.

• On Zechariah, one book.

• On Matthew, one book.

• On the Apocalypse, one book.

There were found in recent years at Basel certain commentaries on the Apocalypse, inscribed to Hippolytus, concerning which there is doubt, on account of the poverty of their erudition and style. He flourished under Alexander Severus, in the year of the Lord 220.

He is cited in many commentaries, both Greek and Latin, as Hippolytus, bishop of Rome; but in some, as Hippolytus, of Rome, or simply the Roman — whom some suspect to be another Hippolytus, different from this one, and to have written in Latin, because Jerome, in the epistle to Magnus the orator of Rome, reckons a certain Hippolytus, a senator of the city of Rome, among the most learned writers of the Church.

Honorius [Honorius of Autun], presbyter of the Church of Autun, assiduously versed in the divine volumes and imbued with all the liberal arts, wrote in Latin and eloquent speech, on the *Hexaemeron,* one book; on the *Psalter,* one book; on the *Song of Songs,* one book, which begins *In the beginnings of the books.* He flourished under the Emperor Henry V, in the year of the Lord 1120.

Hubert Leonard [Hubertus Leonardus], bishop of Darién — a Carmelite, once moderator of the Theological School at Paris, and inquisitor of heretical depravity — wrote, according to the custom of his school, on the Gospel of Luke, one book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1490.

Ubertine of Casale [Ubertino da Casale], of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], a pious man and a student of the divine scripture, when he saw his order falling away from its first institution, began certain new separations under the appearance of a reformation, and obtained that they be confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff; which then, at the petition of the Ministers of the same order, were revoked by the same Pope, because they seemed undertaken to the grave scandal and schism of the order. Whence, moved [by this], Ubertine, having entered the Order of the Carthusians, wrote to all the faithful of Christ a commentary on the Apocalypse, which he entitled *On the Seven States of the Church,* according to the seven visions of Blessed John in the Apocalypse — in which he is thought, by some professors of his order, to have written certain things by a prophetic spirit. The beginning of the work is *To all the truly faithful of Christ Jesus.* He flourished under the Emperor Albert, in the year of the Lord 1300.

Hubert Leonard, a Carmelite, bishop of Darién, wrote on the Gospel of Luke, 1 book. He flourished in the year 1490. *[This entry duplicates the Hubert Leonard notice above — so printed.]*

Hugh [Hugh of St-Cher], of Saint-Cher [*Carensis*] — either from the town of St. Cher, or of St. Theodoric — bishop of Barcelona, by profession a Dominican, cardinal-presbyter of the title of St. Sabina, the first from the Order of Preachers to be raised to the Cardinalate;[1] a man distinguished for holiness of morals and abundance of letters — whom Humbert of Vienne [Humbert of Romans], the fifth Master General of the

Order of Preachers, his hearer and disciple, drew from the Academy of secular disciplines to the institute of his religion. And a little after, Pope Innocent IV, greatly delighted with his sweet and erudite familiarity, co-opted him into the college of Cardinals, and sent him as legate into Germany to the Electors of the Empire, that at his persuasion they might substitute, in place of the deposed Frederick II, another Emperor. This man published many works: of which there are commentaries on the whole Scripture according to the fourfold sense, written in the scholastic (that is, brief, bare, and worn) speech, without any paint of secular eloquence, beginning — after the manner of the Scholastics — from various sentences of the divine Scripture; their beginnings, as being known to all, I omit for brevity's sake.

And after these commentaries, he first of all devised a great index upon the sacrosanct Bible, entitled *Concordances of the Bible*[2] — a most laborious work indeed, of immense tedium and time, but greatly necessary to the students of the sacred volumes; in which he arranged, with most accurate diligence, the several declinable words of the divine scripture according to the sequence of the letters, noting not only the books, but also the chapters of the books, and the lines of the chapters, in which each desired word was contained. There are those who think that this work — on account of the immense expenditure of time and labor, for which the life of one man could not suffice — was, at Hugh's urging, enjoined upon five hundred zealous fathers of various monasteries, on this plan: that each should reduce individual words into Alphabetical classes; and so, in a short time, by the diligence of many, [→ p269]

[→ p269: catchword "se-" (multorum sedulitate)]

[1] Hugh of St-Cher was the first Cardinal from the Order of Dominicans. [2] Hugh of St-Cher was the first author of the Concordances of the Bible.

(Rich PDF p. 269 [printed folio 250, verso]. Book IV: the close of the Hugh entries — Hugh of St-Cher's Concordance (imitated by Isaac Nathan's Hebrew and Euthalius's Greek concordances; †Lyons 1262), ***Hugh of St. Neot****,* ***Hugh Virley*** *of Norwich, and* ***Hugh of St. Victor*** *("the Tongue of Augustine," with his five classes of works). Then* ***letter I opens*** *with* ***James the Englishman****,* ***Jaime Pérez de Valencia*** *(Psalter dedicated to Rodrigo Borgia),* ***James the Apostle****, and* ***James Furnius*** *of Genoa (a Greek-and-Latin acrostic paraphrase of the great psalm). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter H — the Hugh entries, continued from p268:]

...[and so, in a short time, by the diligence of many,] the work was completed. Which we have afterward seen most diligently imitated, both by the Greeks and by the Hebrews — by the work of Rabbi Isaac Nathan the Jew, and of Euthalius the Rhodian monk: of whom the former collected the Hebrew concordances of the Bible, the latter the Greek. These [Greek ones] we saw at Rome, written by a Greek hand on ancient parchments; but those [Hebrew ones], printed at Venice from the press of Giustiniani. He flourished under the Emperor Frederick II, and died at Lyons in the year of the Lord 1262, and there obtained a tomb in the church of the Preachers.

Hugh of St. Neot [de sancto Neoto], a Carmelite, published on the Gospel of Luke, 1 book. He died in the year 1340.

Hugh Virley [de Virley], an Englishman, a Carmelite, professed of the monastery of Norwich, published commentaries on Matthew in the year of the Lord 1344.

Hugh Victorinus [Hugh of St. Victor], or of St. Victor, a Saxon by nation, a Canon of the Augustinian institute, Abbot of the monastery of Blessed Victor at Paris, a man most illustrious for the exquisite erudition of divine and human letters, and so great an emulator of Augustine's doctrine and phrase that he was called, by the common byword of the learned of his time, *the Tongue of Augustine*. This man gathered, from the reading of the old fathers — and especially of Augustine — upon the whole body of the divine Scripture, a great number of little works, divided into five classes, that is, into *Annotations, Questions, Homilies,*

Commentaries, and *Miscellanies.* Of whose number, those which embrace almost universally the explanation of the whole divine scripture are these, namely:

• On all the books of the Old Testament, nine books of *Allegories.* [beginning] *Whoever, by wisdom.*

• From both Testaments, five books of *Miscellanies.* [beginning] *The spiritual man judges.*

• *On the sacred scriptures and writers*, one book, in which he discussed, in a beautiful order: On the excellence and usefulness of sacred scripture; On its matter and its difference from the other sciences; On its threefold understanding; On the order, number, and authority of its books; On the writers of the sacred books; On the translators of scripture and its restorers; On the Apocryphal Scriptures; On the mystical places, times, and numbers of Scripture; and On the difficulties contained in scripture. The beginning of the book is *[To] the reader of the divine scriptures.*

• **The same** composed, for the sake of Raynerius the convert, three books *On the Animals and Plants which are read in the scriptures, and their mystical significations* — bringing great utility to those who approach the spiritual senses of scripture. The book begins, *At the petitions of your desire.*

• On the Pentateuch, five books of *Annotations according to the literal sense*, whose beginning is *Desiderius is a proper name.*

• On the four books of Kings, one book of *literal Annotations.*

• On the various verses of almost all the Psalms, one book of *Annotations, both according to the literal and the spiritual sense*; to which he made the beginning, *Certain things, to you, dearest brother.*

• Likewise, on the first four chapters of Ecclesiastes, 19 *Homilies.* [beginning] *Which things, from the book of Solomon*, etc.

• On the Song of Songs, mystically, 1 book. [beginning] *In the beginning of the work.*

• On the Threni [Lamentations], one book of *Annotations according to the four senses.*

• On Ezekiel, 1 book.

• On Joel, one book of *Annotations according to the fourfold sense.*

• On Abdias [Obadiah], one book of *Annotations.*

• On Matthew, one book of *Allegories.* [beginning] *Jesus, seeing the crowds.*

• On Mark, one book of *Allegories.* [beginning] *Jesus entered into the synagogue.*

• On Luke, one book of *Allegories.* [beginning] *This matter.*

• On John, one book of *Annotations to the letter.* [beginning] *Among all the scriptures.*

• On John, one book of *Allegories.* [beginning] *The first parents.*

• On all the epistles of Paul, four books of *Questions and Decisions*, whose beginning is *Paul, an appellative name.*

• Likewise, on the epistle to the Romans, 1 book. [beginning] *God made all things.*

He flourished under the Emperor Henry V, in the year of the Lord 1130.

I

James [Jacobus] the Englishman, by name and nation, wrote on the Song of Solomon. He lived in the year of the Lord 1270.

James [Jaime Pérez de Valencia], bishop of Christopolis, a Spaniard by nation, of Valencia by fatherland, of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine a most observant follower, copiously imbued with human and divine letters, published on all the Psalms of David a huge and prolix volume of the scholastic kind of

explanation — full of allegorical and anagogical senses, and abounding in many digressions of the various sciences — which he dedicated to Rodrigo Borgia, Cardinal of Valencia, bishop of Portus. Its beginning is *I will open in parables.* He wrote also on the Song of Songs, one book; on the ferial Canticles; and on the Canticle of Zechariah, of Mary, and of Simeon, one book. He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, in the year of the Lord 1490.

James [the Apostle], *the brother of the Lord according to the flesh,* first of all applied an interpretation and exposition to the Gospel of Matthew — which was written in Hebrew by Matthew himself, and published at Jerusalem. Athanasius, in the *Synopsis,* is witness.

James Furnius, a Genoese, a distinguished jurisconsult, translated Psalm 119 [the great acrostic psalm; Vulgate 118] into Greek and Latin verse, after the likeness of the Hebrew verses; of which, as the several octonaries [eight-line stanzas] contain eight verses, beginning from one letter according to the order of the alphabet, so the Greek and Latin octonaries have as many verses, beginning from the same letter, in this manner:

A. [Aleph]

Ἂν ἂδ′ ἄμωμοι μάκαρες βάντες ἐν νόμῳ θεοῦ.

ἁπάσαις φρεσὶ Ὅσια μάρτυροι ἰχνεύοντες ὄλβιοι.

ἄβατοι γὰρ εἰσὶ παρανομοῦσιν αἱ σῶν τρίβοι.

ἂν ἐγαμψναι φυλακτὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς σὰς ἔθου

δι βάσσας ἐμοῦ κομίσαιντ′ ὡς φυλακὴν τῶν σῶν δικῶν.

[A Greek metrical paraphrase of the aleph octonary of Psalm 118 (Vulgate) — "Blessed are the undefiled who walk in the law of God," etc.; the 16th-century Greek type is difficult and partly corrupt in the scan. The stanza continues on the next page.]

[→ p270: catchword "ἄναλο-" (the Greek verse continues)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 270 [printed folio 251, recto]. Book IV, letter I: the close of **James Furnius**'s Greek-and-Latin acrostic paraphrase of Psalm 118 (Vulgate), then a long run of James entries — **Jacobus de Voragine** (the first Italian Bible), **James of Lausanne**, **James of Logenhagen** [later-edition addition], **James López de Zúñiga**, **Jacobus Magnus of Toledo**, **James Martin**, **James Nacchianti of Chioggia**, **James Paniscotius of Molfetta**, **James Sadoleto**, **James Sannazaro** (*De partu Virginis*), and **James Schoepper**. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — James Furnius's acrostic (aleph octonary), continued from p269:]

ἀναίσχυντος ἔσομ′ ἅπαντα σέβων ἐφορῶν προστάγματα.

ἂν μάθω δίκης σοῦ κρα... τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐξομολογήσομαι.

ἃς φυλάξαντ′ ἐντολάς, μηδάμα λιμπάνῃς.

[These three Greek lines complete the aleph octonary begun on p269 (Psalm 118:6–8, Vulgate — "Then shall I not be confounded… I will confess you… I will keep your commandments; forsake me not"); the 16th-century Greek type is difficult and partly corrupt in the scan.]

Then the Latin octonary, also acrostic on **A** [Aleph]:

Blessed is whoever walks in the law of the Lord,

and follows His commands with a steadfast heart,

[who] with a right mind turns aside from crooked ways —

the straight ones. O God, which you have given, so greatly to be kept:

yet to your commandments let my will be ready.

By me, O Father, in loving you may I never be confounded,

and, joined to your law, I will confess you with my heart:

but do you not forsake me, who hold fast to your words.

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1500.

James [Jacobus de Voragine], archbishop of Genoa, of the Order of Preachers, from the town of Varazze [Varagine], which is situated on the maritime coast of Liguria not far from Genoa — a man of much and varied reading, wonderfully eloquent in his own tongue, and celebrated in the opinion of all in sacred preaching, also no contemptible writer of histories, and so studious of the volumes of Augustine that he held almost all of them in memory — first of all men translated the divine volumes of both Instruments [Testaments] into the Italian tongue, with the utmost fidelity and diligence. He flourished under the Emperor Adolf, in the year of the Lord 1290.

James Goeuschelius of Winterthur [Vitodurensis] wrote *On the tropes, figures, and idioms of the divine scripture*, one book, in the year of the Lord 1536.

James of Lausanne [Jacobus Lausannensis], a Dominican, bishop of an uncertain city, distinguished for the knowledge of divine and human things, and most celebrated for the fame of his ecclesiastical preaching, wrote in scholastic speech very many commentaries on the sacred letters — of which, at Venice, in the library of St. John and Paul [Santi Giovanni e Paolo], I read the below-written:

- On the Pentateuch, five books. [beginning] *In the beginning [God] created.*
- On Job, one book. [beginning] *You have heard of the endurance of Job.*
- On Proverbs, one book. [beginning] *I will open in parables.*
- On the Song of Songs, one book. [beginning] *About the beginning of this book.*
- On Wisdom, one book. [beginning] *Wisdom cries out.*
- On Ecclesiasticus, one book. [beginning] *This book is divided.*
- On Isaiah, one book. [beginning] *It is not good.*

He flourished under the Emperor Wenceslas, in the year 1390.

James of Logenhagen [Jacobus a Logenhagen] wrote Annotations on the Canonical Epistle of St. James, printed at Louvain in the year 1572. *[Later-edition addition — the Louvain 1572 printing postdates Sixtus's 1569 death; not in the 1566 original.]* Likewise a Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, collected from all the works of St. Augustine.

James López de Zúñiga [Lopis Stunica] composed two books in defense of the Vulgate edition of the New Testament — the former against Erasmus, the latter against James Faber Stapulensis [Lefèvre d'Étaples], bishop of Vienne. He flourished in the year 1530.

James of Lausanne [de Lusanna], of the Order of Preachers, wrote a Commentary on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. *[This appears to overlap the "James of Lausanne" entry above (both a Dominican of Lausanne); so printed as two notices.]*

James, surnamed Magnus [the Great], of Toledo by fatherland, a follower of the Eremite [Augustinian] order, vehemently exercised in the wrestling-school of scholastic discipline, much renowned, illustrious for the science of natural philosophy, and a distinguished interpreter of the sacred letters, adorned the whole Bible with annotations. He flourished under the Emperor Wenceslas, in the year of the Lord 1400.

James Martin, a Frenchman [Jacobus Martinus, Gallus], in the year of the Lord 1536 published a noble volume, dedicated by himself to Michael, bishop of Langres — in which are briefly contained all the Tropologies and Allegories of Origen Adamantius on the Heptateuch, selected by an uncertain but erudite author, and arranged into seven books. The beginning of the work is *In the beginning,* etc.; *Because our inner man.*

James Nacchianti [Jacobus Naclantus], bishop of Chioggia [Clodiensis], of the Order of Preachers, the most celebrated philosopher and theologian of his time, wrote to Pope Julius III pious and learned enarrations on Paul's epistle to the Romans and to the Ephesians, in a brief, clear, and elegant style, in which he inserted and expounded — according to sacred scripture and the orthodox faith — almost all the difficulties of Christian piety. We have also read a work of his most useful for the understanding of the divine volumes, whose title is *The Marrow of Sacred Scripture*; likewise an explanation on the ninetieth psalm, expounded as a sermon; likewise *Theological Theorems.* He flourished under Pope Julius III, in the year of the Lord 1554.

James Paniscotius of Molfetta [Malfetanus], a Minorite of the regular observance, professor of Theology and of the sacred letters, wrote a prolix work on the exposition of the fourteenth psalm, published as an interrupted dialogue between Solomon questioning and David answering — in which many things are made manifest, most useful and necessary to all the faithful. Its beginning is *When the compass of the heavens.* He flourished in the year 1550.

James Sadoleto [Jacopo Sadoleto], bishop of Carpentras [Carpentoractensis] in Gaul, and Cardinal of the Roman Church, a man plainly learned and a most happy imitator of the Ciceronian style, wrote to Matthew Giberti, bishop of Verona, pious explanations on three psalms — namely 50, 93, and 95 — of which the first begins *David [son] of Jesse of Bethlehem,* the second *Many and grave things press upon [me].* Likewise, on the epistle to the Romans (translated by himself into Latin), eloquent commentaries — of a continuous Collation, or of a continuing dialogue, to Francis, king of the French — arranged into three volumes, whose beginning is *Often, as I ponder.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

James Sannazaro [Jacopo Sannazaro], a Neapolitan patrician, who is also [called] Actius Sincerus Parthenopaeus, a man born under a most happy star to illustrate the sacrosanct poetry of Christians, wrote on the second chapter of Luke, *On the Virgin Birth,* three books in heroic verse — so displaying the Virgilian brightness and sublimity that you would think you were reading and hearing Virgil himself. The beginning of the work is *Of the Virgin's childbirth, and of the great [offspring born] to a virgin parent, I sing.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

James Schoepper [Jacobus Schoepperus], a distinguished professor of divine Theology, and an eloquent preacher, delivered sermons to the people of the city of Dortmund [Tremonia] upon the Gospels which are read on the several feast-days — both of the Saints and of the Season — which he himself afterward wrote out in an elegant method and a most succinct style, and re[duced] into three volumes. [→ p271]

[→ p271: catchword "degit" (redegit); signature Y]

(Rich PDF p. 271 [printed folio 252, verso]. Book IV, letter I: the close of ***James Schoepper****, then* ***James Tralensis****,* ***Janus Vitalis****, an anonymous* On the Theological Poetry of David, ***Innocent III*** *(the seven penitential psalms),* ***Innocent V*** *(Peter of Tarentaise),* ***Joachim of Fiore****, and the opening of the John cluster — **John abbot of Nivelles**, **John Lorich**, **John Alcock of Ely**, **John of Alerio**, and **John Annius of Viterbo**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I, continued from p270:]

...[and re]duced [them] into three volumes. To which he also added sermons upon the Gospels which are recited on the sixth ferias [Fridays] of the whole of Lent, and Catechetical sermons. He flourished under

Charles V, in the year of the Lord 1550.

James Tralensis [Jacobus Tralensis], a German, moderator of the school of Theologians at the renowned city of Cologne, the most noble Theologian and Philosopher of his time, worked out one book of scholastic exposition on the Apocalypse of John, whose beginning is *Jacob saw in a dream.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1480.

Janus Vitalis [Giano Vitale], polished in the more elegant letters, wrote on the fiftieth psalm an elegant commentary, beginning *When David's army.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Of an uncertain, but ancient, author a Latin treatise, not yet printed, is kept by the Academicians of the Venetian Academy, entitled *On the Theological Poetry of David*: in which it is shown how the royal prophet David, in setting forth the divine praises and expressing the affections of his most ardent heart pertaining to the salvation of the soul, left the other poets as far behind him as the divine spirit surpasses all the force of human genius.

Innocent [Innocent III], Supreme Pontiff, the third of that name, a Campanian by nation, of Anagni by fatherland, from his childhood imbued with the best studies in the most celebrated Academy of Paris, celebrated for erudition and holiness of life; after Pope Celestine III — by the common consent of all the Cardinals, although he was the younger among them — raised, at God's nod, to the supreme honor of the pontificate, wrote out many things on the divine Scriptures. Of these I have read learned and holy commentaries on the seven penitential psalms, worked out in the Scholastic manner but in a more conspicuous and ornate speech, in which he reduced the scholastic divisions and distinctions to a fixed number, without any tedium of superfluous multiplication and repetition; and he prudently accommodates the frequent testimonies of the holy scriptures to their places, without any harshness of forcing [the text], mingling among these many pious and sweet little meditations and prayers, by which he kindles the reader's mind with sweet affections. The work has this beginning: *Lest, amid manifold occupations*, etc. He also published certain sermons to the clergy and people — now in the Latin, now in the Italian tongue — in the Lateran church; which, edited into one volume in Latin, he dedicated to Arnulph, abbot of the Cistercian order. The work begins *The prophetic authority teaches.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1200.

Innocent V [Pope], formerly called *Peter of Tarentaise* — which is now a town of the Helvetii [Swiss][1] — of the Order of Preachers, sat in the supreme pontificate, according to the number of his name, only five months; a man certainly most learned in the divine scriptures, and nobly instructed in Aristotelian philosophy, who taught Scholastic Theology for many years in the school of Paris with distinction. He reduced all the works of St. Thomas [Aquinas] into an epitome, and acquired great praise for his erudition. He wrote on the sacrosanct Bible various lectures in the scholastic manner — but especially one book of a lecture on the Song of Songs; on all the epistles of Paul, 14 books, [beginning] *A vessel of election.* In the Dominican Library at Bologna is seen a Postil of his on the whole of Paul, in manuscript, whose beginning is *Your lightnings shone.* He flourished under the Emperor Rudolf, in the year 1275.

Joachim [of Fiore], abbot of the monastery of Fiore [Florensis] of the Order of St. Benedict, sprung from Calabria, a man studious and practiced in the divine scriptures, and in his time believed to be a most true prophet, wrote to Brother Rainerius of Ponza, on the whole prophet Isaiah, in a rude and obscure style, one book of commentaries — in which he discoursed on many things concerning the seven times [ages] of the Church, and concerning the burdens of the sixth time, as if foreknowing the future; mingling in many prophecies and predictions concerning future times — whether these have been fulfilled, or are still to be fulfilled, let others see. The work begins *If [we come] to this center of the mystical wheels.* He wrote also, to the Emperor Henry, on Jeremiah and on Daniel, commentaries of the same kind; likewise on the gospel of John. He wrote also five books *On the Concord of the Old and New Testament*, in which he shows that the times of both Testaments so agree that nothing was done in the Old Testament which is not equally done in

the New — or done, or to be done, in the last days. The work begins *Because of the falling and perishing age,* etc. He flourished under the Emperor Henry VI, in the year of the Lord 1200.

John [Ioannes], abbot of the monastery of Nivelles [Nivicellensis], a Theologian distinguished among the scholastics, most learned in pontifical [canon] law, and consummate in the sacred letters by long practice, wrote a work whose title is *The Concordance of the Bible and of the Canons*: in which, according to the order of the divine books, he gathered from both Testaments all the passages with which the canons and decrees of the holy pontiffs agree, and set beside them the corresponding places of the canons. The work begins *In the beginning God created,* etc. He flourished under Pope Pius II, in the year 1460.

John Adamarius Lorichius [Johann Lorich] illustrated the book of the Wisdom of Sirach with a metrical paraphrase, in the year of the Lord 1540.

John Alcock [Alcoch], an Englishman, bishop of Ely [Eliensis], wrote on the seven penitential psalms, in the year of the Lord 1490.

John of Alerio [de Alerio], a Toulousan by nation, a Carmelite, the thirteenth Prior General of his order, studious and erudite in the divine Scriptures, and no less venerable for fervor of religion than for erudition, published one book of a scholastic lecture on Ecclesiasticus. He flourished under the Emperor Charles IV, in the year of the Lord 1348.

John Annius [of Viterbo], an Italian by nation, of Viterbo by fatherland, a professor of the Order of Preachers, an eminent Theologian, most celebrated for a most exact knowledge of all histories — as many as there are and have been — a most excellent antiquary, and an admirable investigator and discoverer of all the most ancient things, whose accurate commentaries on Berosus the Babylonian, Methasthenes the Persian, Manetho the Egyptian, and many other historians of the most ancient antiquity are extant. He wrote commentaries on the Psalter, of which he himself makes mention [in] the *Chronography of Philo* [→ p272]

[→ p272: catchword "Philonis" (Chronographiam Philonis)]

[1] Tarentaise is a town of Savoy.

(Rich PDF p. 272 [printed folio 253, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the close of ***John Annius of Viterbo*** *(the Beast of Revelation 13 identified with Muhammad, dedicated to Sixtus IV), then a dense run of John entries:* ***John Arundineus****,* ***John Arboreus*** *(the* Theosophia*),* ***John of Abbeville****,* ***John Baconthorpe*** *(a 27-book New Testament commentary),* ***John Balbi*** *(the* Catholicon*),* ***John Baptist Folengo****,* ***John Batmanson****,* ***John Beetz****,* ***John Benedictus****,* ***John Benius****,* ***John Bertram****,* ***John of Beverley****,* ***John Buteo*** *(on Noah's Ark),* ***John Catardus****, and the opening of* ***John Christopher****. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I, continued from p271:]

...expounding the *Chronography of Philo*. He also published one book of *Questions on the Apocalypse,* which he sent and dedicated to Sixtus IV, Pontiff, and to the Christian kings — showing in it that that Beast, described especially in the thirteenth chapter of the Apocalypse (which the commentators commonly interpret as Antichrist), is the pseudo-prophet Muhammad; who, although he died very many years ago, yet his sect lives even now, and rages excessively against the people of God, and it will last so long, until — according to the seventh chapter of Daniel — the kingdom is given to the people of the saints of the Most High, that is, to the Christians. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1460.

John Arundineus [Ioannes Arundineus], a German, of the Order of Carmelites, bishop of Usbita [Usbitensis], a man most practiced in the divine volumes, not ignorant of secular philosophy, and a preacher of most celebrated reputation, published scholastic Lectures on the book of Wisdom, on Psalm 118, and on the epistle to the Romans — lectures earlier expounded by himself in public readings — in the year of the Lord 1490.

John Arboreus [Jean Arboreus], of Laon, a doctor, Theologian of the Sorbonne Academy of Paris, a most learned and truly Catholic man, published a huge volume divided into nineteen books, inscribed with the title *THEOSOPHIA*, that is, *Of Divine Wisdom*: in which — after the custom of the school, in an open and not uncultivated style — he explained the most difficult passages both of the Old and of the New Testament, discussing and examining the various opinions and controversies of the sacred doctors upon those passages, and destroying many machinations of the heretics with strong blows of argumentation. He arranged the Assertions of his work in alphabetical order, so that they might be more easily found. Its beginning is thus: *To the most noble and reverend Cardinal Louis of Bourbon.* He wrote also, to Henry [II], king of the French, on Proverbs one book, beginning *They profit very much*; on Ecclesiastes, to the same, one book, beginning *With all [my] effort*; on the Song of Songs, one book. He also published commentaries on the four Gospels, in which he discussed the opinions of the sacred doctors and rejected the pernicious assertions of certain interpreters. The beginning of the work is *A sacred work to you.* He flourished under Charles V, in the year 1550.

John of Abbeville [de Abbatis Villa], archbishop of Besançon, a Frenchman by nation, wrote commentaries on the Song of Solomon, printed at Paris by Ascensius [Josse Bade] in the year of the Lord 1521.

John Bacon [Baconthorpe], an Englishman, of the Order of Carmelites, the prince of the Theologians of his time, and having obtained no ignoble talent in expounding the divine scriptures, expounded the whole New Testament, publishing in the scholastic manner twenty-seven books of commentaries, which are:

- On the Gospel of Matthew, one book.
- On the Gospel of Mark, one book.
- On Luke, one book.
- On John, one book.
- On the Acts of the Apostles, one book.
- On the epistles of Paul, fourteen books.
- On the Canonical epistles, seven books.
- On the Apocalypse, one book.

He flourished under the Emperor Charles IV, in the year of the Lord 1350.

John Balbi [Giovanni Balbi], a Genoese, of the Order of Preachers, author of the Latin dictionary whose title is *CATHOLICON*, a man imbued with scholastic theology, skilled in the Latin and Greek tongue, wrote — after the scholastic custom — upon the four Evangelists a Postil on the four gospels, which begins *Why did God wish there to be not more than four Evangelists?* It is had at Genoa, in manuscript, in the library of the Preachers. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1280.

John Baptist Folengo [Giovanni Battista Folengo], of Mantua, a Cassinese monk of St. Benedict, composed and completed commentaries on all the psalms — with the utmost fidelity, wondrous clarity, and pleasing brevity, out of the Hebrew verity itself — in which are together a rare erudition, and an author burning with ardor of spirit, and candor and acuteness of the meanings, and the elegance of Latin speech. Their beginning is *The argument of the whole volume.* He wrote also clear explanations on all the Catholic epistles. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

John Batmanson [Batmansonus], a Carthusian, wrote on the Proverbs and the Song of Solomon. He met death in the year 1531.

John Beetz [Beetzius], a German, attached to the institute of the Carmelites in the monastery of Tienen [Tenensi], a distinguished Theologian and philosopher, a most keen disputant in the schools of the theologians, and most pleasing to the people in his sermons, published in scholastic phrase one book of a

scholastic explanation on the epistle of Paul to the Romans. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1470.

John Benedictus [Jean Benoît], a doctor theologian most celebrated in the Academy of Paris, gathered very brief but most useful scholia — from the holy and ancient fathers cited by name — upon the whole scripture. He flourished under Charles V, in the year 1550.

John Benius [Giovanni Beni], of Verona, a priest educated in the school of John Matthew Giberti, bishop of Verona, wrote in the Italian tongue seventy-seven Discourses, or digressions, on the passion of the Lord, [drawn] from the four Evangelists.

John Bertram [Bertramus], a German of Nuremberg, most excellent in the scholastic disciplines, once public professor of Theology in the Academy of Mainz, wrote a huge volume on the Prologue of the Bible, most copiously embracing all things necessary for an introduction to scripture, which begins *As I ponder*, etc. He flourished under the Emperor Maximilian, in the year of the Lord 1495.

John of Beverley [Beverlacius], archbishop of York, an Anglo-Saxon by nation, wrote commentaries on the Gospel of Luke, in the year of the Lord 721.

John Buteo [Jean Borrel], a Dauphinois, a Frenchman, a most excellent mathematician, wrote in the year of the Lord 1550, to Cardinal François de Tournon, one most erudite book on the Ark of Noah — of what form and capacity it was — beginning *Upon that Ark, the seed-bed of the world.*

John Catardus [Giovanni Catardi], of Acquasparta, published an enarration on the prophet Jonah, accommodated to sermons and to Christian consolation, which begins *It looks to this*; likewise a mystical Paraphrase on the same prophet, whose beginning is *Brief indeed.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

John Christopher [Ioannes Chrystophorus], of the Order of Preach[ers] [→ p273]

[→ p273: catchword "torum" (Praedicatorum); signature Y2]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 273 [printed folio 254, verso]. Book IV, letter I: the close of **John Christopher**, then **John Cassian** (†435), **John Colet** (†1519), and the long entry on **St. John Chrysostom** — his teachers and friends, his commentaries and homilies, and an extended description of his homiletic method (the Parasceue / Exegetic / Ethic division), his sparing use of allegory, and his handling of Romans 9:16 against Augustine's predestinarian reading. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I, continued from p272:]

...[of the Order of] Preachers, [John Christopher] wrote commentaries on Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and all the epistles of St. Paul. He flourished in the year 1260.

John Cassian [Ioannes Cassianus], a Scythian by nation, a hearer of John Chrysostom, and ordained deacon by him; after some years, departing from him for an uncertain cause, he was consecrated presbyter at Marseilles, where he also founded two monasteries, of men and of women. He wrote, in a plain and balanced speech, on that which the Apostle says — *For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, [that I do]* — a learned and elegant book, which he afterward inserted among the Collations of the holy fathers published by himself, and marked it as the twenty-third book of the Collations. He dies at Marseilles, not without a reputation for sanctity, Theodosius and Valentinian reigning, in the year of the Lord 435.

John Colet [Coletus], an Englishman, wrote commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon and on the Gospel of Matthew. He met death in the year of the Lord 1519.

John, archbishop of the city of Constantinople, called *Chrysostom* — that is, *golden mouth* — for the golden excellence of his speech, an Antiochene by fatherland, and once a presbyter of the church of Antioch, born of the noble parents Secundus and Anthusa; in the studies of eloquence a hearer and disciple of Libanius the

Sophist, in philosophy of Andragathius the most illustrious philosopher, and in the divine scriptures of Diodore, bishop of Tarsus;[1] joined in the closest familiarity with Basil and Gregory the Great [Nazianzen]; he published on the holy letters very many volumes, both of commentaries and of homilies. Although of the commentaries, as I think, nothing is extant except a fragment of an exposition on the first eight chapters of Isaiah, and an entire explanation on the epistle to the Galatians.

In his Homilies he used a manner of teaching most suited to the office of an ecclesiastical teacher and to the benefit of his hearers, dividing all his sermons — sometimes into two parts, that is, the *Exegetic* and the *Ethic*; but sometimes into three, that is, the *Parasceue* [Preparation], the *Exegetic*, and the *Ethic*. In the Parasceue — that is, the Preparatory part — now commending the argument which he is about to treat, now praising the docility, the numerousness, the eagerness, and the desire of hearing of his hearers, now repeating the things he had said the day before, he prepares the minds of his hearers for the things that are to be said, with pleasant and often chance [extempore] exordia — but sometimes longer than the eager hearer would wish, who is impatient of all delay and hastens to the understanding of the proposed reading. Which Chrysostom himself, perceiving, excuses in the preface of a sermon, *On bearing reproofs*, saying: *Certain of our friends reprove us, that we make the beginnings of our sermons rather long: to whom, whether they censure us unjustly or pass judgment justly, we are grateful for this reproof.*

In the second part of the homily, which is called the Exegetic — that is, the Expository — Chrysostom is occupied in the explanation of the divine Scripture according to the historical, or literal, understanding, which he always lays down as a foundation; and he expounds it so purely, openly, genuinely, rightly, and aptly, as no other does — weighing each and every word of the Scripture cited, and illustrating them with clear paraphrases, and never, out of ignorance of the historical sense, does he either wrench the letter too harshly, or, leaving it, take refuge in certain far-fetched allegories (to which Jerome and Augustine are not ashamed to confess that they were sometimes driven by a lack of historical understanding); but, continually persisting in the true and proper sense of the letter, after the imitation of Eusebius of Emesa the bishop, and of Diodore of Tarsus the bishop (whom he chiefly follows in explaining the sacred volumes), he so abstains from allegorical wrappings that in all his explanations you would not find allegories, or anagogies (which are the same among them), except in a few and quite settled places, in which the most urgent necessity of the divine Scripture vehemently demands it.[2]

He expounds, moreover, in almost every homily, the common translation of his own times, pieced together from the versions of the Seventy interpreters, of Aquila, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion. Whence he often explains many passages of the Old Scripture otherwise than they are now read in our Vulgate codices.

Curious Questions, useless for the edification of the people, the battles of disputations, and conflicts about subtle and obscure matters, he avoids with the utmost care; and the things which some expositors in the divine letters are wont, for the ostentation of erudition — an occasion of disputing being sought — to obscure on purpose with many and great difficulties of doubts, he himself is wont to expedite in a few bare and simple words. Of which quality we can take some, even a slight, taste — for example, from his elucidation of that saying of Paul to the Romans: *It is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God that shows mercy.*[3] Which, whereas the most acute Augustine involves in many subtle and abstruse disputations concerning Predestination and Reprobation, concerning Grace and Free Will, Chrysostom releases himself from all the windings of the questions in almost two words — saying, first, that this saying was brought forward by Paul not from the person of one affirming, but from the person of one objecting; then, that the Apostle's saying is thus to be understood: that when he says *It is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs*, we should understand only [the word] *alone*, together with *but of God that shows mercy* — and rather [chiefly of Him]. For that whose part is the more powerful and greater in any business, we say the whole business is his.

But if it sometimes happens that Chrysostom falls upon some difficulty not to be dissembled, but necessarily to be discussed, he does not approach it before he shows that he has neither found the occasion of that disputation, nor, having found it, taken it up of his own accord, but that — compelled by the perfidy of the heretics — he descends into it to refute their calumnies, accommodating himself by this dexterity to the weakness of the unlearned multitude. In which, although there were some who could understand even higher disputations, yet very many were present who could not grasp the subtlety of doctrine — as being unlearned men, and craftsmen, and [people] occupied with mean business, and women little practiced in such disciplines, and a crowd of boys, and old men advanced in age, who all were to be instructed and refreshed with easy speech. Sometimes, however, to shake off the torpor of his hearers, he proposes certain little questions of no very great moment; and these, on purpose, [→ p274]

[→ p274: catchword "industria"]

[1] The teachers under whom St. Chrysostom studied. [2] St. Chrysostom was sparing in allegories. [3] Romans 9:16.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 274 [printed folio 255, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** entry continuing: the third (Ethic) part of his homilies, with his catalog of "golden paradoxes"; his doxological perorations; and an extended tribute to his Attic eloquence, with the testimonies of Isidore of Pelusium (quoting Libanius's letter "Libanius to John"), of Plutarch, and of Anianus. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, continued from p273:]

...on purpose leaving [them] unresolved, he immediately adds this: *But WHY, and how this is so, I leave to you to investigate. For it is not fitting that you learn everything from us, but that you yourselves also labor and search out, lest you become the more sluggish.* And these things Chrysostom perpetually keeps in the second part of his homilies.

In the third part, which is always the Ethic, or moral, [part], he digresses not only to those ethical Topics common to all who speak in a sermon — namely, on the contempt of riches, on luxury, drunkenness, anger, arrogance, and the other vices to be shunned — but he expatiates very often on certain select paradoxes of moral instruction, peculiar to himself alone, of which these are the chief:[1]

- That virtue is neither a burdensome thing, nor difficult to acquire.
- That it is much easier to live well than badly.
- That small and light sins are to be avoided with greater care than great ones.
- That there is no punishment more dreadful than a bad conscience.
- That no one can be harmed except by himself.
- That it is better to suffer injury than to inflict it.
- That many harm unjustly, but no one is unjustly harmed.
- That the ignominy of this world is glory, but the glory of the world is ignominy.
- That this life is not life, but death.
- That death is better than life.
- That the greatest gain is made in tribulations and temptations.
- That all the punishments sent by God upon mortals are great benefits of divine mercy.
- That almsgiving is the most profitable of all arts.
- That the advantages of solitude and of the monastic life are preferable to all felicities.
- That to be deprived of the kingdom of God is worse than the punishment of Gehenna.
- That to be unwilling to know all things is the highest wisdom.

• That we can demonstrate the divinity of Christ most clearly and most strongly, against all the nations, even without any testimonies of the divine letters.

With these and such-like truly golden digressions, inflaming the minds of his hearers in a wondrous manner, seizing [them], raising [them] up into the love of divine things, and transforming [them], lifted up, into God — he finally concludes all his sermons in brief prayers, thanksgivings, and praises of the kindness and mercy of Christ, to whom, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, he prays there be honor, glory, and empire unto the ages, Amen. But although in almost all his homilies he inculcates the same moral topics, often repeated, yet he treats and re-treats the same thoughts with such variety of words and sentences that he always seems to say new and diverse things. Thus far the manner of teaching peculiar to Chrysostom.

But as for the manner of the words and the kind of diction, all attribute to him the native, plain, and graceful purity of Attic speech, joined with an admirable facility of teaching — such as never fell to the lot even of the most eloquent of the Greeks.[2] His disciple Isidore, Abbot of the Pelusian mountain [Isidore of Pelusium], describing this in an epistle to Ophelius the Grammarian, thus speaks: *John's tongue, and the grace of his diction, I do not compare with others (for that perhaps would be a small thing with many), but with Libanius himself, who is held by all the most illustrious in eloquence.* That [John's diction] was a matter of great admiration to Libanius, the epistle of Libanius himself is a proof — written to him [John], while yet a young man, when he had delivered an oration in praise of the Emperors.[3] It runs thus:

LIBANIUS TO JOHN.

> *I have received your oration, long and beautiful, and I read it to men who themselves also compose orations. There was none among them who did not leap up and cry out, and do all those things which men are wont to do when overwhelmed with amazement. This delights me, that you have preferred to bring to this kind of oration the art of speaking which you could have displayed in pleading causes in the forum; and I judge you blessed, who have been able to adorn princes with such great praises; nor do I think those princes less fortunate, that they have obtained such a eulogist. Thus Libanius.*

Plutarch, moreover, judges that a clear and easy oration is truly and genuinely Attic. *For thus,* says he, *the ancient orators spoke. But Gorgias of Leontini was the first to introduce the vice of ambition and ostentation into civil orations — which vice also often befalls the admirable Plato.* But if Plutarch is to be believed in this matter, John surpasses all the other illustrious orators in many ways — who, in his orations, so recalls the Atticism and retains the perspicuity of speech that I do not know whether anyone else retains it more. Thus far Isidore.

Agreeing with whom, **Anianus,** a very ancient interpreter [translator] of Chrysostom, praises in him an even moderation of speaking, gently and spontaneously flowing of its own accord — thus writing to Bishop Orontius:

> *Chrysostom keeps this, as it were, peculiar and proper to himself: that although he is always solicitous, always watchful, and an enemy of harmful dullness, yet nowhere is his oration lifted up into the pomp of the speaker, but the whole is fitted to the benefit of the hearer. For his very style is accommodated to the ears of the Church, expressing that ancient but erudite kind of speaking — middling, even, mature, modest, foreign to all fault of carelessness and of pomp and of luxuriance; not squalid indeed, nor yet flowery; not unpolished, but neither filed down with excessive subtlety; not rough with harshness, nor yet wanton with charm — showing everywhere the greatest abundance and an admirable faculty, yet nowhere an ambition of speaking. Hence it comes that the simple reader understands him the more, and the eloquent reader praises him. In short, you would easily perceive that admirable care of speaking of St. Basil, and the applauded pomp of [John of] Antioch, and that sublime buskin of Gregory, surpassed by this middle-quality of John. Only the ears of the very young are perhaps less sweetly soothed by him — [ears] which, being set in the school of letters, are not so much pleased by solid things as by painted ones; who follow rather the beautiful than the useful, and love not so much the effective as the sonorous, and rejoice more to be besprinkled with the charm of flowers than to be nourished by the abundance of fruits. Thus Anianus.*

Chrysostom is also wont (as appears in his writings) to abound, above all ecclesiastical writers, in similes, comparisons, and metaphors — fitted together, for the illustration and delight of the matters to be explained, with admirable artifice. Yet nowhere, for the sake of delighting, does he use either the subtleties of sentences, as Ambrose, or the allurements of the poets and the wit of the mimes, as Jerome, or jests and jokes, as Tertullian; but rather, by the affection of fatherly charity and by a certain pious zeal of helping, he wonderfully delights his hear[ers, whom] [→ p275]

[→ p275: catchword "res:quos" (auditores: quos); signature Y3]

[1] The golden paradoxes of Chrysostom. [2] St. Chrysostom was the most eloquent of all the Greeks. [3] The illustrious testimony of Isidore of Pelusium concerning the eloquence of St. Chrysostom.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 275 [printed folio 256, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** entry continuing: his rhetorical interruptions (a list of his repeated phrases); the count of his works (~1000 books); the plan of two catalogs; and **the First Catalog** (genuine works), opening with the 67 Genesis homilies (with Photius's defense of their simplicity) and the 19 homilies on various passages of the Octateuch. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, continued from p274:]

...[he delights his hear]ers, whom — that he may hold them with greater attention — he interrupts the course of his oration with frequent dialogisms, little questionings, and little exercises,[1] often repeating expressions of this kind:

> *What then is this? For what reason are these things said? Have you heard what he said here? Have you seen how he enjoins nothing burdensome? You have seen his self-controlled mind; have you heard his confidence? Hear also his immense charity. Have you perceived the loftiness of his philosophy? Behold his faith. Consider, I pray, the virtue of the man. Do you see how very easy this is? Ponder, I beseech you, these words. Observe that these things are not said simply and at random. Oh, what doctrine is this, and how necessary it is to all mortals! Oh, how full of good things is this sentence! We have need of great prudence and attention in these words. Consider for me, O beloved, those blessed men. Learn here how great virtue is. Where now are they who deride these things? Let those who do not believe hear these things. I would that all were here who blame our words. Gladly would I ask those who do not believe these things, whether… etc. Let not the things you hear disturb you, O beloved; wonder, beloved, that he said this. Do not tell me that you do not understand these things. Come, let us consider this also. What I am always wont to say, that I will not cease to inculcate now also.*

By which figures [tropes], renewing attention, he rouses the slow, helps the weary, and sustains [them] up to the end of the oration. And let these things said concerning Chrysostom's doctrine and manner of oration be enough.

But concerning the number of his lucubrations [writings], Nicephorus Callistus testifies that he read a thousand books.[2] Suidas affirms that he wrote out so many volumes that it is not even possible to review them by counting. But we, passing over the exoteric writings, will review only the exegetical works which pertain to the explanation of the Scriptures — in two separate catalogs: of which the former will contain the truly genuine and legitimate writings of Chrysostom, but the latter will indicate his pseudepigraphal works — that is, those which are attributed to Chrysostom under the title of a false inscription.

OF THE WORKS WHICH, WITHOUT ANY CONTROVERSY, ARE BELIEVED TO BE CHRYSOSTOM'S. THE FIRST CATALOG.

On Genesis he wrote 67 homilies of a continuous and complete enarration, delivered to the people of Constantinople in the time of the Lenten fast, of which the first begins χαίρω μὲν καὶ εὐφραίνομαι ὁρῶν σήμερον τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν — that is, *I rejoice and am glad, seeing today this Church of God.* Concerning these, Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the book whose title is *Myriobiblos* [the

Bibliotheca], left it thus written:

> *Some accuse the divine John, that in his exegesis of Genesis — and especially in those homilies in which he narrated the work of the six days — he is too simple, and altogether destitute of all those speculations in which Origen, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Basil, and the others most learned of our holy fathers especially abound. Who indeed do not seem to me to grasp John's mind. For he, looking to the simplicity of the Mosaic narration, and leaving aside untimely speculations, chose rather to follow Moses in facility and humility of speech — [Moses] who, writing on the creation of the world, resolved not (as some think, foolishly enough) to discourse of the most obscure matters and in the most obscure words, but wished to set before the eyes of a rude and dull people, most simply and most clearly, only those things which could be grasped by the coarse understanding of the multitude. As John himself indicated, in his explanation of the Hexaemeron, in these words: "Moses, in the exordia of his narrations, accommodating himself to our smallness, discoursed nothing concerning the invisible Virtues; for he did not say, 'In the beginning God made the Angels and Archangels,' but 'Heaven and earth' — because in the first beginnings and preludes he spoke, in a coarser way, to the Jews, who wholly gaped after present things, and could comprehend nothing spiritual. And so he leads them, from sensible things and creatures, to the knowledge of the Creator of the universe. For it was not fitting that those should be fed with solid food, who still had need of the nourishment of milk. For just as the teachers of letters imbue little boys — taken from their mother's lap, and ignorant and incapable of all things — with the first elements only, and then hand them over to other teachers who instruct them in more perfect disciplines: so Moses imbued the nature of men, ignorant of all things and rude and (so to speak) but lately weaned from milk, with the first elements of divine knowledge, preparing it for more excellent teachers — namely Paul and John, who lead the boys, imbued with the first rudiments, to greater and loftier things, superimposing now, upon the foundation already laid, the lofty summits of the whole edifice." Thus he.*

Chrysostom also published, besides these homilies, again 19 homilies on various passages of the Octateuch, namely:

• On Genesis chapter 1, On the beginning of Genesis, 1 homily, which begins *Pleasant indeed to sailors.*

• On the same, On the beginning of Genesis, 1 homily, [beginning] *Many things indeed.*

• On the same, *Why are men harmed by beasts, since God wished them to be subject to man?* 1 homily — from which St. Augustine, in Book 1 against Julian, brings forth a testimony concerning original sin, against the Pelagians.

• On Genesis 3, On God, walking in paradise, 1 homily, [beginning] *You heard before.*

• On Genesis 11 [printed "1"], On the confusion of tongues, 1 homily — from which Theodoret recites a fragment in the dialogue entitled *Inconfusus* [the Unconfounded].

• On Genesis 14, On Melchizedek, 1 homily — which Chrysostom mentions in the preface of his enarration on Psalm 41.

• On Genesis 17, On the change of Abraham's name, 1 homily, [beginning] *It would not be difficult.*

• On Genesis 37, On the continence of Joseph, 1 homily, [beginning] *To me indeed always.*

• On Leviticus chapter 7, On the priestly vesture, 1 homily, [beginning] *The prophets preached the gospel of the kingdom of Christ* — whose authority Epiphanius the deacon uses in the Second Synod of Nicaea, session 6.

• On 1 Kings [1 Samuel] chapter 1, On the faith of Hannah, 1 homily, [beginning] *No thing indeed.*

• On the same, again 1 homily — which Chrysostom mentions in the preface of the preceding homily.

• On the same, On the upbringing of Hannah and Samuel, 1 homily, [beginning] *Unless I seem.*

• On 1 Kings [1 Samuel] chapter 2, On the beginning of the Canticle of Hannah, 3 homilies, namely: On the first part of the Canticle, *My heart is strengthened in the Lord,* one homily.

• On the second part of the Canticle, *My horn is exalted in the Lord,* 1 homily.

• On the third part of the Canticle, *My mouth is enlarged over my enemies,* 1 homily, [beginning] *Who a treasu[re]* [→ p276]

[→ p276: catchword "-rum esse" (Qui thesaurum esset)]

[1] By what ways St. Chrysostom interrupted the course of his oration, that he might delight his hearers. [2] St. Chrysostom is thought to have composed a thousand books.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 276 [printed folio 257, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** First Catalog continuing: the close of the Octateuch homilies (the Canticle of Hannah, 1–2 Kings, 2 Chronicles 26, and the five Job homilies in Lelio Tifernate's translation), then the long catalog of his genuine Psalter homilies (Psalms 3 through 125), with citations by John Damascene, Theodoret, and Euthymius. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, First Catalog continued from p275:]

...[On the third part of the Canticle of Hannah, 1 homily, beginning *Who dig for a treasu]re* — in which Chrysostom testifies that he [also] wrote a first and a second homily, which are now lacking [lost].

• On 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 13 and the following chapters, 4 homilies, of which the first begins *As often as [things] lasting*; the second, *You indeed*; the third, *I indeed think*; the fourth, *Not a little the city.*

• On 2 Paralipomenon [Chronicles] 26, upon *The heart of Uzziah was lifted up,* 2 homilies, of which the first begins *Blessed be God,* but the second *Come, to the exposition concerning Uzziah.*

• On Job chapters 1, 2, and 3, 5 homilies, with Lelio Tifernate as translator, of which the first begins *A great contender comes to us this day*; the second, *A great weight of things*; the third, *Now we all*; the fourth, *Everywhere indeed*; the fifth, *Let us therefore propound.*

On the whole Psalter he wrote very many homilies, in which — contrary to his custom — he frequently discussed not only the translations of the Seventy, of Aquila, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion, cited by name, but also the Hebrew verity, and the Syriac (or Chaldaic) translation, expressed in Hebrew and Chaldaic words. These homilies, as appears from Suidas, some of the Greeks prefer to all of John's sermons, both for the sublimity of their meanings and for the smoothness and elegance of the oration. There now circulates, among the works of Chrysostom, a volume of homilies (or rather of expositions) on the psalms, woven together from various sermons of different authors, and given a Latin dress by Gentian Hervet; of which, those which are believed to be his own — both from the evidence of the style and from the testimony of the ancient fathers — are only these:

• On the usefulness of the psalms, one homily, [beginning] *As by food, life.*

• On Psalm 3, 1 homily, [beginning] *To the leaders of the army.* John Damascene cites its exordium in Book 3 against the Iconoclasts.

• On Psalm 4, 1 homily, [beginning] *The prophet does not say these things.*

• On Psalm 5, 1 homily, [beginning] *Let us see first.*

• On Psalm 6, 1 homily, [beginning] *When you shall have heard [of] fury and anger.*

• On Psalm 7, 1 homily, [beginning] *It is fitting indeed.*

• On Psalm 8, 1 homily, [beginning] *In the previous psalm he had said.*

• On Psalm 9, 1 homily, [beginning] *This psalm is long.*

• On Psalm 10, 1 homily, [beginning] *Great are the powers of hope.*

• On Psalm 11, 1 homily, [beginning] *Virtue is indeed an arduous thing.*

• On Psalm 12, 1 homily, [beginning] *This is no small good.*

• On Psalm 38, upon that text *Yet in vain is every living man disquieted*, 1 homily, which begins *The deep gulf [surrounds] the fisherman.*

• On Psalm 41, 1 homily, beginning *You indeed will lately admire us.* (Theodoret, in the *Polymorphus*, brings forth a testimony of Chrysostom from the exposition of Psalm 41 which is not found in this homily.)

• On Psalm 43, 1 homily, beginning *This psalm the prophet indeed speaks.*

• On Psalm 44, 1 homily, [beginning] *I would that all the Jews and Gentiles were now present.*

• On Psalm 44, upon *The queen stood*, 1 homily, [beginning] *Pleasant indeed is a meadow and a garden.*

• On Psalm 45, 1 homily, [beginning] *He uses his accustomed philosophy.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.

• On Psalm 46, 1 homily, [beginning] *This psalm too touches the same argument.*

• On Psalm 47, 1 homily, [beginning] *This too signifies liberation.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.

• On Psalm 48, 1 homily, [beginning] *Certain great and secret [things].* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.

• On Psalm 48, upon that text *Fear not, when a man shall be made rich*, one homily, [beginning] *A farmer indeed.*

• On Psalm 49, 1 homily, beginning *He himself also said elsewhere.*

• On Psalm 50, 2 homilies, of which the first [begins] *Painters imitate*; but the second begins *The leavings of another's table.*

• On Psalm 100, 1 homily, [beginning] *We again, most beloved.*

• On Psalm 108, 1 homily, [beginning] *Here we have need of great prudence.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.

• On Psalm 109, 1 homily, [beginning] *Let us rise up, I pray, and bend our mind.*

• On Psalm 110, 1 homily, [beginning] *What is [it] in the whole?*

• On Psalm 111, 1 homily, [beginning] *The proem of this psalm seems to me.*

• On Psalm 112, 1 homily, [beginning] *In the scriptures words are often made.*

• On Psalm 113, 1 homily, [beginning] *Here he testifies the great kindness of God.*

• On Psalm 114, 1 homily, [beginning] *And who is [it], he says.*

• On Psalm 115, 1 homily, [beginning] *Of this saying, blessed Paul.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.

• On Psalm 116, 1 homily, [beginning] *Whose [meaning] is clear.*

• On Psalm 117, 1 homily, [beginning] *The saying indeed of the psalm.*

• On Psalm 119, 1 homily, [beginning] *Of other psalms indeed.*

• On Psalm 120, 1 homily, [beginning] *See again the soul.*

• On Psalm 121, 1 homily, [beginning] *But now many take the word ill.*

• On Psalm 122, 1 homily, [beginning] *They are sometimes profitable.*

• On Psalm 123, 1 homily, [beginning] *What I have often said, this too I now say.*

• On Psalm 124, 1 homily, [beginning] *Why did he not say absolutely, "Like a mountain"?*

• On Psalm 125, 1 homily, [beginning] *The word "captivity" is indeed.*

• On Psalm 125 [so printed; probably 126], 1 homily, [beginning] *This psalm was spoken concerning the state of affairs.* [→ p277]

[→ p277: catchword "In"; signature Y4]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 277 [printed folio 258, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** First Catalog continuing: the end of the Psalm homilies (Ps 127–150) and Wisdom 3; the Isaiah commentary and homilies; Jeremiah, Jonah, and 2 Maccabees 7; then the transition to the New Testament works — the 91 Matthew homilies, the scattered Matthew sermons (including the "Again Herodias rages" homily against Empress Eudoxia, from Socrates); Matthew 25 and 26; the lost Mark and Luke commentaries with six surviving Luke homilies; and the opening of John. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, First Catalog continued from p276:]

- On Psalm 127, 1 homily, [beginning] *See how he begins from it.*
- On Psalm 128, 1 homily, [beginning] *This psalm too.*
- On Psalm 129, 1 homily, [beginning] *What is [it], Out of the depths?*
- On Psalm 130, 1 homily, [beginning] *What is this? Paul says [it] to be foolish.*
- On Psalm 131, 1 homily, [beginning] *Others indeed wish only to be preserved.*
- On Psalm 132, 1 homily, [beginning] *Many things indeed are beautiful.*
- On Psalm 133, 1 homily, [beginning] *The psalms of the steps [Gradual Psalms].*
- On Psalm 134, 1 homily, [beginning] *To this he again exhorts.*
- On Psalm 135, 1 homily, [beginning] *After he said above.*
- On Psalm 136, 1 homily, [beginning] *It is a great thing to these men.*
- On Psalm 137, 1 homily, [beginning] *Of this often with you.*
- On Psalm 138, 1 homily, [beginning] *What do you say? God knows.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.
- On Psalm 139, 1 homily, [beginning] *Where now are they who say, "Why are there wild beasts?"*
- On Psalm 140, 1 homily, [beginning] *The words indeed of this psalm.*
- On Psalm 141, 1 homily, [beginning] *You see how everywhere.*
- On Psalm 142, 1 homily, [beginning] *It is indeed a prayer, which is made through words.* Euthymius cites this in his commentary on the psalms.
- On Psalm 143, 1 homily, [beginning] *What do you say? Does God teach [how] to make war?*
- On Psalm 144, 1 homily, [beginning] *This psalm is to be attended to most diligently.*
- On Psalm 145, 1 homily, [beginning] *Where he left off, there he begins again.*
- On Psalm 146, 1 homily, [beginning] *He said above, indeed, in the 144th psalm.*
- On Psalm 147, 1 homily, [beginning] *Not to the city, but to them.*
- On Psalm 148, 1 homily, [beginning] *This is the saints' custom.*
- On Psalm 149, 1 homily, [beginning] *If indeed the anagoge be regarded.*
- On Psalm 150, 1 homily, [beginning] *Or this he says of the people.*
- On Wisdom chapter 3, 1 homily, [beginning] *But the souls of the just.*

On Isaiah the prophet, it is reported that Chrysostom composed entire commentaries, of which we now hold a fragment of a continuous explanation — from the beginning of the book up to the middle of the eighth chapter — according to the historical and mystical sense, lately turned into Latin by the industry of Godefridus Tilmannus [Godfrey Tilmann]; whose beginning is *By what virtue especially this prophet outshone the rest.*

We have likewise, of Chrysostom, on Isaiah chapter 1, *On penitence — that it abolishes the stains and traces of all sins*, 1 homily, which begins *Although I have been absent from you for some time*; and it is the same as that which, among the ten homilies of Chrysostom *On Penitence*, is inscribed the third.

• Likewise, on Isaiah chapter 6, *On the vision of [the Lord] sitting on a throne*, 3 homilies, of which the first begins *I behold you*; the second, *I rejoice, beholding*; the third, *A noble theater for us.*

• On the last chapter of Jeremiah, *On the devastation of Jerusalem*, 1 homily — which Chrysostom recalls in the preface of the homily upon *There must be heresies.*

• On Jonah, 1 homily, beginning *It came to pass* — which is collected from the first homily of the author *On Penitence.*

• Likewise, on 2 Maccabees chapter 7, on the contest [martyrdom] of the seven Maccabees, 1 homily, [beginning] *How beautiful and pleasing.*

These are the works which, out of the monuments of Chrysostom on the Old Testament, have come to light up to our times. But those on the New Testament — which are either published here and there, or found cited among the ancient authors — follow below, namely:

On the Gospel of Matthew, from beginning to end, 91 Homilies of continuous explanation, with Anianus the deacon and George of Trebizond as translators; of which the first begins Εἰ δεῖ μὲν ἡμᾶς — that is, *It behoved us indeed.*

He is also said, besides these homilies, to have written various sermons on various scattered passages of Matthew, of which two are especially celebrated — namely, *On the martyrdom of John the Baptist*, on the 14th chapter of Matthew. Of these, the one now extant thus begins: *Alas, what shall I do? whence shall I make the beginning of my discourse?* But the beginning of the other, which we now lack, is *Again Herodias rages.* The occasion of this sermon Socrates, in his ecclesiastical history, relates in these words:

> *The Empress Eudoxia, on account of her statue being cast down [insulted] by Chrysostom, prepared a synod against him. Perceiving which, he brought forth a homily in the Church, in which — under the pretext of setting forth the savagery of Herodias against John the Baptist — he gravely complained of the unjust persecution of the Empress, thus beginning: "Again Herodias rages, again she is disturbed, again she dances, again she desires to receive the head of John on a platter," etc. Which oration so exacerbated the fury of the Empress that she immediately drove him into exile. Thus Socrates.*

• There is extant likewise, upon that text Matthew 25, *What you did to one of the least of mine*, 1 homily, which begins *Meadows and woody places.*

• Likewise, on Matthew 26, On the betrayal of Judas, 1 homily, which begins *Few things are necessary today.*

That upon Mark also, and Luke, celebrated commentaries were left by Chrysostom, Euthymius and Suidas are witnesses — commentaries which our age has not yet seen. Yet there survive, from various passages on Luke, 6 homilies of his, namely:

• On Luke 16, On the rich man and Lazarus, 4 homilies, of which the first begins *Yesterday*; the second, *I marveled*; the third, *No mean profit*; the fourth, *What remains of the parable of Lazarus.*

• Likewise, on Luke 18, On the publican and the Pharisee, 1 homily, which begins *As the concourse of clouds.*

• Likewise, on Luke 23, on the cross and the thief, 1 homily, which begins *This day.*

On the Gospel of John we have [homilies] of continuous [explanation] [→ p278]

[→ p278: catchword "-tuae" (perpetuae)]

*(Rich PDF p. 278 [printed folio 259, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** First Catalog continuing: the John homilies (88, Griffolini's version) and the Cana homily; the Acts homilies (55, defended as genuine against Erasmus, with the "I am called John, but am not the Apostle John" passage; Chrysostom lived under Julian); Acts 9 (Paul's conversion); then the great catalog of the Pauline homilies, prefaced by George of Alexandria's story of St. Paul appearing to dictate the commentary into Chrysostom's ear, recognized by the venerated image of Paul in his chamber. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, First Catalog continued from p277:]

...[On the Gospel of John we have Homilies] of continuous and complete enarration, 88 in number, from the version of Francis of Arezzo [Griffolini]; of which the first begins *Who by the contest of the games.* There are also reported, on various chapters of this Gospel, some Homilies beyond the aforesaid number, of which only one — on John chapter 2, On the marriage celebrated at the feast [of Cana] — is thought to be the author's; whose beginning is *The young of swallows.*

On the Acts of the Apostles we have 55 homilies of continuous and complete exposition, by an uncertain translator; which, although Erasmus has called into doubt, yet no one can doubt that they are Chrysostom's. For besides that the frequent little questionings, dialogisms, and digressions of commonplaces toward the end of the homilies show the work to be Chrysostom's, the author himself, in the ninth homily, professes himself to be a Bishop; and in the eleventh homily indicates that he is Bishop of a most ample City, in which live more than a hundred thousand of the poor, needy of daily alms — such as Constantinople certainly, it is credible, was in Chrysostom's times. And the same [author], in the 9th and 12th homily, continually inculcates that law concerning oaths not to be sworn (peculiar to Chrysostom alone), adding also that he would cast out of the Church those who did not obey this law promulgated by him, and whoever should swear in any way. And in the 41st homily he indicates that he lived in the times of the Emperor Julian.[1] Finally, in the 52nd homily he incidentally makes mention of his own name in these words: *To have the name of a prince is not to be a prince. For many are called by great names, as Peter, James, and John: but they are not, on account of the names, that which they are called — just as I also, although I am called John, am not, however, [the Apostle] John.* But also John Damascene, in the 3rd book *On the Faith,* and Oecumenius, in his catena of explanations on Acts, bring forth testimonies of these sermons, as from a true and genuine work of Chrysostom, whose beginning is *There are very many who are so ignorant of this book.*

There remains likewise, after these sermons, on the 9th chapter of Acts, On the conversion of Paul, 1 homily, which begins *They reprove us.*

On all the epistles of Paul Chrysostom composed a great and distinguished volume of homilies, of which George, patriarch of Alexandria, making mention in the life of Chrysostom published by him, thus writes:

> *The divine John, when he had begun to explain Paul's epistles — which he embraced with a vehement love beyond the other divine books — and had written many narrations upon them on each night, by the light of a wax taper, and had now for the most part interpreted them, one night, sitting in his chamber and bending over the exposition, began to be vexed with a certain human weariness, saying: "And who knows whether these things are accepted by God, and whether they will bring me favor from Him? And would that these things had been narrated without mark of reproof — have I attained the meaning of that wise and great man?" On this matter, that he might be made more certain by some proof, he suppliantly implored God. And behold, that same night, when — the papers snatched into his hands — he was bending more closely over the commentaries to be written on the Apostle, Paul the Apostle came to him, murmuring the exposition into his ears;[2] whom Proclus the chamberlain, keeping watch at the doors of the chamber and looking through a certain hole of the door, plainly saw — putting his mouth downward toward John's right ear, and familiarly dictating the things which John wrote. Now the form and appearance of the Apostle was in every part like the image of St. Paul which Chrysostom kept in his chamber, painted to the life, with the utmost veneration.[3] Thus George.*

And the catalog of the homilies of this volume [on Paul] is this:

• On the Epistle to the Romans, 32 homilies, with Germain de Brie [Brixius] as translator, of which the first begins Συνεχῶς ἀκούων — that is, *Continually hearing.*

• On the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 44 homilies, with Francis of Arezzo as translator, of which the first begins Ὅρα πῶς εὐθέως — *Behold how immediately.*

• On the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 30 homilies, of which the first begins Ἄξιον ζητῆσαι πρότερον — *It is worthwhile to inquire first.*

• On the Epistle to the Galatians, a commentary of continuous exposition, divided into no homilies, whose beginning is Πολλοῦ τὸ προοίμιον — *The proem [is worth] much.*

• On the Epistle to the Ephesians, 24 homilies, of which the first begins Ἰδοὺ πῶς τὸ "διὰ" τῷ πατρὶ δέδωκε — *See how he attributes the [word] "through" to God the Father.*

• On the Epistle to the Philippians, 16 homilies, of which the first begins Οἱ φιλιππήσιοι — *The Philippians.*

• On the Epistle to the Colossians, 12 homilies, of which the first begins πᾶσαι μὲν ἅγιαι — *All [things] indeed holy.*

• On the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, 11 homilies, of which the first begins Τί δήποτε φιλιππησίοις — *For what reason to the Philippians.*

• On the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, 5 homilies, of which the first begins ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ — *In the former epistle.*

• On the First Epistle to Timothy, 18 homilies, of which the general argument begins τῶν τοῦ ἀποστόλου — *One of the Apostles.*

• On the Second Epistle to Timothy, 10 homilies, of which the first begins Τί δήποτε καὶ δευτέραν — *For what reason also a second.*

• On the Epistle to Titus, 6 homilies, with Ambrose the Camaldolese [Traversari] as translator, of which the first begins τῶν Παύλου συνόντων — *One of Paul's companions.*

• On the Epistle to Philemon, 3 homilies, with Ambrose the Camaldolese as translator, of which the first begins πρῶτον ἀναγκαῖον — *First it is necessary.*

• On the Epistle to the Hebrews, 33 homilies, of which the first begins Ῥωμαίοις γράφων — *Writing to the Romans.* These Constantine the Presbyter, after the death of Chrysostom his teacher, collected out of his scattered enarrations into one body of complete enarration; and Mutius the Scholastic made them Latin.

There are extant, besides this already-described order of homilies, also twenty other Homilies on various passages of the epistles of Paul, namely:

• On the passage Romans chapter 16, *Salute Prisca and Aquila,* 1 homily, [beginning] *Are you not learned?*

• On the passage 1 Corinthians 7, *The woman is bound to the law. On the bill of divorce,* 1 homily, [beginning] *Some time ago, to you, blessed Paul.*

• On the passage 1 Corinthians 10, *I would not have you ignorant, that the fathers were under the cloud,* 1 homily, [beginning] *Sailors [shun] that part of the sea.*

• On the passage 1 Corinthians 7, *Concerning virgins [I have] no commandment, etc.: On virginity,* one book — whose author himself mentions [it] in the 19th homily on the First [Epistle] to the Corinthians.

• On the passage 1 Corinthians 11, *There must be heresies,* 1 homily, [beginning] *A sermon* [→ p279]

[→ p279: catchword "Concio"]

[1] Chrysostom lived in the time of Julian the Apostate. [2] St. Paul dictated the things which St. Chrysostom wrote. [3] St. Chrysostom kept in his chamber, with the utmost veneration, an image of St. Paul painted to the life.

(Rich PDF p. 279 [printed folio 260, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the close of the ***St. John Chrysostom*** *First Catalog: the remaining Pauline-passage homilies; the nine homilies* On the Praises of Paul*; and the Armenian translation of both Testaments (made during his exile at Cucusus). Then the* ***Second Catalog*** *— works wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom — opening with the pseudo-Chrysostom homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Judges, Kings, Job, and the Psalms. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, First Catalog concluded, then the Second Catalog:]

- ...[On the passage 1 Corinthians 11, *There must be heresies,* 1 homily, beginning] *Your assembly.*
- On 1 Corinthians 16, On the collection for the saints, and almsgiving, 1 homily, [beginning] *I rose up today.*
- On that text 2 Corinthians 11, *Would that you would bear a little of my folly,* 1 homily, [beginning] *All indeed I love.*
- On that text Philippians 1, *Whether by occasion, or by truth, Christ is announced,* 1 homily, [beginning] *When formerly the Pharisees.*
- On that text 1 Timothy 5, *Use a little wine,* 1 homily, [beginning] *You have heard the Apostolic voice.*
- On that text 1 Timothy 6, *Charge the rich not to be highminded,* 1 homily, [beginning] *What shall I say, or what shall I speak?*
- On that text Philemon 1, *Paul, a prisoner of Christ,* 1 homily, [beginning] *The prudence indeed of the ruler.*
- On that text Hebrews 10, *If we sin willfully,* 1 homily, [beginning] *All the trees.*

Likewise, on the praises of Paul, nine homilies, with Anianus as translator, explaining many things both of Paul's epistles and of those things which Luke writes of Paul in the Acts; of which the first begins *He would err in nothing at all.*

There is extant likewise, besides the lucubrations already enumerated, a Translation of both Testaments into the Armenian tongue — which the Armenians now use — published (as they themselves believe) by the industry and solicitude of Chrysostom.[1] George, patriarch of Alexandria, mentions this Translation in the life of Chrysostom, relating that when he was in exile at Cucusus, a town of Armenia, he led the inhabitants of that region to Christ, and thereafter took care that the Psalms of David, together with the holy Gospels and other histories of the Old Instrument, should be turned into Armenian — that the peoples of that province might the more easily obtain the knowledge of the divine scripture.

These, then, are the true and legitimate writings of Chrysostom which survive out of the so many published by him on the sacred letters. But the other exegetical writings, which — under the false title of Chrysostom — are mixed in among his true works, the following catalog will comprise.

CATALOG OF THOSE [WORKS] WHICH ARE WRONGLY THOUGHT TO BE INSCRIBED TO ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

- On Genesis chapter 2, 1 homily, which begins *The dignity of human origin.*
- On Genesis chapter 2, 1 homily, beginning *God the founder of the World* — which is collected from centos of Augustine; and there are in it two entire chapters transcribed from the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas,* namely the thirty-first and the thirty-second.
- On Genesis chapter 2, 1 homily, [beginning] *Adam is commanded.*
- On Genesis chapter 3, 1 homily, [beginning] *God without beginning.*

• On Genesis chapter 3, 1 homily, [beginning] *As often as with me of time.*

• On Genesis chapter 3, 1 homily, [beginning] *For the Christian with the enemy.*

• On Genesis chapter 15, 1 homily, [beginning] *Faith is [the ground] of religion.*

• On Genesis chapter 25, 1 homily, [beginning] *Rebecca was carrying.*

• On Genesis chapter 37, 1 homily, [beginning] *But the sons of Jacob.*

• On Exodus chapter 17, 1 homily, [beginning] *Moses stood.*

• On Judges chapter 11, 1 homily, [beginning] *God who willed.*

• On 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 13, 1 homily, [beginning] *The Lord God with David.*

• On 2 Kings [2 Samuel] 7, 1 homily, [beginning] *Imitators of Christ.*

• On 2 Kings [2 Samuel] 17, 1 homily, [beginning] *Absalom destroyed.*

• On 3 Kings [1 Kings] 17, On Elijah, 1 homily, [beginning] *Glorious once.*

• On the same, 1 homily, [beginning] *When the sins committed.*

• On 4 Kings [2 Kings] 2, On the ascension of Elijah, 1 homily, beginning *Among certain ancients.* This, Bede, in his Questions on the book of Kings, thinks to be Chrysostom's; but the style points to the author of that homily whose beginning is *Rejoice, O heaven, and be in gladness, O earth* — which is placed among the pseudepigrapha of Jerome, for the day of the Lord's resurrection, and among the sermons of Eusebius of Emesa.

• On 4 Kings [2 Kings] 5, On Naaman, 1 homily, [beginning] *When Naaman.*

• On 4 Kings [2 Kings] 6, On Elisha, 1 homily, [beginning] *Although frequently.*

• On Job chapter 1, 1 homily, [beginning] *Yet, most beloved brethren.*

• On Job chapter 1, 1 homily, [beginning] *An athlete into the contest.*

• A Preface to the book of psalms, beginning *After Moses.*

• On the book of psalms, another Preface, beginning *All scripture.*

• On Psalm 1, 1 homily, [beginning] *Blessedness is [the goal] of all.*

• On Psalm 2, 1 homily, [beginning] *As those who [look] into the Sun.*

• On Psalm 9, 1 homily, [beginning] *Of the Creator of all things.*

• On Psalm 9, 1 homily, [beginning] *God of our race.*

• On Psalm 13, 1 homily, [beginning] *As when the Lord.*

• On Psalm 14, 1 homily, [beginning] *It is a beautiful psalm.*

• On Psalm 22, 1 homily, [beginning] *By the consecrated cycle.*

• On Psalm 24, 1 homily, [beginning] *Travellers by the strait and narrow way.*

• On Psalm 25, 1 homily, [beginning] *Sons of light.*

• On Psalm 26, 1 homily, [beginning] *From the fullness of the word.*

• On Psalm 29, 1 homily, [beginning] *The solemnity of confession.*

• On Psalm 33, 1 homily, [beginning] *The divine word.*

• On Psalm 37, 1 homily, [beginning] *Often by us.*

• On Psalm 38, 1 homily, [beginning] *And how can the psalm.*

• On Psalm 39, 1 homily, [beginning] *Nor indeed this psalm.* [→ p280]

[→ p280: catchword "In"]

[1] St. Chrysostom translated both Testaments into the Armenian tongue.

(Rich PDF p. 280 [printed folio 261, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the ***pseudo-Chrysostom Second Catalog*** *continues: the remaining spurious homilies on the Psalms (Ps 40→142), then on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Zechariah; then Sixtus's own argument that these sermons are not genuinely Chrysostom's (Latin word-etymologies betraying a non-Greek author; absent exordia and doxologies; Augustinian commonplaces; a verse-by-verse dividing formula). It closes the Old-Testament pseudepigrapha and opens the New with the* Opus imperfectum on Matthew. *Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, Second Catalog (spurious works) continued:]

- On Psalm 40, 1 homily, [beginning] *Some indeed.*
- On Psalm 40, 1 homily, [beginning] *Even if the prophet.*
- On Psalm 42, 1 homily, [beginning] *This is the psalm.*
- On Psalm 42, 1 homily, [beginning] *It coheres with the previous.*
- On Psalm 68, homily 1, [beginning] *Who by prayers.*
- On Psalm 71, homily 1, [beginning] *The Lord of hosts.*
- On Psalm 84, homily 1, [beginning] *Everyone who knows himself.*
- On Psalm 90, homily 1, [beginning] *The ninetieth psalm.*
- On Psalm 93, homily 1, [beginning] *Against the waves.*
- On Psalm 95, homily 1, [beginning] *Excellent and truly wonderful.*
- On Psalm 96, homily 1, [beginning] *Paul, struck by a viper.*
- On Psalm 106, homily 1, [beginning] *The Holy Spirit.*
- On Psalm 115, homily 1, [beginning] *It is related that the little bee.*
- On Psalm 118, homily 1, [beginning] *The kindness of God.*
- On Psalm 118, homily 1, [beginning] *The truth to be preached.*
- On Psalm 121, homily 1, [beginning] *Our Lord.*
- On Psalm 142, homily 1, [beginning] *The judgments of the Lord are like a great deep.*
- On Isaiah chapter 1, homily 1, [beginning] *If you be willing and will hearken.*
- On Isaiah 9, homily 1, [beginning] *Christ, together with the Father.*
- On Isaiah 42, homily 1, [beginning] *Life renewed.*
- On Isaiah 62, homily 1, [beginning] *Since the time has come.*
- On Jeremiah 1, homily 1, [beginning] *Great is the merit of Jeremiah.*
- On Daniel 3, On the three young men, homily 1, [beginning] *A sermon of the three young men.*
- On Daniel 13, On Susanna, homily 1, [beginning] *Divine readings.*
- On Zechariah 6, homily 1, [beginning] *Noble by birth.*

Although these sermons thus far enumerated are themselves learned and worthy to be eagerly read by the studious, nevertheless by many not-to-be-despised conjectures it appears that they are not Chrysostom's, but of other authors — in whom there is neither that candor nor that unbroken ease of discourse which we admire in Chrysostom, but a discourse choppy, clipped, and somewhat harshly overwrought, having nothing of those similitudes and comparisons which are Chrysostom's chief ornaments; but abounding on the contrary in words that answer one another alike and in sentences that end alike, as is that which is read in the exposition of Psalm 33: *Come now, my brethren, in this manner I wish to reply: as many as now say "I will not," who were but now saying "I will."* And likewise this: *Let the holy oracles of the reading, which sound in your ears, make a nest in your hearts* — from which forms of speaking Chrysostom most greatly recoils.

Some also of these sermons contain certain marks from which you might easily suspect that their author did not write in Greek: such as some figures of speech which cannot be adapted to the Greek tongue, and likewise certain interpretations of words — as the etymology of *Meridies* (Midday), which you have in the homily on Psalm 90, namely: *It is called Meridies because it divides the day; for meros* [a part] *is a divided portion of the day.* And in the homily on Psalm 118: *Veritas* (Truth) *is three syllables and seven letters: because on the seventh day God rested from his works.* Besides, these homilies, contrary to Chrysostom's custom, are stripped of any exordium at the entrance of the discourse, without moral exhortations before the end, and without any doxologies or prayers in the conclusion of the sermon; and moreover the commonplaces on original sin, on predestination, on foreknowledge, on the hardening [of the heart], on grace and merit, which are handled at length in certain of the sermons, seem more peculiar to Augustine than to Chrysostom — who, as he always abstains from these, so he is nowhere accustomed to cite the names of the ecclesiastical doctors.[1] Some of them, however, are in these sermons brought in by name, as Hippolytus and Cyprian; and John the Evangelist too is cited under the title of "the Theologian" — which surname I do not know whether Chrysostom anywhere bestowed on John, though he was often accustomed to call him "the son of thunder."

Nor do I think it ought to be passed over, that this author divides and expounds the readings of the Scriptures, whatever they be, verse by verse, sometimes indeed marked off by number, frequently repeating this: *The verse which we have just now heard;* likewise, *There follows another verse;* likewise, *Let us return to the proposed verses of the narrative;* and again, *Now that the first verse has been examined, and likewise the second, let us look at the third also* — which formula of dividing you will nowhere find in Chrysostom's writings. To this is added, that the author often, forsaking the historical sense, without any occasion slides off into allegorical and anagogical senses — a thing Chrysostom does most rarely, and only when driven by necessity. But whoever the writer of these sermons may have been, it appears that he is ancient: both from the ancient translation of the Scriptures expounded by him (which is no light indication of antiquity), and from the paschal baptism and the other ancient rites of the Church, which he records as having been in observance in his own times.

Thus far concerning the pseudepigrapha belonging to the Old Testament; now we shall enumerate those which look to the New.

ON MATTHEW there is extant an *unfinished work* [Opus imperfectum] of an uncertain author, divided into 54 homilies — although it has no [true] homilies, but is one continuous commentary, containing an uninterrupted exposition of the Evangelist, namely from the beginning down to the middle of chapter 13, and again from the beginning of chapter 19 to the end of chapter 25; whose opening is, *As they relate, that Matthew, &c.* Concerning this work indeed diverse judgments are reported. There are those who deny it to be Chrysostom's, both on account of the Vulgate translation of the Latin Church which is discussed in it, and on account of the frequent allegories and citations of apocryphal writers, [→ p281]

[→ p281: catchword "quibus"]

[1] St. Chrysostom is not accustomed to cite the names of ecclesiastical doctors.

*(Rich PDF p. 281 [printed folio 262, verso]. Book IV, letter I — still within **St. John Chrysostom** (Second Catalog, spurious works). Sixtus finishes the* Opus imperfectum on Matthew: *the case against it (a Latin author, heretical dogmas of Montanus/Mani/Arius/Donatus/Pelagius, condemned by Pope Paul IV) and the case for it (its public liturgical use and weighty sentences; the heresies interpolated by heretics, shown by a threefold argument; Chrysostom's own anti-Arian homilies quoted at length). Then the medley [farrago] of diverse sermons of an "Uncertain Monk" begins. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, Second Catalog: the *Opus imperfectum on Matthew*, continued:]

...[apocryphal writers] whom the author uses, citing the Scripture of Seth, the Apocryphon of Ezekiel, the Itinerary of Clement, and other things like these, most remote from Chrysostom's practice. To these they add that the phrasing, the expositions, and the dogmas of the commentaries are more contrary to Chrysostom's tongue and mind than fire is to water. For both the character of the diction and certain figures, in no way answering to Greek discourse, indicate that the writer was a Latin; while the heretical dogmas scattered everywhere throughout the work openly prove that the same [author] was a heretic — not attached to one sect only, but entangled in the various heresies of Montanus, the Manichaeans, Arius, Donatus, and Pelagius, and on account of those heresies deservedly condemned by the Church, and by Pope Paul IV enrolled in the catalog of writers of suspect faith.

There are, on the opposite side, those who contend that this very work is Chrysostom's — led not only by the authority of the Apostolic Church, which publicly, among the divine praises, reads homilies out of these commentaries under the name of John Chrysostom, but also moved by the weight and gravity of the sentences and propositions of this work; which, for the confirmation of Christian dogmas, are brought in under the title, testimony, and authority of Chrysostom in the authentic Glosses which they call the Ordinary [Gloss], in the Catenae of the Gospel explanations, in the Decrees of the supreme pontiffs, and in the Summae of Theologians of great name — in which places many of these sentences, most diligently weighed, are vindicated from all suspicion of error.

Nor does the recent edict of Pope Paul IV stand against these [defenders] in anything: since he did not simply and altogether reject this whole work — approved now for so many ages by the common assent of the Church — but forbids only those copies of the work which are found corrupted by heretics beyond the author's intention, and defiled with those dregs with which they now teem. But that these dregs and filth crept into these commentaries not by the author's fault, but by the fraud of heretics, they establish by a threefold indication. **First,** because certain very ancient copies contain nothing of errors of this kind, but others have them all added in the margins by another hand. **Secondly,** because whatever is heretical is so stitched onto the genuine reading by [an added] inference, that if it be cut away, not even a hair's breadth of the sense is changed — which surely could not be so, if it had been genuinely woven in by the author himself; just as no member can be taken from the human body without a deforming mutilation of the whole frame. **Thirdly,** because it is not credible that an author who was neither mad nor forgetful — writing on the same matters and in almost the same passages — should have thought and said things contrary to himself, and especially in those matters wherein he is accused of being an Arian. For how would it be likely that he agreed with the Arians about the inequality and the diverse substance of the Father and the Son, who in many places defends against the Arians the unity and equality of both? — and especially in homily 44, upon those words, *Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, who shut up the kingdom of heaven,* where he writes thus: "So also now the priests of the heretic shut up the gate of truth. Therefore, when they read among their people something such as *He who sent me is greater than I,* by a perverse interpretation they shut the gate of truth, saying the Son is less than the Father — whereas he is called 'less' only according to the dispensation of the flesh." And in homily 28, in the exposition of that saying, *All things have been delivered to me by my Father,* propounding and dissolving the argument of those who from these words built up [the claim] that the Son is less than the Father, he says thus: *"By whom were all things delivered to him, if the Father and the Son are one? Or why could he not have [them] unless they had been delivered to him, if in all things he was equal to his Father? For the signification of 'delivering' excludes the notion of unity as much as of equality. I answer: they were delivered to him according to that whereby he was made a little less than the angels; for according to that whereby he thought it not robbery to be equal to God, God is one, and equal to him who delivered all things."* And in the forty-fifth homily, expounding that [text] of Matthew 23, *And do you also fill up the measure of your fathers,* he says: *"When you see three heretics equal in all things, saying [they are] not of the same substance, not of the same authority, without beginning, all these differing from one another in some part — do not wonder: for they fill up the measure of their Gentile fathers, since those likewise*

worshipped many gods." By which words, indeed, what could be said more openly against the Arian opinion that is ascribed to this author?

This, then, is the controversy over these commentaries; concerning which let those more learned than I judge. I, for what I would add, have nothing except this: that the work itself is eloquent and learned, and worthy to be read continually — provided, however, that it first be most diligently purged of those errors which, in the sixth book, in the censures upon the expositors of Matthew, I have noted. This author flourished (as is gathered from his 33rd and 49th homilies) after the times of Theodosius Augustus; and he wrote also, upon the other Evangelists, commentaries of like industry.

Thus far concerning the *unfinished work* on Matthew. After which there is held, among the works of Chrysostom, a medley [farrago] of diverse sermons upon various passages of the four Evangelists — of which some are taken from the homilies of Chrysostom, others from the already-mentioned *unfinished work*, and others are thought to be by the same author of whom we have fourteen sermons on Mark; who (so far as is discerned from his writings) was a monk placed under the authority of a bishop, and published his explanations for monks, with frequent allegories interspersed — and sometimes forced ones, a thing of which he himself was not unaware. For in homily 9 on Mark he excuses himself in these words: *"You think we do violence to the scripture; and perhaps someone may say in silent thought, 'This man always follows allegories and does violence to the holy scripture,' &c."* Of this [author], then, and of others, these following are the homilies:

- On the second chapter of Matthew, On the coming of the Magi, a homily of an Uncertain Monk, which begins *This Isaiah [foretold as] to come.*
- On Matthew 2, On the flight of the child into Egypt, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *This child I.*
- On Matthew 2, On the slaughter of the infants, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *A new [one] is dedicated.*
- On Matthew 2, On the return of the child into Judea, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *In that which he said.*
- On Matthew 4, On the temptation of Christ, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *O incomparable one.* [→ p282]

[→ p282: the medley of diverse sermons continues]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 282 [printed folio 263, recto]. Book IV, letter I — still **St. John Chrysostom** (Second Catalog, spurious works): the medley [farrago] of diverse sermons continues, arranged by Gospel — Matthew, then Mark, Luke, and John, with two on 1 Corinthians — each tagged as by "an Uncertain Monk," or noted as Chrysostom's, Peter Chrysologus's, Origen's, or Jerome's, and cross-referenced to the* Opus imperfectum; *incipits given. The Chrysostom entry then closes with a note on his biographers (Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Nicephorus; Palladius, George of Alexandria). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom, Second Catalog: the medley of diverse sermons, continued (each incipit shown after the em-dash):]

- On Matthew 5, On the Beatitudes, a homily beginning *Not only the bodies* — which is part of the 15th homily of Chrysostom on Matthew.
- On Matthew 5, On the greatest and the least in the kingdom of heaven, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *Since for us, by [our] office.*
- On Matthew 5, On the love of enemies, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *In all things he wills us.*
- On Matthew 6, On the Lord's Prayer, a homily. — *The Lord's prayer.*
- On Matthew 6, On fasting, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *As in the preceding.*

• On Matthew 6, On avoiding the fasting of the hypocrites, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *The series of the reading.*

• On Matthew 7, On being wary of false prophets, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *It is known to all.*

• On Matthew 9, On the little boat, a homily. — *Christ in human acts.* It is by Peter Chrysologus.

• On Matthew 9, On the conversion of Matthew, a homily. — *Many storms.*

• On Matthew 14, On the beheading of John, a homily. — *Today for us the virtue of John.* It is by Peter Chrysologus.

• On Matthew 15, On the Canaanite woman, a homily. — *The Evangelist marvels.* It is held among the works of Origen.

• On Matthew 18, On the necessity of scandals, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *It seems indeed.*

• On Matthew 18, On fraternal correction, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *The exercises of the law.*

• On Matthew 18, On fraternal correction, a homily. — *Something great, &c.* — which is taken from Chrysostom's explanation on Matthew, homily 62.

• On Matthew 19, On divorce, a homily. — *The Lord is just.* — which is in the unfinished work, homily 32.

• On Matthew 19, On Peter questioning Christ, a homily. — *Since [it is] possible.* It is part of homily 33 of the unfinished work.

• On Matthew 20, On the ascent of Christ to Jerusalem, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *After that, to the virgin.*

• On Matthew 20, On Christ ascending to Jerusalem, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *Recently, when.*

• On Matthew 21, On Christ borne on the ass, a homily. — *I think the matter itself.* — which is in the unfinished work, homily 37.

• On Matthew 21, On the withered fig tree, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *If to the tree.*

• On Matthew 22, On the tribute, a homily. — *All malice.* — which is part of homily 42 of the unfinished work.

• On Matthew 22, On the love of God and neighbor, a homily. — *Frequently the Jews.* — which is the other part of the same homily.

• On Matthew 26, On the Lord's Supper, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *To the present day.*

• On Matthew 26, On the Lord's Supper, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *According to the Savior's.*

• On Matthew 27, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *The Gospel series.*

• On Matthew 27, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *Let them indeed suffice.*

• **On the 1st chapter of Mark,** On the beginning of Mark, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *That animal.*

• On Mark 1, On John the Baptist, a homily of the same. — *Now let us come.*

• On Mark 1, On Jesus coming from Nazareth of Galilee, a homily of the same. — *See the unions.*

• On Mark 1, On Christ dwelling among the beasts, a homily of the same. — *Since [on] the past Sunday.*

• On Mark 1, On Christ entering Capernaum, a homily of the same. — *A happy and fair change.*

• On Mark 1, On the mother-in-law of Simon, a homily of the same. — *The Lord had instructed.*

• On Mark 5, On the woman with the flow of blood, a homily of the same. — *He asks, looking about him.*

• On Mark 8, On the loaves, a homily of the same. — *In the earlier part.*

• On Mark 9, On the Transfiguration, a homily of the same. — *Christ swears.*

• On Mark 10, On the blind man, a homily of the same. — *Since the holy presbyter.*

• On Mark 11, On Christ borne on the ass, a homily of the same. — *This one who [was] sent.*

• On Mark 11, On the withered fig tree, a homily of the same. — *The Lord enters.*

• On Mark 11, On the casting out of the sellers, a homily of the same. — *In the Gospel according to John.*

• On Mark 13, On the day of judgment, a homily of the same. — *The Gospel reading.*

• **On the 1st chapter of Luke,** On the nativity of John the Baptist, a homily of the same. — *Concerning the sun.*

• On Luke 2, On the birth of Christ, a homily of the same. — *But Joseph did not dare.*

• On Luke 10, On him who fell among robbers, a homily of the same. — *Then the Lord said.*

• On Luke 15, On the two sons, a homily. — *Of all things indeed, from the scriptures.* It is reckoned among the works of Jerome, although it is not Jerome's either.

• On Luke 16, On the rich man, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *Since he had said.*

• On Luke 19, On Zacchaeus, a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *If through Christ.*

• **On the 1st chapter of John,** On the Word, the Son of God, [of an] Uncertain Monk, a homily. — *If you believe that God.*

• On John 1, On John the Baptist, a homily of the same. — *It is said of John.*

• On John 4, On the [true] worshippers, a homily of the same. — *Innumerable benefits.*

• On John 11, On Lazarus, a homily. — *With great [grief], brethren.* It is believed to be Chrysologus's.

• On John 15, upon *You are my friends,* a homily of an Uncertain Monk. — *The Lord Christ in the Gospel.*

• On John 20, On Mary standing at the tomb, 2 homilies, of which one begins *Mary coming;* the other, *Although all.*

• On John 20, On Thomas, 1 homily. — *This therefore, today.*

• On 1 Corinthians 13, On faith, hope, and charity, 1 homily. — *The Apostle Paul speaks.*

• On 1 Corinthians 15, upon that [text], *When all things shall have been made subject to him,* 1 homily. — *Yesterday, brethren.*

And these are the writings of Chrysostom which are extant in general — the undoubted as well as the doubtful — pertaining to the exposition of the divine Scripture.

The life of Chrysostom was written by Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Nicephorus in the universal history of ecclesiastical affairs; and particularly, in separate volumes, by Palladius, first bishop of Hibernia [Ireland], and by George, patriarch of Alexandria. [→ p283]

[→ p283: catchword "MORI"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 283 [printed folio 264, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the **St. John Chrysostom** entry closes with his death (exiled by Theophilus of Alexandria and the Empress Eudoxia, †Comana in Pontus, AD 405) and the abridgers of his exegesis (Theodoret, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Oecumenius). The **John (Ioannes)** catalog then resumes: John son of Christopher, John Dietenberger, John Docaus of Laon, the long John Dominici (Cardinal, Archbishop of Ragusa, †1418), John Driedo of Turnhout (his four* Isagogic *books on the Ecclesiastical Scriptures), and the opening of John Duns Scotus. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — St. John Chrysostom concluded, then the John catalog resumes:]

This most blessed man dies — driven into exile by the faction of Theophilus of Alexandria and of Eudoxia Augusta — at the little town of Comana on the borders of Pontus, in the year (as Socrates relates) 405 from the birth of Christ, on the 14th day of September, in the seventh consulship of Honorius and the second of Theodosius. His exegetical writings were abridged by Theodoret bishop of Cyrrhus, Theophylact bishop of Bulgaria, Euthymius Zigabenus, and Oecumenius.

John, son of Christopher [Ioannes Christophori], a Dominican, long exercised in the Scriptures and nobly learned in secular philosophy, a scholastic in faculty and in speech, wrote a scholastic Postil on the four gospels and on all the epistles of Paul. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1240.

John Dietenberger [Ioannes Dietembergius], of the Order of Preachers, an excellent professor of theology and an inquisitor of heretical depravity, whose work of *Confutations against the Lutheran scripturarians* is extant; he bestowed both instruments of the sacred Law [both Testaments] upon the German tongue. He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, in the year 1520.

John Docaus [Ioannes Docaus], bishop of Laon, learned and eloquent, wrote upon the gospels which are read on the weekdays of Lent homilies elegant in style and notable for piety, of which the first begins *In the first place let us say;* likewise a narration on the Lord's Passion according to Matthew, which begins *Paul, a chosen vessel.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1555.

John Dominici [Ioannes Dominici], Cardinal of the title of St. Xystus, Archbishop of Ragusa, a Florentine by birth, a Dominican by order, the teacher of Antoninus Archbishop of Florence; a man resplendent in sanctity, learning, and Tuscan eloquence, and excelling in such quickness of wit and tenacity of memory that he himself, in the book which he entitled *Lucula Noctis* [the Firefly of the Night], affirms upon inserted oath that he had no teacher in any branch of knowledge, but, after the example of Augustine, learned and understood all the disciplines by himself.[1] When this man had been sent to the Council of Constance by Gregory XII for the union of the Church, the Council being finished and the union entered upon, at the urging of the Emperor Sigismund he was sent by Pope Martin V as legate into Pannonia [Hungary] to extinguish the heresies of the Bohemians lately sprung up. Having set out thither, when he found minds so hardened in heresy that they could neither be bent by exhortations nor recalled from their undertaking by any prayers or threats, the case being desperate, he betook himself to Buda, the royal city of Pannonia, where, wasting away with grief of mind, he put off mortality in the year of the Lord 1418; and he was buried in the church of St. Paul the first hermit, resplendent with many miracles. He therefore, among his many scholastic expositions of the scriptures, left [these] scholastic commentaries:

- On Ecclesiastes,
- On the Song of Songs,
- On the Gospel of Matthew,
- On the Epistle to the Romans,
- Likewise, *fifty sermons on the first nine Psalms*, which he delivered to the people at Florence in the cathedral church, from Septuagesima Sunday to the third day of Easter, arranged in scholastic discourse;
- Likewise, on 1 Corinthians chapter 12, one [book] On Charity, beginning *If I speak with the tongues of men.*

John Driedo of Turnhout [Ioannes Driedo, Turnoutensis], most learned on every side, and public professor of sacred Theology in the most flourishing University of Louvain, wrote — in an easy and not at all uncultivated style, [dedicated] to John, king of Lusitania [Portugal] — four *Isagogic* [introductory] books on the Ecclesiastical Scriptures, learned and much to be praised, whose division is this:

The first book, divided into four chapters, shows in the first chapter the dignity, utility, number, order, and division of the Books of sacred Scripture; the second propounds certain difficulties arising, from the opinions

of the fathers, over the things already said; the third brings forward certain canons necessary for resolving the difficulties; the fourth resolves the difficulties.

The second book is completed in three chapters: of which the first is on the translations of the holy Scriptures; the second on the multitude of the senses of sacred Scripture; the third on the way by which the ancient understanding of the Scriptures is to be investigated.

The third book contains treatises divided into several chapters. In the first it delivers certain general precepts, drawn from Augustine's book *On Christian Doctrine*, necessary for opening up the twofold difficulty of Scripture — namely, of things and of words. In the second it deals specially with certain obscurities which occur in the Scriptures according to the speech or diction. In the third, [it treats] of the difficulties which are in the Scriptures on account of the things themselves being difficult in themselves.

The fourth book, divided into six chapters, discusses the Apocryphal books and the writings of the ecclesiastical Fathers established outside the canon. The beginning of the whole work is, *[He who is] about to treat of the things of the faith.*

After these, he composed a treatise on the times, for illustrating the obscurities arising in sacred Scripture from the varying number of the periods and the diverse reckoning of the years, divided into five parts, whose distribution is this. In the first part he shows the diversity, and the cause of the diversity, of reckoning which exists among the ancient writers, and lays down that the reckoning to be followed is that of Berosus the Chaldaean, Metasthenes the Persian, Manetho the Egyptian, Philo the Jew, Xenophon the Greek, and Fabius Pictor and Cato of the Romans — whose Chronography he demonstrates to agree with the Hebrew truth of holy Scripture. In the second he reviews the enumeration of the aforesaid Chronographers, conformable to holy Scripture. In the third he compares the times of the Gentile kings whom Scripture records with the deeds of those same kings recorded in the Scriptures. In the fourth he works out the reckoning of the weeks of Daniel. In the fifth he treats of the times to come at the last coming of Christ. This treatise, previously published by him, he most fittingly joined to the third book *On the Divine Scriptures* which he afterward wrote. He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, [in] 1540.

John Duns [Ioannes Dunsius], a Scot by nation, of the family of the Minorites [Franciscans], formerly a hearer of Alexander of Hales the Briton in the school of Paris,[2] a man endowed with a subtlety of admirable erudition, on account of [his] profound [→ p284]

[→ p284: catchword "fundi"]

[1] John Dominici attained the knowledge of the sciences without a teacher. [2] John Scotus was a disciple of Alexander of Hales.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 284 [printed folio 265, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the **John (Ioannes)** catalog: John Duns Scotus concluded (the "Shadowy" surname; Sixtus's Virgilian-labyrinth epigram anecdote; fl. 1308); John Eck; John Ferus [Wild] of Mainz (works list; the Soto–Medina controversy over his John commentary); **John Fisher** of Rochester (his martyrdom under Henry VIII); John Francis Pico of Mirandola; John Francis Quintianus of Brescia; John of Frankfurt; John of Wales; and the opening of John Gagnée of Paris (New-Testament scholia). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — the John catalog, continued:]

John Duns [continued] — on account of [his] most profound obscurity of speech he was surnamed Σκότιος [Skotios], that is, *the Shadowy* (which was once the surname of the most obscure Anaxagoras); and, because of the new Academy of Scholastic Theology called after his name, he is most famous in all the schools. He is reported to have written commentaries on the Gospel and on the Apostle [Paul], of which I myself have read a fragment on the Epistle to the Romans — very learned and profound in sense, but (true to the author's name) shadowy, obscure, and scarcely passable in his school even to the well-practiced — whose beginning

is, *Concerning the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.* When in recent years a printer of Lyons was undertaking to print this, and demanded of me an epigram to be prefixed (as is the custom) to the beginning of the work, it came at once into my mind that no verse fits the obscurity of the work more aptly than that which Jerome, from his treatise on Ezekiel, sets before the vision, in these lines:

> *This [is] the toil, that the house, and the error past unravelling —*
> *as once in lofty Crete the Labyrinth is said*
> *to have held its path woven amid blind walls, and a treacherous*
> *guile of a thousand ways, whereby the tokens of the followers*
> *were baffled, undetected, and the error past all return.*

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1308.

John Eck [Ioannes Eckius], a Swabian, a German by nation, a doctor of the purer Theology and a most keen champion of the Catholic faith against the impiety of the Lutheran heresy, wrote a brief and learned commentary on Haggai, and published two volumes of homilies on the gospels of the whole year. The same [author] translated both Testaments into the German tongue, in the year of the Lord 1540.

John Ferus [Wild] [Ioannes Ferus], a Teuton by nation, of the Order of Minorites, preacher of the cathedral church at Mainz, a man nobly learned in divine letters and endowed with singular eloquence — whose equal in the office of Catholic evangelical preaching the Church of the Germans does not possess in this our age — wrote in Latin, and in cultivated speech, pious and learned lucubrations according to Catholic doctrine, in which he reduced, as into a compendium, the labors of expositors both ancient and recent. Of those which are now extant, and are studiously read by almost all preachers, [these] are:

- Commentaries on Genesis, whose beginning is *The face of Moses, when everywhere.*
- Lenten sermons on Ezra.
- On Psalm 31, On penitence, 10 sermons.
- On Psalm 66, 10 sermons.
- On Ecclesiastes, according to the letter, 1 book of annotations.
- On Matthew, expounded for preaching, 4 books of commentaries.
- On the Gospel of John, narrated in sermons to the people, 1 book of commentary.
- On Luke chapter 15, On the prodigal son, several sermons.
- An Exegesis on the Epistle to the Romans.
- On the first epistle of John, 1 book of annotations.
- On the festal gospels of the whole year, two volumes of sermons.

He flourished under Charles V, in the year of the Lord 1536.

Dominic Soto [Dominicus Soto] of Segovia, of the Order of Preachers, published Annotations upon the commentaries of this author [Ferus] on John, pointing out that sixty-seven passages in them are to be read with caution; to whom Michael Medina, a Franciscan — praiseworthy for the highest probity and erudition — replied in an Apologetic volume published in defense of those same passages.

John Fisher [Ioannes Fischerus], bishop of the church of Rochester in England — deservedly to be compared, for his abundance of erudition, his sincerity of piety, and his constancy of soul, with any of the most holy and most keen champions of the Church — when he rebuked with the utmost constancy of mind and word the profane marriage of Henry VIII king of the English (who, having repudiated his former wife, had married another), provoked against himself, like another John [the Baptist], the wrath and savagery of a new Herod. By him he was thrust into prison and grievously afflicted with various and frequent torments;

and at length, when he had received in chains the insignia of the dignity of Cardinal, sent to him by the Roman pontiff in testimony of his approved faith and constancy, on the following day — before he could put them on — together with very many other innocent monks he received, for faith and truth, the triumphal crown of martyrdom from that most cruel tyrant. He, therefore, among the many and illustrious offspring of his genius which he sent forth into the light against the heretics, left also, for the use of the pious, a most holy and most pious exposition on the seven [penitential] psalms, worthy of a most learned bishop and most constant martyr. He wrote also, on the seventh chapter of Luke, *On the single Magdalene,* against Jacobus Faber [Lefèvre d'Étaples], "bishop of Vienne" [so styled as printed, but erroneous — Lefèvre held no such see; the same misdescription was flagged at p105], who asserted that there had been several Magdalenes — three books, whose beginning is *A certain little book, by the author Jacobus Faber.* He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 1536.

John Francis Pico [Ioannes Franciscus Picus], nephew of John Pico [della Mirandola], Count of Mirandola, wrote a brief and moral exposition of the fifteenth Psalm, whose beginning is *If anyone perfect;* likewise, on Matthew chapter 6, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1500.

John Francis Quintianus of Brescia [Ioannes Franciscus Quintianus, Brixiensis], a most graceful poet, wrote in Latin — from the four Gospels, after the manner of Sophocles and Euripides — a most weighty tragedy on the Passion of the Lord, in the year of the Lord 1520.

John of Frankfurt [Ioannes de Francforte], a German, of the Order of Preachers, put together a scholastic explanation on Job, which Vincentius Bardellus mentions in his book *On the Conception of Christ.* It is held at Lyons in the Library of the Preachers, with this beginning, *O all you who pass by the way.*

John Valois, otherwise **Galensis** [John of Wales], an Englishman by nation, of the Order of Minorites, most learned in the divine Scriptures, who for a long time gloriously taught Theology in the school of Paris; among many illustrious little works he wrote one book on the Apocalypse of John. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1270.

John Gagnée [Ioannes Gagnaeus] of Paris, a Theologian, preacher to Francis, most Christian King of the French, and his chief almoner; a man learned in secular letters and in the divine scriptures, and especially most accomplished in delivering homilies; he gathered, in a brief compendium, most clear and most easy scholia on the whole New Testament, selected from various manuscripts of both languages and from the chief opinions of both Greeks and Latins. Of which the catalog is this: [→ p285]

[→ p285: catchword "In san[ctum...]" — the Gagnée New-Testament scholia catalog]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 285 [printed folio 266, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the **John (Ioannes)** catalog: John Gagnée's New-Testament scholia and versified Psalter (fl. 1550); John Gauver of Mainz; the long John Gerson (Chancellor of Paris, †1419); John Glodeston; John Goodwick; John Haiton of Lincoln; John Hagen de Indagine (Carthusian); John Halgrin of Abbeville (his "sixth" exposition of the Song of Songs); a second John Hayton entry (a doublet); and the opening of John Hentenius. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — the John catalog, continued; first, John Gagnée's New-Testament scholia catalog (each incipit shown after the em-dash):]

- On the four holy gospels, 1 book, which begins εὐαγγέλιον *[euangelion], a Greek word.*
- On the Acts of the Apostles, 1 book.
- On all the epistles of Paul, 1 book, whose beginning is *Those who give a preface.*
- On the seven Canonical [epistles], 1 book, beginning *The author of this epistle.*
- On the Apocalypse, 1 book, beginning *It seemed [good], Christian reader.*

The same [Gagnée] also recast all the Psalms of David into lyric [verses] of diverse kinds and into stanzas of various odes, emulating the grace of the song of Pindar and Horace, with a brief prose argument prefixed to each ode explaining the theme of the Psalm, and with the very words of the Psalms themselves written down at the side of the page according to the truth of the Ecclesiastical version — which he everywhere follows in the text of the odes, and expounds, together with the Hebrew truth, in flowery paraphrases. The work begins, *[He] who [desires] a studious and exact [rendering]*. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

John Gauver [Ioannes Gauuer], a German, of the Order of Carmelites, lector of the monastery of Mainz, a Theologian and distinguished declaimer, in the year of the Lord 1440 wrote, according to the custom of the Scholastics, one book of explanation on Exodus, whose beginning is *A law for the common utility;* likewise, *On the Concord of the Evangelists,* 1 book, which begins *Because God sent.*

John Gerson [Ioannes Gerson], a Gaul by nation, chancellor of the most flourishing University of Paris, most skilled in Scholastic Theology, a poet and orator distinguished in his time, legate of Charles king of the French at the Council of Constance, wrote many noble volumes on the divine letters — in a style indeed scholastic, but not at all unpleasant — in which he so mixed and tempered scholastic subtleties with the sweet affections of mystical Theology that it may be doubted whether he surpassed piety by erudition, or erudition by piety. Of their number there are extant:

- On the literal sense of divine Scripture, 1 book.
- Commentaries on the 7 penitential Psalms, which are believed to be [the work] of Pierre d'Ailly [Petrus Aliacus], his teacher.
- A Monotessaron of the Gospels, that is, *One out of four*.
- On the Canticle of the Virgin Mary [the Magnificat], 12 books, issued in dialogue form.
- On the beginning of Mark, 1 book.
- On various passages of the Gospels, 1 book of sermons.
- Commentaries on the Song of Songs, published in his extreme old age near the end of his life: in which he discoursed with such diligence upon the fifty properties of divine love, scattered everywhere throughout the whole book of the Song, that all the affections of divine love seem to have been reckoned into this one [work].

This work being finished, three days after, as he lay upon his little bed repeating again and again, with great constancy of countenance and soul, those last words of this Song, *Strong as death is thy love,* he rendered his soul to God in the 69th year of his age, and in the year of our salvation 1419.[1]

John Glodeston [Ioannes Glodeston], an Englishman, a Carmelite, wrote commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew and of John, and on the Canonical epistle of John. He lived in the year of the Lord 1320.

John Goodwick [Ioannes Goodvvyck] wrote commentaries on Genesis and Daniel. He flourished in the year 1360.

John Haiton [Ioannes Haiton], an Englishman, wrote annotations on the four Gospels, when he was at Lincoln, in the year 1428.

John Hagen de Indagine [Ioannes Hagen de Indagine], a German, a Carthusian, excelling in the knowledge of things divine and human, composed, among very many Scholastic commentaries which he published on the books of the divine scripture:

- On the four books of Kings, according to the fourfold sense, 4 books.
- On the vision of Daniel chapter 7, 1 book.
- Likewise, on that saying [1 Thessalonians 5], *We pray that the whole spirit, flesh, and soul be preserved,* one book, On the spirit, the soul, and the flesh.

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1460. There are listed, in the Catalog of books lately condemned by Pope Paul IV [the Index], works "of John de Indagine" — not indeed of this one, but of another, who wrote on chiromancy [palmistry].

John Halgrin of Abbeville [Ioannes Halgrinus ab Abbatis villa], dean of Amiens and Cardinal of Sabina, a Scholastic in profession, style, and method, illustrated the Song of Songs with a new kind of explanation, which is called the Sixth. For before him only five modes of exposition of this book had appeared. **The first** of them [is] of those who interpret the whole Song, according to the literal (Western) letter, of the loves of Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh, or Abishag the Shunammite. **The second,** of those who expound the same [Song] as a colloquy between Solomon and the commonwealth of the Jews. **The third,** of those who — alluding to the book of Martianus Capella entitled *On the Nuptials of Philology and Mercury* — say that this Song is an Epithalamion of the Wise Man [Sapiens] and Wisdom [Sapientia] conversing with one another. **The fourth,** of those who affirm this book to be an Epithalamium of Christ and the Church. **The fifth,** of those who expound the same [Song] concerning the love of the soul toward God, and the love of God toward the soul. To these five expositions, then, John added a sixth, narrating the mutual colloquies of Mary the mother of Christ and of Christ her son — the argument of which narration he himself, in the preface of his commentaries, briefly comprised in these words:

> *This Song contains the mutual and joyful applause of the mother and the son — namely, of the blessed Virgin and the Lord Jesus Christ. For here the mother applauds the son; here the son rejoices in the mother; here the son describes the privileges of the mother; here the mother describes the excellence of the son. Now there speak in this Song four persons, namely the Mother, and the Son, and the Angels who attend upon the Son as their Lord, and the young maiden virgins who attend upon the Virgin as their Lady, as the following series of the scripture will make clear.*

The work begins, *About to expound the Song of Songs to the honor of the mother and the son.* Ascensius printed it at Paris in the year 1521. This author flourished in the year of the Lord 1450.

John Hayton [Ioannes Hayton], an Englishman, wrote Annotations on the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John; likewise on the Epistle to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews, and on the Canonical Epistle and Apocalypse of John. He lived in the year 1428. *[This is a doublet of "John Haiton" above — the same Englishman (fl. 1428) entered twice, with differing work-lists.]*

John Hentenius [Ioannes Hentennius], a German by nation, of Nechlin by fatherland, a monk of the Order of St. Jerome, wrote a very brief little commentary on the Apocalypse, to which he gave the title [→ p286]

[→ p286: catchword "IVDI[...]" — the title of Hentenius's Apocalypse commentary]

[1] He was buried at Lyons in the church of St. Paul.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 286 [printed folio 267, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the **John (Ioannes)** catalog continues (H→M): John Hentenius (his Apocalypse commentary identifying the Beast of Rev 13 with Muhammad); John Hessels of Louvain; John Hoffmeister; John son of Ulrich of Basel; John Justus Landsberg [Lanspergius]; John de Isunio; John Kynyngham; John Louis Vives of Valencia; John Maistrosius; John Major the Scot; John Montholon of Autun; John Mary Verattus of Ferrara; John of Mechelen; John Milbachius of Erfurt; John the Benedictine; John of Neuville; and the opening of John Nider. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — the John catalog, continued:]

...[John Hentenius, to whose Apocalypse commentary he gave] the title *A Judgment concerning the Apocalypse and Antichrist:* in which he maintains that that Beast, described in the thirteenth chapter of the Apocalypse, is Muhammad, the false Prophet of the Turks. Its beginning is, *Before these [I write] commentaries on the Apocalypse.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.[1]

John Hessels of Louvain [Ioannes Hessels à Louanio], royal professor of sacred Theology, wrote commentaries on the Gospel of St. Matthew, on the first Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy; likewise on the first canonical [epistle] of St. Peter, and on the first Canonical [epistle] of John; he wrote also other things against the heretics of our own time. He was a man especially pious and learned, whom I heard teaching at Louvain in the year 1565; and, if I am not mistaken, in the year 1566 he migrated to the world above.

John Hoffmeister [Ioannes Hoffmeisterus], a Swabian by fatherland, of the institute of St. Augustine, and a well-deserving provincial of the same order in Swabia, wrote:

- On Tobit, brief and polished exegeses.
- On Matthew — 1 book.
- On Mark — 1 book.
- On Luke — 1 book.
- On the two epistles of Paul to the Corinthians — 2 books.
- On the epistle to the Philippians — 1 book.
- On the Sunday Gospels — 1 book of homilies.

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1546.

John, son of Ulrich [Ioannes Huldalrici], of Basel, of the Order of Preachers, a youth of a genius divine rather than human — whom you might call erudition itself and sincerity of faith itself — while still young acquired such knowledge of the Greek idiom as scarcely one or another of his age possessed; he wrote therefore, on the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, in Greek and in an elegant style, most praiseworthy commentaries. He died at Cologne in the year 1536, while still a youth.

John Justus Landsberg [Lanspergius], a Bavarian, a Carthusian, wrote on all the epistles and gospels of the whole year narrations and sermons, reproducing that ancient and genuine sense and piety of the orthodox fathers. The work begins, *Knowing that, &c.* [the following printed words, *Quinquam nulli non tempori*, are obscure as set]. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

John de Isunio [Ioannes de Isunio; name uncertain as printed], of the Order of the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of Jerusalem, a not-ignoble Theologian, well-deserving of the divine Scriptures, and public lector in the University of Paris, elaborated in scholastic phrasing one book of explanation on Job, whose beginning is *He will sustain unto the time;* likewise one book on Mark, whose beginning is *He was made like to a lion;* and, on all the epistles of Paul, [dedicated] to Philip the bishop of Rouen, 14 books. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1390.

John Kynyngham [Ioannes Kininghan], an Englishman, made a lecture [commentary] on the Lamentations, in the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 1399.

John Louis Vives of Valencia [Ioannes Ludouicus Viues, Valentinus], a Spaniard by nation, among many most noble lucubrations — learnedly indeed and accurately composed, in which he joined the highest eloquence with the most complete erudition and most Christian piety — wrote, [dedicated] to William de Croÿ [Guillielmum Crouium], Archbishop of Toledo, most eloquent meditations on the seven penitential Psalms: in which now he himself, now the psalmist, now the sinner, now some other person speak, with sweet affections, either to God, or to themselves, or to others, most piously. Of these the beginning is, *I think there are very few*. He flourished in the year 1518.

John Maistrosius [Ioannes Maistrosius], a Scot, wrote three books of commentaries on Matthew, in the year of the Lord 792.

John Major [Ioannes Maior], a Scot, wrote a scholastic Postil on the four Gospels, in the year of the Lord 1400 [so printed; the well-known John Major/Mair the Scot belongs to the sixteenth century].

John Montholon of Autun [Ioannes Montholonius, Eduensis], most skilled in both laws, patched together a huge volume, to which he gave the title *A Storehouse [Promptuarium] of the Divine and of both branches of Human Law:* in which, in alphabetical order, he collected all the maxims and passages which agree in the sacred Letters and in both Laws — the Imperial and the Pontifical — with the addition of many not-to-be-despised annotations opening up the obscurity of those same passages. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1520.

John Mary Verattus of Ferrara [Ioannes Maria Verattus, Ferrariensis], a Carmelite, a Theologian piously and holily learned, and a distinguished declaimer in the Italian tongue, published — [dedicated] to Ippolito d'Este, the most eminent Cardinal — most abundant narrations on five [so printed; six are listed] chapters of Matthew, that is, on the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth, arranged into fifteen books, which most beautifully embrace the whole evangelical law and are filled with disputations against the false dogmas of Luther. The work begins, *Jesus, seeing the crowds, &c. Here the discourse of the Lord is divided.* He wrote also, on the festal gospels of the whole year, 2 volumes of homilies. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

John of Mechelen [Ioannes Mechlinius], a German by nation, perfected by long exercise in the study of secular Philosophy and excellently instructed in the divine oracles — whom the University of Cologne had for many years as public teacher of Theology — among his other works wrote, according to the method of the school, one book of exposition on the Psalms. He flourished under Frederick III the Emperor, in the year 1460.

John Milbachius [Ioannes Milbachius], a German, renowned for scholastic erudition in both sacred and profane letters, and public professor of Theology in the University of Erfurt, sent forth thirteen books of commentaries on Paul, in the scholastic manner, in the year of the Lord 1494.

John, a monk, a Benedictine, a Theologian, Philosopher, and rhetorician, sprung from Germany, professor of the monastery of Kastl [Castellensis] in the diocese of Eichstätt, composed a most useful compendium of the whole scripture, to which he gave the title *Breviarium Bibliae* [Breviary of the Bible]; likewise, on the gospels and epistles of the whole year, three books of sermons. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1390.

John of Neuville [Ioannes Neouilleus], styled Genuillanus, wrote — [dedicated] to Charles of Lorraine the Cardinal — commentaries on the seven penitential psalms, beginning *The Maker of men, &c.,* in the year of the Lord 1550.

John Nider [Ioannes Nider], of the Order of Preachers, a Teuton by nation, studious and learned in the divine Scriptures, sufficiently taught in scholastic Theology, and most pleasing to the people in delivering sermons, wrote — in a rough but plain style — on the twentieth chapter of Exodus, concerning the ten precepts of the Decalogue, a learned and large [→ p287]

[→ p287: catchword "volu[men]"]

[1] From a Hieronymite he became a Dominican; I heard him teaching Theology at Louvain in the year of the Lord 1565.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 287 [printed folio 268, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the **John (Ioannes)** catalog: John Nider (his Decalogue and moral-leprosy books); John à Pastura of Gembloux; John Pfeffer of Wittenberg; the great **John Pico della Mirandola** ("the Phoenix") — his* Heptaplus *on Genesis 1, the varied judgments on it, and Bishop Lippomano's reason for omitting him; then John Poccanus of Cologne; John du Pré; John Quinquarboreus of Arles; John de Regno; John Royaerts of Antwerp; and the opening of John Rubius of Hainaut. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — the John catalog, continued:]

...[John Nider wrote, on Exodus 20, a learned and large] volume, whose beginning is *The most sacred law of the Decalogue;* likewise, on the thirteenth chapter of Leviticus, On the moral leprosy, 1 book; likewise, on the gospels of the whole year, two volumes of sermons. He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 1430.

John à Pastura [of Pasture], Prior of the monastery of Gembloux [Géblacensis], published a Paraphrase on the Psalter, collected from the doctors of the Church, in the year of the Lord 1510.

John Pfeffer of Wittenberg [Ioannes Phefir, Vitembergensis], the first illustrious teacher of the school of Freiburg, published a distinguished scholastic work, divided into fourteen books, upon the epistles of Paul, which — read publicly — he entitled *A Sacerdotal Directory* [Directorium Sacerdotale], whose beginning is *Concerning the reading of the epistles.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1490.

John Pico [della Mirandola], prince of Mirandola and Concordia in Italy, surnamed the PHOENIX on account of the nobility of his lineage and the rare and singular grace of his most beautiful body and most fair soul — a man of an almost prodigious genius, polished even to a miracle in every variety of the arts, sciences, and tongues — wrote, while quite young, and scarcely reaching his twenty-third year, [dedicated] to Lorenzo de' Medici, a Latin commentary on the first chapter of Genesis, brief but of admirable boldness and beyond the powers of adolescence, marked with the title *Heptaplus*, whose beginning is *The emulation of your studies has moved me, &c.:* in which, passing over all that the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldaean narrators of Genesis had previously brought forward, he dared not only to promise but also to bring into the open seven new expositions, never before attempted by anyone, but first devised, discovered, and perfected by himself:

- **The first** is on the elemental and corruptible world, in which he draws all the single words of the first chapter, in a continuous series of exposition, to the explaining of the creation of this sublunary world.
- **The second** is on the celestial world, in which, by a like artifice, he applies the whole Mosaic narrative to the creation of the celestial spheres.
- **The third** is on the invisible and angelic world, in which he turns all that Moses writes concerning the work of the six days to the first creation of the Angels.
- **The fourth** is on the human world, which interprets the whole chapter of the nature of man.
- **The fifth** is on the distinction of the fourfold world, showing by what operations, properties, and differences the four worlds already mentioned are distinguished from one another.
- **The sixth** is on the mutual kinship of the worlds, demonstrating how these four worlds agree with one another.
- **The seventh** is on the Sabbath of the world, and the rest of all creatures in [their] final and eternal felicity.

To these seven expositions there is added, as it were for a crown, a certain specimen of an eighth, Cabalistic explanation — that is, drawn from the Kabbalah of the Jews — which elicits many senses not only from the single sentences and words, but deduces almost infinite mysteries from the single Hebrew letters of each syllable.

But concerning this work the judgments of learned men are various: some admire it as learned and sublime; some despise it as a display of youthful boldness, outwardly swollen but within utterly empty. I remember that in recent years, when I was at Rome, I familiarly asked that most excellent man Luigi Lippomano [Aloysius Lippomanus], bishop of Verona, why, among so many noble authors inserted by him into his Catena, he had made no mention of John Pico, that distinguished man. Then he, turning to me, said with the utmost emphasis of countenance and words: "When I was weaving together a Catena of explanations on Genesis, I chose those Writers who seemed to me to explain the words and thoughts of Moses by their

expositions. Accordingly, since I had observed that Pico bent his effort to this one thing only — to express Platonic thoughts, or rather his own fancies, in Mosaic words and sayings — I judged that I had no need of his work." This most noble youth undertook, besides this *Heptaplus* (which lately Antonio Bonagratia, canon of Pescia, translated into the Tuscan tongue), also commentaries on the Davidic hymns according to the Septuagint edition, and along with these other labors on the sacred letters — about to publish many more still, had not an untimely death, as he was passing his thirtieth year, extinguished him, in the year of the world's redemption 1494. His life was written, in a splendid oration, by John Francis Pico, his nephew, heir of his ancestral virtue. And Antonio Tebaldeo, no ignoble poet, inscribed this elogium on his friend's tomb:

Here lies John Mirandola; the rest is known

to Tagus and to Ganges — perhaps to the Antipodes too.

John Poccanus [Ioannes Poccanus], provost of the church of St. George at Cologne, published a Psalter in the Chaldaean tongue, but printed in Ethiopic characters — which the Ethiopian monks now use, who call themselves Indians, and they sing it publicly in the church which they have at Rome.

John du Pré [Ioannes de Pratis], a Gaul, [whose] Dictionary on the sacred Bible I saw in the Library of the Preachers at Lyons, written by hand: whose beginning is such:

The difficult parts which the Bible bears I strive

to lay open, &c.

John Quinquarboreus of Arles [Cinqarbres] rendered into Latin the *Targum Kinoth,* that is, the Chaldaean [Aramaic] Paraphrase on the Lamentations, with the common Latin translation added, that it might more easily appear what advantage or usefulness that translation brings; with notes added also, on each chapter of the Paraphrase, [notes] not to be regretted. The work begins, *They wrote most holily.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1549.

John de Regno, a Gaul, professed in the Order of Carmelites in the monastery of Toulouse, a Scholastic in the kind of his Theology and speech, wrote one book on the Gospel of Matthew, in the year of the Lord 1348.

John Royaerts of Antwerp [Ioannes Roiardus, Antuerpiensis], of the Order of Minorites, wrote literal homilies on all the Gospels — the weekday ones as well as the festal, the Lenten, the Advent, and [those] of the whole year — in a style midway between the ancients and the scholastics. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

John Rubius of Hainaut [Ioannes Rubius Hannonius] gathered a Harmony of the four Evangelists into one body of History, with the [reasons] of the order and the agreement added in their places, [→ p288]

[→ p288: catchword "sus" (consensus)]

(Rich PDF p. 288 [printed folio 269, recto]. Book IV, letter I — the close of the ***John (Ioannes)*** *catalog (John Rubius of Hainaut through John Voretan; then John Trithemius and John Zacharias), followed by* ***Jordan the Teuton*** *and the opening of the* ***Josephus*** *(Flavius Josephus) entry — his lineage, his honors at Rome, his testimony to Christ, the* Antiquities, *and the beginning of* Against Apion. *Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — the close of the John catalog, then Jordan and Josephus:]

...[John Rubius of Hainaut gathered a Harmony of the four Evangelists into one body of History,] with the reasons of the order and the agreement added in their places. [Printed] at Cologne, 1572. *[The 1572 Cologne imprint post-dates Sixtus's death (1569) — a later-edition detail.]*

John Ruusbroec [Ioannes Rusbrochius], a Carthusian, a most eminent and most holy man, whom they call a second Dionysius the Areopagite, wrote commentaries on the Tabernacle of Moses and on things pertaining to it, wherein many mysteries of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are explained lucidly by the divine Spirit, and by no means in a commonplace way. Their beginning is, *So run, that you may obtain.*

John of Sancta Fides [Ioannes de Sancta fide], an Englishman, expounded the first epistle of John, in the year of the Lord 1359.

John Scotus, a monk of St. Benedict, a hearer of Bede, colleague of Albinus [Alcuin] the deacon and abbot, especially dear to Charlemagne, and learned by continual exercise in the divine Letters, published, in a clear and plain style, three books of commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew. He flourished in the year of the Lord 800.

John Soares [Ioannes Soarezius], Bishop of Coimbra and Count of Arganil in Spain [Iberia; Coimbra is in Portugal], published commentaries on Matthew, distinguished by many most useful treatises, whose beginning is *The blessed Apostle and Evangelist.* He flourished, celebrated at the Council of Trent, in the year of the Lord 1560.

John Tacesphalus, an Englishman, a Carmelite, famous for his erudition in the holy Scriptures and his practice of preaching, left two books of scholastic commentaries on the Apocalypse of John.

John Tauler [Ioannes Taulerus], a Dominican, a German, whose sermons — published with an admirable spirit — are extant; he wrote one most devout book On the Passion of the Lord, from the four Gospels; likewise one book of sermons, of scholastic meditations, on various passages of the Gospels.

John Tylney of Norwich [Nordouicensis] wrote a postil on the Apocalypse of John. He lived in the year 1430.

John de Torquemada [Ioannes ex Turre cremata], of the Order of Preachers, Cardinal of the title of St. Xystus, a man exercised in the divine scriptures and a most learned interpreter of pontifical law, among other splendid works of his genius published, on all the Davidic Psalms, [dedicated] to Pius II Supreme Pontiff, a most brief, most rich, and most lucid Paraphrase, dictated in a simple and plain style, whose beginning is *To the most blessed father, and most merciful.* He composed also, on the festal gospels of the whole year, a scholastic Postil; likewise, on the same Gospels, one book of scholastic questions. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1560 [so printed; read ~1460 — his dedication to Pius II, pope 1458–64, places him a century earlier].

John Wallensis [Ioannes Valeis], an Englishman, wrote 1 book on the Apocalypse. He lived in the year 1270. *[This duplicates the "John of Wales" (Valois, alias Galensis) entry at p284 — the same Englishman (fl. 1270), one book on the Apocalypse.]*

John Verdiacus, of the Order of Preachers, explained the book of the Canticles with scholastic commentaries. Vincentius Bandellus mentions this work in his book *On the Conception of the Blessed Virgin.*

John Viguier of Grenade [Ioannes Viguerius, Granatensis], a Gaul, of the Order of Preachers, a scholastic by profession, wrote commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, in the year of the Lord 1550.

John Voretan of London [Ioannes Voretan, Londinensis], a Carmelite, wrote a Postil on the Song of Solomon, in the year 1406.

John Trithemius [Ioannes Tritemius], Abbot of Sponheim, author of the *Catalog of Illustrious Men,* wrote, from the Greek [sources], questions on the Gospel of John, and homilies on various passages of the divine scripture. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1490.

John Zacharias [Ioannes Zacharias], born at Erfurt in Germany, a distinguished interpreter of secular Philosophy, exercised by assiduous reading in the divine volumes, and at the Council of Constance a notable champion of the Catholic faith against the Hussite and Wycliffite heretics, published many illustrious little works: of which there are reported five books on the Pentateuch, and 14 books on all the epistles of Paul, written in scholastic fashion. He flourished in the time of the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 1430.

Jordan the Teuton [Iordanus Theutonicus], of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine, a distinguished expounder of the divine Scriptures, and of excellent genius in delivering sermons, wrote — in a humble and plain style, in the year of the Lord 1410 — not-to-be-despised commentaries on the Apocalypse.

Josephus, born of royal and priestly blood, son of Matthias the priest — whom Jerome calls "the Greek Livy," but the more recent Jews call Joseph Bengorion [ben Gorion] — a Hebrew by nation, a Jerusalemite by fatherland, a priest by lineage; captured in the destruction of Jerusalem, he was led to Rome by the Emperor Titus. And there, on account of the excellence of his genius, he so earned [favor] from the Senate and people of Rome that, while he yet lived, his books were deposited in the public Library, and after his death a bronze statue was set up to him. He was a friend of the Christians, although he was a Jew; and he celebrated our Lord Jesus Christ with a notable elogium in the 18th book of the Antiquities[1] — for which reason St. Jerome reckons him, with fitting praise, in the catalog of Ecclesiastical writers. He, therefore, when he had observed that only the five books of Moses were extant among the Greeks — translated by the Seventy interpreters, by the labor of Ptolemy king of Egypt — resolved, spurred on by the exhortations of Epaphroditus, a most learned man, to deliver the whole history of the Old Testament to Greek ears. Which he also accomplished: having written first in the Hebrew tongue, then also in Greek, περὶ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας, that is, *On Antiquities,* in twenty books; in which, preserving at once both the truth of the holy Scriptures and the laws of history, he fitted [the material into] a certain kind of Paraphrase on almost all the books of the Old Instrument — promising also that, if God should prolong his life, he would explain in another volume the causes of the sacred history and all its reasons, both natural and allegorical. These books Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, rendered into Latin, beginning his edition in this manner: *To write the history, &c.*

He wrote likewise, [addressed] to the same Epaphroditus, two books against Apion the Grammarian and Molon [Apollonius Molon], and many others who slandered the sacred histories of the Hebrews as a thing lately sprung up, fabulous, and lying — on the ground that among the noble Greek historians no mention of these things was found. Meeting these [objectors], Josephus brought forward so many testimonies out of the writings of the Phoenicians, Chaldaeans, Egyptians, and Greeks [→ p289]

[→ p289: catchword "testi[monia]"]

[1] Josephus the Jew celebrated Christ the Lord with a notable elogium.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 289 [printed folio 270, verso]. Book IV, letter I — the close of the **Josephus** (Flavius Josephus) entry (his Daniel and 4-Maccabees books; fl. AD 100); a second **Josephus** (Count Joseph of Tiberias, the convert who found the Hebrew Matthew; †370); Jovita Rapicio of Brescia; **Irenaeus of Lyons** (with Jerome's report of his millenarianism); Isaac the monk; and the **Isidore** cluster — Isidore the Elder of Cordova, Isidore Clario of Foligno, and the opening of Isidore of Seville. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I — Josephus concluded, then Jovita, Irenaeus, Isaac, and the Isidores:]

...[Josephus brought forward so many] testimonies, conformable to the sacred histories, that St. Jerome greatly marveled how a Hebrew man, trained from infancy in the sacred letters, could have unrolled such great Libraries of foreign authors. The work begins, *Sufficiently, I think.*

He wrote also, On the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, one book, of which Jerome makes mention in the preface of the 11th book on Isaiah.

He composed also a very elegant book, περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ [εἰς τοὺς] Μακκαβαίους, that is, *On the Sovereign Reason:* in which, describing the contest of the seven sons of one mother, who suffered together with their mother herself, he shows, by the example of the Maccabees, that it is the mind which holds the sovereignty within us. Concerning this work Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 10, says thus: "There is also another elegant volume of Josephus, entitled Εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός, that is, *That pious reason is mistress of the passions;* which little book some have entitled *[the book] of the Maccabees*, because in it are contained the contests and struggles sweated out for piety by the Maccabees." The work begins, φιλοσοφώτατον λόγον [a most philosophical discourse]. *[The Greek titles here are set in the difficult 16th-century type and are given as best readable; the Eusebian title is restored to its standard form.]*

He flourished under Vespasian and Titus Augustus, and reached down to Trajan Augustus — that is, to the year of the Lord 100.

Josephus, a Jew by nation, of Tiberias by fatherland, a Count in dignity, and drawn to the faith by a mighty miracle — while he was not yet a Christian, he so loved and cherished Christians that he received in hospitality the blessed Eusebius, bishop of "Fregellae" [so printed; read Vercellae — Eusebius of Vercelli] in Italy, exiled by the Arian Emperor Constantius on account of the Orthodox faith; and he honorably brought in Bishop Epiphanius, who had come thither with very many holy brethren, to visit this [Eusebius]. And after his own conversion he built many churches of the Christians in the cities of the Jews — at Tiberias, Diocaesarea, Nazareth, and Capernaum. This man, then, as Epiphanius testifies, first brought to light the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew[1] — written in Hebrew by the very hand of Matthew — which, in a hidden treasury of the Jews at Scythopolis, he discovered, together with the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles, translated from the Greek tongue into Hebrew. He flourished under the Emperor Constantius, and died a nonagenarian in the year of the Lord 370.

Jovita Rapicio of Brescia [Iouita Rapicius, Brixianus] wrote, [dedicated] to Reginald Pole, a Paraphrase on twenty-two Psalms, composed in various kinds of verse, whose beginning is *Not you who take up the Maeonian [strain]*. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Irenaeus of Lyons [Irenaeus Lugdunensis], bishop in Gaul after the triumph [martyrdom] of the blessed martyr Pothinus, once a hearer of Polycarp the martyr, a man endowed with the highest erudition and piety, sent as legate to Rome under Pope Eleutherius, was proved most illustrious no less in sanctity than in doctrine. He wrote in the Greek tongue many excellent volumes, but especially — as the Chronicle of Eusebius testifies — commentaries on the Apocalypse; concerning which Jerome, in the preface of the 18th book of his commentaries on Isaiah, speaks thus: "The Apocalypse of John, if we take it according to the letter, we must Judaize; but if we take it spiritually, as it is written, we shall seem to go against the opinions of many — especially of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons: against whom that most eloquent man Dionysius, pontiff of the Church of Alexandria, writes an elegant book, deriding the fable of the thousand years, and the golden and jeweled Jerusalem upon earth, the restoration of the temple, the blood of victims, the rest of the Sabbath, the injury of circumcision, marriages, childbirths, the rearing of children, the delights of banquets, and the servitude of all nations; and again wars, armies, and triumphs, and the slaughters of the conquered, and the death of the sinner at a hundred years — to whom Apollinaris replied in two volumes; whom [Irenaeus] not only the men of his own sect, but also a great multitude of our own in this matter, follow." This blessed pontiff dies, in a raging persecution, crowned with martyrdom together with almost all the people of his city, for the Catholic faith, under Marcus Antoninus, in the year of the Lord 175.

Isaac, a monk by profession, most skilled in Greek literature, wrote in Greek, on that [text], *This I command you, that you love [one another], &c.*, one homily.

Isidore the Elder, Bishop of Cordova, not unacquainted with secular letters but most skilled in the divine, and famous also for the sanctity of his life under Theodosius and Honorius, wrote — [dedicated] to St. Orosius, a Spanish presbyter — on all the books of Kings, four books. Augustine, in sermon 35, On the Saints, cites the exposition of this Isidore on Luke. He flourished under Honorius, in the year of the Lord 420.

Isidore Clario of Brescia [Isidorus Clarius, Brixianus], from a monk of Monte Cassino [made] Bishop of Foligno [Fulginatensis], gathered scholia on the whole body of the Bible, again translated by himself: which, when at first they had been forbidden to Christians, at length — the prologue and prolegomena being cut away — were restored [to use] by the authority of the most holy Council of Trent. He wrote also, on the discourse of the Lord delivered on the mount, from the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew, 69 orations to the people, whose beginning is *It would indeed be a fair thing;* likewise, on various passages of Luke the Evangelist, 54 orations to the people, filled with elegance of words and gravity of sentences, of which the first begins *That which first, in time, to you.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Isidore, Bishop of Seville [Hispalensis], called Isidore the Younger to distinguish him from Isidore the Elder, Bishop of Cordova; and, as some think, a disciple of St. Gregory — a man of exceptional sanctity and erudition, most skilled in the divine Scriptures. And, in reading, collecting, and fitting together the sayings, sentences, and rhapsodies of the ancient fathers out of their innumerable and immense volumes, having an insatiable desire and strength altogether inexhaustible, he gathered from the labors of others innumerable illustrious volumes of almost all the arts and sciences: of which I have read a short and slender little compendium of Allegories on the Octateuch, collected from Origen, Victorinus, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Fulgentius, and especially Gregory of his own time; in whose preface he indicates that he had already, long before, [written] an ex-[position] on the same books of the divine Scripture [→ p290]

[→ p290: catchword "plana[tionem]" (explanationem)]

[1] Josephus brought to light the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 290 [printed folio 271, recto]. Book IV, letter I — Isidore of Seville concluded (fl. 630); then **Isidore of Pelusium** (Chrysostom's disciple, his ~10,000 letters); Isidore of Thessalonica; **Isotta Nogarola of Verona** (her dialogue on the sin of Adam and Eve); the **Itala** (Old-Latin version); **Judas the Syrian**; **Josse Clichtove** of Chartres (supplementing Cyril's John commentary); **Julius Africanus** (the Letter to Aristides on the Gospel genealogies); and **Julian of Eclanum** (the Pelagian; Bede's warning against his Song commentary). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter I — Isidore of Seville concluded, then Isidore of Pelusium onward:]

...[Isidore of Seville had already, long before, penned literal] explanations on the same books of the divine Scripture. This little book, which begins *The history of the sacred law,* Trithemius — to amplify the abundance of Isidore's lucubrations — cut up into twelve books, adding that he had written on the rest of the volumes of both Testaments, 62 books; of which, however, he [Trithemius] noted neither the beginnings, nor showed [them as] seen by himself. He flourished under the Emperor Heraclonas, son of Heraclius, in the times of Sisebut, king of the Goths, in Spain, in the year of the Lord 630; to whom, on account of the sanctity of his life, annual honors were appointed on the 16th day of January.

Isidore of Pelusium [Isidorus Pelusiota], Abbot of the monks of the Pelusiac mountain in Egypt, a disciple of St. John Chrysostom, leading an angelic life in the flesh, wrote many things full of varied usefulness —

but especially nearly ten chiliads, or ten thousand, epistles of every kind, filled at once with divine and human grace: in which he expounded all the divine Scriptures of both Testaments, and formed the morals of all men, using in them a kind of speech most suited to teaching. We have seen in the Marciana Library at Venice a manuscript volume containing 1148 epistles of this holy man, of which the first begins thus: Ἐπειδὴ κυκλικόν ἐστι τοῦ χρόνου [Since the course of time is cyclical]. He flourished under Theodosius the Younger, in the year of the Lord 440. Nicephorus, book 14, chapter 53.

Isidore, Bishop of Thessalonica, a pious and learned man, wrote Greek homilies on Luke, which are held in the Vatican Library.

Isotta Nogarola of Verona [Isota Nogarola, Veronensis], devoted to the studies of letters and to perpetual virginity, composed a dialogue in which — in the Latin tongue — she discoursed upon the third chapter of Genesis: *Who sinned first and more, Adam or Eve.* She flourished under Nicholas V and Pius II, to whom also she wrote very many orations.

The Italic [Old-Latin] Translation of both Testaments [Itala], having an uncertain author, was formerly, before St. Jerome's version, famous in the Church. This translation Augustine, in the second book On Christian Doctrine, preferred to the others, as being more faithful to the words and clearer in the perspicuity of its sense. For which reasons the Latin Church kept it in use down to the times of St. Gregory. How much it differs from our Vulgate edition in individual [passages] is shown by that book of Augustine entitled *The Mirror* [Speculum]: in which innumerable testimonies of this Translation are collected from all the volumes of both Testaments.

Judas, a Syrian by nation, disputed most fully concerning the seventy weeks in Daniel, and carried down their chronography through the earlier times to the tenth year of Severus; in which he is accused of error, because he said that the coming of Antichrist would be about his own times — but this [he said] for the reason that the greatness of the persecutions threatened the imminent downfall of the world. He flourished in the year of the Lord 200.

Josse Clichtove of Nieuwpoort [Iudocus Chlictoueus, Neoportuensis], Canon of the Church of Chartres in Gaul, a Theologian, Philosopher, Orator, and distinguished in expounding the sacred oracles, collected from Chrysostom and Augustine four books of explanation on the Gospel of John, and inserted them into the commentaries of St. Cyril — so that, out of the twelve books which that blessed father [Cyril] had published on John, he might supply and complete the four middle ones, lost through the injury of the times, that is, the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth: in which he narrates from the Gospel of John, from that place of the seventh chapter, *There said therefore certain of them of Jerusalem, Is not this he whom they seek to kill?,* down to those words of the twelfth chapter, *If any man hear my words, and keep them not.* The work begins, *There said therefore.* He wrote likewise, on the festal gospels of the whole year, two volumes of homilies. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1513.

Julius Africanus, of whom five books *On the Times* are extant, under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus — that is, in the year of the world's redemption 220 — wrote in Greek various epistles on several passages of the divine Scripture; among which there is celebrated by the ancient writers his elegant epistle to Aristides the philosopher, in which he disputed most fully concerning the discrepancy which seems to be in the genealogy of the Savior according to Matthew and Luke. A great part of which disputation is recited by Eusebius at the beginning of the Ecclesiastical History, and is cited by Augustine in the third book against Faustus. He wrote also to Origen a brief epistle, containing much in few words, concerning the History of Susanna — which, on account of many conjectures, he judged to be spurious and fabricated by a recent author. To whom Origen wrote back, in defense of the same history, a long and learned epistle, whose beginning is *Your letter, by which I understood [what you say] of Susanna, &c.;* but the epistle of Africanus begins thus: *When you were holding [i.e. present at] the sacred disputation.* Both [epistles] Ambrose of

Milan — a monk of Monte Cassino, Abbot of San Benigno, a man most skilled in the three languages, who lately gave to Roman ears very many works of Origen and Cyril not yet known to the Latins — translated into Latin.

Julian, Bishop of Eclanum [Celanensis] in Campania, reckoned among the Ecclesiastical writers by Gennadius, Honorius, and Trithemius: a most skilled rhetorician, and — as his own little book to the virgin Demetrias, rashly ascribed to St. Jerome, shows — not an unhappy imitator of Ciceronian eloquence. Before he had begun openly to profess the heresy of Pelagius, he wrote, in a plausible but insidious style, commentaries on the Song of Solomon; concerning which Bede, in the preface of his own explanations on the Canticle, speaks thus: "Being about to write, with the help of grace from above, upon the Song of Songs, I thought the reader must first be warned to read most cautiously the little works of Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Campania, which he composed on the same book — lest, through the abundance of flattering eloquence, he fall into the mire of harmful doctrine; but, as it is wont to be said, so let him pluck the grape-cluster that he also beware the thorns — that is, in his sayings let him search out and choose the sound senses, that he no less shun the unsound; or rather let him do that [word] of Maro [Virgil]:

> *You who gather flowers and the strawberries growing low on the ground,*
>
> *flee hence, O boys: cold in the grass there lurks a snake.*

That is, let him restrain himself above all from the reading of him, since he has those who have expounded the same book both with sound senses and with simpler words. For the man is, as he is a most skilled rhetorician, so — the grace of God being assailed after Pelagius — a most bitter assailant of it; so that his writings are the more openly [dangerous], by which, against the most strenuous champion of that same grace, [→ p291]

[→ p291: catchword "Augu[stinum]" — Augustine]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 291 [printed folio 272, verso]. Book IV — the close of **letter I**: Julian of Eclanum concluded; **Junilius the African**; **Justus of Urgell**; **Justus of Tiberias**; **Justin Martyr**; **Juvencus** (the Gospel-versifier). Then **letter L opens** — Lanfranc of Canterbury, Lawrence Justinian, Lorenzo de Villavicencio, Leander of Seville, and the beginning of Pope Leo I the Great. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter I concluded, then letter L opens:]

...[his writings are the more openly dangerous, by which, against the most strenuous champion of that same grace,] Augustine, he raved" — they show. Gennadius writes that this man, in a time of public famine, distributed all his goods in alms to the poor, and in this way drew a great multitude of nobles, deceived by the appearance of piety, into his heresy. He dies under Valentinian Augustus, son of Constantius Caesar and of Placidia, sister of Honorius and of Arcadius, in the year of the Lord 440.

Junilius the African [Iunilius Afer], bishop of an uncertain city in Africa, learned in the good arts in the world, and most skilled in the holy Scriptures, brief in speech and acute in sense, at the urging of Primasius the African, bishop of Utica, collected for the benefit of the simple explanations on Genesis; in place of which the fraud of the printers has substituted for us a slender commentary, beginning *Concerning the beginning of the book of Genesis.* But fragments from the Morals of Gregory, mixed into this little work, prove that it is not Junilius's — who preceded the times of Gregory by nearly two hundred years. I judge the author of the work to be Bede, in whose most ancient volumes it is found, and under whose title centos cut out from the same work are read in the Gloss which they call the Ordinary. He flourished under Theodosius the Younger, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 440.

Justus, Bishop of the Church of Urgell in Spain, brother of three bishops — namely Justinian, Nebridius, and Elpidius — exercised and learned in the holy Scriptures, at the urging of Justus the deacon wrote to him,

on the Song of Songs, according to the edition of St. Jerome, a commentary brief indeed, but learned, elegant, and pious. Its beginning is *Desiring, in the house of God.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 540, under Pope Sergius, to whom also he dedicated the present work. *[The "under Pope Sergius" dedication does not square with the year 540 — Justus of Urgell belongs to the sixth century, whereas Sergius I was pope 687–701; noted as printed.]*

Justus, a Jew by race and religion, of Tiberias by fatherland, from the province of Galilee, whom Jerome numbers among the Ecclesiastical writers, himself also attempted to weave a history of Hebrew affairs out of the divine Scriptures, and to write certain commentaries on the sacred Books; but Josephus, at the end of the twentieth book of the Antiquities, makes him suspect of falsehood in certain matters. He flourished under Vespasian Augustus, in the year of the Lord 56.

Justin, a Samaritan by race, a Philosopher of the Stoic sect [so printed], as he himself testifies in the second Apology for the Christians to the Emperor Antoninus, was a citizen of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, son of Priscus Bacchius; and at Rome he held τὰς διατριβάς [his discourses], and had Crescens the Cynic as an adversary in life and religion. This man, then, among the many immortal monuments of his genius, left commentaries on the Apocalypse of John. He is believed also to be the author of a certain book which is entitled *Of a Hundred and Forty-Six Questions* — which the Gentiles used to raise against the Christians out of various passages of both Testaments; whose beginning is thus, *Whence is the beginning.* This book Joachim Périon the Benedictine translated into Latin. But, since in questions 82, 86, and 115 of the same book Irenaeus and Origen are cited, the work must be of another author, far later than he. The style is not unlike the Questions of Theodoret on the Octateuch. He flourished under Antoninus Pius, and was crowned with martyrdom in the year of the Lord 150.

Juvencus, a Spaniard of most noble birth, a presbyter, the most celebrated poet of his age, translating the four Gospels into hexameter verses almost word for word, composed four books of the Evangelical History — the first of all who dared to put the majesty of the gospel under the laws of meter. [He flourished] while Constantine was prince, and his sons reigned, in the year of the Lord 330. The work begins:

> *Nothing immortal is held in the frame of the world.*

L

Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury in Britain, an Italian by nation, of Pavia by fatherland, formerly Abbot of the monastery of Caen [Codoniensis] — the most learned of all in his time in every kind of letters, and by far the most illustrious in the Council which was held at Rome against Berengar, deacon of the Church of Angers, the heretic, by 113 bishops under Nicholas II — left, among other monuments of his excellent genius, pious and learned commentaries on the whole Psalter and on all the Epistles of Paul. He flourished under the Emperor Henry III, in the year of the Lord 1060.

Lawrence Justinian [Laurentius Iustinianus], a Venetian by fatherland, of the Celestine order [so printed], Patriarch of the illustrious city of Venice, most renowned for the sanctity of his life, the glory of his miracles, and the candor of his sincere erudition, wrote — in a not inelegant style — on the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of John, one book On the discourse of the Lord at the Last Supper, most delightful for its sweet colloquies. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1410.

Lorenzo de Villavicencio [Laurentius Villauincentius], a Spaniard, a preacher among the people of Burgos, of the Order of Hermits, collected tables of memorable things which can be treated in the individual gospel and epistle lections of the festal days, exceedingly useful to preachers. The preface of these begins, *The office demands.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1560.

Leander, Bishop of the Church of Seville in Spain, an African by nation, of Carthage by fatherland, a monk by institute, a man illustrious for his erudition in the holy Scriptures — to whom Gregory I, Supreme Pontiff, dedicated his commentaries on Job [the *Moralia*] — published many volumes of edifying reading, but among the rest a twofold order of prayers and meditations on the whole Psalter. He flourished under Reccared [Richardus], the most pious king of the Visigoths, whom he converted from the Arian perfidy, together with the whole nation of the Visigoths subject to him, to the Catholic faith — having before led back from that same impiety also his brother Hermenegild [Hermilgildus], son of Leovigild [Leuigildus] king of the Goths, whom his most cruel father, a defender of the Arian impiety, on the vigil of Easter — beheaded for the confession of the Catholic faith — crowned with the laurel of martyrdom. He flourished under the Emperor Maurice, in the year of the Lord 590.

Leo, the first Pope [Leo I the Great], a Tuscan by nation, most learned in the divine Scriptures and most eloquent in delivering homilies, under Leo Augustus [the Emperor], in the year [→ p292]

[→ p292: catchword "anno"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 292 [printed folio 273, recto]. Book IV — **letter L**: Pope Leo I concluded; **León de Castro**; **Leonard of Giffoni**; **Leontius of Neapolis** (Cyprus); two **Lucas** entries; **Lucian of Antioch**; **Lucretius of Asolo**; **Ludolph of Saxony** (the* Vita Christi*); two **Louis** entries. Then **letter M opens** — Mammotreptus (the* Mammotrectus *dictionary), and the beginning of Maffeo Vegio of Lodi. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter L, continued:]

...[Leo I flourished under the Emperor Leo,] in the year of the Lord 461. Among many homilies he wrote on the fifth chapter of Matthew two homilies, of which the first begins *At that time Jesus, seeing the crowds;* but the second, *While the Lord was preaching.* Likewise, on the Transfiguration of Christ, from Matthew chapter 17, a Sermon beginning *The gospels, dearly beloved.*

León de Castro [Leo Castri], professor of Theology in the University of Salamanca, wrote commentaries on Isaiah, which were printed at Salamanca in the year 1570. *[The 1570 imprint post-dates Sixtus's death (1569) — a later-edition detail.]*

Leonard of Giffoni [Leonardus Giphonensis], or "from the temple of Jove" [ex Iovis phano], which is a town of Campania — thirty-fourth Minister General of the Franciscans, and thereafter Cardinal of the Roman Church, a most noble professor of Scholastic Theology — wrote a huge scholastic *Lectura* upon the Song of Songs, [divided] into one hundred and forty Canticles, that is, divided into as many particles or sentences of that book, containing many secrets of the more abstruse Theology; which Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, writes that he saw and read, in the third volume of his Chronicles. He flourished under Charles IV, Augustus, [in] 1370.

Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, an eloquent and learned man, who composed five books against the Iconoclasts and dictated many panegyric orations, wrote on the 17th chapter of Matthew one homily *On the Transfiguration of the Lord,* cited in the 6th session of the Second Council of Nicaea. He flourished about the times of the Emperor Phocas, in the year of the Lord 610.

Lucas, Abbot of the mountain of St. Cornelius [Kornelimünster], of the Benedictine order, endowed with a noble genius in expounding the divine Scriptures, wrote a little work, collected from the writings of Aponius, on the Song of Songs, in the year of the Lord 1130.

Lucas, a Greek monk of the institute of St. Basil, wrote an exposition on the four Gospels, which is kept, written in Greek, in the Library of San Salvatore at Bologna.

Lucian, a most eloquent man, presbyter of the Church of Antioch, and afterward Bishop of Nicomedia [so printed; Lucian was a presbyter of Antioch, martyred at Nicomedia], and a most holy martyr — having

examined all the editions made before him, and most diligently compared them with the Hebrew verity — delivered to the Christians his own Greek edition, as Euthymius testifies, much more corrected than the earlier ones; which, written by his hand, was found at Nicomedia in a certain tower among the Jews, smeared with lime, after Lucian's own death, under Constantine the Great, Emperor. This [edition], since it agrees in sense with the edition of the Seventy interpreters, and its copies are by some called Λουκιάνεια [Lucianic], but among some received the name of *the Seventh Edition* — although Isidore, Bishop of Seville, judges that Origen was the discoverer not only of the fifth and sixth, but also of the seventh edition. Of this Lucianic translation all the churches, from Constantinople to Antioch, made public reading and use. And Lucian suffered as a martyr at Nicomedia for the confession of Christ, under the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian; and he was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia, in the year of the Lord 280.

Lucretius Tyroboscus of Asolo [Lucretius Asulanus], a Carmelite, wrote — [dedicated] to the illustrious John Trevisan, Patriarch of the city of Venice — a concise Paraphrase on Psalm 118, to which he gave the title *The Ethics of the Holy Spirit* [Ethica Spiritus Sancti], in the year of the Lord 1566.

Ludolph [of Saxony] [Ludolphus], a Saxon by nation, of the Order of Preachers — after the thirtieth year of his profession transferred to the institute of the Carthusians, and received in the monastery of Strasbourg — a man most studious in the holy volumes, scholastic in profession, simple in speech, and lovable for certain fervent affections, gathered from the sentences of Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, and Peter Lombard an exact exposition on the Psalms: in which he especially pursues the typical [figurative] senses, yet not so as to neglect the literal understanding, adding at the foot of each Psalm a devout prayer, consonant with that Psalm. The beginning of the work is, *As of old the manna.* The same [Ludolph] gathered from the four Evangelists a single history of the life of Christ [the *Vita Christi*], which he illustrated with most lucid and most pious explanations according to the fourfold sense, adding at the end of the individual chapters most devout prayers, serving the theme of the preceding chapter. The work begins, *Another foundation.* He flourished under the Emperor Louis IV, in the year of the Lord 1330.

Louis the Younger of Parete [Ludouicus Iunior Parisetus], of Reggio, wrote in heroic verse — [dedicated] to his brother Vario Ptolemaeus — on the first chapter of Genesis, six books of *Theopoeia,* whose beginning is:

> *Long since has a desire come upon the soul of Ptolemaeus.*

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Louis Pittorio of Ferrara [Ludouicus Pictorius, Ferrariensis], a not-ignoble poet, published in prose a Paraphrase on the Psalter, in the year of the Lord 1510.

M

Mammotreptus, so surnamed from the title of the Dictionary published by him, a simple and devout man, of the Order of Minorites — following the poor largess of that little poor widow, who out of her slender poverty cast two mites into the treasury of the temple — himself also offered into the temple of the Lord, out of his scanty means, what he had: that is, a Dictionary of the words of the whole Bible, explaining the pronunciation, accent, and meaning of the Latin words with a coarse and rude Minerva [rough skill]. And because he had presented it to unlearned clerics — still, as it were, infants in the Latin tongue — like a breast to be sucked, and to be handled by infant hands after the manner of a devoted nurse, he entitled it *Mammotreptus* [the breast-fed], suppressing his own name out of humility; in place of which he afterward, by growing custom, got the name of *Mammotreptus* [himself]. The work begins, *Impatient of my own unskillfulness.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1450.

Maffeo Vegio [Matthaeus Veggius], an Italian by nation, of Lodi by fatherland, Datary of Pope Martin V, a man not unacquainted with the divine Scripture, an orator and poet, never [→ p293]

[→ p293: catchword "nun[quam]"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 293 [printed folio 274, verso]. Book IV, **letter M**: Maffeo Vegio concluded; **Marbod of Rennes**; Marcus of Ulm; **Marianus Scotus**; **Matthew of Aquasparta**; Matthew of Königsaal (anti-Hussite); **Matthew Aurogallus** (Hebrew onomasticon); Matthew Bredenbach; **Matthew Döring** (defender of Lyra vs Paul of Burgos); Matthew of Évreux; Matthew Orio; Matthew of Constantinople; Matthew of Vendôme; **Maurice de Sully**; **Maximus the Confessor**; **Maximus of Turin**; **Melchior Cano**; and the beginning of **Melito of Sardis**. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter M, continued:]

...[Maffeo Vegio, an orator and poet] never sufficiently praised, whose 13th book, added by himself to the Virgilian Aeneid, shows abundantly the felicity of his most rich vein. In his extreme old age he brought forth, in elegiac verse, on the seven Psalms an elegant and truly swan-like Paraphrase. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1430.

Marbod [Marbadus], Bishop of Rennes, learned in the liberal disciplines, a distinguished poet of his times, and a notable professor of the sacred oracles, published in elegant verse a most beautiful explanation on the Song of Solomon, according to the threefold sense — anagogical, allegorical, and moral. He flourished under Henry III, in the year of the Lord 1050.

Marcus of Ulm [Vlmensis], a German, of the Order of Minorites, a scholastic by profession, collected a *Distinctionarium* on the whole holy scripture, most useful to scholastic expositors, whose beginning is *Abstinence is taken in many ways.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 400 [so printed; read ~1400 — a Franciscan cannot belong to the year 400].

Marianus [Scotus], a monk of Fulda, a Scot by nation, of the order of St. Benedict, a writer of history, composed one book *On the Concordance of the Gospels.* He dies in the year of the Lord 1086.

Matthew of Aquasparta [Matthaeus de Aquasparta], the twelfth Minister General of the Order of Minorites, and afterward Bishop of Porto, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church — magnificently learned in secular Philosophy according to the custom of his time, and most excellent in the divine Scriptures — published, under the Emperor Rudolf, in the year of the Lord 1280, one book on the epistles of Paul.

Matthew, a monk of Aula Regia [Königsaal], a German by nation, a man subtle and keen in disputation, who in Bohemia often engaged with John Huss of Prague the heresiarch, and very often overcame him along with his heretical followers; but after the excessive sprouting-up of heresies he came out of Bohemia into Germany, to the monastery of Altzelle [Veteris cellae] of the Cistercian order, as it were into a harbor, in which — instructing the brethren by assiduous reading of the sacred [scriptures] — he left on all the Psalms a scholastic Lecture much to be praised. He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 1415.

Matthew Aurogallus [Goldhahn], a German by nation, most skilled in the three languages, emulating Eusebius, published a book on the Hebrew [names] of cities, regions, peoples, rivers, mountains, and other places which are read in the holy Scriptures; in which he arranged all the appellations in Hebrew characters in alphabetical order, with the individual passages of divine scripture cited in which those names are found. The book begins, *When lately with me, &c.* He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 1526.

Matthew Bredenbach of Kerpen [Bredembacchius, Kerspensis], while he lived headmaster at Emmerich, wrote on Matthew, and on sixty-nine Psalms, beautiful commentaries, collected partly from ancient, partly

from more recent authors. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Matthew Döring [Doringus], a Saxon by nation, a Minorite, minister of the province of Saxony, a distinguished professor of Scholastic Theology — having undertaken a battle in defense of his master Nicholas of Lyra against Paul, Bishop of Burgos, after that [Paul's] attack upon the same Nicholas — strove to overthrow his objections, publishing new disputations, which — appended to the commentaries of Lyra immediately after the Pauline additions — he entitled *Replies against Paul of Burgos* [Replicae adversus Paulum Burgensem]. The beginning of the work is, *The ancient modesty*. He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, in the year of the Lord 1440.

Matthew of Évreux [Ebroicensis], a Norman, a professor of the Order of Preachers, a subtle searcher of the sacred volumes, most pleasing to Charles VI, king of the French, for his exceptional piety and erudition, composed a most useful Postil on the five books of Moses and on Isaiah.

Matthew Orio [Oryus], a Spaniard, a Dominican, inquisitor of heretical depravity throughout Gaul, wrote on that saying of Paul, *I wish to speak five words* [1 Cor 14:19], against the heresies, one book.

Matthew, Patriarch of Constantinople, of the Order of Preachers, reduced the whole body of the divine Scripture into four books of commonplaces, whose beginning is *All new fruits.* It is kept at Bologna in our Library of the Preachers.

Matthias, a Presbyter of Vendôme [Vindocinensis], expounded the history of Tobit in elegiac verse, beginning thus:

> *From the old field, the seeds of the virtues of morals.*

He flourished among the Scholastics, in the year of the Lord 1400.

Maurice [de Sully], Bishop of Paris, subtle in genius, scholastic in speech, and singular in erudition, published two books of sermons on the festal Gospels. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1190.

Maximus the Monk [Maximus the Confessor] published a sermon on that [text] of Exodus 37, On the Candlestick and the seven lamps; from which Thomas [Aquinas], in his book against the errors of the Greeks, brings testimonies that the Spirit proceeds from the Father.

Maximus, Bishop of the Church of Turin [Taurinensis], most skilled in the holy Scriptures, and an admirable extempore declaimer, wrote most elegant homilies on various passages of both Testaments. He dies under Theodosius the Younger, in the year of the Lord 420.

Melchior Cano, a Spaniard, bishop of the Fortunate Islands [the Canaries], of the Order of Preachers, composed a most useful book *On the most difficult passages of the divine Scripture;* likewise, on that [text] of Luke chapter thirteen, *Unless you do penance*, one book On penance. In the year of the Lord 1560.

Melito the Asian, Bishop of the Church of Sardis, venerable for sanctity and erudition, whom Tertullian asserts was held by the ancients as, so to speak, a prophet, excerpted from all the scriptures here and there six books of Ἐκλογῶν, that is, of *Excerpts,* [dedicated] to his brother Onesimus: in which he fitted in a beautiful order various testimonies of the Scriptures, conducive to the instruction of the Christian life, [→ p294]

[→ p294: catchword "ne apta" (ordine apta)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 294 [printed folio 275, recto]. Book IV — the close of **letter M**: Melito of Sardis concluded; **Methodius of Olympus**; several **Michael** entries (Adam the convert, Aiguani of Bologna, of Massa, of L'Isle, of Milan). Then **letter N opens** — **Nepos** the millenarian (with Dionysius of Alexandria's critique), Nicetas of Remesiana, Nicephorus Callistus, Nicholas of Alsentia, and Nicholas Hanapus. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter M concluded, then letter N opens:]

...[Melito] fitted in a beautiful order [various testimonies of the Scriptures]. Likewise:

- On that [text] of Genesis 1, *Let us make man,* one book On God the incorporeal.
- On the Life of the Prophets, one book.
- On the Apocalypse, one book.
- On the catalog of the divine volumes of both Testaments, [dedicated] to Onesimus, one epistle.

He flourished under Marcus Antoninus Verus, in the year of the Lord 160.

Methodius (who is also called *Eubulius*), Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and afterward of Tyre, a man of singular sanctity and doctrine, of a polished and well-composed eloquence, wrote — in defense of the holy Scriptures, against the mad Porphyry who had assailed them — a most illustrious work. He also left commentaries on Genesis; likewise, on the 28th chapter of the first [book] of Kings, On the Pythoness [the Witch of Endor], one book; on the Song of Songs, one book; on the Apocalypse, one book, whose fragments are read in the Rhapsodies of the explanations of Arethas on the Apocalypse. And he dies under the last persecution of the Church, or, as others affirm, under Decius and Valerian, at Chalcis, a city of Greece, crowned with martyrdom, in the year of the Lord 255.

Michael Adam, a converted Jew, translated the Bible into the German tongue, and, for the use of the Jews, set it forth in Hebrew characters.

Michael Aiguani of Bologna [Angrianus, Bononiensis], Minister General of the Carmelites, a Theologian, philosopher, and supreme canonist, who governed his order justly and holily for nine years under Pope Urban VI, wrote in scholastic fashion five books of commentaries on the whole Psalter, and one book on the Gospel of Luke, which are held in great esteem among the professors of his own institute. He dies in the last year of the Emperor Wenceslaus, in the year of the Lord 1396.

Michael, a Tuscan by nation, from the town of Massa, an [Augustinian] Hermit, a scholastic Theologian very acute, many of whose commentaries on the sacred Bible the injury of the times has consumed, wrote in scholastic style: On Isaiah, 1 book; On Matthew, 1 book; On Luke, 1 book; On Mark, 1 book; On John, 1 book; On the Passion of the Lord, from the four gospels, one book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1350.

Michael of L'Isle in Picardy [de insula Picardia], of the Order of Preachers, wrote a scholastic Lecture on the Song of Songs, beginning *I will sing to my beloved, &c.,* and a Postil on Daniel, which begins *He brought forth hidden things.* It is kept at Venice in the library of SS. John and Paul.

Michael of Milan [Mediolanensis], of the Order of Minorites, a Theologian and celebrated declaimer, conspicuous also by the example of his life, published in scholastic fashion eleven sermons on the Decalogue, from the 20th chapter of Exodus. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1480.

N

Nepos, bishop of an uncertain city in Egypt, a man plainly good and learned, but deceived by the error of the Chiliasts [millenarians], wrote an interpretation of all the promises which are contained in the Apocalypse of John, and taught that they were to be understood corporally, and confirmed from those same testimonies of John that the saints would reign with Christ for a thousand years in bodily delights on this earth. Concerning whom Dionysius of Alexandria, in the second volume of his explanation on the Apocalypse, speaks thus: "They bring forward certain *Commentaries* of Nepos, on which they lean very much, and through which they think it is shown in what manner the kingdom of Christ shall be upon earth. But in many other respects I too

embrace and love Nepos, both for his faith and for his erudition in the Scriptures, and especially for his exercise in psalmody; since indeed many of the brethren gladly chose his fellowship for this [reason]. And so there is in me too, toward him, much reverence — and the more so because he has already gone before to God. But in truth, more than all things, truth is to be loved and preferred. We must praise, and without envy embrace, whatever has been rightly said by him; but reject, if anything has been less soundly written by him — as in these books, in which he teaches [us] to think nothing lofty, nothing magnificent, concerning the coming of our Savior Jesus Christ, nor concerning the glory of the resurrection and the promises of our gathering unto him and of being made like him; but he persuades [us] to hope, in the kingdom of God, [for] certain small and ever-mortal things, and no other than those which we now see." Thus far Dionysius. He flourished under the Emperor Gallienus, in the year of the Lord 270.

Nicetas [Niceas], Bishop of the city of Remesiana [Romaciana], a man studious in the divine Scriptures, among his many other little works wrote, under Theodosius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 420, one book *On the Victim of the Paschal Lamb,* on the twelfth chapter of Exodus.

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, of whom there are extant eighteen books of Ecclesiastical History, published a Synopsis — that is, *A Survey of the whole divine Scripture,* arranged in iambic trimeters — in which he briefly comprised the themes of all the sacred volumes. The work begins thus: Ὃς πατὴρ υἱός ἐστιν, ἄναρχος φύσις [He who is Father [and] Son — a nature without beginning]. *[The Greek incipit is set in the difficult 16th-century type and is given as best readable.]* He flourished under the Emperor Manuel, in the year of the Lord 1100.

Nicholas of Alsentia, a Carmelite, wrote commentaries on Exodus and on the Apocalypse. He lived in the year of the Lord 1425.

Nicholas Hanapus [de Hanapes], of the Order of Preachers, Patriarch of Jerusalem, moved by zeal of charity, plucked from the sacred volumes an *Enchiridion* [Handbook]: in which, for the benefit of preachers, he collected with the utmost brevity all the examples both of virtues and of vices scattered through the books of both Testaments, arranged under the titles of various subjects according to the order of the letters. The beginning of the work is such: *So great an excellence prevails.* He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 430 [so printed; the date is corrupt — Nicholas de Hanapes was Patriarch of Jerusalem in the later thirteenth century (†1291), which fits neither "430" nor the Emperor Sigismund]. [→ p295]

[→ p295: catchword "NI" — a further Nicholas]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 295 [printed folio 276, verso]. Book IV, **letter N**: **Nicholas of Cusa**; Nicholas Cabasilas; Nicholas Kenton; **Nicholas Cleynaerts**; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Nicholas the Gaul; **Nicholas of Gorran** (whole-Bible commentaries, with incipits); Nicholas Grandis; Nicholas Herborn; and the great **Nicholas of Lyra** (his 85-book Postil on the whole Bible). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter N, continued:]

Nicholas [of Cusa], Bishop of Brixen and Cardinal of the title of St. Peter ad Vincula, from Kues [Cusa], a town of Germany — a man admirable in every kind of letters, a mathematician, philosopher, and Theologian, learned beyond what could be credible to anyone, to whom a certain learned obscurity, both in words and in sentences, was a friend — published on the beginning of Genesis a brief dialogue of such obscurity that it can scarcely be understood by the most learned men; its beginning is *Often more delightful.* Likewise, on that [text] of the first [chapter] of James, *Every best gift,* [dedicated] to Gerard, Bishop of Solothurn, one book On the gift of the Father of lights; [beginning] *Even though before.* Likewise, encyclical sermons through the circle of the year and Lent; wearied of their length, he himself gathered out of these — as out of most abundant fields — the more elegant flowers, and arranged them, marked in the tenth book of *Spiritual*

Exercises; the beginning of these is *Who are you?* He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, in the year of the Lord 1460.

Nicholas Cabasilas, Bishop of Thessalonica, wrote, in the year of the Lord 1300, one book of observation on the vision of the four living creatures of Ezekiel, which is kept in Greek in the Vatican.

Nicholas Kenton [Chenton], a Carmelite, an Englishman, wrote on the history of the prophet Elisha, and a Postil on the Song of Songs, in the year of the Lord 1468.

Nicholas Cleynaerts [Clenardus] of Mechelen, most skilled in the three languages, for many years publicly professed good letters at Mechelen; and, that he might benefit all, published some things Latin, some Greek, and also Hebrew — among which are the *Grammatical Meditations on the Lamentations,* for the sake of those who lack the living voice of a Hebrew teacher. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1530.

Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl [Dunkelpulus], a German, rector of the University of Vienna, wrote, according to the custom of the school, on that [text] of Isaiah, *And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, [the spirit], &c.,* one book On the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, in the year of the Lord 1420.

Nicholas the Gaul [Gallus], of the Order of Preachers, confessor to the king of the French, left a scholastic Postil on all the epistles of St. Paul, which begins, *I have given you for a light to the Gentiles* [Isaiah chapter 49].

Nicholas of Gorran [Gorranus], of the Order of Preachers, provincial of France, acute in treating scholastic questions, and most exercised in the reading of the saints [Fathers], in the year of our salvation 1390 published, in a scholastic and plain style, brief commentaries on the whole Bible, very profitable to the studious of the sacred volumes; of which, at Venice in the library of SS. John and Paul, I saw the following (each with its incipit):

- On the Pentateuch — 5 books. — *In the beginning, &c.*
- On the Psalter — 1 book. — *My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord.*
- On Ecclesiastes — 1 book. — *He looked upon the earth.*
- On Ecclesiasticus — 1 book. — *Wisdom hath built.*
- On the Lamentations — 1 book. — *To this lamentation.*
- On the Song of Songs — 1 book. — *Sing to the Lord a new song.*
- On Matthew — 1 book. — *The book of the generation, &c., like the river of paradise.*
- On Mark — 1 book. — *Daughter of Sion, rejoice, &c.*
- On Luke — 1 book. — *The discipline of a physician.*
- On John — 1 book. — *Behold, my servant shall understand.*
- On all the epistles of Paul — 14 books. — *I have given you for a light to the Gentiles.*

Nicholas Grandis [le Grand], of the Order of Minorites, a Theologian of the most sacred faculty, wrote — [dedicated] to Francis, king of the French — elegant commentaries on the epistles of Paul to the Romans and to the Hebrews, adorned with innumerable sentences of the Fathers; in which, where a passage offers itself, he strives rather, with gentleness of mind and Christian modesty, to raise up the fallen, than to exasperate them with censorious and reproachful speech, or to gnaw around them with a rabid tooth — anxiously investigating not a victory over those who contradict, but truth against falsehood. The work begins, *I should be charged with the height of ingratitude.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1546.

Nicholas Herborn [Herbron], of the Order of Minorites, Cismontane Commissary General of the Regular Observance, wrote in Latin eloquence narrations of the Lenten Gospels — which had been declaimed at Cologne in the German tongue — likewise on Psalm 78 a lamentatory narration, beginning *Who will give*

[water] to my head, &c., in the year of the Lord 1530.

Nicholas of Lyra [Lyranus], an Englishman by nation, or — as some write — from Lyra, a town of Brabant; a Jew by race, and imbued with Hebrew letters from earliest childhood, but after his conversion devoted to the Franciscan religion; a professor of scholastic Theology and a not-ignoble expositor of its sentences; and endowed with so true, pure, and genuine an understanding of the divine Scriptures that in expounding them he had no equal among the most learned Theologians of his time. He published, on the individual volumes of both the Old and New Testament, 85 books of scholastic postils — not only useful, but exceedingly necessary, to the studious of the holy Scriptures, and especially to beginners hastening on to greater things. In the former fifty of these books he expounded the whole body of the holy Scripture — without the allurement of oratory and the wrappings of words — in a brief, bare, and plain style, opening up and elucidating with the utmost diligence in each [passage] the sense of the letter, as more excellent than the other senses of divine Scripture, so also more difficult; bringing to this [task] not only the expositions of the ancient fathers of the Church, but also the sentences of the Rabbis, whose authority is chief among the Jews. This work being finished, with labor again repeated, in the thirty-five later books he illustrated both Testaments with a moral exposition. The beginnings of his books you have in Trithemius. He flourished under the Emperor Louis, in the year of the Lord 1320. Annotations and Censures on all his works were written by [→ p296]

[→ p296: catchword "Paulus" — Paul of Burgos]

(Rich PDF p. 296 [printed folio 277, recto]. Book IV — close of ***letter N****: Nicholas of Lyra's apparatus (Paul of Burgos, Deza, Döring);* ***Nicholas Zegers of Diest****; Nicholas Trivet;* ***Ninian*** *apostle of the Picts; Nilus; Nonius Marcellus Saia;* ***Nonnus of Panopolis****. Then* ***letter O opens — Odo of Cluny****, Odo of Cambrai, Odo the Gaul,* ***Oecumenius*** *(his catena and its twenty-two Greek sources), and the beginning of Olympiodorus. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter N concluded, then letter O opens:]

...[Annotations and Censures on all his (Lyra's) works were written by] Paul, Bishop of Burgos, Diego de Deza, and Matthew Döring: of whom the first attacked the expositions of Lyra as contrary to Hebrew and Christian authors; the second published defenses against certain passages in which Lyra opposes St. Thomas [Aquinas]; the third contends for Lyra against the Bishop of Burgos.

Nicholas Zegers [Tacitus Zigenus], a Minorite, from Diest, a town of Brabant, published — [dedicated] to Julius III, Supreme Pontiff — corrections on the New Testament, in which the corrupted [readings] are restored, the added [ones] cut away, and the removed [ones] rejected; to which he gave the title *Epanorthotes,* or *The Restorer of corrupted or altered passages.* The work begins, *So great [a corruption] is everywhere.* The same [author] collected scholia on all the books of the New Testament, in which the difficult, or even ambiguous, passages are most learnedly and exquisitely explained according to the original phrase of Scripture and the citation of the most ancient Theologians. A pleasant work, exceedingly useful to all who wish rightly to divide the divine scripture. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Nicholas Trivet, an Englishman, of the Order of Preachers, wrote in scholastic fashion — [dedicated] to Aymeric, Master of the Order — a Postil on Leviticus, beginning *To the venerable father Brother Aymeric;* likewise, on the Psalter, [dedicated] to Brother John, provincial of England, a Postil, beginning *To the reverend father Brother John.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 400 [so printed; read ~1300 — Trivet is a fourteenth-century figure, and Aymeric of Piacenza was Master of the Dominicans about 1304–1311].

Ninian [Ninianus], Bishop of the Picts, born of the royal blood of the Britons; when as a youth he had come to Rome, and there had learned Christian wisdom with the utmost zeal, returning into the Northern regions he led the nation of the Picts from the impiety of idols to the worship of Christ; and when he had assiduously taught the divine oracles among them, he wrote certain commentaries on the sacred Letters of great piety and

erudition — of which the most celebrated are the *Meditations on the Davidic hymns.* He lived, as is gathered from Bede's history, in the year of our salvation 440.

Nilus, of Constantinople by fatherland, passing from the prefecture of that same city to the monastic life, a Father of many monks in the East, famous for sanctity and erudition, whose writings the Sixth Synod venerates, wrote commentaries on Job.

Nonius Marcellus Saia of Roccagloriosa [à Rocca gloriosa] published on the penitential psalms deprecatory Paraphrases, in the year of the Lord 1550.

Nonnus of Panopolis [Panapolitanus], the chief among the Greek Christian poets, whose 48 books of *Dionysiaca,* written in heroic verse, are reported [extant], composed a Paraphrase, in Greek hexameter verses, on the Gospel of John — which we have read printed in the type of Aldus; its beginning is: ἄχρονος ἦν ἀκίχητος ἐν ἀρρήτῳ λόγος ἀρχῇ [Timeless was the untraceable Word, in an unspeakable beginning]. *[The Greek is set in the difficult 16th-century type and is given as best readable.]*

O

Odo, first abbot of Cluny, of the order of St. Benedict, once a hearer of Remigius of Auxerre, most skilled in music, chief cantor of the Church of Tours, most studious of the divine Scripture, a distinguished declaimer of homilies — at the request of the brethren he compressed the thirty-five books of the commentaries of the blessed Gregory on Job [the *Moralia*] into one brief volume. He flourished in the year of the Lord 920.

Odo, Bishop of Cambrai [Cameracensis], a man elegantly learned in the Latin tongue, most skilled in Theology, a distinguished declaimer among his own [people], wrote one book *On the Steward of Iniquity* [the Unjust Steward]: whose beginning is *A certain man was rich.*

Odo the Gaul [Gallus], of the Order of Preachers, wrote a scholastic Postil on all the epistles of Paul, which is held at Venice in the library of SS. John and Paul, and begins, *Out of the eater came forth meat.*

Oecumenius, a Greek author, exceedingly learned — brief, plain, and elegant in explaining the divine Scriptures, and assiduously engaged in unrolling the commentaries of the ancients — collected with skillful care, from the sayings of the most excellent doctors of the Greek church, noble commentaries of annotations on the Octateuch, which he himself, in his commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews, chapter six, testifies that he wrote. He collected also, with very similar industry, a Catena of explanations on the whole New Testament; of which I have read:

- On the Acts of the Apostles, 1 book — beginning *Luke the Evangelist.*
- On all the epistles of Paul, 14 books — beginning *Of Euthalius the deacon.*
- On the Canonical epistles, 7 books — *This James writes.*
- On the Apocalypse, one book — *It must be known that the whole.*

Now the names of the authors, out of whose explanations it is woven together, are these: Papias, Clement, Methodius, Dionysius, Irenaeus, Origen, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa; Acacius, Isidore, Photius, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Severian, Gennadius, Arethas, Andrew, Cyril, Theodoret. To these explanations Oecumenius inserted his own explanations also, marked with his own name, so that from the title the reader might know both what he had from Oecumenius himself and what from the other fathers. This work John Henten of Nechin [Hentennius Nechliniensis], a Hieronymite monk, translated into the Latin tongue, with annotations added on several passages in which the edition of Oecumenius differs from the Vulgate Greek edition of the New Testament. He flourished (as appears from the times of the authors who are cited by him) after the year of the Lord 800.

Olympiodorus the Monk, a Greek by nation, a Philosopher of the Peripatetic school, whose illustrious commentaries on Aristotle's *Meteorology* are extant, wrote in Greek, according to the threefold sense, a concise, learned, brief, and elegant narration on Ecclesiastes; which Zenobio Acciaioli [Acciaiolus] the Florentine, into La-[tin → p297]

[→ p297: catchword "tinum" (Latinum)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 297 [printed folio 278, verso]. Book IV, **letter O**: Olympiodorus the Monk concluded; **Olympiodorus the Deacon** (Job commentary); **Orsiesius** the Pachomian; then the giant **Origen Adamantius** entry begins — his bio and universal learning, Porphyry's grudging testimony, the Fathers' testimonies (Didymus, Athanasius, Sulpicius Severus, Jerome, Epiphanius, Rufinus, Vincent of Lérins), the corruption of his works by heretics, his patron Ambrose, and the threefold division of his exegesis (Scholia, Homilies, Tomes). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter O, continued:]

...[Zenobio Acciaioli] translated [Olympiodorus the Monk on Ecclesiastes] into Latin. Its beginning is *A sure knowledge of things.*

Olympiodorus the Deacon, a Greek by nation, a learned man, wrote in Greek most learned and most elegant commentaries on the whole book of Job, according to the sense of the letter; of which many fragments still survive in the Greek Catena on Job, which is held at Genoa in the Sauli Library. The work begins ὑπόθεσις μὲν ἡμῖν [Our theme indeed...]. But the whole work is kept in the Vatican library.

Orsiesius [Oresiesis], a monk and hermit, colleague of Pachomius and Theodore, monks dwelling in the solitudes of Egypt, a man fully instructed in the holy Scriptures, gathered from the divine oracles a volume containing the whole instruction of monastic discipline, in which the whole Old and New Testament is found expounded in compendious disquisitions, only so far as the need of monks [requires]; which, in the manner of a testament, he offered to the brethren near the day of his death. He flourished under Honorius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 420.

Origen Adamantius, of Alexandria by fatherland, son of Leonides the Martyr, a hearer and disciple of Ammonius [Saccas], a most excellent philosopher, in philosophy, and of Clement of Alexandria in the sacred dogmas — a man of such erudition and genius that most learned Greece, the parent of the most fortunate geniuses, never had his equal.[1] For, as regards the secular disciplines, he so mastered the Greek and Hebrew tongue, so knew Rhetoric, Dialectic, Geometry, Arithmetic, Music, Astronomy, and Physics, and so embraced all Philosophy — and all the sects of the Philosophers, the authors and champions of the sects and all their assertions and dogmas, and the whole variety of histories and studies — with a certain wonderful and insatiable capacity of mind, that he had philosophers of great name (although strangers to Christ) as followers, admirers, and praisers. Of whose number Porphyry, a most bitter enemy of the Christian name,[2] when in those books which he sent forth against our religion he impiously accused the divine Scriptures together with their expositors, and cast reproaches and calumnies against Origen, yet [wrote] among us things most worthy of all praise and commendation, writing plainly in this manner:

> *"The Christians cling to the follies of the Jewish Scriptures, and affirm that those things which Moses wrote in a rustic and simple style are divinely sanctioned and veiled with figures and enigmas; and they expound them as though filled with immense mysteries — of which absurd kind of exposition the beginning was had from a man whom I, when I was still quite a boy, saw holding the citadel of all erudition; as is also proved from those things which he handed down to the memory of posterity. This is Origen, whose immense glory is held among their masters; who had attained all the secrets of Plato, and had been instructed in the books of Numenius and Cronius and Apollophanes and Longinus and Moderatus and Nicomachus; and among the Pythagoreans the commentaries of the greatest men were not hidden from him. He touched also the volumes of Chaeremon the Stoic and of Cornutus; from which, taking all the secret and mystical things whatsoever are held among the*

Greeks, and fitting them, with a barbarian custom, to the Jewish superstitions, he turned the glory of the philosophers to the foreign and outlandish dogmas of the Christians."

This [says] Porphyry, in the third volume against the Christians. But of what sort, and how great, Origen was in the divine Scriptures, we could easily know, if that huge index of the Origenian volumes survived, which Eusebius of Caesarea, in the book On the Life of Pamphilus the martyr, and Jerome, in the epistle to Paula, mother of Eustochium, described.

But in place of a most copious index, the testimonies of the most illustrious Fathers of the Church concerning him can suffice to show this.[3] Didymus, first of all, calls him *the second master of the Churches after the Apostles.* Athanasius calls him *a most abundant witness of his [own] faith.* Sulpicius Severus asserts that, in that part in which he is approved, *he had no equal after the Apostles.* Jerome proclaims the same [Origen] *the victor of all the sacred expositors,* wishing — despite the odium of the name of Origen — to have his understanding of the Scriptures too. Epiphanius and Rufinus report that he elaborated *six thousand volumes on the sacred Scriptures.*[4] Vincent of Lérins, contemporary with both, adds that *no mortal wrote more than Origen, whose works it is not only impossible to have read through, but not even to be found.* Pamphilus, a most holy martyr, affirms that he fought so bravely and constantly, with the arms of the divine Scripture, against all the heresies of his time, that he overthrew all the edifices of the heretics and the foundations of the diabolical machination. Finally, so great was the sacred doctrine of Origen — joined too with a wonderful sanctity of life — that certain of the highest chiefs of the Church did not sometimes hesitate to say that *they would rather err with Origen than think rightly with others.*

But although Origen was such and so great, he nevertheless suffered a grievous loss of his labors, by the fraud and fault of the heretics, who contaminated all his works with innumerable heresies,[5] so that under the pretext and favor of the name of Origen they might the more easily persuade their impious thoughts and sell them the dearer. Which adulteration of the heretics many — either not noticing it, or believing it to be rather the fault of the author than the corruption of the heretics — rejected Origen, together with his works, among the heretics. But however it be, Origen, at the exhortation of Ambrose of Alexandria (who also supplied his living, paper, books, expenses, and copyists), published, besides infinite exoteric books, also innumerable *Exegemata* on the whole holy Scripture — that is, *volumes of Explanations* — which Jerome, in the preface of the commentaries on Ezekiel [dedicated] to Vincent, distinguished into a threefold kind, that is, into Scholia, Homilies, and Tomes.

The first kind, which the Greeks call σχολιαστικόν [scholiastikon], he assigned to the Scholia, which in Latin can be called *vacationes* [leisure-notes], or *ocia,* or *things excerpted at leisure.* In these, whenever leisure was lacking for a full commentary, he briefly touched upon, in a summary way, with certain short annotations, only those things which seemed to him obscure.

But in the second kind, which the Greeks call ὁμιλιαστικόν [homiliastikon], we call [it] *Familiar colloquy* [→ p298]

[→ p298: catchword "mus" (dicimus)]

[1] Eunapius of Sardis, in the book On the Lives of the Philosophers, writes that Origen was a disciple of Plotinus and a fellow-disciple of Porphyry. [2] Porphyry was a most bitter enemy of the Christian name. [3] Testimonies of the Fathers of the Church concerning Origen. [4] Origen wrote six thousand volumes on the sacred Scriptures. [5] The works of Origen are contaminated with heresies.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 298 [printed folio 279, recto]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: the three exegetical genres completed (Homilies and Tomes), with the two further genres Eusebius adds (Epistolary and Interpretative); then the great textual works — the **Hexapla** and **Octapla**, the six/eight Greek editions, and Origen's own LXX-and-Theodotion recension with the critical signs. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

...[the second, homiletic kind we call *Familiar colloquy*] — he placed [here] the sermons and discourses, in which (as the blessed Pamphilus testifies) Origen daily, and as it were extempore, expounded the Scriptures to the people, seven notaries taking [them] down from his mouth, and as many maidens most swift in writing, and other scribes, who handed them down to the monument of posterity. His style in this homiletic kind is familiar, plain, and simple, and foreign to all the pomp of rhetorical apparatus — brief, succinct, and without prolix prefaces and long and frequent digressions, such as many are found in Chrysostom and Augustine in their homilies. But Origen in his homilies touches the historical explanation little and lightly, and that according to the common edition of the Seventy interpreters; but he ascends to the senses of the higher allegorical understanding, and from these descends again to moral topics and brief exhortations.[1]

In the third kind, which Origen [calls] τόμους [tomous], we name *Volumes,* Jerome placed the greater commentaries — namely those in which Origen, expounding the divine Scriptures according to the Hebrew verity, gave all the sails of his genius to the breathing winds; and, receding from the land, so fled off into the midst of the deepest senses and the ocean of mysteries, that he brought fear and peril even upon the most learned readers who wished to follow him thither. Yet in treating these so hidden secrets he always used the utmost humility of mind and modesty of words, affirming nothing rashly, but — as one eager to learn — humbly inquiring into each thing, and rather rousing the reader to a common zeal of investigation than teaching; compelling him with these perpetual formulas of admonition, namely: *Consider whether perhaps these things which we say can be fitted to the sacred Scripture? Let us see whether we can find this which we say in the divine Scriptures;* likewise, *I indeed suspect thus; see you whether it can be so;* and he wished everywhere to use these and similar little rousings, as befitted a man almost αὐτοδίδακτος [self-taught], and who was the first to undertake the explanation of all the divine Scriptures, not yet attempted by anyone on account of their immense difficulty. He was delighted, too — both in this and in the higher [homiletic] kind — with the structure of allegories, to such a degree that it was objected against him by his rivals that, with the wrappings of allegory and the windings of anagogy, he did violence to the protesting Letter, and destroyed the truth of the Scriptures. He uses also, in this kind chiefly (after the imitation of Clement his teacher), many apocryphal testimonies from the most ancient monuments of hidden volumes, such as are the book of the Shepherd [Hermas], the book of Enoch, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Preaching of Peter, the Prayer of Joseph, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and others like these.

To these three kinds of exposition Eusebius adds also two others, namely ἐπιστολικόν [epistolikon] and ἑρμηνευτικόν [hermeneutikon] — that is, *the Epistolary,* and *[the kind] of Interpretations.* In the *Epistolary* [kind] he explained, by written-back epistles, questions from the divine Scripture sent to him by the letters of friends; among which is that magnificent [letter] on the history of Susanna, [addressed] to Julius Africanus, most celebrated among the hundred Origenian epistles collected by Eusebius. In the *Interpretative,* or *Translational* kind, are finally to be placed all the translations of the divine Scripture which he embraced in the Hexapla, the Octapla, and in the codices of the Palestinian edition. In this so manifold variety of labors, then — although Origen always showed himself the same — yet the divine Ambrose, writing to Clementianus, judges that he was far greater in the Old Testament than in the New.

But those volumes, out of each of these orders [genres], which still survive, or are found only cited by ancient authors, are these:

Collections of various Translations of the whole Old Testament. For Origen — as Epiphanius writes in the book *On Weights and Measures* — after the four editions (namely of the Seventy interpreters, of Aquila, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion) found two other Greek translations: one, together with very many other Hebrew and Greek volumes, in the city of Jericho in Palestine, which he called the Fifth; but the other on the Actian shore at Nicopolis, hidden in jars, which he named the Sixth edition. Out of which six versions Origen composed two different kinds of copies, namely the Hexapla and the Octapla. And first the **Hexapla:** in whose codices he so distinguished six little columns through each page, that —

• in the first little column the very words of the Scripture [were written] in Hebrew;

• [in the second] the Hebrew words in Greek [transliterated] letters, opposite the Hebrew, for the sake of those who did not know how to read Hebrew;

• in the third he subjoined the translation of Aquila;

• in the fourth, [that] of Symmachus;

• in the fifth, [that] of the Seventy interpreters;

• in the sixth he placed the edition of Theodotion.

And on account of this kind of composition, as Eusebius notes, he named these copies ἑξαπλᾶ [Hexapla, "sixfold"]. For which reason also — as Suidas and John Zonaras testify — they are by some called Τετραπλᾶ [Tetrapla], that is, "Quadruple," on account of the four Greek editions (namely of the Seventy, of Aquila, of Symmachus, and of Theodotion). Then, after these sixfold copies, Origen again composed other **Octapla** [eightfold] copies, in which — eight little columns being arranged through each page — he added the fifth and sixth editions after the four aforesaid; which, because he had found them without the title of their authors, he called the one of them the Fifth (prefixing to it an inscription by the letter E, the index of the number five among the Greeks), but the other he named the Sixth, and inscribed on it the mark of the number six, ☐ — namely that which the Greeks call *epis■mon.* And these copies were afterward called Octapla, on account of the number of the eight columns.

Which [Octapla], after Origen had completed [them] not without immense labor, he undertook again another translation for the daily use of the Church; which he compounded out of two editions — namely the Seventy and Theodotion's — mixing both together, and marking with asterisks what was lacking [in the Seventy], but with obeli and metobeli what seemed superfluously added. Which edition, when afterward it had been divulged by Pamphilus the martyr and by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, published [→ p299]

[→ p299: catchword "uulga[ta]"]

[1] Eunapius of Sardis, in the volume which he wrote On the Lives of the Philosophers, reports that Origen's style was one of acuteness and precision — praised indeed by Porphyry, but by very many neglected for this reason: that it had no graces of speech nor any charms of eloquence.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 299 [printed folio 280, verso]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: the "Palestinian translation"; his* On the interpretation of Hebrew names; *the* Stromata *(10 books); the 13 Genesis Tomes (mostly lost, suppressed for suspect dogmas); then the surviving homilies — on Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus (each with its passage), and the beginning of the Numbers homilies. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

...[when it had been] divulged [by Pamphilus and Eusebius], it was called the *Palestinian translation,* because all the Churches of Palestine and Syria received the reading of it in their daily lections. Origen mentions this labor published by himself, in the eighth treatise on Matthew and in the sixth tome on John.

He wrote also a book *On the interpretation of the Hebrew names* occurring in the sacred letters, which Justin mentions in the book of Questions, and Epiphanius in the book *On Weights and Measures.*

He composed also *Stromata,* that is, [a work] of *variegated* [work], ten books: in which, comparing the sentences of the holy Scriptures and of the Philosophers, he confirmed all the dogmas of the Christian religion from the sayings of the Philosophers. The ninth and tenth of these books he completed wholly in a comma-style [clause-by-clause] exposition of the book of Daniel and of the whole epistle to the Galatians.

He then dictated, on the first four chapters of Genesis, thirteen Tomes of continuous explanation, most filled with the deepest senses and more sublime mysteries — that is, from the beginning of the book down to that

sentence of the fourth chapter, *Everyone who kills Cain shall be punished sevenfold.* In the exposition of which, as Jerome in the Questions to Damasus left attested, he composed the twelfth and thirteenth tome by dictation. Of these, as I judge, nothing at present survives, except a certain Disputation *On the Stars and Fate,* comprised in three leaves, which is held in Eusebius, book 6, *On the Evangelical Preparation,* chapter 9. I suspect that these tomes perished — the ancient Fathers so wishing it — on account of many suspect dogmas sprinkled in them; concerning which some are reviewed in the following book, in the censures of the book of Genesis.

He published besides, as Rufinus indicates in the 2nd volume against Jerome, two books of homilies on Genesis; of which only seventeen, on various passages of the same book, have come down to us, namely:

- On Genesis chapter 1, On the World in the beginning, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 6, On the building of the ark, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 17, On the circumcision of Abraham, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 18, On the three men seen by Abraham, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 19, On Lot and his daughters, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 20, On Abimelech desiring the marriage of Sarah, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 21, On the birth and weaning of Isaac, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 22, On Abraham offering his son, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 22, On the promises made to Abraham, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 24, On Rebecca, having gone out to draw water, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 25, On Abraham betrothing Keturah to himself, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 25, On the conception and birth of Rebecca['s children], 1 homily.
- On Genesis 26, On the wells dug for Isaac, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 26, On God, who appeared to Isaac at the well, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 45, On the sons of Jacob announcing to their father the rule of Joseph in Egypt, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 47, On the land of Egypt bought by Joseph in the time of famine, 1 homily.
- On Genesis 49, On the blessings of the patriarchs, 1 homily.

He elaborated also other, almost innumerable, lucubrations on the Octateuch, of whose number are:

On Exodus, one book of *Excerpts, or Annotations,* cited by Rufinus in the aforesaid place. Likewise, one book of homilies on Exodus, of which now, from Jerome's version, only thirteen survive, namely:

- On Exodus chapter 1, On the beginning of Exodus, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 1, On the midwives of the Hebrews, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 4, On the ten plagues, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 12, On the departure of the children of Israel, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 15, On the Canticle of Moses, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 15, On the water of Marah, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 17, On the thirst of the people at Rephidim, and the war of the Amalekites, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 20, On the beginning of the Decalogue, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 21, On the pregnant woman [struck by] two quarreling men, &c., 1 homily.
- On Exodus 26, On the Tabernacle, 1 homily.
- On Exodus 34, On the veiled face of Moses, 1 homily.

• On Exodus 35, On the things to be offered for the tabernacle, 1 homily.

On Leviticus, one book of *Excerpts*, which Rufinus recalls in the work already mentioned. Likewise, on Leviticus, one book of homilies from various passages, of which sixteen are held as translated by Jerome, namely:

• On Leviticus chapter 1, On the beginning of Leviticus, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 2, 3, and 4, On the various rites of the sacrifices, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 5, On not keeping silent about the crimes of others, and on those who touch the unclean, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 6, On him who lies to his neighbor concerning a deposit and a partnership, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 6, On the law of the victim for sin, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 7, On the priestly garments, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 9 and 11, On wine and strong drink not to be drunk by the priests when entering the tabernacle, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 12, 13, and 14, On the Woman unclean for seven days after childbirth, and on leprosy, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 16, On the sacrifices of propitiation and the two goats, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 16, On the fast on the day of propitiation, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 20, On that [text] *Be holy*, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 21, On the high priest, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 23, On the feast days, the candlestick, and the [shewbread] table, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 24, On the son of an Israelite mother and an Egyptian father, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 25, On the sales and redemptions of houses, 1 homily.

• On Leviticus 26, On the blessings of Leviticus, 1 homily.

On Numbers chapter 1, On the first numbering of the children of Israel, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 2, On the order of encampment, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 3, On the Levites, taken from the midst of the children of Israel, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 3, On the twenty-two thousand Levites, 1 hom[ily → p300]

[→ p300: catchword "milia" (homilia)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 300 [printed folio 281, recto]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: the homily-catalog runs on through Numbers (from ch. 4) and Joshua, then the homilies on Judges and on Kings; after which Sixtus argues that the two Job commentaries circulating under Origen's name are not genuinely his. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

(The page opens completing the last entry of p. 299 — "On Numbers 3, On the twenty-two thousand Levites, 1 homily.")

• On Numbers 4, On the people of Kohath not to be destroyed, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 11 and 12, On Moses going out to the people, 1 homily.

• On the same, On the Ethiopian woman and the leprosy of Miriam, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 14, On the things which the spies reported back, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 16 and 17, On the censers of Korah and the sedition of the people against Moses, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 18, On that which the Lord said to Aaron, *You and your sons*, etc., 1 homily.

• On Numbers 20, On the well and the Song, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 22, On the things which were left over from the earlier treatise, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 22, On Balaam, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 23, On the first prophecy of Balaam, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 23, On the second prophecy of Balaam, 1 homily.

• On the same, On the fourth prophecy of Balaam, 1 homily.

• On the same, On the fifth and last prophecy of Balaam, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 25, On him who committed fornication with the Midianite woman, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 26, On the second numbering of the people, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 27, On the daughters of Zelophehad, and on the succession of Moses, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 28, On that text, *My offerings, my gifts*, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 29 and 30, On the sacrifices of every feast, and on vows, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 31, On the vengeance upon the Midianites, 1 homily.

• On the same, On the sum of the number of the children of Israel, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 33, On the encampments of the children of Israel, 1 homily.

• On Numbers 34, On the description of the Holy Land, 1 homily.

On Joshua chapter 1, On the beginning of the book of Joshua, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 1, On that which is said, *Moses my servant is dead*, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 2, On the two and a half tribes, Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 3, On the crossing of the Jordan, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 4 and 5, On the two and a half tribes which crossed the Jordan, and on the people circumcised with stone knives, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 5, On the Passover celebrated at Gilgal, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 6, On the destruction of Jericho, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 8, On the overthrow of the city of Ai, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 9, On Deuteronomy written upon the stones of the altar, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 9, On the deceit of the Gibeonites, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 9, On Joshua aiding the Gibeonites, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 9, On the wars of Joshua to be understood spiritually, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 10, On the cities Lachish, Libnah, and Hebron, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 11, On Jabin king of Hazor, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 11, On the deeds done after Jabin was conquered, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 13, On the old age of Joshua, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 13, On the Levites not receiving land, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 14, On the beginning of the division of the land of promise, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 14 and 15, On the borders of the inheritance of the tribe of Judah, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 15, On Caleb receiving Hebron, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 15, On the children of Judah unable to destroy the Jebusites, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 16, On the tribe of Ephraim, and on the Canaanites, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 18, On the manner of the lots, where seven tribes receive an inheritance, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 19, On the Amorites dwelling with Ephraim, and on Joshua receiving a city from the children of Israel, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 21, On the cities and the lot of the Levites, 1 homily.

• On Joshua 22, On the stone knives buried in the ground, and on the altars built beyond the Jordan, 1 homily.

On Judges chapter 2, On that the people served the Lord under Joshua, 1 homily.

• On Judges 3, On the Israelites delivered into the hand of their enemies, and on Othniel and Ehud, 1 homily.

• On Judges 4, On Shamgar, Jabin, and Sisera, 1 homily.

• On the same, On Deborah and Barak, 1 homily.

• On Judges 5, On the Song of Deborah, 1 homily.

• On Judges 6, On the Israelites handed over into the hands of Midian, 1 homily.

• On Judges 6, On Gideon, 1 homily.

• On Judges 7, On the battle of Gideon with the three hundred men, 1 homily.

On 1 Kings chapter 2 [Vulgate *Regum;* = 1 Samuel], On the Song of Hannah, 1 homily.

• On 3 Kings 3 [= 1 Kings], On the judgment of Solomon, 1 homily — which Origen mentions in the 3rd homily on Joshua.

On Job he issued many Homilies, or Treatises, which Jerome mentions in writing against Vigilantius. In place of these we now have, inserted among the Origenian volumes, a twofold work of exposition: the one very prolix, distinguished into three books, containing an exposition from the opening of the history of Job down to the middle of the third chapter; the other, which quite briefly and almost paraphrastically sets forth the historical sense of the whole book of Job, lately translated from the Greek by the industry of Joachim Périon. But neither is Origen's, although both are learned and worth reading. For, besides that the phrasing of both, and their method of teaching, is far removed from Origen's diction, this too is to be added: that the author of the former work, contrary to Origen's custom, abounds in almost countless *battologies* [vain repetitions], and consumes much time while he fashions for the persons speeches longer than is fitting, and by *apostrophe* speaks now to Job, now to the devil, and amid all this celebrates the combat of Lucian the Martyr, and commemorates the name of *Homousius* [Homoousios] and the opinion of the Homousians.[1]

In the latter work, however — in which, contrary to Origen's manner, he keeps to the bare letter — he also expounds those words of Job's wife which are found in the Greek codices in the second chapter, and which are rejected by Origen himself as apocryphal and adventitious [spurious]. Next he brings in an exposition of Lucian the Martyr on the third chapter of Job, and in the seventh and in the eighth chapter he refutes the Manichaeans by name, and in the thirty-eighth chapter he makes mention of the Homousianists. But it is established that both Lucian the Martyr and the Manichaeans lived after Origen, and that the very name of *Homousius* and of the Homousians came into being long after Origen's time. Again, in the same 38th chapter, he condemns the opinion of those who affirm [that the stars →]

[→ p301: catchword "affirmant"]

[1] The name "Homoousios" arose after Origen's time.

*(Rich PDF p. 301 [printed folio 282, verso]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: his twofold labor on the Psalter and the three extant Psalm-treatises; the Proverbs commentaries; Ecclesiastes; the ten books on the Song of Songs, with Jerome's encomium, and the two-chapter Song fragment once ascribed to Jerome; then his works on Isaiah and Jeremiah, each with a surviving homily-list. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

...[those who] affirm the stars to be animate [ensouled] — which is Origen's own peculiar dogma.[1] In each work there are read certain few little points worthy of censure, which you will find noted in the following book of censures.

On the Psalter also Origen exhibited a twofold labor. For he wrote — as Jerome indicates in the preface to the Psalms — an *Enchiridion* [Handbook] on all the Psalms, in a comma-style, or clause-by-clause, kind of exposition, annotated with terse and necessary little interpretations. He then composed, for the sake of Ambrose of Alexandria, the amplest narrative expositions upon the Psalter, following the order of the edition of the Seventy interpreters, of Aquila, of Symmachus, of Theodotion, and of the fifth and sixth editions; and, first of all the Greeks — as Jerome in his letter to Augustine is witness — he published upon the whole body of the Psalms very many tomes. Of these the same Jerome relates that he translated seven tomes, or treatises, that is, from the tenth psalm up to the sixteenth. Best known among his other treatises on the Psalter is the exposition of Psalm 1, which, on account of the variety of very great matters, is discussed in almost all the writings of the ancients.

There are still extant, under Origen's name, three Treatises on the Psalms, namely on Psalms 36, 37, and 38, which Rufinus — without indicating the name of their author — asserts that he translated from Greek into Latin, and, for the greater convenience of readers, divided into nine homilies. Trithemius in his *Catalog* relates that he saw 150 Treatises of Origen on the Psalter, whose beginning was, *Blessed is the man,* etc. This Psalm. But in Epiphanius, and in the Greek Catena of the Psalms, the preface of Origen on the Psalms so begins: Κεκλεῖσθαι καὶ ἐσφραγίσθαι τὰς θείας γραφάς [*so printed; the 16th-c. Greek type is hard*] — that is, *That the divine Scriptures are shut up and sealed.*

After these Origen worked out Commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon, cited by St. Pamphilus in his Apology.

On Ecclesiastes also, Explanations, of which Methodius, bishop of Olympus, makes mention in his book *On the Resurrection.*

Likewise, ten books of Commentaries on the Song of Songs: of which he wrote the first five at Athens, and finished the other five after returning to Caesarea. He also had, on the same book, some Homilies to the people, of which Jerome translated two, having prefixed at their front a little epistolary preface to Pope Damasus; in which he set forth an encomium both of the commentaries and of the homilies, in these words:

> *ORIGEN, though in all other things he has surpassed everyone, in the Song of Songs surpassed even himself. For, having completed ten volumes — which reached almost to twenty thousand verses — he discoursed, first upon the Seventy interpreters, then upon Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion, and finally upon the fifth edition, which he writes he found on the shore of Actium, so magnificently and so openly that it seems to me there was fulfilled in him what is said, The king has brought me into his chamber. And so, setting that [larger] work aside — because it is of vast leisure, labor, and expense to translate into Latin things so great, a work so worthy — I have translated these two treatises, which he composed after the manner of everyday speech, for little ones still nursing, more faithfully than elegantly, offering you a taste of his meaning, not [full] food. Do you take note how highly those things are to be esteemed which are great, since even these small ones can so please. Thus far Jerome.*

There is also carried about, under Origen's name, another pious, learned, and eloquent work — or rather a fragment of a work — in which the first two chapters of the Song of Songs are most eloquently and most learnedly explained. In certain old codices this was headed with the name of JEROME. Someone or other divided it into four Homilies, although they are not homilies but a continuous and unbroken explanation. Its beginning is, *A little book, an Epithalamium.* The Master of the Sentences, in book 3, distinction 29, and St. Thomas, in the Second [part], question 26, cite testimonies from this work under the name of Ambrose. He wrote besides,

On Isaiah, volumes entitled [as follows], namely: upon the whole of Isaiah, in scattered fashion, ΣΗΜΕΙΩΣΕΩΝ [*so printed;* = σημειώσεων] — that is, one book of *Annotations* or *Excerpts.*

Likewise, on a part of Isaiah according to the four editions, up to the vision of the four-footed beasts in the desert; that is, from the beginning of the book up to the thirtieth chapter, thirty tomes of continuous exposition. In these, ranging through the free fields of allegory, by interpreting the names of the several things, he made his own genius [into] the mysteries of the Church. But of these volumes the twenty-sixth book had already perished by Jerome's time.

Likewise, *On the vision of the Four-footed Beasts* [Τετραπόδων] *in the desert,* which begins, *The burden of the beasts of the South in a land of tribulation and distress,* upon the thirtieth chapter of Isaiah, to Grata, an illustrious woman: two books, which very many have falsely supposed to be inscribed with the name of Origen.

Likewise, upon various passages of Isaiah, 25 Homilies to the people, of which only the nine written below survive [*so printed "nine"; the entries below total ten homilies*], namely:

- On that [text] of chapter 4 [printed *Ex 4.*; = Isaiah 4:1], *Seven women shall lay hold of one man,* 1 homily.
- On chapter 6, On the first vision of Isaiah, 5 homilies.
- On Isaiah 7, On the words of the angel to Ahaz, 1 homily.
- On Isaiah 7, upon that [text], *Behold, I and my children,* 1 homily.
- On Isaiah 10, upon that [text], *As I have done to Samaria, so will I do to Jerusalem,* 2 homilies.

On Jeremiah also he is said to have written a huge number of homilies: of which Rabanus [Maurus], archbishop of Mainz, in the preface of his commentaries on Jeremiah, affirms that forty-five were known to him; of which number we have only the fourteen written below, in Jerome's translation, namely:

- On Jeremiah 1, On the beginning of Jeremiah, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 2, That one must flee from Babylon, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 2, On the vine turned into bitterness, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 3, upon that [text], *And the Lord said to me in the days of king Josiah,* 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 5, On the Hammer of the whole earth, broken, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 10, On him who makes the earth by his power, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 11, upon that [text], *Hear the words of this covenant,* 1 homily.

[→ p302: catchword "In"]

[1] Origen held the stars to be animate [ensouled].

*(Rich PDF p. 302 [printed folio 283, recto]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: the rest of the Jeremiah homilies; his works on Lamentations, Ezekiel (with the 14-homily list), and the Susanna-defense letter to Julius Africanus on Daniel 13 (with Eusebius's testimony); then, on the New Testament side, his*

labors on the Minor Prophets, Matthew, and the opening of Luke. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

- On Jeremiah 12, On the land laid waste, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 12, upon that [text], *Make [it] known to me, O Lord, and I shall know,* 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 13, On the wineskins to be filled with wine, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 13 and 14, On the threatenings of God against Jerusalem, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 15, upon that [text], *Woe is me, my mother,* 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 16, On the Sending of the fishermen, 1 homily.
- On Jeremiah 17, On the cry of the partridge, 1 homily.

On the Lamentations [Threnoi] of Jeremiah also Origen wrote, while he was at Alexandria, nine Tomes, of which Nicephorus makes mention in the fifth volume of his History; and, while he was living at Athens, already more than sixty years old, he worked [them] out — Eusebius being witness.

On Ezekiel, 25 Tomes — though before that he had given very many homilies on the same prophet, of which 14 are extant in Jerome's translation, which are:

- On Ezekiel chapter 1, On the captivity of the people of Israel, and of king Jehoiachin, and the vision of Ezekiel, 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 13, On the evil prophets prophesying in Jerusalem, 1 homily, which begins, *No form of sinners.*
- On the same, upon that [text]: *Son of man, set thy face firm,* 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 14, On the sins of sinful Jerusalem, 1 homily.
- On the same, ch. 14, On the two plagues, namely the sword and death, 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 15, On the parable of the wood of the vine, 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 16, upon that [text], *Thy root and thy generation [are] from the land of Canaan,* 1 homily.
- On the same, On the garments given by God to sinful Jerusalem, 1 homily.
- On the same, On the rebuke of sinful Jerusalem, setting up a brothel, 1 homily.
- On the same, On that which is written, *Your father [was] an Amorite, and your mother a Hittite,* 1 homily.
- On the same, On that which is written, *Be confounded, and receive thy shame,* 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 17, On the great Eagle entering Lebanon, 1 homily.
- On the same, On Nebuchadnezzar entering Jerusalem, 1 homily.
- On Ezekiel 28, On that which is written, *Thou [wast] the seal of resemblance, full of wisdom,* 1 homily.

On Daniel chapter 13 he wrote to Julius Africanus, in defense of the history of Susanna, one letter — lately translated into Latin by Ambrose [Traversari], of Milan, a Cassinese monk, a most learned man: concerning which Eusebius, in the 6th book of the Ecclesiastical History, thus writes: *At that time there was also Africanus, a man renowned in the ecclesiastical Scriptures; whose letter is said to have been written to Origen, objecting to him, or proposing, that the history of Susanna, which is written in Daniel, seemed fictitious and foreign to the prophetic Scripture. To whom Origen, writing back most magnificently, [replied] that one must by no means give ear to the fabrications and frauds of the Jews, but that this alone is to be held for true in the divine Scriptures which the Seventy interpreters translated; for that alone is [truly Scripture] which is confirmed by apostolic authority.* Thus far Eusebius.

Again, Origen followed out the whole context of the history of Susanna in the tenth book of the *Stromata*, in a clause-by-clause explanation; a part of which is now contained in the Hieronymian commentaries on Daniel, inserted by Jerome himself under the title of Origen.

He wrote besides, on the fourteen [*so printed; = twelve*] Minor Prophets, ἐξηγήσεων — that is, very many books of *Narrative-Expositions* [Enarrationes] — of which Eusebius complains that he could scarcely find twenty-five. Concerning these Jerome, in the Catalog of writers, thus speaks: *I found, on the Twelve Prophets, volumes written by the hand of the blessed Pamphilus the Martyr, which I embrace and keep with so much joy that I believe I possess the wealth of Croesus. For if it is a joy to have one letter of a martyr, how much more so many thousands of verses, through which he seems to me to have signed the traces of his own blood?*

Of these books he composed two in particular. On Hosea, one to which he gave the title Περὶ τοῦ πῶς ὠνομάσθαι τοῦ Ὡσηὲ Ἐφραίμ [*so printed; the 16th-c. Greek type is hard*] — that is, *Why Ephraim is [so] called in Hosea* — wishing to show that whatever things are said against him [Ephraim] are to be referred to the person of the heretics; and the other, [called] ἀκέφαλον καὶ ἀτέλεστον, so called because it lacks both a head [a beginning] and an end.

Likewise, on Zechariah he wrote two books, expounding allegorically scarcely a third part, from the beginning of the book up to the vision of the four-horse chariots [quadrigae].

Likewise, on Malachi, three books of allegorical exposition.

And these are the things which I have found written by Origen upon the Old Testament. But those which pertain to the New Instrument [Testament] are these:

On Matthew, a threefold kind of explanation, that is: Tomes, Scholia, and Homilies. Of these, first he composed on this whole gospel 36 Tomes; of which the first ten tomes are wanting, the rest survive, namely from the exposition of that passage, *Then, having dismissed the crowds, he came into his house,* from chapter 13 up to chapter 27 — which the copyists imprudently divided into treatises, or 35 homilies, although not a trace of the homiletic kind appears in them, which [kind] always runs from brief openings into little prefaces and doxologies.

Secondly, he wrote also, on the same Evangelist, one book of the scholastic kind, in which, through clauses and intervals, with certain brief scholia, he briefly annotated whatever seemed to him obscure.

Thirdly, he published, of the homiletic kind, on various passages of Matthew, twenty-five Homilies to the people; of these, those which now survive are these:

- On Matthew 1, On Mary betrothed, 1 homily.
- On Matthew 2, On the appearance of the angel to Joseph, 1 homily.
- On Matthew 6, upon that [text], *When ye fast,* 1 homily.
- On Matthew 8, On the leper cleansed, 1 homily.
- On Matthew 15, On the Canaanite woman, 1 homily.
- On Matthew 25, On the coming of the Son of Man to judgment, 1 homily — whose earlier part was cut from a treatise of Origen on Matthew 34; but the latter part seems to contain two fragments of Latin Fathers, of which the one is found at the end of Jerome's commentaries on Isaiah, the other in Gregory, book 15 of the *Morals,* chapter 14. Nor is there any doubt that very many things like these, excerpted here and there, are found also in some homilies which are read, under Origen's name, on various passages of the gospels.

On Luke he dictated five Tomes, which are now wanting, and very many Homilies, of [which →]

[→ p303: catchword "quibus"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 303 [printed folio 284, verso]. Book IV, **letter O** — the **Origen** entry continues: the surviving Luke homilies; the great commentary on John (39 tomes, of which nine survive — Périon's version, and the padded 32-tome version), with the two John homilies; then his fifteen books on Romans, prefaced by Jerome's letter to Heraclius. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter O — Origen, continued:]

...of which 39 are still extant, which — because they are little wrought out, and because some are sprinkled even with condemned errors — Jerome, their translator, excuses, as having been born from Origen when he was quite young; for some are the preludes of youth, and others the serious [works] of old age. Of these, the first thirty-three homilies explain Luke in a continuous series of exposition, from the beginning of the gospel up to the middle of the fourth chapter; but the six later ones expound certain scattered passages, and are these:

- On Luke 10, On him who fell among the robbers, 1 homily.
- On Luke 12, upon that [text], *Be agreeing with thy adversary*, 1 homily.
- On Luke 17, upon that [text], *Whoever will save his soul shall lose it*, 1 homily.
- On Luke 19, On the colt of the ass, 1 homily.
- On Luke 18, On the weeping of Christ over Jerusalem, 1 homily.
- On Luke 20, On the question of the Sadducees, 1 homily.

On John's Gospel, [books] of complete explanation, to Ambrose of Alexandria, 39 Tomes — which Jerome, in the preface to the 39 homilies of Origen on Luke, excuses himself for not having dared to render into the Latin tongue, deterred by the magnitude of the labor and the expense. They lay hidden, unknown to all the Latins down to our age; but lately, out of these, Joachim Périon, a Cassinese monk, first translated nine tomes into Latin. For only so many survived in a very ancient Greek codex, which he obtained from the most illustrious library of the King of the French; and these indeed [are], in many places, mutilated, by no means consecutive, and interpolated — namely the first, second, sixth, tenth, thirteenth, eighteenth, twentieth, twenty-eighth, [and] thirty-second:

- Of which the first contains the preface of the work, together with the exposition of only the first proposition, namely, *In the beginning was the Word.* Its beginning is, *Just as the ancient people [of God]...*
- In the second is expounded that [text] from chapter 1, *And the Word was with God*, up to those words of the same chapter, *He who came after me was made before me.*
- In the sixth are expounded those words from chapter 1, *And this is the testimony of John*, up to that [text], *Behold the Lamb of God.*
- In the tenth is explained that [text] from chapter 2, *After this he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother*, up to the end of the same chapter, *For he himself knew what was in man.*
- In the thirteenth is expounded that [text] from chapter 4, *Jesus answered, Everyone who drinks of this water*, up to that [text] of the same chapter, *When therefore he had come into Galilee, the Galileans received him.*
- In the eighteenth is expounded that [text] from chapter 8, *Neither do you know me, nor my Father*, up to the words which follow a little after in the same chapter, *Unless you believe that I am [he], you shall die in your sins.*
- In the twentieth is expounded, from chapter 8, that sentence, *I know that you are the seed of Abraham*, up to that [one] in the same chapter, *Now we know that you have a demon.*

• In the twenty-eighth is explained that [text] from chapter 11, *Jesus said, Take away the stone,* etc., [and] what follows, up to the end of the same chapter.

• In the thirty-second is expounded that [text] from chapter 13, *And supper being ended, when the devil had put [it] into the heart, that Judas should betray him,* up to those words of the same chapter, *You will seek me, and, as I said to the Jews, where I go, you cannot come.*

These nine tomes of the interrupted [fragmentary] explanation, a certain petty Greekling of uncertain name, by a new kind of imposture, cut apart into thirty-two tomes — so that he might render the work more desirable (swollen by a multitude of numbers and made continuous by the order of arithmetical reckoning) and sell it at a greater price. Deceived by his fraud, Ambrose the Milanese, a Cassinese monk, a man otherwise shrewd and of a clever wit, translated this very work into Latin, and published it in print, divided into thirty-two tomes, thus beginning, *Just as the people who once [were] God's.*

He published also, on this gospel, several homilies, but now only two are extant inscribed with his name: one on the beginning of John, the other on the beginning of chapter 20, on Mary weeping at the tomb; of which the former — whose beginning is, *The voice of the spiritual eagle* — it appears is not Origen's, both from the names of the Manichaeans and of the Arians commemorated in it, [sects] which arose long after Origen. So much for the expositions of the Gospels; after which, having undertaken to explain Paul, he labored [as follows].

On the Epistle to the Romans, fifteen books of commentaries: concerning which it pleases [me] to append the judgment of Jerome from the little preface which he set before those same commentaries, translated by himself, writing in this manner to Heraclius:[1]

> *You compel me, brother Heraclius — me who am willing, carried in a little skiff, to skirt the shore of a tranquil coast and to gather little fishes from the pools of the Greeks — to loose my sails into the deep; and, the work abandoned which I had in hand in translating the homilies of the old man Adamantius [Origen], you urge that I should render in our tongue his fifteen volumes, in which he discoursed upon the epistle of Paul to the Romans: in which [volumes] that [author], while he pursues the Apostle's meaning, is carried out into so deep a sea that there is great fear in following him thither, lest I be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the meanings, as by the monstrous vastness of the waves. Then, neither do you consider this — that my breath is too slight to fill up his so magnificent throng of speaking. But above all the difficulties is this: that the books themselves are interpolated. For in almost everyone's libraries there are lacking (by what chance is indeed uncertain) some volumes from the very body [of the work]; and to fill these up in the Latin work, and to give a complete sequence, is not [a thing] of my talent, but, as you believe — you who demand these things — perhaps of a divine gift. You add, moreover, that nothing may be lacking to my labors, that I should abbreviate this whole body of fifteen volumes — which the Greek discourse brought forth to almost forty, or more, thousands of verses — and, if it can be done, compress it to half its extent. Commands hard enough, and imposed as if by one who would not know the weight of this work; yet I will attempt [it], if perhaps by your prayers (which seem to me, as to a man, impossible) — with the Lord breathing upon [them] — they may become possible. But let us now hear the man himself, if it seem [good], namely Origen, how he directs the preface of the work undertaken. Thus far Jerome.*

There are some who think that the translation of these commentaries is Rufinus's, the conjecture being taken from the peroration of the translator himself, placed at the end of the whole work. Origen wrote likewise:

[→ p304: catchword "In"]

[1] The judgment of St. Jerome on Origen's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

*(Rich PDF p. 304 [printed folio 285, recto]. Book IV — the giant **Origen** entry concludes (his Pauline commentaries; the roster of his apologists; his death at Tyre); then the remaining **letter O** entries — Oronce Finé, Orosius, Otfrid, Othmar Nachtgall — after which **letter P opens** with Paduanus Crassus, Paganus of Bergamo, Pantaleon, and the opening of Pantaenus. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter O — Origen, concluded:]

On the first Epistle to the Corinthians, commentaries, of which Jerome makes mention in the letter to Pammachius, which begins, *Of Christian modesty.*

On the Epistle to the Galatians he elaborated various [works] according to the threefold kind of exposition, that is: five Tomes of continuous and complete narration on the whole epistle. Likewise, out of the ten books of his *Stromata,* he completed the tenth volume, in a clause-by-clause discourse, upon the explanation of this epistle. Likewise, one book of *Eklogai* [Ἐκλογῶν], or *Excerpts.* Likewise, not a few Treatises to the people; all of which the injury of time has consumed. Jerome mentions these in his letter to Augustine.

On the Epistle to the Ephesians, three Tomes, which Jerome — in the preface of his commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians, and in the first apology against Rufinus — confesses that he followed.

On the Epistle to the Colossians, 3 books of commentary, of which Pamphilus cites the third book in his Apology.

On the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, several books, of which Jerome cites the third in his letter to Minervius and Alexander, saying: *Origen, in the third volume of the Expository [works]* [ἐξηγηματικῶν] *on the Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians (the first), after many things which he discoursed in a varied and prudent discourse, introduced these; in which there is no doubt to anyone that Acacius drew off* [borrowed] *very much,* etc.

On the Epistle to Titus, one book, a fragment of which is cited by Pamphilus in the Apology.

On the Epistle to the Hebrews, several books, of which Pamphilus cites a fragment in the Apology.

These, then, are Origen's works upon the sacred Letters. But concerning his life and sanctity, and concerning the rest of the exoteric volumes composed by him outside the explanation of the divine Scriptures, if anyone desires to know more, let him read Eusebius in the 6th book of the Ecclesiastical History. Many most illustrious men wrote, in defense of Origen's works, various apologetic books,[1] namely: Pamphilus of Caesarea, the most holy martyr, one book, to which is joined one book of Gregory [Thaumaturgus], bishop of Neocaesarea, *On the Praises of Origen;* Eusebius of Caesarea, the bishop, six books; Didymus of Alexandria, one book; Methodius of Olympus, one book — a Palinode [recantation] of the Origen he had once censured; Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzen, by a common labor, one book; Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, to Macarius, two books; John Pico della Mirandola, one book; Jacques Merlin of Saint-Victurnien, one book.

Origen flourished under Alexander [Severus], son of Mamaea, down to Gallus and Volusianus his son — that is, down to the seventieth year of his age — and he died at Tyre, and was buried in the same place, in the year 260 from the birth of Christ.

Orontius Finaeus [Oronce Finé], a Dauphinois, royal professor of mathematics at Paris, drew a Chorography of the lands necessary for the understanding of sacred Scripture, which they call *The Peregrination of St. Paul,* in the year of the Lord 1540.

Orosius, a Presbyter, a Spaniard by nation, a man most learned in secular and in divine letters, a disciple of St. Augustine[2] — to whom also he wrote his book of Histories, and by whom in turn he was sent from Spain to Bethlehem, to Jerome, to learn the question of the origin of the soul — wrote most praiseworthy commentaries on the Song of Songs, in the year of the Lord 420, Honorius and Arcadius reigning [*so printed; Arcadius died in 408*].

Otfrid [of Weissenburg], a German by nation, a Benedictine monk of the monastery of Weissenburg, a hearer of Rabanus [Maurus] of Mainz — that most excellent archbishop — a poet, rhetor, philosopher, and theologian, in the opinion of all most learned in the times of Louis, Lothair, and Charles, among many noble monuments of his erudition left three books of commentaries on the whole Psalter; likewise, on the four

gospels, to Luitbert, bishop of Mainz, a notable work, digested into five books, which he entitled *Gratiam Theotistae* [*so printed; apparently his Gospel-work in the Teutonic tongue*] — its beginning is, *By the summit of dignity*. He flourished under the Emperor Lothair, in the year of the Lord —— [*year left blank in the print*].

Othmar Nachtgall [Otomarus Luscinius], a German, of Strasbourg by fatherland, a monk and lector of the monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra of Augsburg, a man distinguished both by the example of his life and by no common erudition — at the urging of John Schrot, his abbot — wrote, in polished discourse, to Wolfgang Rem, triumvir of Swabia, an *Isagogic* [Introductory] book to the mystical understanding of the Psalter: in which he arranged all the recondite and more abstruse expressions of the Psalms according to the order of the letters [alphabetically], and explained their spiritual and allegorical senses purely, aptly, and germanely. The book's beginning is, *Weaned. Quite fittingly*, etc. He flourished under Charles V, Augustus, 1520.

P

Paduanus Crassus [Paduano Grasso], an Apulian by nation, of Barletta by fatherland, of the Franciscan institute, a scholastic theologian, worn down by constant exercise in the Schools of the Scotists, also a declaimer famous for his Italian eloquence, collected — in the manner of a dialogue, out of Augustine and other Fathers — a compendium of the Passages [Loci], in all the epistles of Paul, that apparently conflict, which he entitled *The Council of Paul* [Concilium Pauli]. He flourished in the year from the birth of Christ our Savior, [1]547 [*so printed "547"*].

Paganus of Bergamo, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], wrote a scholastic Postil on the Song of Songs, beginning, *The bridegroom and the bride say, Come.* It is extant at Venice, in the library of St. John and [St.] Paul [Santi Giovanni e Paolo].

Pantaleon, a deacon of the great Church of God, wrote — in elegant Greek eloquence — on the holy Lights [the Feast of Lights], on the Lord Jesus Christ and on St. John his forerunner, a sermon upon that [text], *I ought to be baptized by thee;* which begins, Τὴν τῆς πανηγύρεως χάριν [*so printed; the 16th-c. Greek type is hard*], that is, *The grace of this festive assembly.*

Pantaenus, a philosopher of the Stoic sect — after his conversion [made] prefect of the ancient Alexandrian school founded by Mark the Evangelist, on account of his outstanding glory both in secular literature and in sacred erudition — by Demetrius [Demetrian], [bishop] of Ale-[xandria →]

[→ p305: catchword "xandriae"]

[1] Authors who wrote apologetic books for Origen. [2] Orosius was a disciple of St. Augustine.

*(Rich PDF p. 305 [printed folio 286, verso]. Book IV, **letter P** — Pantaenus concluded (his mission to India), then Paterius, Paschasius Radbertus, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, the great Paul of Burgos, Paul of Emesa, Paul de Palacio, Paul Ricius, Paulinus of Nola, Peregrino Grimaldi, Peter of Ailly, and the opening of Peter of Sens. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter P, continued:]

...[bishop] of Alexandria, [Pantaenus] was sent into India, that he himself, a Philosopher, might preach Christ among the Brahmans, the Gymnosophists, and the other Philosophers of that nation. Jerome testifies that many commentaries of his upon the holy Scriptures were extant in his own times; among whom [the Indians], when he had preached the Gospel according to Matthew, written in Hebrew letters, he — returning — brought it back with him to Alexandria. He flourished under Septimius Severus and his son Caracalla, in the year of the Lord 200.

Paterius, a hearer of St. Gregory the Pope, the first of that name, a disciple and notary — secundicerius — of the Holy Roman See, a man devoted to the divine Letters, patched together, out of all the works of St. Gregory, three books of *Explanations on various Passages of both Testaments*, preserving in them the number and order of the books and chapters of sacred Scripture, and citing by name the books of the blessed Gregory, and the chapters of the books, from which he took those explanations; of which, when St. Gregory had read a part already begun, he commended it, and urged Paterius himself to complete the work. Bede mentions this work in the preface of the seventh book on the Song of Songs, saying: *I have heard that a certain Paterius, a disciple of the blessed Pope Gregory, gathered together, in order, into one volume, [the things] collected from the whole holy Scripture, whatsoever [Gregory] explained in his works.* The beginning of this work, which was lately printed at Rome, runs thus: *While [the writings] of the most blessed and Apostolic [men]...* He flourished under the Emperors Maurice and Phocas, in the year of the Lord 600.

Paschasius Radbertus, Abbot of Corbie, a Benedictine monk, a theologian and philosopher learned in Greek and Latin, as strong in verse as in prose, wrote, in elegant eloquence, on the Lamentations, 1 book. He flourished under the Emperor Charles the Fat, in the year of the Lord 808 [*so printed; the date and the reign of Charles the Fat (881–888) do not agree*].

Patrophilus of Scythopolis, a bishop of Palestine, distinguished in the first Council of Nicaea, translated the whole Hebrew Scripture into Greek, in the year of the Lord 300. Gregory, bishop of Laodicea, mentions this translation in the Life of Eusebius of Emesa.

Paul of Burgos [Pablo de Santa María], bishop of Burgos, a Spaniard by nation, from the town of Santa María, a Hebrew by race, of Levitical blood among his own people, a most excellent Rabbi or master; and, after his conversion, first prelate of the church of Cartagena [Carthago Nova], and then of Burgos, of the Spanish churches, and arch-chancellor of the most invincible king of the Spains — discoursed, for the sake of his son Alfonso, Dean of the church of Compostela, upon very many Passages from the several books of divine Scripture, against the commentaries of Nicholas of Lyra, to which he added these disputations of his, endeavoring in them to correct all of Lyra's explanations either as worthy of reproof, or to supply them as incomplete and deficient. He entitled this work *Notable Additions to the Postil of Nicholas of Lyra* [Additiones notabiles ad Postillam Nicolai de Lyra], of which the beginning is, *What would you have me, while living, bestow [on you]...* He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord one thousand four hundred and thirty [1430].

Paul, bishop of Emesa, in the Council of Ephesus delivered a sermon upon that sentence from John's gospel, *And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.* In which, when he had most brilliantly demonstrated the two natures in one and the same Christ, he took away — to the great joy of all — the schism which was in the council on account of this dogma, and restored peace to the church, in the year of the Lord 436.

Paul de Palacio wrote commentaries on the Gospel of St. Matthew.

Paul Ricius [Paulus Ricius], an Israelite, a most learned man, converted to the Christian faith a few years ago, and made physician to the Emperor Maximilian. He composed many excellent volumes; but among the rest, one book *On the six hundred and thirteen [precepts] of the Mosaic sanction, or of the Pentateuch.* Likewise, he composed on Psalm 1 one book *On Divine Providence.* He flourished in the year of the Lord one thousand five hundred [1500].

Paulinus, bishop of Nola in Campania, bound by the highest friendship with Rufinus, Jerome, and Augustine, was a man most devoted to divine Scripture and of singular eloquence. Concerning whom Jerome, in a certain letter, [says]: *Paulinus,* he says, *representing almost a [second] Tully in the study of letter-writing, provokes me by his voice to write, [and] frightens [me] by his eloquence.* But he was distinguished also by such virtue of piety and compassion that, when he had paid out everything to the poor, he at last offered himself, ready, into servitude for the redemption of a certain widow's son; and, dismissed

by them [the captors] a little afterward on account of the admirable sanctity of his life, he wrote many pious volumes up to his death; among which he also published *On the Blessings of the Patriarchs, according to allegory,* in Latin and polished discourse, one book — in imitation of Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, from whom by letters he had obtained two books of the same subject. He flourished in the year of the Lord 420.

Peregrino Grimaldi [Peregrinus Grimaldus], a Genoese, wrote a Meditation on Psalm 102, to Vittoria [Colonna] of Pescara, a most illustrious woman, which begins, *What shall we do, O soul?* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

Peter of Ailly [Petrus Aliacus], bishop of Cambrai, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, formerly Chancellor of the University of Paris, teacher of John Gerson, a man most skilled in the divine Scriptures and most consummate in Peripatetic Philosophy and in the Astronomical disciplines, elegant in speech and an eloquent declaimer, gathered together, out of Augustine and other Fathers, very many volumes upon the sacred letters; of which I have read:

- One book of *Questions on the Hexaemeron,* whose beginning is, *In the beginning of the book.*
- A paraphrastic exposition on the whole Psalter, which begins, *The abbreviated word.*
- Meditations on the 7 penitential psalms, which are also ascribed to Gerson.
- On Psalm 30, a Meditation, which begins, *It frightens me.*
- On Psalm 41, a Meditation, whose beginning is, *O highest Priest.*
- On the Song of Songs, a Meditation, 1 book: *Let him kiss me.*

He flourished under Sigismund Augustus, distinguished in the Council of Constance, in the year of the Lord 1416.

Peter, Archbishop of Sens [Senonensis], learned in the divine Scriptures by continual study, and of the ancient [→]

[→ p306: catchword "rum le" (vete-rum le...)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 306 [printed folio 287, recto]. Book IV, **letter P** — a long run of Peters: Peter of Sens (concl.), Peter Bersuire, Peter of Città Nuova, Peter Canisius, Peter the Chanter, Peter Comestor, Peter Chrysologus, Peter of Edessa, Peter Gottfried, Peter of Herentals, and the opening of Peter Izuzqui. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter P, continued:]

...[Peter, Archbishop of Sens] — rich in the reading of the ancients, and nobly learned in secular letters, subtle in wit, and distinguished in eloquence — wrote on all the epistles of Paul, fourteen books. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1200.

Peter Bersuire [Petrus Berthorius], a Gaul by nation, a Poitevin by fatherland, prior of the monastery of St. Éloi at Paris, of the Benedictine order, wrote on the whole Bible four notable volumes:

- The first he entitled *The Moral Reductorium of Both Testaments,* divided into four books; in which, the historical sense being passed over, he briefly expounded all the chapters of Scripture tropologically, with allegories sometimes interspersed, using a style lowered, open, and most accommodated to explaining the meanings of the mind. The beginning of the work is, *When now, through the shadowy wood of nature...*
- The second volume is headed *The Moral Repertory,* or *Biblical Dictionary,* divided into three large volumes and arranged in the order of the alphabet. Its beginning is, *To the reverend father in Christ.*
- The third, which is entitled *The Moral Inductorium,* divided into three books, begins, *See that not only...*

• The fourth, which is called *A Breviary of the Histories of the Bible,* thus begins, *Considering the history...*

He flourished in the times of the Emperor Charles the Fourth and of Pope Innocent VI, in the year of the Lord 1260 [*so printed; Charles IV and Innocent VI place him rather c. 1360*].

Peter, bishop of Città Nuova [Novae civitatis], an Italian by nation, from the town of Brunaquello, an Augustinian Hermit by profession, a teacher of Scholastic Theology, is said to have published scholastic Lectures on the whole Bible, of which I recall having seen none; but I have heard that his commentaries on the three books of Solomon — that is, on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs — are still extant in Germany. He flourished under Rupert, king of the Romans, in the year of the Lord 1410.

Peter Canisius, a theologian of the Society of Jesus, of outstanding piety and erudition, vindicated the most blessed Virgin Mother of God, and St. John the Baptist, the Lord's forerunner, from the calumnies of the heretics, and in the first place of the Centuriators [the Magdeburg Centuriators]; and he wrote a Catechism, by an excellent method easy for understanding; and, as we hope, in his extreme old age he will bring forth into the light other excellent works — for he does not cease to deserve well of the Catholic Church, both by preaching and by writing. He now dwells among the Catholic Swiss, in the College of Fribourg of the Society of Jesus. His works have been printed several times, both in France and in Germany. *[Later-edition detail — Canisius resided at Fribourg from 1580 until his death in 1597; this notice reflects the later printing, not the 1569 primary.]*

Peter the Chanter [Petrus Cantor] of Paris, and afterward — as is reported — bishop of the same city, among other excellent works published by him, wrote a scholastic Gloss on the whole sacrosanct Bible: of which I myself, in the Dominican Library at Lyons, saw the books written below:

• On the Psalter, 1 book — [incipit] *John was weeping, because there was none who could open the book.*

• On Proverbs, 1 book — *The parable of Solomon according to the Hebrew truth.*

• On Ecclesiastes, 1 book — *Blessed the man whose help is from thee.*

• On Wisdom, 1 book — *The palace of the highest king.*

• On Ezekiel, 1 book — *And it came to pass in the thirtieth year.*

• On the Acts of the Apostles, 1 book — *The earth was melted.*

• On the Canonical Epistles, 1 book — *My mouth shall speak wisdom.*

• On the Apocalypse, 1 book — *This alone among the books of the New Testament is called Prophecy.*

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1200.

Peter Comestor [Peter the Eater], a presbyter of the church of Troyes, who by the Scholastics was called, by way of excellence, *Master of the Scholastic History*, reduced all the historical books, both of the Old and of the New Testament, in a continuous series of the Scriptures, briefly into one body; interweaving — for the complete supplement of a finished structure — not only many external histories, handed down in the writing of the most approved authors, but also many apocryphal narratives, received by the sole tradition of the ancients without any writing; and he added likewise, in various places, certain brief annotations from the sayings of the Fathers, which might illustrate obscure passages of the history. His work — which by usage is now entitled *Historia Scholastica* — thus begins, *To the Imperial Majesty*, etc. He flourished under Frederick [Barbarossa] the First, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1160. Walter Hunter, an Englishman, abridged his work.

Peter, Archbishop of Ravenna [Peter Chrysologus], from the Forum of Cornelius, which they call Imola, born of distinguished parents, a man excelling as much in the sanctity of life as in every kind of erudition, and — on account of the golden abundance of his wit and eloquence — having obtained the surname

CHRYSOLOGUS [Golden-worded], dictated, upon the various readings of the four Gospels, one hundred and twenty-two sermons: brief indeed, but venerable for the weight of their meaning; pleasant for the brightness of the discourse and the charming little flowers of words; delightful for certain witty little sentences flowing with a certain natural ease; and admirable for certain strong emotions, sometimes expressed in tragic words. He dies at Forum Cornelii [Imola] about the year of the Lord 500, under Anastasius Augustus, when he had already presided over the church of Ravenna about sixty years — greatly distinguished by the two Councils in which he took part with the highest praise.

Peter, a presbyter of the church of Edessa, wrote — in the manner of St. Ephrem, in the Syriac tongue — most elegant Homilies on the several Psalms, kindled with the fervid ardor of the spirit. And the same man sang the whole Psalter in Greek verses of various kinds. He flourished in the year of the Lord 450.

Peter Gottfried [Petrus Gottifredus], a doctor of scholastic Theology, published a scholastic commentary on Proverbs.

Peter of Herentals [Petrus Herentalsius], of Floreffe, a Premonstratensian monk, collected a Catena of explanations on the Psalms from various monuments of the orthodox Fathers, in the year of the Lord one thousand four hundred and ninety [1490; *so printed — the known Peter of Herentals flourished rather in the late 1300s*].

Peter Izuzqui [Petrus Izuzquius], from Navarre in Spain, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], illuminated with a clear exposition one work compiled by himself out of the four Gospels, and [entitled] it *The Series of the Sacred Gos-[pel... →*]

[→ p307: catchword "Evange"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 307 [printed folio 288, verso]. Book IV, **letter P** — still the Peters: Peter Izuzqui (concl.), Peter John, Peter Lombard, Peter of Lautern, Peter Nannius, Peter of La Palud, Peter of Perpignan, and Peter Riga's* Aurora *(with its book-list), then Peter of Rosenheim, Peter Rufus, Peter of Santa Fe, and Peter Scala. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter P, continued:]

...[Peter Izuzqui] entitled [it] *The Series of the Sacred Gospel of Jesus Christ,* pieced together out of the four Gospels.

Peter John [Petrus Ioannis], of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], a formed Bachelor of the Sorbonne of Paris, wrote Postils on almost the whole of divine Scripture, in the year of the Lord 1400.

Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris, whom all the Schools of the Theologians, by a certain singular excellence of veneration, call *the Master of the Sentences,* and upon whose compendium of Theology the most learned Theologians of the most illustrious Academies throughout the whole Christian world have elaborated innumerable volumes of disputations — gathered, on all the Psalms of David and on all the epistles of Paul, commentaries most replete with all erudition, out of the opinions of Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Cassiodorus, and Remigius (their names being suppressed); in which he also interposed some things of his own, not wholly to be rejected. The commentaries on the Psalms begin, *Since it is established that all the Prophets spoke by the revelation of the Holy Spirit.* But the commentaries on Paul begin, *The beginnings of things are to be inquired into.* He flourished under the Emperor Conrad III, in the year of the Lord 1140.

Peter of Lautern [Petrus de Lutra], of the Premonstratensian order, wrote on the Gospel of John. He lived in the year of the Lord 1330.

Peter Nannius [Petrus Nannius], of Alkmaar, professor of the Latin tongue in the Busleyden College [at Louvain], wrote a Paraphrase and Scholia on the Song of Songs, beginning, *With the common [reading]...*

Likewise, on the Wisdom of Solomon in the same manner, beginning, *Often having been asked...* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Peter of La Palud [Petrus Paludanus], Patriarch of Jerusalem, a Gaul by race, a Dominican by institute, most skilled in Canon Law, a theologian sufficiently celebrated among the scholastics, and a foremost defender of the Thomistic doctrine, wrote — according to the threefold sense, literal, moral, and allegorical — a Postil on the whole sacrosanct Bible, of which I myself, in the Dominican Library at Lyons, read only the [books] written below:

- On the whole Bible, one book of most ample Prefaces, which begins, *Establishing a Library.*
- On Genesis, 1 book — [incipit] *This is the book of Adam.*
- On Exodus, 1 book — *God led them out of Egypt.*
- On the Psalter, a huge work, digested into seven volumes, which begins, *Be filled with the Holy Spirit.*

He flourished in the year of the Lord 1330.

Peter of Perpignan [Petrus Perpinianus], surnamed Rimes, a Catalan by nation, a Carmelite, in whom the erudition of secular Philosophy and of the holy Scriptures was equal, wrote — according to the custom of the school — on the whole Psalter a Lecture not to be despised. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1300.

Peter Riga [Petrus Riga], a presbyter of the church of Rheims, a scholastic poet, celebrated as far as his times allowed, and illustrious for his knowledge of the holy Letters, briefly expounded all the historical books of divine Scripture in verse — partly in elegiacs, and partly in hexameters of the Leonine kind — according to the literal and allegorical sense. He entitled his work *AURORA.* Its books, and their beginnings, taken from the Dominican Library at Lyons, are these:

- On Genesis, 1 book — *Initium mundi quales.*
- On Exodus, 1 book — *These are the names of the twelve fathers.*
- On Leviticus, 1 book — *The voice of the Lord [came] to Moses.*
- On Numbers, 1 book — *God addresses Moses.*
- On Deuteronomy, 1 book — *These are the words of God.*
- On Joshua, 1 book — *After Moses, Joshua [came] to the people.*
- On Judges, 1 book — *The Hebrew sins, he says.*
- On Ruth, 1 book — *He hastens to Ruth.*
- On Kings, 3 books — *Monte manens Effra* [obscure — so printed].
- On the Song of Songs, 1 book — *Origen alone, when he has surpassed all the learned.*
- On the fourth [book] of Kings, 1 book — *Solomon reigned.*
- On Daniel, 1 book — *After [he had made] them subject to himself.*
- On Tobit, 1 book — *You who read the history.*
- On Job, 2 books — *Librum Iob Mosi quidam* [obscure — so printed].
- On Judith, 1 book — *To Eustochium and Paula.*
- On Esther, 1 book — *Up to [the reign] under the Ethiopians.*
- On the books of the Maccabees, 1 book — *Alexander the Great.*
- On the four Gospels, 1 book — *He grew illustrious in the [days of] Herod.*
- On the Acts of the Apostles, 1 book — *In the nineteenth [year] of Tiberius.*
- Of Recapitulations, 1 book — *Concerning the new law and the old.*

He flourished under Frederick I, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1170.

Peter of Rosenheim [Petrus Rosenheimensis], a German, a Benedictine monk in the monastery of Melk in Austria, a scholastic poet, not unacquainted with the divine Letters, wrote to Branda [Castiglioni], Cardinal of the title of St. Clement, a little work concise in elegiac distichs, briefly touching upon all the chapters of both Testaments; to which he gave the title *ROSEUM MEMORIALE DIVINORUM* [The Rosy Memorial of Divine Things], its beginning being such: *Astripotens coelum terram* [The star-ruling (God made) heaven (and) earth]. He flourished under the Emperor Sigismund, in the year of the Lord 1440.

Peter Rufus [Petrus Rufus], the thirty-second prior of the Charterhouse, wrote commentaries on the Psalter and on the Song of Songs, in the year of the Lord 1503.

Peter of Santa Fe [Petrus de sancta fide], an Englishman, a Carmelite, wrote commentaries on the Epistles of St. Peter. He lived in the year 1452.

Peter Scala [Petrus Scala], bishop of Verona, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], published a scholastic Postil on John, which — written by hand on parchment — I saw at Genoa in the Library of the Observant Minorites. Its beginning is, *Shall the eagle be lifted up at thy command?* etc. [Job 39:27]

[→ p308: catchword "PETRVS"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 308 [printed folio 289, recto]. Book IV, **letter P** — the last Peters (Peter Sutor, Peter of Tarentaise, Peter of Tripoli, Peter Auriol), then the Philips (Philibert Aresches, Philip of Otterberg, Philip Albert of Neuss, Philip the Chancellor, Philip the presbyter-monk, Philip of Side), Philo of Carpasia, and the opening of the great Philo the Jew. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter P, continued:]

Peter Sutor [Pierre Cousturier] wrote *On the Translations of the Bibles*, against Erasmus, in the year of the Lord one thousand five hundred and forty.

Peter of Tarentaise [Petrus de Tarantasia], of the Order of Preachers — [Pope] Innocent [V], the holy Supreme Pontiff — wrote commentaries on the Psalms, the Canticles, and on the epistles of St. Paul. Likewise, postils on the 5 books of Moses. He lived in the year of the Lord 1275.

Peter, Abbot of Tripoli [Tripolitanus], as Cassiodorus testifies in the first book *On the Institution of the Divine Scriptures*, collected from the sayings of the little works of the blessed Augustine commentaries on all the epistles of Paul, in the year 498. They are preserved at Bologna in the Dominican Library, bearing this beginning: *First, why after the Gospels, which* etc.

Peter Auriol [Petrus Verberius, surnamed Aureolus], Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, bishop of Aix, a Franciscan by profession, doctor and rector of the University of Paris, in which — in the times of Louis [IV] the Bavarian, Emperor — he publicly taught the scholastic kind of Theology; a man most distinguished in the skill of all the sciences, an ecclesiast and preacher, held in the highest admiration among his own on account of his singular erudition in the Scriptures; wrote, in a scholastic style, a brief compendium of all the holy volumes, an articulated *BREVIARY OF THE BIBLE*, whose beginning is, *Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.* He flourished under Louis the Bavarian, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1317.

Philibert Aresches [Philibertus Aresches], a doctor of the Augustinian family, a theologian by faculty, and by origin and convent a Parisian, published brief and clear commentaries on the epistle of St. Paul to the Romans; in which, after an exact exposition of the Apostolic mind, he explained with most lucid annotations the definitions of the more difficult words, and the acceptations of their various significations, and their authorities; likewise [passages] from the Old Testament — whether of the Septuagint interpreters or of the Hebrew truth, which the Apostle sometimes follows. In the year of the Lord 1540.

Philip, Abbot of the monastery of Otterberg [Otterburgensis], in the diocese of Worms, of the Cistercian order, a German, whose soul and conduct sanctity and the study of divine things adorned, put forth a noble and notable work of commentaries on the Canticles.

Philip Albert of Neuss [Philippus Alberti de Nussia], a German, a Carmelite, made a Postil on the Canticles, in the year of the Lord 1495.

Philip the Chancellor of Paris [Philippus Cancellarius], and prefect of the great school of the Parisians, a man learned in every respect, and dear to the people in sacred declamations, delivered on the several Psalms two or three learned and eloquent sermons. He flourished in the year of the Lord 140— [*so printed; the final digit(s) do not print*].

Philip, a presbyter and monk, an excellent hearer of the blessed Jerome, and a very great lover of poverty, published — in a simple discourse, as Gennadius says — commentaries on Job; in place of which Adam of Basel, the printer, in recent years published three books of a *mystical exposition of commentaries on Job,* to Bishop Nectarius, beginning, *At your exhorting, or rather compelling, most blessed father Nectarius.* These, again, John Herwagen, printer of Basel, printed among the works of Bede and under the title of BEDE. But Bede himself, in the little book *On the reckoning of ounces,* claims these very commentaries for their [true] author, [saying]: *He disturbs many of the unskilled,* he says, *because Philip, in the exposition of the blessed Job, describing the tide of the Ocean sea, added that it comes on three-quarters of an hour later at the equinoctial hour, without intermission, whether by day or by night.* But this passage is cited by Bede in the explanations on Job which lately, under the name of Philip, the same Herwagen printed, book 3, on the exposition of that sentence, *Hast thou entered into the depths of the sea?* etc., Job 38. He dies, Marcian and Avitus reigning, in the year of the Lord 430.

Philip of Side [Philippus Sidetes], a presbyter, born at Side in Pamphylia, a kinsman of Troilus the sophist, [who], when he was a deacon, was a hearer of John Chrysostom; and, affecting much the Asiatic kind of speaking, he wrote many things, but especially a magnificent work *in defense of the whole divine Scripture,* in which he overthrew the seven books published by the Emperor Julian against the sacrosanct Bible. He dies in the year of the Lord 440, leaving behind thirty-six books of Histories.

Philo, bishop of Carpasia [Philo Carpathius], wrote a Greek exposition on the Song of Songs, of which the beginning is, *Who [likens thee to] the contests of horses...* — which is thought to be [the work] not of one Philo, but of several authors; of whom the commentary which is circulated among the Greeks under the name of Philo is quite a brief little work. There are some who think that it was enriched with many additions by Eustathius and Eusebius, at whose request Philo himself had composed this little commentary. Whether this is so, I would not rashly venture to affirm. Concerning Philo, moreover, Suidas is witness in these words: Φίλων Καρπάθιος ἔγραψεν ὑπόμνημα εἰς ᾆσμα τῶν ᾀσμάτων [*so printed; the 16th-c. Greek type is hard*] — [that is, *Philo of Carpasia wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs*]. But concerning those [other Philos] I do not recall having read anything certain, nor at what time he lived. Stephen Salutatus of Pescia made these commentaries into Latin.

Philo the Jew [Philo Judaeus], an Alexandrian by fatherland, of Levitical blood, upon whom alone all the praises of the Christian fathers pour themselves out,[1] was placed by Eusebius and Jerome in the catalog of the Writers of the Church for this reason: that, writing a book *On the first church of Mark the Evangelist at Alexandria,* he adorned the nation of the Christians with wondrous encomia. This man indeed was, in the skill of Pythagorean, Platonic, and Aristotelian Philosophy, far superior to all the men of his age; and in Greek eloquence he easily held the first place among all — Christians, Jews, and Gentiles alike — of his age. Whence also by the Greeks themselves he was called *the Jewish Plato,* and there passed among them concerning him into a proverb, ἢ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει, ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει — that is, *Either Plato philonizes, or Philo platonizes* — so great was the resemblance of both in thought and in eloquence. Yet

there were not lacking those who ascribed to him an ignorance of his own, that is, of the Hebrew tongue. His works the Romans so greatly admired that they judged them worthy to be placed in their public Library, as certain monuments. He was besides — beyond what can be told — admirable in expounding the divine Scriptures, which he explained most excellently in a threefold sense according to the LXX edition, namely the literal, the moral, and especially the allegorical; in which kind of exposition indeed he so excelled that all the most ancient Doctors of the church imitated him in drawing out mystical allegories, as [the] first [→]

[→ p309: catchword "primum"]

[1] Philo the Jew praised the Christians.

(Rich PDF p. 309 [printed folio 290, verso]. Book IV, ***letter P*** *— the* ***Philo the Jew*** *entry continues: his allegorical genius; the classes of his Old-Testament works (the* Hebrew Names, *the* Epitome of the Chronicle, *the pseudo-Philonic* Biblical Antiquities*); then his catalog of Genesis works, laid out chapter by chapter with their Greek incipits. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter P — Philo the Jew, continued:]

...[they imitated him] as the first inventor and craftsman of the sacred allegories;[1] who, that he might set divine wisdom, as it were a queen, more honorably upon her throne, attended by the retinue of her handmaids, took up in his explanations innumerable [things] from the secular sciences — but especially concerning the natural disciplines according to the opinion of the Peripatetics, and concerning supra-mundane speculations according to the mind of Pythagoras and Plato.

He wrote, moreover, upon the Old Testament many and most noble volumes, which Eusebius, in the second [book] of the Ecclesiastical History, digested into three classes; that is: first, into books of continuous explanation; in the second, into books of questions, containing scattered [treatments] of the various chapters of Scripture, in which he both proposes and resolves the things that ought to be inquired into; third, into books of propositions, in which he treats the various sentences of Scripture in separate commentaries. To these classes can be added three other orders of his books, namely: the Grammatical, the Historical (or Paraphrastic), and the Chronographical — which he wrote for the understanding of the words, the histories, and the times contained in the sacred Letters.

From these little works, then, of so diverse a kind, I have found only the [following] written below — of which the greater part pertain to the Pentateuch — under diverse titles, partly translated into Latin by Lelio Tifernate and by Sigismund Gelenius, partly cited here and there by ancient authors. They are these:

- *On the interpretation of the Hebrew names which are found in the Old Testament, according to the order of the volumes of holy Scripture,* one book, arranged according to the series of the letters [alphabetically]: in which the etymologies, or properties, of all the names are explained in Greek with the utmost fidelity and diligence. To this Origen Adamantius added the interpretations of all the Hebrew words which are had in the New Testament, so that what Philo, as a Jew, had omitted, he himself, as a Christian, might supply. The blessed Jerome translated this book, prefixing a little preface which would attest the author of the work. It begins, *Philo, a most eloquent man,* etc.

- *An Epitome of the Chronicle,* that is, *A Breviary of the times:* in which, the fabulous reckonings of the Gentile historians being omitted, the whole number of the years from the beginning of the world up to Christ is reckoned most exactly and most faithfully, according to the truth of sacred Scripture, and according to the times of the life of the illustrious men of the Old Testament. This [work] John Annius of Viterbo, of the Order of Preachers, most splendidly illustrated with most copious commentaries, gathered out of Berosus, Metasthenes, Manetho, Xenophon, Fabius Pictor, and Cato. The beginning of the work is, *From Adam up to the flood.*

• The book which is entitled *Of Biblical Antiquities,* in which the whole Old Testament is run through in the manner of a brief history — but its phrasing everywhere smacking of a Hebraism, and its narrative abounding here and there in Apocryphal matters, indicate that the work is either not Philo's, or, if perchance it be his, that it was written by him not in Greek but in the Hebrew tongue. The beginning of the work is, *In the beginning of the world Adam begot three sons.* Of which I have seen only a fragment, that is, from the generation of the sons of Adam up to the death of Saul, the first king of the Jews.

On the whole book of Genesis, according to the edition of the LXX interpreters, [he wrote] very many [works] — under diverse titles, most elegant little Greek works, distinguished by the threefold kind of explanation, that is: into Commentaries of continuous exposition; into Commentaries of propositions set forth from Genesis; and into Commentaries of questions and solutions. Of which little works I have found only thirty-five books, for the greater part printed by the typographers, the rest cited partly by various ancient authors, partly by Philo himself. The inscriptions of all these, [their] arguments and beginnings, arranged by us for the first time according to the series of the chapters of Genesis, are these:

• On the first chapter of Genesis, περὶ τῆς κοσμοποιίας — that is, *On the Fabric of the World,* or *On that generation of the world which Moses describes,* one book: in which the words of the whole first chapter are explained sublimely and copiously, with a literal and allegorical explanation. The book begins, τῶν ἄλλων νομοθετῶν — [*The other lawgivers...*][2]

• On Genesis ch. 2, *On the allegories of the sacred Law after the work of the six days,* book one: in which all the things narrated from the beginning of the second chapter are expounded allegorically, up to those words of the same chapter, *In whatever hour you shall eat, you shall die the death.* The book's beginning is, *So the heavens were finished,* etc.

• On Genesis ch. 3, *On the allegories of the sacred Law,* book 2: containing the allegorical exposition of those words, *And Adam hid himself,* up to those, *Thou art earth, and unto earth shalt thou return.* The book's opening is, Ἄδυμα εἰσηγέναι [*so printed; corrupt*] — [that is,] *A doctrine is introduced.*

• On Genesis ch. 3, *On the Cherubim and the flaming sword, and on Cain, who was the first born of man,* one book: in which the words of Moses are narrated in a threefold sense, from that place, *And the Lord drove Adam out of Paradise,* up to that place in chapter 4, *I have gotten a man through God.* The book has this beginning: καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὸν Ἀδάμ — that is, *And the Lord drove out Adam.*

• On Genesis ch. 4, *On the sacrifices of Abel and Cain,* one book: in which that place is explained, *And again she bore his brother Abel,* up to that place of the same chapter, *Under thee shall be thy appetite,* etc. The book's beginning is, καὶ προσέθηκε τεκεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ἀβέλ — that is, *And she went on to bear his brother Abel.*

• On Genesis ch. 5 [*so printed; the content is Genesis 4*], *On [the fact] that the worse is wont to lie in wait for the better,* one book, explaining the remainder of this chapter from that sentence, *And Cain said, Let us go forth abroad,* up to that, *Cain went out from the face of the Lord.* The book so begins: καὶ εἶπε Κάϊν πρὸς Ἀβέλ — *And Cain said to Abel.*

• On Genesis ch. 5, *On the succession of the human race,* one book, containing the narration of the genealogy, or posterity, of Adam. The book begins, Ἀδὰμ ἐγένετο — *Adam begot three sons.*

• On Genesis chapter 6, *On the Giants,* one book, expounding those words at the beginning of the chapter, *And when men had begun to multiply,* up to those, *After the sons of God went in to the daughters of men.* The book begins, καὶ ἐγένετο — *And it came to pass,* etc. *One must inquire, I think, why after,* etc.

[→ p310 (next batch): catchword "In"]

[1] Philo was the supreme craftsman of Allegories. [2] Empedocles wrote a book *On the Making of the World* [Cosmopoeia], of whom Aristotle makes mention in the Metaphysics.

*(Rich PDF p. 310 [printed folio 291, recto]. Book IV, **letter P** — the **Philo the Jew** entry continues: his catalog of works on Genesis, chapter by chapter (with their Greek incipits), then the* Questions and Solutions, *the further attested Genesis works, and the sum of his thirty-five Genesis books. The 16th-c. Greek type is hard throughout — rendered as best readable and flagged where corrupt. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter P — Philo the Jew, continued:]

• On Genesis ch. 6, *That God is unchangeable,* one book: in which those words are explained, *After the sons of God went in,* etc., and, *It repents me that I made man,* up to those, *The end of all flesh is come before me.* The book so begins, καὶ μετ᾽ ἐκεῖνο φησίν — *And after this he says.*

• On Genesis ch. 9, *On Agriculture,* one book, expounding that proposition, *And Noah, a husbandman, began to till the earth;* in which he treats of the spiritual cultivation of the soul through the virtues. Its beginning is, καὶ ἤρξατο Νῶε — *And Noah began.*

• On Genesis ch. 9, *On the planting of Noah,* one book, upon that saying, *Noah planted a vineyard.* [Incipit] ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ βιβλίῳ — *In the first book indeed.*

• On Genesis ch. 9, *On the drunkenness of Noah,* one book, upon that saying, *And Noah, drinking wine, became drunk;* its beginning is, ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσόφοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης — *The things said by other philosophers concerning drunkenness;* in which he narrates what Noah's drunkenness mystically signifies.

• On Genesis ch. 9, *On the sobering of Noah,* one book, upon that saying, *But Noah, awaking from the wine,* etc.; which begins, Τὰ περὶ μέθης — *After those things which [were said] concerning drunkenness.*

• On Genesis ch. 11, *On the confusion of tongues,* one book, upon that [text], *And the earth was of one lip [language],* etc.; which begins, περὶ μὲν δὴ τούτων ἀρκέσει τὰ εἰρημένα — *Concerning these things, let what has been said suffice.*

• On Genesis ch. 12, *On the migration of Abraham,* one book, upon that [text], *The Lord said to Abraham, Go forth from thy land,* up to that, *And he took Sara his wife.* Its beginning is, καὶ [εἶπε κύριος] [*so printed, corrupt*] — *And the Lord said.*

• On Genesis ch. 12, *On Abraham,* or *On the life of the wise man made perfect through doctrine,* or *On the unwritten laws,* one book: in which Philo expounds, historically and mystically, the life of Abraham and his several deeds, which are related from the beginning of chapter 12 up to chapter 23; showing that Moses, in Abraham, painted — in colors somehow living — the image and exemplar and law of the theoretical [contemplative] man, that is, of the man made wise through contemplation.[1] The book begins, τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἐν πέντε βιβλίοις — that is, *The five volumes of the sacred law.*

• On Genesis ch. 15, *On rewards,* one book, upon that [text], *I am thy reward exceeding great,* which I have not seen: yet it is cited by Philo in the preface of the book *On the heir of divine things.*

• On Genesis ch. 15, *On the heir of divine things,* or *Who is the heir of divine things,* one book: in which the whole fifteenth chapter is explained in a series of continuous exposition. The book's beginning is, ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βίβλῳ — *In the book immediately preceding.*

• On Genesis ch. 16, *On the union to be sought for the sake of acquiring erudition,* one book, upon that [text], *Now Sara, [Abraham's] wife, had not borne children,* up to that, *Sara therefore afflicting her.* In which book he shows allegorically that our soul is not fit to receive the offspring of good works from divine wisdom, unless it first unites with wisdom's handmaid — that is, with secular literature — by the example of Abraham, who could not receive offspring from Sara until after he had lain with Hagar, the Egyptian handmaid.[2] The book begins, Σάρρα ἦν γυνὴ Ἀβραάμ — *Now Sara was the wife of Abraham.*

• On Genesis ch. 16, *On fugitives,* one book, in which the words of Scripture are expounded from that place, *Sara therefore afflicting her,* up to the end of the same chapter. Its beginning is, καὶ ἐκάκωσεν αὐτὴν Σάρρα — *And Sara afflicted her.*

• On Genesis 17, *On circumcision,* one book, upon that [text], *[Every male among you] shall be circumcised,* etc.; in which it is delivered that circumcision was instituted by God for six causes — namely four natural [physical] and two mystical.[3] [Incipit] *The heads of the laws,* etc.

• On Genesis ch. 28, *On dreams,* one book — to which Philo testifies that he had also sent ahead another book on dreams, thus writing in the preface: *In the earlier treatise we spoke of the first kind of dreams divinely sent, when the heavenly Godhead of its own accord sends visions through sleep; we shall now speak of the latter kind, when our mind, once moved, seems by itself to divine and foretell what times to come may bring.* But in this book he explains the mystical signification of that famous dream of Jacob concerning the heavenly ladder, described in chapter 28. Jerome and Sophronius assert that Philo wrote five books *On dreams;* but of these I have seen none except this one, whose beginning is, ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸ ταύτης γραφή — *In the treatise immediately preceding.*

• On Genesis chapter 35, *On the change of names,* or *Why the names of certain [persons] were changed in the Scriptures,* one book, upon that [text], *Thou shalt no more be called Jacob, but Israel.* Which book, cited by Jerome and Sophronius, I have not yet seen.

• On Genesis ch. 37, *On the life of the civil [political] man,* or *On Joseph,* one book: in which the life and deeds of Joseph are narrated, and are expounded according to the things written from chapter 37 to the end of the book; and it is shown, by the example of Joseph, what sort [of man] the truly Political man is, and fit for the helm of the commonwealth.[4] The book begins, Τρεῖς μέν εἰσιν ἰδέαι — *There are indeed three kinds.*

Besides these he also wrote three books of *Questions and Solutions on the whole volume of Genesis,* which I have not yet seen; but I have read, under the name of Philo the Jew, a fragment of *Questions and Solutions on Genesis* — which indeed the very doctrine and phrasing prove to be [the work] of a Jewish man, yet not of Philo. For, besides that the name of Philo is cited more than once in the work itself, and his opinion is censured, there are also condemned in it, by name, the Apollinarist heretics, because they denied that a human soul was in Christ. Although I would not deny that this could have happened by the fault of an unskilled copyist, who inserted into the author's text those [remarks] which perhaps some studious person had noted, outside the text of the letter, in the margin of the book. But in this fragment are expounded allegorically almost the whole of chapters 25 and 27 of Genesis. Its beginning is, *Why was Isaac forty years old when he had married?*

Beyond the aforesaid books, Eusebius, Jerome, and Sophronius testify that Philo wrote on Genesis: *On the nature and discovery of things,* one book; *On the division of equal and unequal things,* one book; *On covenants,* two books. And this is the sum of the thirty-five books of Philo on Genesis; from which Basil and Ambrose borrowed much in their commentaries on Genesis, as we shall note below. He is said also to have composed many other excellent works on Genesis, which [→]

[→ p311: catchword "quae"]

[1] Abraham [is] the exemplar of the contemplative man. [2] What Abraham's union with Sara signifies allegorically. [3] The six causes of circumcision. [4] Joseph [is] the exemplar of the political man.

*(Rich PDF p. 311 [printed folio 292, verso]. Book IV, **letter P** — the **Philo the Jew** entry concludes (his works on Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy; his floruit under Caligula–Claudius–Nero), then Photius, Pierius, Placido of Parma, Polychronius of Apamea, Pontius Carbonell, two "Precious Catenae," and the opening of Primasius. The 16th-c. Greek type is hard throughout — rendered as best readable and flagged where corrupt. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter P — Philo the Jew, continued:]

...[many other excellent works on Genesis] which are wholly hidden from me. Wolfgang Lazius, a Viennese, historian of the Imperial Majesty, says that there are extant in his own Library certain commentaries of Philo on Genesis and on Exodus, with a preface of St. Jerome, translated by an uncertain translator. He wrote after these:

On Exodus, 13 books, whose inscriptions and beginnings are these:

• *Of Questions and Solutions on Exodus,* five books.

• *On the life of Moses,* or *A universal history of a paraphrase* [of that] which is described in Exodus and the three following books, four books, whose beginning is, Μωσέως τοῦ κατά μέν τινας νομοθέτου — that is, *Of Moses, as some think, the lawgiver.*

• On Exodus ch. 20, *On the Decalogue,* which is the summary of the whole law, one book. [Incipit] Βίος τῶν κατὰ Μωσέα σοφῶν — that is, *The life of the wise men whom Moses [describes].*

• On Exodus ch. 20, *On the special laws,* which are referred to two precepts of the Decalogue — namely the sixth, against the lustful, and the seventh, against murderers — one book. [Incipit] ἦν ποτὲ χρόνος — *There was once a time.*

• On Exodus ch. 20, *On the Judge and witnesses,* which pertains to the penultimate precept of the Decalogue, one book. [Incipit] *It pleases some.*

• On Exodus ch. 25, περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς — that is, *On the Tabernacle,* one book.

On Leviticus, *On monarchy,* one book — which is entitled THE SECOND — treating of the conditions and offices of the priests, enumerated in Leviticus. Its beginning is, Τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω — *The highest indeed.*

• *On the rewards and honors of the priests,* described in Leviticus, one book. [Incipit] Τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν — that is, *To the priests,* etc.

• *On the Victims,* or *On the animals fit for sacrifice, and on the kinds of victims* which are related in Leviticus, one book. [Incipit] τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱερουργίαις ζώων — *[On] the animals which [are used] in the sacrifices.*

• *On those offering the victims,* or *what sort the offerers of victims ought to be,* one book. [Incipit] Βούλεται τὸν ἄγοντα τὰς θυσίας — that is, *[He] wishes that the one bringing the sacrifices [should be...].*

On Deuteronomy, four books *of propositions expounded,* whose inscriptions and beginnings are these:

• On Deuteronomy 17, upon that [text], *Thou shalt not be able to make a man of another nation king:* one book, explaining what conditions the one to be chosen as ruler requires. Its beginning is, ἔνιοί τὰς κληρωτὰς εἰσηγήσαντο ἀρχάς — [*Some have introduced offices [assigned] by lot.*]

• On Deuteronomy 20 and 22, *On fortitude,* one book: in which he abridged and expounded the precepts of those setting out to war, which are had in Deuteronomy 20, and the precepts pertaining to dress — both men's and women's — from chapter 22 of Deuteronomy. The beginning of the work is, *On justice, and on these things,* etc.; in whose preface he testifies that he wrote two other books — one *On Justice,* the other *On Modesty.*

• On Deuteronomy 23, one book, *On the harlot's wage not to be received into the sanctuary,* upon that [text], *Thou shalt not offer the wage of a prostitute.* Which begins, Πάνυ καλῶς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς τοῦ νόμου — *Very beautifully, in the sacred [books] of the law.*

• On Deuteronomy 28, one book. Περὶ εὐλογιῶν καὶ ἐπιτιμιῶν — that is, *On the rewards, penalties, and curses* which God sets before those who observe or neglect the laws [both human and divine]. Its beginning is, τοῦ προφήτου Μωϋσέως λογίων — *Of the sayings of Moses the Prophet.*

He is also said to have written many other things on Moses, which have not come to my hands. He flourished under the Emperor Caius [Caligula] — to whom he was sent as ambassador of his nation — and under the Emperors Claudius and Nero, up to the fiftieth year of our salvation.

Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, diligent in gathering the opinions of the Fathers, excerpted from various commentaries of authors most praiseworthy scholia on all the Epistles of Paul: a great part of which is read in the Catena of expositions of Oecumenius. He flourished under Michael [III], with his mother Theodora, in the year of the Lord 810 [*so printed; Photius flourished rather c. 858–886*].

Pierius, a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, under the Princes Caius [*so printed; = Carus*] and Diocletian, at the time when Theonas the Bishop governed that same church, most flourishingly taught the people, and came to such elegance of discourse and of diverse treatises that he was called *Origen the Younger*. It is established that he [lived] wonderfully in an ascetic manner [ἀσκητικῶς], a lover of voluntary poverty, most learned in the dialectic and rhetorical art; and that after the persecution he spent all the time of his life at Rome. He left a very long treatise on the Prophet Hosea, which he poured out upon the exordium of this Prophet, on the day of the vigils of the Lord's Passion, in an extempore and eloquent discourse. Thus Jerome, in the Catalog and in the preface to Hosea. He also wrote most copious commentaries on the first Epistle to the Corinthians, of which Jerome makes mention in the letter to Pammachius, which begins, *Of Christian modesty*. He flourished under the Emperor Diocletian, in the year of the Lord 290.

Placido of Parma [Placidus Parmensis], of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], a theologian celebrated in our times, left an explanation on all the Psalms of David — notable for its erudition, elegance, and brevity — which the Venetian Academy lately printed with its own types, dedicated to Henry, king of the French [Henri II]. He dies in the year of the Lord 1558.

Polychronius, bishop of Apamea, brother of Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, and a hearer of Diodore, bishop of Tarsus, teaching excellently both by life and by word, wrote Greek commentaries on Job and on Ezekiel: very many fragments of which are had in the Greek Catena of explanations on Job; and in the volume of John Damascene against the destroyers of images [the iconoclasts] some [passages] are cited. He flourished in the year of the Lord 400.

Pontius Carbonell [Pontius Carbonellus], of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], teacher of St. Louis, king of France, wrote a Postil on both Testaments.

A Precious Catena, upon forty Psalms, following [each other] in number and order, gathered from the Orthodox fathers in the Latin tongue, and not yet printed, is had at Venice in the most noble Academy of the Venetians.

A Precious Greek Catena on all the Prophets, both major and minor, gathered from the explanations of the most excellent Fathers, is extant, written by hand, in the renowned Academy of the Venetians — which we hope will shortly come forth into the light.

Primasius, bishop of Utica in Africa, a disciple (as is believed) of St. Augustine, gathered, on all the epistles of Paul, from [the works] of Ambrose, Je-[rome →]

[→ p312: catchword "ronymi"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 312 [printed folio 293, recto]. Book IV, **letter P** — Primasius concluded, then Proba Falconia (the Virgilian cento), Proclus of Constantinople, Procopius of Gaza, Prosper of Aquitaine, and Michael Psellus. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter P, continued:]

...[Primasius] gathered, on all the epistles of Paul, from the monuments of Jerome, Augustine, and the other Fathers, a *Collectanea;* in which he inveighs so against the Pelagians, in defense of grace, that at times he seems to prejudge the liberty of our will and our merits. Their beginning is, *First we must understand.* He also wrote to Castorius commentaries on the Apocalypse, of a mystical exposition, gathered both from Augustine's explanations and from the commentaries of Tyconius the African — from which, separating, as it were, gems from dung, he culled only those things which were to be chosen, omitting those which were not consonant with sound doctrine. The work begins, *Thou, illustrious man.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 440.

Proba Falconia, an illustrious woman, wife of Adelphius the Roman proconsul, a matron of rare and elegant genius, most highly learned in Greek and Latin, most devoted to the divine letters, and, as it were, a second Latin Sappho of the Christians, first of all [women] devised to describe in verse the various Passages of both Testaments out of the verses of Virgil Maro, whom she held whole in her memory. Having therefore excerpted, here and there from Virgil's poem, now whole verses, now hemistichs and portions of hemistichs, she gathered the intended work — like a cento sewn together from many precious rags and shreds, the law of the hexameter being preserved — and entitled it *THE VIRGILIAN CENTOS* [Virgiliocentonas]. Its beginning is:

> *Iandudum temerasse duces pia foedera pacis — That the leaders had long since violated the pious covenants of peace.*

Fulgosio [Battista Fregoso], in his Collectanea, relates that the same woman composed this very thing in Homeric verses. There are some who think that by the works of this woman the city of Rome first came into the power of the Goths, in the year 1164 from its founding. For, when Alaric, King of the Goths, had already for two years been besieging the city, and the Roman populace, without any hope of aid, was falling everywhere by famine and by disease after the manner of cattle, Proba, pitying the common calamity, opened a gate to the Goths — judging it more tolerable to endure the rule of barbarians than that the whole city should perish by famine and plague. She flourished under Honorius and Theodosius the Younger, about the year of the Lord 430.

Proclus, after Maximian [bishop] of Constantinople, was from his earliest age a Lector, and devoted himself to contemplative study; but when he had grown to manhood, he was frequently present with John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, and had been the amanuensis of his books; by whom he was ordained deacon and presbyter, then [became] Bishop of Cyzicus, afterward of Constantinople, and was most dear to Theodosius the Younger. When the Scythians, under their leader Rugas [Rua], had taken up arms against the Roman empire, he published, on the Prophecy of Ezekiel chapter 39, *Son of man, prophesy against Gog and Magog,* a most brilliant oration; in which, adapting the prophecy to the occasion of the present war, he foretold that the penalties predicted by Ezekiel were threatening the Barbarians — which prediction God immediately confirmed by fire sent down from heaven, the chief of the Barbarians being consumed by the conflagration. He also wrote, upon that [text] of Isaiah 9, *A child is born to us,* one sermon, whose beginning is, Τὸ παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν — [*A child is born to us*] — which Theodorus the Monk cites in the book *That the Father always begets.* He flourished under Theodosius the Younger, in the year of the Lord 400.

Procopius of Gaza [Procopius Gazaeus], a sophist, a Christian, a man liberally educated and eloquent in Greek speech, composed first, in the Greek tongue, *Narrative-Expositions on the Octateuch,* which he gathered with great diligence from the Orthodox fathers and from other Greek authors, following various monuments and homilies of pious men. But since he had set forth in that work the opinions of the several [authors], with the words not even changed, caring little whether they disagreed among themselves or agreed, and since his volume had thence grown to an immense size, he resolved to reduce the size of the volume a little; and, that this might be done more conveniently, he determined to say once [only] those things in which

the authors unanimously agreed, but wherever they differed, in order that this might be made known to the reader, he explained these in very few words — wishing to reduce the interpretations of all into the consonance of a perfect body, from which, as from a single fountain, the Reader might draw the explanations of all, as if one man, and he alone, were speaking. But, that everything might be more clear and perspicuous, he sometimes added something of his own as well. He is fuller on Genesis and Exodus, more compressed on the six following books, in which he gathered, as it were, certain annotations. He expounds according to the fourfold understanding of the divine Scripture, [using] not only the editions of the Seventy interpreters, of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and the codices of the Samaritans and the Jews, but also the version of St. Jerome — whom he often cites by name — turned by Sophronius from Latin into Greek. The beginning of the work is: *Before, indeed, with God kindly favoring the undertaking,* etc. He wrote, in the same order and with the same care, a commentary on Isaiah, which — not yet turned into Latin — is preserved in the Marcian Library of the Venetians. He flourished, as far as we could reach by conjecture, under the Emperor Anastasius, in the year of the Lord 500.

Prosper [of Aquitaine], bishop of Reggio of Flaminia in Italy, an Aquitanian by nation, formerly a notary of Pope Leo the First, a man of keen wit, of compressed, sinewy, and elegant diction, having — together with sanctity of life — great erudition in divine and human matters, wrote, on the last fifty Psalms (that is, from the hundredth Psalm up to the last) very brief commentaries according to the literal and the spiritual sense, comprised in a terse and pointed kind of exposition, whose beginning is, *Mercy and judgment*, etc. *This Psalm, from the first verse,* etc. Likewise, three books *On the promises and predictions of God,* in which he elucidated all the prophecies and promises concerning Christ and the Church expressed in the sacred letters. The book's opening is, *The whole rationale of faith [Omnis fidei ratio]*. He flourished under Leo the Great, Augustus, in the year of the Lord 460.

Psellus [Michael Psellus], a Greek author, wrote on the Song of Songs, to Stephephorus, brief and clear commentaries, whose beginning is, *Since your mind, O Stephephorus, [is] eager to learn.*

[→ p313: catchword "RABA" (Rabanus)]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 313 [printed folio 294, verso]. Book IV — **letter R opens** with Rabanus Maurus (his 172 books of commentaries; a work-list), then Radulph of Flavigny, Rainuldus of Piperno, Rainerius Snoy of Gouda, Remigius of Auxerre, and Remigio de' Nannini. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

R

Rabanus Magnentius Maurus [Hrabanus Maurus], the sixth Archbishop of Mainz, a German by nation, from the city of Fulda in Buchonia, formerly the fourth Abbot of the monastery of Fulda, of the Order of St. Benedict, a hearer of Albinus the Englishman [Alcuin], a man most consummate in the knowledge of all the disciplines — Rhetor, Poet, astronomer, Philosopher, and Theologian, to whom Germany had no equal in that age. He, I say, offended by the wickedness of his monks, who condemned him because — too intent on the studies of the sacred letters — he neglected temporal things, deserted the ungrateful ones and betook himself to Louis Augustus, and remained with him some months, the monks earnestly recalling him (of their deed they had already repented); but they did not prevail, God so willing, who a little afterward, to their confusion, took him up to the Archbishopric of Mainz. He, then, while he was still in his monastery, at the urging of Freculf, Bishop of Lisieux, and of the Augusti Louis and Lothair, composed on all the divine Scriptures, according to the sense of the letter and the spiritual understanding, 172 books of commentaries; which he gathered from all the Latin Fathers, in a continuous series from Jerome down to Bede, everywhere preserving their sayings and their meanings; and in those places where he did not find an exposition of the Fathers, he used his own explanations, noting at the head of the pages the names both of himself and of the

other interpreters, whose opinions he had fitted together in the codices, so that the reader might know both what he had from the Fathers and what from him, and by what judgment each thing was to be read. Besides these, he also gathered, on the whole divine Scripture, a *Dictionary of mystical significations*, most useful for the spiritual senses of the holy volumes. Of these volumes I have read only the [following] written below, printed, their beginnings for the greater part different from those which Trithemius noted in his catalog:

- On Genesis, to Freculf, Bishop of Lisieux, 4 books — [incipit] *The endeavor of the men of old.*
- On Exodus, to the same, 4 books — *Among the other scriptures.*
- On Numbers, to the same, 4 books — *The book of Numbers.*
- On Deuteronomy, to the same, 4 books — *These things, therefore, having been run through.*
- On Ecclesiasticus, to Otgar the Archbishop, 10 books — *Knowing [your] benevolence.*
- On Jeremiah, to the Emperor Lothair, 18 books — *After the little commentaries.*
- On Lamentations, to the same, 3 books — *The last part of Jeremiah.*

...which the typographers, inserted among the Hieronymian works and falsely inscribed with the title of JEROME, sell. The beginnings of his other lucubrations, not yet seen by us, you have in Trithemius. He flourished in the year of the Lord 855.

Radulph [Ralph of Flavigny], a Benedictine monk of the monastery of Flavigny — or, as others say, of Fulda in Germany — a man most distinguished in his time in the more polished letters, and, in expounding the divine Scriptures, having obtained a divine genius, published twenty books of commentaries on Leviticus; in which he explained all the mysteries of this book so eloquently, piously, and learnedly, both according to the historical and according to the spiritual sense, that in comparison with him the other expositors of the same book seem hardly to have expounded [it] at all. The opening of the work is, *When once, among friends, a discourse chanced [to arise] concerning the contentions of the Jews.* He also wrote fourteen books on all the epistles of Paul. He flourished in the year of the Lord 910 [*so printed; Radulph of Flavigny flourished rather in the 12th century*].

Rainuldus of Piperno [Reginald of Piperno], of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], gathered from the explanations of St. Thomas Aquinas a scholastic Lecture on the Gospel of John, beginning, *I saw the Lord.* It is extant, written by hand, in the Dominican Library at Bologna.

Rainerius Snoy of Gouda [Rainerius Snoygoudanus], a physician, gathered from Jerome, Arnobius, Augustine, Cassiodorus, and other ancient fathers a Paraphrase — or rather Scholia — on all the Psalms of David; which he so explained that not even a single word was omitted by him, with little glosses interposed within the text, so welded together that, unless the words of the Psalm were distinguished by different type-characters, these could not be told apart from those; adding also, at the end of the several Psalms, some pious little prayers, drawn from the very bowels of the preceding Psalm. The work begins, *The sacrosanct Psalter.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Remigius of Auxerre [Antisiodorensis], a bishop [*so printed; Remigius of Auxerre was a monk, not a bishop*], a Benedictine monk, most learned in divine and human letters, illustrious in doctrine and sanctity, wrote a succinct narrative-exposition on all the Psalms; in which he compressed most briefly whatever Ambrose, Augustine, and Cassiodorus wrote on the Psalms, with additions also, and thoughts interspersed of his own, not wholly to be despised. The work begins, *It must be said what Prophecy is.* He wrote likewise, with similar industry, five books on the Pentateuch.

- On the Song of Songs, one book — [incipit] *Solomon inspired.*
- On the 12 Prophets, twelve books.
- On Matthew, one book.

• On all the epistles of Paul, 14 books.

He flourished under Charles the Bald, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 880.

Remigio de' Nannini [Remigius de Nanninis], a Florentine, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], a professor of Theology, a poet of elegant genius and skilled in histories, wrote on the sacred Books of both Testaments *Annotations* not to be regretted; in which he embraced most diligently the history of illustrious men, and the description of the animals, plants, stones, mountains, rivers, cities, towns, and other such things which the divine Scripture mentions here and there. He also gathered a volume of *Scholia* on the encyclical readings of the Epistles and Gospels [the lectionary], published in the Italian tongue, and rendered the Psalms of David into Tuscan verses. He lives up to the present year of our salvation 1566, being 44 years old.

[→ p314: catchword "RÆTHI"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 314 [printed folio 295, recto]. Book IV, **letter R** — Reticius of Autun, Richard of Cluny, Richard of Exeter, Richard Lavenham, Richard Middleton, the long Richard of St. Victor (with a work-list), Richard Rolle of Hampole, Rhodon the Asian, and the opening of Rudolph Agricola. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter R, continued:]

Rhaethicius [Reticius], bishop of Autun of the Aedui, reputed a Churchman of most celebrated fame in Gaul, was sent to Rome by the Emperor Constantine, under Pope Sylvester, on account of the affair of the Montenses [the Donatists]; where he had earlier taken part, under Pope Miltiades, together with those who had condemned Donatus, the author of the schism, and had absolved Caecilian, Bishop of the Church of Carthage. He published commentaries on the Song of Songs; of whom Jerome, writing to Marcella, approves the eloquence, raised on the Gallic buskin [cothurnus], but disapproves the erudition and the judgment. He lived in the year of the Lord 320.

Richard, a Monk of Cluny, learned and pious, composed a book, entitled τῶν ἀντικειμένων — that is, *Of Contraries,* or *Of things set in opposition* — comprising questions from both Testaments that seem to conflict, and their clear solutions, explained by question and answer in a terse brevity; whose beginning is, *Why in Genesis seven,* etc. Alfonso [de Castro] of Zamora, in book 14 against heresies, attributes this work to Salvian, bishop of Marseilles. He flourished under Frederick the First, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1160.

Richard of Exeter, an Englishman, wrote a Postil on the Psalms, in the year of the Lord one thousand three hundred and thirty [1330].

Richard Lavenham, a Carmelite, an Englishman, wrote a Scholastic Postil on Isaiah, in the year of the Lord one thousand three hundred and eighty-one [1381].

Richard Middleton [Mediavilla], a Scot, of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], most highly learned in the divine Scriptures, in Pontifical [canon] law, and in secular doctrines, wrote, in scholastic discourse, on the four Gospels, four books — one on each — in the year of the Lord 1290.

Richard, a monk and Prior of the monastery of St. Victor at Paris [Richard of St. Victor], of the Order of Augustinian Canons, a man conspicuous for the honesty of his life and for the doctrine of his erudition, subtle in wit, and in eloquence walking a middle path between the sharpness of Augustine and the sweetness of Bernard, wrote many little works on the divine Scriptures of the mystical sense, in which he instructs the understanding, kindles the affection, and advances and draws forth the reader's zeal to greater things. Of their number are:

• An *Epitome* of the whole divine Scripture, one book.

• On Genesis ch. 14, *On Melchizedek, mystically,* one book.

• On Genesis ch. 15, *On the sacrifice of Abraham, mystically,* 1 book.

• On Genesis ch. 49, *On the blessings of the Patriarchs,* 1 book.

• On Exodus 26, *On the tabernacle of the covenant,* two books — one according to the letter, the other mystically.

• On the 3rd book of Kings, from ch. 6, *On the Temple of Solomon, according to the letter,* one book.

• On the same book, a *Chronography,* to St. Bernard, one book — most necessary for the understanding of the things written from chapter 12 of the 3rd [book] of Kings up to the end of the fourth [book] of Kings; in which is treated *On the division of the kingdom of Judah and Israel,* and *On the concord of the times of the kings co-reigning over Judah and over Israel.* And there are in it two tables, of which the first represents those things which make and bring about the contrariety of the times of the kings co-reigning over Judah and over Israel; but the second shows the concord of the same co-reigning kings over Judah and Israel. The book begins, *In these things which [are] in the book of Kings.*

• On the Song of Songs, commentaries of an interpolated explanation, which expound spiritually the various sentences of the same book here and there. At the beginning of the work is prefixed the preface of the fourth book of the Dialogues of St. Gregory, in these words, *After [I had spoken] of the joys of paradise.*

• On that [text] of Isaiah 7, *Behold, a virgin shall conceive,* two books, entitled *On Emmanuel;* in which, to refute the perfidy of the Jews, he most strongly shows that the aforesaid prophecy cannot be understood except of the Virgin Mary. The work begins, *Behold, a virgin.*

• On the description of the temple of Ezekiel, a literal explanation being applied, in which — with most fitting pictures and geometrical demonstrations — he expressed most diligently the several parts of the temple. The beginning of the work is, *About to speak of the building of Ezekiel.*

• On the whole of Daniel, one book of mystical explanation, cited by Trithemius; which, when I had long sought and not found, I at last found a great part of in the compendium of Allegories of Godfrey Tilmann on the book of Daniel.

• One book of explanation of many difficult Passages in all the epistles of Paul, which begins, *If those things which [are said] of the law.*

• On the Apocalypse, a notable work according to the seven visions which John saw, divided into seven books; whose beginning is, *Receive, brother.*

He flourished under Conrad III, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1140.

Richard of Hampole [Richard Rolle], an Anglo-Saxon, a hermit, a man of sincere piety and erudition, wrote on the Psalter a compendious and lucid exposition, beginning, *Great spiritual joy.* Likewise, on the lections which are read in the suffrages [Office] of the dead, from the seventh and tenth chapters of Job, two books, of which he gathered the latter from the sayings of St. Gregory. The beginning of the work is, *My soul is weary.* He also wrote, on the twentieth Psalm, a particular little book, beginning, *When Christ.* And on the Lamentations of Jeremiah, one book, opening, *The Lamentations, as Jerome says.*

Rhodon the Asian [Asianus], a hearer and disciple of Tatian in the holy Scriptures, composed in the Greek tongue, on the first chapter of Genesis — which by the Greeks is called HEXAEMERON — most elegant treatises, or homilies to the people; in which he most strongly refuted especially the heresy of Apelles the Marcionite, who asserted that the whole world was created by an evil God. He flourished in the times of the Emperors Commodus and Severus, in the year of the Lord 200.

Rudolph Agricola [Rodolphus Agricola], a Frisian, the chief of all the most learned men of his time, a Philosopher, Rhetor, and most noble poet, [most learned in] Greek, [→]

[→ p315: catchword "Graecae"]

*(Rich PDF p. 315 [printed folio 296, verso]. Book IV, **letter R** — Rudolph Agricola (concl.), Rudolph Bayne, Rudolph Lange, Rufinus of Aquileia, Rupert the Gaul, Rupert Goullet, Rupert Holcot, Robert Grosseteste, Rupert of Limburg, Rupert Rose, Rupert the Englishman, and the great Rupert of Deutz (*On the Holy Trinity and Its Works, *42 books — the Index begins). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter R, continued:]

...[Rudolph Agricola,] excellently skilled in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, translated the Psalter from the Hebrew truth, which is highly commended by those learned in the Hebrew tongue. He flourished under Frederick III, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1485.

Rudolph Bayne [Rudolphus Baynus], of Cambridge, most learned in the sacred eloquences, and public professor at Paris of all the tongues, and especially of the holy tongue [Hebrew], wrote to Henry, King of the French, three books of commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon; in which he pursued the historical sense — before nearly untouched by other expositors — according to the property of the Hebrew tongue, with a clear and open exposition, the allegorical and more sublime senses not being neglected.[1] The preface of the work so begins, *It is a glorious thing for the great fathers.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1553.

Rudolph Lange [Rudolphus Langius], a German, a Canon of the church of Münster in Westphalia, a man adorned with all the arts and sciences, of singular genius and eloquence, wrote to Hermann Lange, a deacon of the same church, two not-useless books *On the city of Jerusalem,* for the understanding of the things which the divine Scripture mentions concerning the affairs of Jerusalem; in which he set forth brilliantly the ancient form, site, and state of that city. The beginning of the work is, *Of the once most splendid city.* He flourished under the Emperor Maximilian, in the year of the Lord 1444.

Rufinus Turranius [Tyrannius Rufinus], a monk, presbyter of the Church of Aquileia, at the request of Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, wrote to him, in the Latin tongue, one book *On the blessing of the Patriarch Judah,* according to the threefold sense of the divine Scripture; whose beginning is, *The more I excuse myself to you.* Then, the same Paulinus urgently demanding [it], he published another book to the same, in which he pursued, with a threefold explanation, the blessings of the other eleven Patriarchs. The book begins, *First it must be known.* He also wrote on Hosea one book, on Amos one book, and on Joel one book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 400.

Rupert the Gaul [Rupertus Gallus], a Carmelite, a professor of Scholastic Theology, a declaimer eloquent in his own tongue, and a not-contemptible expositor of the holy Scriptures, wrote on all the epistles of Paul fourteen books, in the year of the Lord 1350.

Rupert Goullet [Rupertus Goulletus], a doctor of the Parisian Academy, gathered from the four Evangelists a single body of the Gospel history, which he entitled *TETRAMENON EVANGELICUM* [The Fourfold Gospel]. Its beginning is, *Although the doctors.*

Rupert Holcot [Robert Holcot], an Englishman by nation, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], greatly exercised in Scholastic Theology, and outstanding in expounding the holy Scriptures, wrote a *Lecture on the book of Wisdom,* which begins, *The Lord [is] my rock;* and a *Lecture on the Song of Songs.* But most recently he composed, on the first seven chapters of Ecclesiasticus, a scholastic Lecture divided into eighty-eight lections, filled with copious and subtle erudition, which he left unfinished, overwhelmed by a sudden death from that sharp pestilence which was under Charles IV, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1300 [*so printed; Holcot died in the plague of 1349*]. The work begins, *Master and lord Gandisalvus.*

Rupert [Robert Grosseteste], Bishop of Lincoln, surnamed Grosseteste, having obtained the first place among the Philosophers and Theologians of his age, most subtle in the keenness of his wit, most brief in speech, and most copious in the weight of his sentences, wrote succinct commentaries on the whole Psalter;

whose beginning is, *The book of the Psalms, in Greek.* They are extant, written by hand, at Bologna in the Dominican Library. He flourished under the Emperor Conrad, in the year of the Lord 1140 [*so printed; Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, belongs rather to the 13th century*].

Rupert, Abbot of Limburg, a Benedictine monk, a German by nation, a man illustrious for sanctity and for divine revelations, formerly a celebrated philosopher in the Academy of Paris, and after his entry into religion most skilled by assiduous meditation in the holy Scriptures, published, in an open, simple, and not inelegant style, four books of *Commentaries on the Song of Songs;* whose beginning is, *Whoever [understands] the nature of his own self.* He flourished under Henry the Fifth, Emperor, in the year of the Lord 1124.

Rupert Rose [Rupertus Roseus], an Englishman, a Carmelite, wrote on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Ecclesiasticus a scholastic Postil. In the year of the Lord 1420.

Rupert the Englishman, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], a Scholastic by profession, made a Postil on Job, on Daniel, on John, on Matthew, and on Luke; which is seen at Bologna in the Dominican Library.

Rupert, Abbot of Deutz [Tuitiensis], near Cologne, a Benedictine by profession, a German by nation, a man most learned in the divine Scriptures — the Holy Spirit illuminating him through vision — outstanding in eloquence; at the urging of Cuno, Abbot of Siegburg (afterward Archbishop of Regensburg), gathered, on all the divine Scriptures, excellent terse commentaries of varied sense — and especially very many of the allegorical [sense] — from the writings of the Fathers: from which is derived a notable volume, whose title is *ON THE HOLY TRINITY AND ITS WORKS,* on both Testaments, to Cuno, Abbot of Siegburg — 42 books. Which work he so divided into three parts, that the first part contains the proper works of the Father in three books, that is, from the first creation of the world up to the casting-out of Adam from Paradise; the second part has the proper works of the Son, which — from the casting-out of Adam up to the incarnation and death of the Son of God — were said and done in figures, prophecies, visions, and Scriptures on account of the Christ to come, in 30 books; and the third part concludes, in nine books, the proper works of the Holy Spirit — namely, [those] recited in the Scriptures from the incarnation of the Son of God up to the end of the age. Of which 42 books, all noted together, here is the Index:

FIRST PART. *On the holy Trinity, and on the works of the Father,* on the first three chapters of Genesis, three books of commentaries: of which the first begins, *Of all the Scriptures.*

SECOND PART. *On the Trinity, and on the works of the Son,* thirty books of commentaries. Namely: [→]

[→ p316: catchword "In"]

[1] The Genevan ministers corrupted the doctrine of this author.

(Rich PDF p. 316 [printed folio 297, recto]. Book IV — the Rupert of Deutz Index concludes (the Son's works, the Third Part, and his other commentaries), then Rupert Walsingham; then ***letter S opens*** *with Salonius of Vienne, Salvian of Marseilles, Sancho de Porta, and the great Santes Pagninus (his new Latin Bible). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter R — Rupert of Deutz's Index, continued (Second Part, the works of the Son):]

- On the Residue of the book of Genesis, 6 books of commentaries — [incipit] *A human creature.*
- On Exodus, 4 books of commentaries — *For what cause, or in what order.*
- On Leviticus, 2 books of commentaries — *This book.*
- On Numbers, 2 books of commentaries — *Opened in the Apocalypse.*
- On Deuteronomy, 2 books — *This book.*
- On Joshua, 1 book of commentaries — *In seven periods.*

• On Judges and Ruth, 1 book — *After the death of Joshua.*

• On the four books of Kings, the book of Psalms being adjoined, 1 book — *After the ample [reward] of virtue.*

• On Isaiah, 1 book — *Every soul which [seeks] Christ,* etc.

• On Jeremiah, 1 book — *The twilight of the fifth age of the world.*

• On Ezekiel, 1 book — *In this age of the world.*

• On Daniel, Zechariah, and Malachi together, 2 books — *Christ opening [it].*

• On the Maccabees, 1 book.

• On the volume of the four Evangelists, 1 book — *In the sixth age of the world.*

THIRD PART. *On the works of the Holy Spirit,* from the coming of Christ up to the end of the age, 9 books — [incipit] *The wrath of the Almighty.*

But besides these he also wrote, in a broader style, more commentaries on various books of Holy Scripture; among which are: *On the incarnation of the Lord,* on the Song of Songs according to the mystical sense, seven most learned books, whose beginning is, *Who against man;* on the XII Minor Prophets, to Frederick, Archbishop of Cologne, 30 books, of which the first begins, *To the Holy Spirit;* to Cuno the Abbot, *On the glory and honor of the Son of Man,* on Matthew, 13 books, whose beginning is, *You demand of me, O Christ-loving Cuno;* on John's Gospel, 14 books — [incipit] *The disciple whom* [Jesus loved], etc.; to Frederick, Archbishop of Cologne, 12 books of commentaries on the Apocalypse, whose beginning is, *That you too, O venerable Archbishop of the people of Cologne.* He dies in the year of the Lord 1124.

Rupert Walsingham [Rupertus Valsigen], an Englishman, a Carmelite, a Norwich man by fatherland, wrote, in scholastic manner, commentaries on Ecclesiasticus, in the year of the Lord 1310.

S

Salonius, Bishop of Vienne in Gaul, having entered the desert scarcely ten years old, nourished among the hands of the holy hermits, and there trained through all the disciplines of spiritual matters by Honoratus, and Hilary of Arles, and Salvian — most holy and most learned men — and at last imbued with the divine Letters, together with his brother Veranius (afterward a bishop), by Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, published many excellent commentaries on the holy Scriptures; of whose number there still survive brief commentaries on the Proverbs [Parables] and on the Ecclesiastes of Solomon, to his brother Veranius, composed in the manner of a dialogue: in which, under the persons of Salonius and Veranius, various little questions about the several chapters are explained through questions and answers. The beginning of the former commentary is, *Veranius: In what language are the Proverbs spoken?* But the opening of the second commentary is, *Veranius: By what names was Solomon called?* He flourished under Valentinian and Marcian, in the year of the Lord 450.

Salvian, Bishop of the Church of Marseilles [*so printed; Salvian was a presbyter of Marseilles*], copiously furnished with divine and human literature, a master of the bishops of his time, wrote, in a Latin, clear, and terse discourse, many most praiseworthy little works; but among others he composed, in most elegant verse, a book *From the beginning of Genesis up to the creation of the first man;* and likewise one book of commentaries on the last part of Ecclesiastes, to Claudianus, Bishop of Vienne; he also composed [a book] τῶν ἀντικειμένων — that is, one book *Of Passages set in opposition,* from both Testaments. He flourished under the Emperor Zeno, in the year of the Lord 480.

Sancho de Porta [Sanctius de Porta], of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], a scholastic by profession, venerable both in life and in erudition, wrote, in a rude and simple discourse, on the Lections of the gospels and epistles mixed together — which are read in the Church throughout the Sundays of the whole year —

two volumes of sermons, filled with pious morality. Volume 1 begins, *Looking from afar.* Volume 2, *This is the day which [the Lord] made,* etc.

Santes Pagninus [Sante Pagnini], of Lucca, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], an Apostolic preacher, a man exceedingly learned in the divine Scriptures, and most skilled in the three tongues, but especially in Hebrew — when he had observed that that famous version of Jerome had, by the injury of the times and the carelessness of men, either in great part fallen away or in great part been corrupted, he too attempted to undertake a new translation of the whole Scripture, Leo X, Supreme Pontiff, urging [him on] and supplying the funds necessary for the work. Having therefore compared among themselves many, and those the most approved, exemplars of the Hebrews, with the greatest diligence and fidelity he could, he gave the whole Old Testament into Latin from the Hebrew truth, and restored the multitude of Hebrew names — which earlier interpreters had bent into Latin forms — to the utterance of the Hebrew tongue. And, that the reader might have the correct method of pronouncing in Hebrew, he placed accents over the Hebrew words, with certain numbers added in the margin of the whole volume, which would indicate how many verses — which the Jews call *Pesukim* [*so printed* Pesuchim] — were contained in each chapter of the Hebrew scripture. All of which he executed with such skilful care that the most skilled Rabbis of the Hebrews prefer his edition to all the translations which now exist, extolling it with many praises. He also translated, with no less praise, the whole New Testa-[ment →]

[→ p317: catchword "men"]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 317 [printed folio 298, verso]. Book IV, **letter S** — Santes Pagninus's remaining works (the trilingual dictionary, the* Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae, *the two* Isagoges, *the Silver Chains), then Angelo Sangrino, and the great entry on the **Seventy-two Interpreters** (the Septuagint): the Aristeas legend and why the LXX passed over the testimonies to Christ. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter S — Santes Pagninus, continued:]

...[he translated the whole New Testa]ment according to the Greek text; in which, just as also in the Old Testament, he strove to follow the authority of the Vulgate edition, the sense of the Greek context being preserved. And he dedicated his work to Clement VII, Supreme Pontiff.

To these he added one book *On the interpretation of the Hebrew, Chaldaean, and Greek words contained in the sacred letters:* in which, according to the idiom of each language, he set the proper interpretations, derivations, and their compositions, with the books and chapters of the divine scripture cited; where each word is contained, just as it was interpreted and expounded by him.

The same [Pagninus] gathered, from all the Hebrew dictionaries of the Rabbis, a huge Hebrew Lexicon — not undeservedly called the *THESAURUS OF THE HOLY TONGUE* — in which he assembled, in abundant plenty, all the riches and wealth of the holy tongue, for the use of those who aspire to the Hebrew skill of the sacred letters.

He published besides, in imitation of Tyconius and Augustine, one book whose title is *ISAGOGE [Introduction] TO THE SACRED LETTERS:* in which he gathered from the ancient fathers many rules, highly necessary for expounding obscure phrases, figurative locutions, and the mystical senses of the divine scriptures. Its beginning is, *That the Hebrew tongue was...*

He also composed eighteen books of a similar subject, filled with an admirable abundance and variety of all heavenly matters, which he entitled *ISAGOGAE for understanding the mystical senses of sacred scripture,* because in them he treats of the mystical and spiritual senses of the sacred words according to the series of the letters, expounding almost the whole divine Scripture mystically under the pretext of this occasion. He was incited to this labor, as he himself indicates, by the example of St. Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, who

gathered a book of not-dissimilar subject, entitled *ON THE DIVINE FORMULAS,* from many monuments of the ancients. The beginning of the work is, *Seven demons.*

He gathered likewise, not without great labor, a huge work on the Pentateuch, distinguished into six large volumes, called the *SILVER CHAIN* [Catena Argentea]: in which he wove together the expositions of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, as if with certain links inserted into one another.

With similar industry he also gathered a *Silver Chain on the whole Psalter,* cut into three parts.

Likewise, on the whole of Psalm 118, a *Grammatical explanation of the Hebrew words,* most useful to beginners of the holy tongue, which is annexed to the Hebrew *Institution* [grammar] of the same author. He dies at Lyons in the year of the Lord 1541, and was buried there, in a marble tomb in the middle of the choir of the sacred church of the Preachers [Dominicans].

Sangrinus the Englishman, or **Angelo Sangrino** [Angelus Sangrinus], a not-ignoble poet, Abbot of Monte Cassino, composed a Paraphrase on the Psalter, wrought in various kinds of meter, which begins, *O how blessed [is he] whom I foretell.*

The Seventy-two Interpreters, Hebrews by nation, most wise and most holy men, first of all — as Philo and Epiphanius write — translated into the Greek tongue the whole Old Testament (which among the Jews was kept in twenty-two books),[1] at the urging of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second king of Egypt; who, since he greatly desired to build at Alexandria a Library celebrated in the whole world, commanded Demetrius of Phalerum, a most learned man, set over his Library, to procure from the whole world of lands as many volumes as he could — men being distributed through suitable places, who, with no reckoning of expense or labor, should both buy and transcribe the books. When therefore he had heard from those who had been sent that there were extant at Jerusalem the sacred Laws of the Jews, worthy of the royal Library, if they could be translated into Greek from the Hebrew tongue in which they were written, he brought a petition to the king, that he should summon Hebrew interpreters together with those books, who might faithfully transcribe them into Greek speech. This petition being accepted, the king wrote letters to Eleazar, the pontiff of the Jews, that from every tribe he should send to him six men — instructed indeed in the best morals, venerable in age, and most learned in the meditation of the Law itself — together with the Law of the Jews, so that, with many [men] interpreting with every keenness of mind and choosing some concordant [reading], they might accomplish a matter worthy of so great an effort.

When therefore six men from each of all the tribes of the Jews, sent by Eleazar, had come to the king, and he feared that they might not translate plainly and candidly the truth inserted in the divine volumes, but might of set purpose conceal some [part], he ordered them each to be kept in separate cells on the island of Pharos, and, placed there apart, to translate the same [text]. But by divine counsel it came about that they all, with the same words, the same names, and the same sentences, from beginning to end, turned the twenty-two volumes of the Old Instrument [Testament]; so that the king, and the Gentiles themselves, might manifestly recognize that those divine Scriptures had been translated not by human but by divine prompting — which Ptolemy the king, embracing with the highest joy, dedicated to his Library.

But it must be known that these seventy-two interpreters passed over, in their translation, many testimonies of the Prophets concerning Christ and the holy Trinity[2] — not indeed out of carelessness or malice, but by a pious and prudent counsel, and that they kept silent for no light reasons. In the first place, because, since they were translating before the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, they could not know many of the mysteries of the Christ to come, not yet fully perceived in those ages — God so disposing that all the mysteries of his divinity should be reserved to be disclosed, at the rising of the Evangelical light, by the splendor of Christ. And so, what they either did not know, or did not fully know, or translated in doubtful and ambiguous sentences, or passed over entirely — preferring rather to keep a good silence about things unknown than, by speaking of things they did not know, to pronounce ill. Then, lest they should scandalize King Ptolemy, they

concealed many things about the Son of God and about his coming, lest perhaps the king, hearing that God has a Son, should suppose that the Jews, according to the dogma of Plato, held a twofold godhead [→]

[→ p318: catchword "numen"]

[1] The seventy-two interpreters, first of all, translated the whole Old Testament into the Greek tongue. [2] The LXX interpreters, for three reasons, passed over many things concerning the Trinity and Christ.

*(Rich PDF p. 318 [printed folio 299, recto]. Book IV, **letter S** — the Septuagint entry concludes (the names of the 72 interpreters by tribe, and the sources), then Serafino da Feltre, Serapion of Thmuis, Sertorius Fortanerius, Severianus of Gabala, Sigebert of Gembloux, Simon of Afflighem, and the opening of Simon the Englishman. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter S — the Seventy-two Interpreters, concluded:]

...[a twofold] godhead, and worship two Gods — [the Jews] whom [Ptolemy] therefore held in great esteem, because they were said to worship only one God. Finally, they kept silent about many other mysteries besides these, lest they should betray all the mysteries of their faith to the heathen, deeming it unworthy — according to Christ's saying — to give the holy thing to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine. For these most just causes, then, many things were omitted by the seventy-two interpreters, which gave to later interpreters an occasion for preparing new editions. Now the names of these seventy-two interpreters,[1] according to the order of the twelve Hebrew Tribes, collected by Aristeas, are these:

- **From the tribe of Judah:** Josephus, Ezechias, Zacharias, Joannes, Ezechias, Eliseus.
- **From the tribe of Reuben:** Judas, Simon, Samuel, Adeus, Mathias, Eschemias.
- **From the tribe of Gad:** Nehemias, Josephus, Theodosius, Baseas, Ornias, Datis.
- **From the tribe of Asher:** Jonathas, Anxeus, Eliseus, Ananias, Chabrias, Sachus.
- **From the tribe of Naphtali:** Iasachus, Jacobus, Jesus, Gabateus, Simon, Levi.
- **From the tribe of Manasseh:** Judas, Josephus, Simon, Zacharias, Somelus, Selemias.
- **From the tribe of Simeon:** Sabatheus, Jason, Jesus, Theodorus, Joannes, Jonathas.
- **From the tribe of Levi:** Theodosius, Jason, Jesus, Theodorus, Jonas, Jonathan.
- **From the tribe of Issachar:** Theophilus, Abraham, Arsamus, Jason, Endemias, Daniel.
- **From the tribe of Zebulun:** Jeremias, Eleazarus, Zacharias, Baneas, Eliseus, Datheus.
- **From the tribe of Ephraim:** Samuel, Josephus, Judas, Joathes, Gabel, Dositheus.
- **From the tribe of Benjamin:** Isaelus, Joannes, Theodosius, Arsamenes, Abiethas, Ezecelus.

All these seventy-two men flourished together in the times of Eleazar, pontiff of the Jews, and of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second king of Egypt, in the 124th Olympiad, 350 years before the birth of Christ. Whose history was written by Aristeas, the shield-bearer of the aforesaid King Ptolemy, in a book *On the LXXII interpreters,* published specially to Philocrates, his brother; Philo also in the second book *On the life of Moses;* Josephus likewise in the twelfth book of the *Jewish Antiquities;* Epiphanius too, bishop of Salamis, in the book *On weights and measures;* and St. Jerome in many of his little works — from which authors we have taken these few [things]. Nor do I think it should be passed over that Philo, in the book already cited, writes that there was once among the Jews so great a veneration of this translation that most of them were accustomed to cross over each year to the island of Pharos, to honor with a solemn celebration the place in which the interpretation of the divine Law had first been published, and to give thanks to God for so great a benefit. The same Philo testifies also that the whole Old Testament was translated by the LXX interpreters, although Josephus reports that only the Pentateuch was translated by them. Francisco Ximénez [Cardinal Cisneros] gave this whole edition of theirs to Latin ears [in the Complutensian Polyglot].

Serafino da Feltre [Seraphinus Cumiranus Feltrensis], of the regular family of the Minorites [Franciscan Observants], most exercised in the holy Scriptures, gathered from all the books of divine Scripture two Volumes of passages which seemed to conflict among themselves — one on the passages of the Old Testament apparently conflicting, the other on the contrary passages of the New Testament; in which, no less piously than learnedly, he dissolved and settled the apparent conflicts of the divine Scriptures according to the opinion of the orthodox Fathers. The title of the work is, *A Reconciliation of the Common Passages of the whole sacred Scripture which seem to conflict among themselves.* He still lives, celebrated among the learned of his religion, in the year of the Lord 1566.

Serapion, bishop of the Egyptian city of Thmuis [μύεως — *so printed;* = Θμούεως], renowned in the confession of Christ under Constantine Augustus (whose huge and most noble work against the Manichaean, written in the Greek tongue, I lately read) — and who, on account of the elegance of his wit, earned the surname of THE SCHOLASTIC, especially dear to the great Antony the Monk, once a monk and Abbot, having under him about ten thousand monks living by their own labor — wrote one book *On the titles of the Psalms.* He flourished under Constantius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 340.

Sertorius Fortanerius [Sertorio Fortanieri], Archbishop of Ravenna, Patriarch of Grado, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], from a Welsh town of England [*so printed "ex oppido Angliae Galensi"; doubtful*], composed on almost all the holy Scriptures many volumes of scholastic explanation. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1356.

Severianus, bishop of Gabala — which is a city of Syria — learned and eloquent, was often called to Constantinople by John Chrysostom and the Emperor Arcadius, to deliver sacred sermons in the Church; and Chrysostom lent him his own church while he [himself] was being driven into exile, venerating in him not only doctrine but also the merit of his life. But he [Severianus], commending himself to the people more than was fitting, supplied fuel for discord between himself and John [Chrysostom]; yet, when Chrysostom had returned from exile, he came back again into favor with him. This man, among the other monuments of his wit, left on Genesis several Homilies, of which fourteen, not yet translated from the Greek, are kept at Vienna in the Brassican Library. He also left commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians. Oecumenius, in his commentaries on the first epistle to the Corinthians, cites fifty-eight volumes of his sermons. He flourished in the year of the Lord 400.

Sigebert, a monk of Gembloux, of the Benedictine order, a Gaul by nation, a most celebrated poet of his time, and worn [versed] from his youth in the divine Scriptures, wrote on the book of Ecclesiastes in hexameter verse, 1 book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1110.

Simon of Afflighem [Simon Affligeniensis], a Benedictine monk, distinguished for erudition in the divine Scriptures and for the holiness of his conduct, terse and elegant in speech, wrote brief commentaries on Ezekiel; and the same man abridged the 33 books of the commentaries of Blessed Gregory on Job, and reduced them to the number of ten small volumes; in the year of the Lord 1300.

Simon the Englishman, of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], gathered a Postil on the four major Prophets, and on the books of the Maccabees, [and] on the Proverbs of Solo-[mon →]

[→ p319: catchword "monis"]

[1] The names of the seventy-two interpreters of sacred Scripture.

*(Rich PDF p. 319 [printed folio 300, verso]. Book IV, **letter S** — Simon the Englishman (concl.), Simon of Cascia, Simon Atumano, Simon Corroy, Simon of Speyer, then the author's own entry, **Sixtus of Siena** (with the list of his own works, this very* Bibliotheca Sancta *among them), Sixtus Vicedominus, Smaragdus, Sophronius, and the opening of Stephen Langton. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter S, continued:]

...[Simon the Englishman gathered a Postil] on the Proverbs of Solomon, and on the biblical prefaces of St. Jerome.

Simon of Cascia [Simon à Cassia], from the town of the Hernici, of the Order of Hermits [Augustinian], learned and eloquent, illustrated with a prophetic spirit, published a notable work *On the deeds of the Savior*, digested into fifteen books; in which he brilliantly expounded the whole history of the four Evangelists, arranged in the order of a single narration, according to the historical and mystical understanding. Its beginning is, *From the good and above the good.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1340.

Simon Atumano [Simon Iatumaeus], first bishop of Gerace, and soon archbishop of Thebes, a Constantinopolitan by fatherland, learned in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, and exercised by continual reading in the divine Scriptures, reduced into one the series of the whole New Instrument [Testament] from the most corrected Greek codices, with the highest diligence; and then he turned it also into Hebrew and into Latin, interpreting most faithfully word for word. Finally he arranged these three editions in three columns on each page with such industry that line answered most aptly to line, and word to word, placed opposite one another, as much in sense as in word. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1400.

Simon Corroy [Simon Corroyus], of the Celestine order, composed a *Monotessaron* on the Gospels, which he called the *EVANGELICAL PANDECT*, beginning, *Who first.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Simon of Speyer [Simon Spirensis], of the Carmelite order, a theologian of Paris, wrote a scholastic Postil on Paul, delivered by him as lectures at Cologne, in the year of the Lord 1340.

Sixtus of Siena [Sixtus Senensis], of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], least among the ecclesiastical declaimers — although I long and much refused to insert mention of my ignoble and obscure name into this catalog, yet it was necessary for me (my friends so wishing) to note briefly in this place my unlearned labors, and [those] scarcely worthy of any commemoration, after the example of Jerome, Gennadius, Honorius, and Trithemius, who in the catalogs of writers published by them reviewed their own lucubrations.[1] I have written, then, up to the present forty-sixth year of my age, and 1566 of human salvation, the following volumes upon the divine letters:

- On the whole body of the Bibles, a *Holy Library* [Bibliotheca Sancta], eight books.
- *On the use of the Concordances of the sacred Bible*, 1 book.
- On various passages of divine Scripture, one book *of Astronomical questions.*
- On various passages of divine Scripture, 1 book *of Geographical questions.*
- On various passages of divine Scripture, 1 book *of Physical [natural] questions.*
- On various passages of divine Scripture, 1 book *of Problematical letters.*
- On the four volumes of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, a *Monotessaron of Wisdom* — that is, *of one Wisdom out of four* — one book.
- On the Epistle to the Romans, to Giovanni Battista, Cardinal of the title of St. Clement, one book *of a Scholastic compendium.*
- On the same epistle, to the same, 1 book *of Scholastic questions.*
- On the Lenten gospels, expounded for preaching at Genoa over four years, four Volumes of Homilies — that is, one Volume for each year.
- On the gospels which [are read] on the feasts of Pentecost and of Advent, which we expounded for preaching at Genoa over six years, six Volumes of Homilies — one Volume in each year.
- On the Hexaemeron, 8 homilies.

• On the first three chapters of Job, 6 homilies.

• On Psalm 1, 6 homilies.

• On Psalm 50, expounded in sermons at Genoa, 20 homilies.

Sixtus Vicedominus [Sisto Vicedomini], of the Order of Preachers [Dominican], a native of Como, a Theologian by profession, so joined with the studies of sacred Theology the riches of all the sciences and the ornaments of eloquence, that in the Ecumenical assembly [General Chapter] of the Dominican commonwealth, held at Bologna in the year 1564, he did not hesitate — though quite young — to propose in public disputations ἐν κυκλοπαιδείαν, that is, the *Circular [encyclopedic] and perfect comprehension of all the disciplines,* all the heads of the Academies being challenged into the arena; to whom, when he had responded with the highest erudition — both to the several things asked and to the objections raised — and with equal elegance of discourse, he obtained for himself a great glory of wisdom and of eloquence. He, now at Verona, expounding the disputative or scholastic part of Theology in the school of St. Anastasia the martyr, and narrating to the people the other part of Theology — which embraces the interpretation of the holy volumes — writes also excellent explanations on various books of divine Scripture; from which we shortly expect [to come] into the light most ample *Commentaries* on the epistle to the Romans, elaborated by a compendious method of exposition.

Smaragdus, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Michael, a man distinguished for erudition in the divine Scriptures, wrote commentaries on the Psalter, and — on the Epistles and Gospels which are read through the year — brief and perspicuous expositions, whose beginning is, *Epistle is a Greek word.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 680 [*so printed; Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel belongs rather to the early 9th century*].

Sophronius, nobly learned in Greek and Latin letters, most intimate with St. Jerome, translated into Greek the Latin edition of the whole Old Instrument [Testament] which Jerome had translated from the Hebrew truth. This Greek translation, as appears from the Collectanea of Procopius the Sophist on the Octateuch, many Greek expositors — Jerome's name being also cited — illustrated in their commentaries. He flourished under Theodosius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 400.

Stephen the Englishman [Stephanus Anglicus; = Stephen Langton], formerly the ornament and rector of the University of Paris, studious and learned in the divine Scriptures, and in Aristotelian philosophy second to none in his time, gloriously taught Theology for many years, and was the first to begin expounding sacred Scripture morally; and hence the custom grew up that the masters of scholastic Theology should open the divine books in the schools more lucidly and easily. He wrote, therefore, on the sacred Letters many excellent expositions, but especially on the Octateuch, [books] of commenta-[ries →]

[→ p320 (next batch): catchword "riorum"]

[1] Hitherto I have seen nothing of all the works of Sixtus of Siena except the *Bibliotheca Sancta.*

---

*(Rich PDF p. 320 [printed folio 301, recto]. Book IV, **letter S** — Stephen the Englishman (concl.), a second Stephen Langton [Cardinal-Archbishop of Canterbury], Stephen Paris, Stephen Poloniacus, a Paris doctor named Stephen, Strabo the Monk, Walahfrid Strabus (author of the Ordinary Gloss), Sylvester Prierias, Symmachus the Samaritan translator, and the Syriac / Chaldaic (Targum) Edition. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter S, continued — Stephen the Englishman, concluded:]

...[he wrote on the sacred Letters many excellent expositions, but especially on the Octateuch] eleven books of commenta-[ries], and on the sixteen prophets sixteen books, in style and feeling not ungrateful, as appears from his fragments recently published by Tilmann the Carthusian in the *Tomes of Allegories.* He flourished

in the year of the Lord 1200.

Stephen Langton [Stephanus Langion], the Englishman, Cardinal-Presbyter of St. Chrysogonus, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote on the Octateuch twelve books, and on all the epistles of Paul 14 books. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1228. Whether this one is different from the Stephen above, I do not sufficiently know.

Stephen Paris [Stephanus Paris], of Orléans [Aurelianensis], Bishop of Avellino [Abellunensis], doctor of Theology, of the Order of Preachers, wrote in elegant discourse upon that [text], *The Word was made flesh,* a prolix exposition, very suited to preachers through Advent, and arranged by lections, whose beginning is, *To piety and religion*: likewise one book of Lenten sermons. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1550.

Stephen Poloniacus [Stephanus Poloniacus], a Frenchman, of the Order of Preachers: a *Postil on John* I have seen in the Dominican library at Lyons, thus beginning, *In his hands he hides the light.*

Stephen, a Paris doctor. He put out a scholastic *Postil on the epistle to the Romans and to the Hebrews,* of whom Vincentius Bandellus [Vincenzo Bandelli] makes mention in his treatise *On the Conception.*

Strabo the Monk, English by nation, of Cambridge [Cantabrigensis] by homeland, brother of the Venerable Bede the presbyter, and gatherer of his studies, learned and pious, wrote on the whole book of Genesis commentaries not ignoble, which he gathered from the sayings of the orthodox Fathers, in imitation of his brother, with diligent skill, in the year of the Lord 750.

Strabus [Walahfrid Strabo], monk of the monastery of Fulda, German by nation, once the hearer and scribe of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz: a man abundantly polished in secular literature, most skilled in the divine Scripture, and delighting in the varied and assiduous reading of the ancient authors — among other little works, in which with clear and succinct discourse he illustrated certain particular books of the sacred Law, he also gathered, in imitation of his teacher, from the sayings of the holy fathers (their names being appended), commentaries on the whole sacrosanct Bible:[1] which they now call the **GLOSSA ORDINARIA** [the Ordinary Gloss], afterwards enriched by many other later writers and by various opinions of the ancient doctors. He flourished under Louis Augustus [Louis the Pious], in the year of the Lord 840.

Sylvester Prierias [Sylvester Mazzolini], of Piedmont [Pedemontanus], of the Order of Preachers, gathered from the commentaries of St. Thomas a scholastic *Postil on the Gospel lections of the whole year,* which he entitled the **GOLDEN ROSE** [*Aurea Rosa*], with questions added not altogether to be despised, in the year of the Lord 1510.

Symmachus, the third Greek interpreter of the Scriptures, a Samaritan by nation, of the number of the wise men of Samaria, when he could not by his ambition obtain the principate among his own people, in indignation defected to the Jews, and among them, having been made a proselyte, was again circumcised with a second circumcision.[2] For this was the custom among the ancient Hebrews, that those who fled from the Jews to the Samaritans, and in turn from the Samaritans to the Hebrews, should be circumcised anew, aided by the help of a certain medical traction instrument which they call a *Spatister*: by which indeed they would draw the little skin of the pudendum over the glans, and, with agglutinative [plasters] applied round about, would draw the foreskin over again upon the now-bared glans, and the drawn-over [foreskin] they would circumcise afresh. Of which matter Paul, making mention in the first epistle to the Corinthians,[3] says: *Is anyone called being circumcised? let him not draw the foreskin over to himself; is anyone in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.*[4] Although Jerome, weighing that which is read in the first [book] of Maccabees, *And they made themselves foreskins,*[5] affirms that this is to be understood not of the fathers themselves, but of their sons. This Symmachus, therefore, when after being circumcised again he was living in dishonor among the Jews, went over to the Christians, and embraced the heresy of the Ebionites: according to whose dogmas he wrote also commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew, endeavoring thence to

confirm his own impiety, by which he contended that Christ had been a mere man — occasion being taken from the carnal generation which is recited at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel. By him, therefore, was the third translation of divine Scripture so put out, that in it not word-for-word (which Aquila had done) but sense-for-sense was expressed. He flourished under the Emperor Septimius Severus, in the year of the Lord 190.

The Syriac Edition [*Syra Editio*], which the Greek Fathers often expound together with the other Greek and Latin editions, is believed by some to be the Chaldaic translation, called by the Jews *Thargum* [Targum], that is, *Paraphrase,* and once not only familiar but vernacular to them, while they inhabited the land of promise, and even now of the highest authority among them: which, though in many places it is clearer than the Hebrew text itself, is yet found to be conflated in no small part of itself from the translation of the Seventy interpreters in the places that are most obscure. Jacobus [James], Bishop of Christopolis, asserts that the author of this translation was Jonathan ben Uzziel [Ionathan Abenuziel] the Jew, who in the twenty-first year of Octavius Augustus — that is, in the 21st year before Christ was born — translated the whole Old Instrument [Testament] into the Chaldaic, or Syriac, tongue, expressing sense-for-sense rather than word-for-word. The same Bishop relates also, in his exposition of the twentieth Psalm, that this Jonathan explained in his Targum many mysteries concerning the divinity of Christ and the holy Trinity — as in his edition of the second Psalm: in which, while he was illustrating in paraphrase that sentence, *The Lord said to me, Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee,* etc., he wrote thus:

> *These two, the Father and the Son, are three in one third person, namely in the Holy Spirit: and these three are one — one, I say, in substance, one in essence, and one God.*

And while Jonathan was committing these things to writing, suddenly a voice was brought to him from heaven, saying: *Who is this that dares to reveal my secrets to the nations?* Then Jonathan: *I, O Lord,* said he, *have dared to attempt this for the reverence and glory of thy name.* These things [says] the Bishop of Christopolis — whether they be so, I leave to others to inquire. Plainly it is certain that these words are not to be had in the Chaldaic interpretation of the Psalms which is now in circulation. The Jews report that the Targum [was made] by three most skilled Rabbi-[s →]

[→ p321 (next batch): catchword "nis" (Rabbi-nis)]

[1] The author of the Ordinary Gloss is Strabus. [2] Symmachus, the Greek interpreter of the Scriptures, was twice circumcised. [3] 1 Cor. 7:18. [4] The Vulgate edition has "let him not draw over the foreskin" (*non adducat praeputium*). [5] 1 Macc. 1:16.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 321 [printed folio 302, verso]. Book IV — the Syriac (Chaldaic / Targum) Edition concludes (letter S), then **letter T opens**: Tatian (the Diatessaron), Tertullian, Theodolus of Coelesyria, and the opening of Theodore of Antioch. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter S — the Syriac Edition, concluded:]

...[the Targum was composed] by three most skilled Rabbi-[s] — Onkelos, Jonathan, and Joseph — of whom Onkelos translated the Pentateuch alone; Jonathan, the Pentateuch and the Prophets, both former and latter; but Joseph, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, and Esther. Francisco Ximénez [Jiménez de Cisneros] the Cardinal, in the preface to the Complutensian edition, teaches that this Chaldaic translation faithfully answers to the Hebrew truth in the five books of Moses alone, but that in the other divine volumes it is corrupt, and in many places besprinkled with mere fables and with the trifles of the Talmudists.

T

Tatian [Tatianus], numbered by St. Jerome in his catalog of Ecclesiastical writers, was a Syrian by nation, and a disciple of Justin the philosopher and martyr. He, since he flourished with all abundance of the disciplines and great power of the oratorical art, left an infinite number of books of his own genius, but among the rest a notable volume of *Propositions and Questions*: in which, as Eusebius writes in the 4th [book] of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 27, he unlocked all the things that are obscure and difficult in the divine Scriptures. The same man compacted into one [work] the history of the four Gospels, to which he gave the title **DIATESSARON**, that is, *One out of four,* or *On the harmony of the four Gospels*: to which Victor, Bishop of Capua, a most excellent astronomer, who flourished about the year of the Lord 480, diligently affixed the numbers of the Evangelical Canons from Eusebius of Caesarea, throughout the fitting places, a preface being prefixed which begins thus, *When by chance it fell into my hands.* Abbot Trithemius made Victor the author of this work, though Victor's own preface contradicts him, which testifies that it is the work of Tatian. This man, as long as his teacher lived, flourished greatly in the Catholic Church: but after his [teacher's] death, he founded a new heresy, called that of the Encratites. He flourished under the Emperor Marcus Antoninus Verus and L. Aurelius Commodus, in the year of the Lord five hundred and seventieth [*so printed, "570"; but Tatian belongs to the 2nd century, c. AD 170 — the reign named*].

Tertullian [Tertullianus] Florens, whose praenomen was Quintus Septimius, a presbyter by dignity, an African by nation, of Carthage by homeland, his father a proconsular Centurion — a man indeed of sharp and vehement genius, imbued no less with human than with divine disciplines, the most excellent Rhetor also of his own times and the public [teacher] of that Art in the city of Carthage, a master, wrote many things elegantly in the Latin tongue, but in a style too elaborate and hard, and, on account of the unusual novelty of his words, obscure. Whence Jerome also, writing to Paulinus, ascribes these two [faults] chiefly to him: namely, that he is crowded in his sentences, and difficult in his speech.[1] And Lactantius, in the fifth book of the *Divine Institutions,* describing the same man's phrasing, says: *Septimius Tertullian was skilled in every kind of letters, but in speaking little easy, and less polished, and much obscure.* The blessed Cyprian esteemed his writings so highly that he would let no day pass without reading them, often urging upon Paul of Concordia, his notary [secretary], *Give [me] the master* — meaning, of course, Tertullian.

This man, therefore, among the other monuments of his genius, left [these]:

On Genesis chapter 2, *On Paradise,* one book, of which the author himself made mention at the end of his book *On the Soul.*

Likewise on Genesis chapter 7, one treatise, inquiring therein: why God, who made all things very good, brought the unclean animals together with the clean into the ark. Jerome mentions this little work in the preface of his *Questions* to Damasus.

Likewise on the conflagration of Sodom, on the 18th chapter of Genesis, one book, elegantly composed in heroic verse: which begins,

> *Now God Almighty, with the avenging flood, had abolished*
>
> *all the crimes of the first age with the waves.*
>
> *Those which heaven scattered, the water of the Tyrian sea drove out.*

Likewise *On the vestments of Aaron,* on Exodus 28, one book: of which Jerome, in his epistle *On the garb of priests* to Fabiola, thus says: *There is reported in the Index of Septimius Tertullian a book on the vestments of Aaron, which meanwhile up to this day has not been found by me: if it be found by you, on account of the fame of the city, I pray, do not compare my little drop to that river; for I am to be judged not by the genius of great men, but by my own powers.*

He wrote also on the Lord's Prayer, from Matthew chapter 6, one book entitled *On Prayer*: which Hilary recalls in his commentary on Matthew. He flourished under the Emperor Severus, in the year of the Lord

200.

Theodolus [Theodulus], a presbyter in Coelesyria, and afterwards a Bishop, an Italian by nation, wrote a book *On the Concord of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*, against the ancient heretics: who, on account of the difference of precepts or of ceremonies, said that the God of the Old Testament was one, and the God of the New another. In it he showed that it was [a matter] of the dispensation of one and the same God, the author of both scriptures — that some things were given as law through Moses to the ancients in the ceremonies of sacrifices and in the executions of judgments, other things in these times through the presence of Christ in the sacred mysteries and in the future promises; and that they ought not to be believed diverse, nor dictated by more than one spirit and one author: since those things which, if only they were observed according to the letter, would kill, the very same, according to the [spiritual] understanding, give life. The same man also published a volume of *Eclogues* in verse: in which he most felicitously sang all the miracles of the Old Testament, and the fables of the poets composed in imitation of these. Its beginning is, *The lands of the Ethiopians,* etc. He is also said to have collected, on the Epistle to the Romans, a succinct and easy exposition, woven together in the manner of a catena, from the opinions of the Greek Fathers, whose names, cited by him, are these: Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Photius, Isidore, Severianus, Gennadius, and Oecumenius. But since Photius and Oecumenius flourished two hundred years after Theodolus, it appears that the inscription of the work is false. The beginning of the work is, *Paul,* etc. This epistle contains the instruction of the Gospel. He died under the Emperor Zeno, in the year of the Lord 480.

Theodore [Theodorus], a presbyter of the church of Antioch, a learned man and eloquent in Greek fluency, whose [work] against the Eunomians and Apollina-[rists →]

[→ p322 (next batch): catchword "ristas" (Apollina-ristas)]

[1] Tertullian is crowded in his sentences, and difficult in his speech.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 322 [printed folio 303, recto]. Book IV, **letter T** — Theodore of Antioch (concl.), Theodore of Heraclea, and the long **Theodoret** entry (his life and deposition by Dioscorus, and a full catalog of his commentaries — the Mystical Isagoge, the* Quaestiones, *the Psalter, the ferial-Canticles catena, all the Prophets with their Greek incipits, and the Pauline commentaries). Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter T, continued — Theodore of Antioch, concluded:]

...[whose work] against the Eunomians and Apollina-[rists] is extant, a most elegant volume, wrote also on the Psalms magnificent commentaries, of which many and frequent fragments are read in the Greek Catena of explanations of the Psalter, arranged by Epiphanius Scholasticus. He flourished under Honorius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 420.

Theodore [Theodorus], Bishop of Heraclea of Thrace — which was once called Perinthus — a man of elegant and open speech, illustrious in the times of Constantine II, published (according to the literal understanding, which he everywhere followed in the exposition of the divine Letters) Commentaries on the Psalter, on Matthew, on the Gospel of John, and on the epistles of Paul. He flourished in the year of the Lord 340.

Theodoret [Theodoretus], or **Theodoritus** (for the Greek copies bear both readings), a Syrian by nation, of the city of Cyrrhus — which Stephanus calls Κυρούπολις (that is, Cyropolis), [and] the Persians call Cyrecbata — Bishop and pastor of eight hundred churches[1] (for that city then had so many parishes, [a city] once founded by Cyrus, king of the Persians, in the farthest bounds of Persia); a man renowned for Attic eloquence, and most illustrious in the explanation of the holy volumes, and also a most keen assailant of the heretics — by whom he even endured stones for the defense of the catholic faith. After many labors of life, in extreme old age he was branded with anathema by Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, and most unjustly

deposed from his bishopric, because he had agreed with Flavian, Archbishop of Constantinople, in the condemnation of the Eutychian heresy. He, therefore, having obtained an admirable facility in teaching, left many commentaries on the divine Scriptures, abridged for the most part from the richest [works] of St. John Chrysostom — whom he took to himself as it were the primary model to imitate. Of these I have read the following:

A volume of **Mystical Instructions,** an *Isagoge* [Introduction] into the whole holy Scripture, expounding the mystical and spiritual understandings of all the names and words that are contained in the divine Letters; which work, written in Greek on ancient parchments, is preserved at Vienna in Austria, in the library of Alexander Brassicanus.

Εἰς τὰ ἄπορα τῆς θείας γραφῆς κατ᾽ ἐκλογήν, that is, *On selected ambiguous questions of divine Scripture,* from the beginning of Genesis up to the last book of Kings — a notable work: in which he briefly and lucidly explains, through question and answer, only the obscure passages. Its beginning is, Μετρεῖν εἴωθε [so printed, 16th-c. Greek type hard], that is, *He was accustomed to measure.*

On the whole Psalter, commentaries chiefly according to the letter, in which with wonderful skill he joined together the little verses of the psalms which seemed to agree among themselves in no order. These noble commentaries are extant at Genoa, in the Sauli library: whose beginning is, Ἐμοὶ μὲν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων θείων λογίων κατὰ θυμὸν ἦν τοῦ μεγάλου Δαβὶδ ἑρμηνεῦσαι τὴν προφητείαν, that is, *It is indeed my mind, before the other divine discourses, to interpret the prophecy of the great David.*

There is annexed to this work a *Catena of explanations on the ferial Canticles,* collected by an uncertain author from Eusebius, Didymus, Basil, Chrysostom, Severus of Antioch, Hesychius, Cyril, Theodoret, Eudoxius the philosopher, and Nicolaus the presbyter.

On the Song of Songs, graceful commentaries [addressed] to John the Bishop, beginning, *The exposition of the divine scriptures.* Into which some recent collector, I know not who, mixed fragments of the explanations of Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus, Nilus, and Psellus, upon various places of this book.

He composed [lucubrated] also, on all the Prophets, very many volumes of commentaries: whose openings, gathered partly from Greek, partly from Latin codices, are these:

- On Isaiah — one book.
- On Jeremiah — one book.
- On Threni [Lamentations] — one book.
- On Ezekiel — one book. [incipit: *With the eyes of the body ... of the figures.*]
- On Daniel — one book. [incipit: *If it were easy for all.*]
- On Hosea — one book. [incipit: Ἴσως μὲν τινες...]
- On Joel — one book. [incipit: Ἰωὴλ ὅθεν...]
- On Amos — one book. [incipit: Ὁπλῶσαι...]
- On Obadiah [Abdias] — one book. [incipit: Ἰδουμαῖοι πρόγονον...]
- On Jonah — one book. [incipit: Πάντας ἀνθρώπους...]
- On Micah — one book. [incipit: Τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ...]
- On Nahum — one book. [incipit: Οἱ Νινευῖται...]
- On Habakkuk [Abacuc] — one book. [incipit: Εἰσί τινες...]
- On Zephaniah [Sophonias] — one book. [incipit: Δόγος...]
- On Haggai [Aggaeus] — one book. [incipit: Κύριος...]
- On Zechariah — one book. [incipit: Σφόδρα παλαι...]

• On Malachi — one book. [incipit: Μωσῆς μέν...]

(The Greek incipits above are set in a very difficult 16th-c. type and are rendered as best they can be read.)

Besides these, there are reported to be printed in type *Commentaries on all the epistles of Paul*: in which, as far as can be done, the meanings of Paul are explained succinctly, elegantly, in order, and piously, and the opinions which in Paul seem most difficult are joined together with [other] opinions with wonderful skill. St. Thomas cites from these commentaries, in his little work *Against the errors of the Greeks,* a testimony of the Armenians for the fire of purgatory, from the third chapter of the epistle to the Corinthians, upon that [text], *If any man's work shall burn* — in these words:

> *The Apostle says, He shall be saved, thus, as it were, through a smelting-furnace — a fire purging whatever has crept in through incaution in the past life, from the dust at least of the feet of the earthly sense, in which [state] he remains so long as any bulk and earthly affection has clung to him, until he be purged: for whom Mother Church devoutly offers victims and peaceful gifts.*

Which words, indeed, I could nowhere find, neither in the Latin nor in the Greek commentaries. I suspect that they were either withdrawn by certain Greeklings hostile to purgatory, or drawn by St. Thomas from some other work where Theodoret expounded this passage thus. The beginning of the work is, *Scio quidem ferè* [I know indeed almost], as, *while [the epistles] of the divine Paul...* This holy man flourished in the time [→]

[→ p323 (next batch): catchword "pore" (tem-pore)]

[1] Theodoret was the pastor of 800 churches.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 323 [printed folio 304, verso]. Book IV, **letter T** — Theodoret (concl.), Theodore/Theodoric of St-Trond, Theodoric Herxen, Theodotion, Theodotus of Ancyra, Theognostus, Theophilus of Antioch, Theophylact (with his works), Thomas the Englishman, and the opening of Thomas Aquinas. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter T, continued — Theodoret, concluded:]

...[he flourished] in the time of the Council of Ephesus, contemporary with St. Cyril, with whom he also had disputes concerning the acts of that same synod; and he reached even to the times of Pope Leo the First, to whom he wrote an entreating epistle for his own restoration to the bishopric. He died about the year of the Lord 450.

Theodore, or **Theodoric** [Theodoricus], Abbot of St. Trond [St.-Trudo] in the diocese of Liège, a Benedictine by profession, German by nation, of great erudition and holiness, whose excellence in prose and in verse was equal, composed a book *comprising the histories of the Old and New Testament in heroic verse.* He flourished under the Emperor Henry IV, in the year of the Lord 1100.

Theodoric Herxen [Theodoricus Herxenius; Dirk van Herxen], German by nation, visitor of the order of clerics living in common [the Brethren of the Common Life], renowned for holiness of life and the powers of his genius, wrote — in scholastic order, but in a more devout style — one book on the Psalter. He flourished under the Emperor Frederick III, in the year of the Lord 1476.

Theodotion, as Epiphanius reports, a Pontic by nation, or, as Euthymius holds, an Ephesian — while he was a Christian, a follower of the heresiarchs Tatian, Marcion, and Ebion; when he had deserted from the Christians to the Jews, he was circumcised, and among them well instructed in the Hebrew tongue, and under the Emperor Severus Augustus he put out the fourth Greek translation of the Old Instrument, in the year of the Lord 200.

Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, wrote very many homilies: of which Epiphanius the deacon, in the sixth session of the Second Nicene Synod, cites four —

- the first, *On Elijah and the widow,* on 3 Kings [1 Kings] 17;
- the second, *On the two blind men,* on Matthew 9;
- the third, *On the distribution of the talents,* on Matthew 25;
- the fourth, *On the lame man healed by Peter and John,* on Acts 3.

He was illustrious in the Council of Ephesus against Nestorius, writing in a dialectical manner and very obscurely, in the year of the Lord 430.

Theognostus, an ancient author, whom Athanasius calls an eloquent, studious, and admirable man, wrote a Treatise on that [text] of Matthew 12, *Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man*: which Athanasius cites in the book he composed upon that same saying of the Gospel.

Theophilus, the sixth bishop of the church of Antioch after the Apostle Peter, who under the Emperor Marcus Antoninus Verus, in the year 173, was taken up to the bishopric, is said to have written commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon: which, however, Jerome asserts do not agree, in phrasing and elegance, with the other volumes of that author. The same man compacted the sayings of the four Evangelists into the body of a single history, and illustrated it with Greek commentaries. Jerome testifies that these are unequal, in elegance of diction, to his other volumes which he wrote against the heretics, exhibiting a modest taste of his phrasing in the exposition of the parable of the Unjust Steward — which he himself translated from Theophilus's commentaries, when, being asked by Algasia about the question of that parable, he answered her.

Theophylact [Theophylactus], Archbishop of Bulgaria — long and much versed and worn in the reading of St. Chrysostom — reduced into a brief and open compendium, according to the historical understanding, whatever that admirable father had poured out from his golden mouth, as from a most abundant fountain, in expounding the holy Scriptures; omitting the commonplaces, in which Chrysostom was wont to run out under the full sails of eloquence. And since he found the Allegories either none or rare in Chrysostom, he supplied them from the commentaries of others, and most aptly fitted them to his places. There are reported, among the rest, [these works] collected by him on both Testaments:

- On Hosea, one book, headless and endless [*acephalus & atelestus*] — that is, by the injury of time lacking its beginning and its end: the surviving fragment of which begins, *And no one has snatched [her] out of my hand,* etc.
- On Jonah, one book, which begins, *After all...*
- On Nahum, one book. [incipit:] *The admirable one preached.*
- On Habakkuk, one book. [incipit:] *There are some who grievingly...*
- On the four Gospels, four books, whose beginning is, *In what manner [Quemadmodum].*
- On Paul, 14 books. [incipit:] *Frequens divinarum...* [*so printed; the reading is uncertain*].

He flourished in the year of the Lord 900, under Michael and Theodora [*so printed; Theophylact of Bulgaria in fact belongs rather to the late 11th century*].

Thomas the Englishman [Thomas Anglicus], of Wales [Galensis] by homeland, of the Order of Preachers, professor of scholastic Theology, wrote on the sacred Books very many commentaries of scholastic method: of which there are, in the library of Sts. John and Paul at Venice, a *Lecture on Genesis,* beginning, *Let it not depart,* etc., and a *Postil on the first twenty-five Psalms,* which begins, *Blessed is the man who keeps.* There are believed to be, of this author, commentaries on Genesis, on Isaiah, on Jeremiah, on the Canonical Epistles, on the Apocalypse, and on Boethius *On the Consolation of Philosophy* — [works] ascribed to St. Thomas [Aquinas].[1] For, since for honor's sake the surname of *Angelic* had been given to Aquinas, and there

was great similarity of sound between *Anglicus* [English] and *Angelicus* [Angelic], it gradually came about that, through carelessness and error, the writings of Thomas the Englishman were marked with the title of Thomas the Angelic. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1400.

Thomas Aquinas, of the Order of Preachers, sprung from the illustrious family of the Counts of Aquino, born of most splendid parents on the borders of Campania — himself the greater disciple of Albert, Archbishop of Regensburg [Ratisbon], surnamed the Great, a doctor;[2] a man of the greatest and loftiest genius, to whom, for the full and complete glory of all erudition, both divine and human, there was lacking only the use of the [ancient] tongues and of eloquence — which the learned of that age, being intent on loftier studies, neglected. He was, without any controversy, the prince of theologians, and of all the Philosophers whom the Academy of the Scholastics has produced up to this day:[3] inasmuch as he, the first of all the Latin philosophers, illustrated the whole philosophy of Aristotle with most lucid commentaries, by a daring no less incredible than felicitous. But in sacred [studies], he came so near, in the studies of a purer theology, to the most wise Augustine, that thus [he brought] his [Augustine's] mind, and all [→]

[→ p324 (next batch): catchword "recon" (recon-)]

[1] Some commentaries on sacred Scripture which are commonly attributed to St. Thomas are thought to be [the work] of Thomas the Englishman. [2] St. Thomas Aquinas was a disciple of Albert the Great. [3] The exceeding praises of St. Thomas.

*(Rich PDF p. 324 [printed folio 305, recto]. Book IV, **letter T** — the long **Thomas Aquinas** entry continues: the encomium (Augustine's soul migrated into Thomas; Copiousness, Brevity, Facility, Security), then his scriptural works — the Genesis Postil (authenticity denied by Antoninus of Florence), Job, Psalms 1–51, the Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah & Lamentations, the* Catena aurea, *the Gospel and Pauline Lectures, the catholic epistles, the Apocalypse — and the Fossanova deathbed anecdote. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter T, continued — Thomas Aquinas:]

...he looked into and drained his [Augustine's] hidden meanings, so that — according to Pythagoras's μετεμψύχωσις [metempsychosis, the transmigration of souls], as tossed about in the common adage of all the most learned — Augustine's soul migrated into Thomas. In the scholastic disputations of mystical Theology also he so surpassed the other leaders of the Academies, that it has been received by the universal consent of all the schools that Thomas, the restorer of Scholastic Theology, joined together in an indissoluble bond of peace four things implacably warring among themselves — namely, Copiousness, Brevity, Facility, and Security — which it befell no professor of letters ever, either before or after him, to be able to connect together at once. And first, so copious a richness of all things is in him, that hardly anything from the whole compass of Theology and Philosophy could be desired that he himself has not embraced with most copious variety in his richest writings. Then Brevity — which is the inseparable companion of obscurity, its mother — he so joined to Facility, all difficulty being shut out, that by the disposition of order, by the perspicuity of the sentences, and by the splendid clarity of words, he left all writers far behind him; and, what is much more admirable, whereas in the ecclesiastical Writings of many Fathers of great name one must proceed cautiously and with wary foot, lest one imprudently strike upon certain opinions little safe, to this one truly divine man there fell, by a divine [gift], so great a security of assertions and opinions, that in reading him the reader, free from all suspicion of error, may range at large safe and secure with unimpeded step, without any offense — as it were along a royal road, worn by the common tread of the ecclesiastical fathers, far from those byways of the particular sects, [their] paths and detours, which often lead the incautious away into inextricable mazes and irretraceable errors.

With these, then, most rare conditions of teaching, this incomparable doctor wrote almost innumerable volumes of the scholastic kind: of which those that pertain most to the understanding of Sacred Scripture are

distinguished by a triple division — into Expositions, Questions, and Opuscula [Minor Works]. In the Expositions (which he also called *Lectures*) he expounded those books of holy Scripture — which we shall indicate in their place — in a continuous order of explanation, briefly and to the letter, most lucidly. In the Opuscula, or Treatises, he treated some particular passages of the scriptures more fully and copiously. But in the Questions, upon various propositions of divine Scripture, applying contrary argumentations on both sides, he constructed most beautiful disputations: among which are greatly praised the Questions *On the work of the seven days* — which, when he had first published them (as Aegidius Romanus [Giles of Rome] testifies) in a separate volume, he afterwards placed, in a most fitting order, into the first part of his *Summa.*

He is also **said** to have written on Genesis a certain scholastic *Postil,* which is circulated inscribed under his name; but Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, denies that it is his, affirming that it was published by another Thomas of the same order — a man indeed learned and pious, but in no way to be compared to Thomas Aquinas in facility of style and gravity of sense.

He **composed** also most lucid and most learned commentaries on the whole book of Job according to the letter: which are preferred to the other commentaries published by him on the Old Testament, for erudition and for a genuine and sincere explanation of the history. Their beginning is, *As in things [Sicut in rebus].*

He **published** likewise, on the first fifty of the Psalms — that is, on fifty-one Psalms — pious and learned commentaries according to the literal and anagogical understanding, in the same kind of interpretation which he had used in the commentaries on Job; but the exposition on the remaining Psalms, being prevented by death, he could not finish. The opening of the book is, *In all his work,* etc.

He **wrote** also a *Postil on the Song of Songs,* which begins, *Let thy voice sound.*

There **is reported,** besides, a *Postil on Isaiah,* whose beginning is, *Write the vision, and explain,* etc.: which very many, on account of its poverty of erudition, judge not to be his. Lyranus [Nicholas of Lyra] asserts that it was put together from his sayings by some studious person.

There **is extant** also a *Postil on Jeremiah and Threni [Lamentations],* whose beginning is, *This is a lover of the brethren and of the people*: which, on account of the barrenness of its doctrine, is not believed to be his.

He **collected** besides — by command of Pope Urban IV — from the patchwork [centos] of the Latin fathers, and from the rhapsodies of the Greek authors (which he had caused to be translated into Latin), a most noble work of explanation on the four Gospels: which he entitled *A Continuous [commentary] on the Four Evangelists,* but which more recent [writers] call the *Golden Chain* [*Catena aurea*]. Its beginning is, *To the most holy and most blessed,* etc.

Besides these, Trithemius asserts that he wrote scholastic *Lectures on the four Gospels,* of which I have seen only the *Lecture on Matthew,* which begins, *Matthew from Judaea,* etc., and the *Lecture on John,* which begins, *I saw the Lord.*

To these he added a *Lecture on all the Epistles of Paul,* filled with the highest erudition: in which he left the other scholastic expositors far behind him. Its beginning is, *A vessel of election.*

On all the catholic epistles, 7 books. [incipit:] *James,* etc.

On the Apocalypse, a huge volume, which begins, *The voice of the Lord, preparing the harts.*

The same, when in the Cistercian monastery of Fossanova — near the Amaseno, a river of Campania — he lay sick, his bodily strength broken by continuous studies, being asked by the monks who sat by his bedside that he would explain the Song of Solomon in imitation of the sense and spirit of St. Bernard, but far more briefly, refused, saying: *Give me the spirit of Bernard, and I will [expound →]* to you...

[→ p325 (next batch): catchword "expo" (expo-nam)]

(Rich PDF p. 325 [printed folio 306, verso]. Book IV, ***letter T*** *— Thomas Aquinas (concl.: his death at Fossanova reciting the Song, aged 48, 1274), Thomas the Cistercian (Song of Songs), Thomas Hasselbach, Thomas Sperman, Thomas Walden, and the long* ***Thomas de Vio Cajetan*** *entry (his life to his death in 1534, and the catalog of his Scripture commentaries). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter T, continued — Thomas Aquinas, concluded:]

...[Give me the spirit of Bernard, and I will expound to you] an exposition breathing the spirit of Bernard. But when they still more earnestly begged him that he would at least bring forth some brief explanation of the Song from his own understanding, having summoned to himself certain monks to take down his words as he dictated, he began a second exposition on the Song, differing in style and erudition from the former exposition on the same book — as that time, and the prayers of the monks, and the occasion of his sickness demanded — writing not what art, but what sincere piety and a soul now hastening to the coming immortality, poured forth. In this explanation, therefore, when in expounding he had reached the sixth chapter of the book, and was uttering — with a vehement ardor of spirit and the highest alacrity of voice, his eyes lifted to heaven — those words of that same chapter which were his last, *Come, my beloved, let us go forth into the garden,* suddenly his most holy soul, going forth from the mortal body into the garden of eternal felicity, to its beloved (longed for all the days of its life and summoned by the last words of its life), happily departed, in the 48th year of his age, from the nativity of Christ 1274. But the rest of the exposition, to the end of the book, some studious person added. The opening of the work is, *Solomon inspired by the divine spirit.*

Demetrius Cydonius wrote his life in the Greek tongue; he also translated into Greek the first and second parts of the *Summa Theologica,* and the four books *Against the Gentiles,* which are now preserved at Venice in the Marciana library.

Thomas, a Cistercian monk, aspiring to the eloquence of St. Bernard and to his diligence in gathering the flowers of the divine scripture, wrote to Pontius, Bishop of Clermont, eight books of commentaries on the Song of Solomon, not to be despised: whose method he himself set forth in the preface of the whole work in this manner:

> *I, together with Ruth the Moabitess, after Origen and the other aforesaid reapers — Gregory, Bede, and Bernard — busy myself to gather the ears [of grain], that is, the sentences [meanings], wrapped in the chaff of the letter: but I loose each little verse from its covering of chaff by a brief and compendious exposition; then, disposing the unfolded meaning by a manifold distinction, afterwards, like an argumentative bee, running through the little flowers of the Scriptures which have been expounded and distinguished, I strengthen them with attestation.*

The beginning of the work is, *I am vehemently astonished, and beyond what can be said I do not cease to marvel.* Ascensius [Josse Bade] printed it at Paris in the year 1521.

Thomas Hasselbach [Hasselbachius], a German, most skilled in the divine scriptures and in secular philosophy, rare in acuteness of genius, scholastic in speech, but too diffuse and prolix, and on that account liable to the censure of some (for, when he was the ordinary lecturer of sacred Theology in the University of Vienna, publicly expounding the prophet Isaiah for twenty-one years, he did not reach the end of the first chapter) — is reported to have written, of his so prolix exposition on the first chapter of the prophet Isaiah, twenty-four books, in the year of the Lord 1410.

Thomas Sperman, an Englishman, of the Order of Preachers, scholastically expounded the epistle to the Hebrews and the epistle of James, in the year of the Lord 1290.

Thomas Walden [Netter of Walden], a Carmelite, an Englishman, who first put out learned and strong volumes against the Hussites and Wycliffites, wrote a scholastic *Postil on the Pentateuch.*

Thomas de Vio [Cajetan], Cardinal with the title of St. Sixtus, of the Order of Preachers, an Italian by nation, of Gaeta [Caietanus] by homeland, and bishop of that same city, a man as illustrious for holiness of life as for excellence of genius[1] — a most subtle dialectician, an admirable philosopher, an incomparable theologian, and among the most erudite the most learned of his age by far — in the thirtieth year of his age, on account of his singular excellence of manners and of doctrine, was elected the thirty-eighth Master General of his order at Rome; and after some years was taken up into the College of Cardinals by Pope Leo X. Soon he was sent into Germany with the office of legate, to quell the profane rumors which Martin Luther of Wittenberg, a new heresiarch, had stirred up among the Germans. Thence, having returned, he was again sent as legate by Pope Adrian [VI] into Pannonia [Hungary], with a great sum of money, to raise forces against Suleiman, Emperor of the Turks, who was striving to invade Pannonia with hostile arms. Then, recalled by Clement VII, the Supreme Pontiff, he returned to Rome: where, when the city was captured and burned by the Imperial army, he was made the prey of most abandoned robbers, and redeemed himself from their hands for the price of five thousand gold pieces. Not long after, when Clement, the Supreme Pontiff, had fallen into a most grave illness, given up by the physicians, he himself also began to be most gravely sick — as if he wished to snatch himself away from the imminent burden of the pontificate, to which he was being called by the common expectation and prayers of all — and by his own death he anticipated the death of the Pontiff, happily rendering his soul to God on the fourth day before the Ides of August [10 August], in the 66th year of his age, from the nativity of Christ 1534; and he was buried at Rome, in the vestibule of the temple of Minerva [Santa Maria sopra Minerva], before the doors, in a sepulchre dug into the ground, which while living he had himself prepared. His life Flavius Aquilanus, his intimate secretary, most eloquently wrote in prose and verse.

This man, therefore, in his extreme old age, after innumerable lucubrations published on the philosophy of Aristotle and on the whole theology of St. Thomas, expounded the entire mass of the Old and New Testament — the most difficult of all — according to the sense of the letter, from the Hebrew and Greek truth, in a bare and brief discourse; except for the Song of Songs and the Prophets, which, having begun them as he was dying, he left [unfinished], and the Apocalypse, which he deliberately left untouched, saying that in expounding it there was need not of genius, but of divination. But on the other books of divine Scripture he left commentaries complete and entire: of which I have read only those set down below:

- On the Pentateuch of Moses, to Clement VII, 5 books. [incipit:] *Quotidianam de diuinis...*
- On all the historical books which are of the Hebrew Canon, to Clement VII, 11 books, namely:
- On Joshua, one book. [incipit:] *To St. Jerome, most blessed Father...*
- On Judges, 1 book. [incipit:] *The time of the elders who knew the works of God.*
- On Ruth, 1 book. [incipit:] *In the days,* etc.
- *[On the books of Kings →]*

[→ p326 (next batch): catchword "In die" (In diebus...)]

[1] The praises of Cardinal Cajetan.

(Rich PDF p. 326 [printed folio 307, recto]. Book IV, ***letter T*** *— Cajetan's Scripture-commentary list concludes (with a note on Ambrosius Catharinus's* Invectives *against him), then Tyconius (his seven mystical Rules, his Apocalypse commentary and Bede's verdict), Tilmann of Aachen, Titus of Bostra, Tryphon, and the opening of Triphyllius of Ledra. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter T, continued — Thomas de Vio Cajetan's works, continued:]

- On the books of Kings [Regum], 4 books. [incipit:] *And there was a man,* etc. — the title likewise of this book.

• On Paralipomenon [Chronicles], 2 books. [incipit:] *Concerning the title of the book.*

• On Ezra [Esdras], 1 book. [incipit:] *This beginning has been expounded.*

• On Nehemiah, 1 book. [incipit:] *The beginning of this book testifies.*

• On Job, 1 book. [incipit:] *Just as the five books of Moses.*

• On the Psalter, to Clement VII, 1 book. [incipit:] *Of the divine psalms.*

• On Proverbs, 1 book. [incipit:] *All the prior things having been expounded.*

• On Isaiah, 1 book. [incipit:] *The vision of Isaiah.*

• On Matthew, to Clement VII, 1 book. [incipit:] *A part of the Roman ruin.*

• On Mark, 1 book. [incipit:] *Matthew being finished.*

• On Luke, 1 book. [incipit:] *Mark being completed.*

• On John, 1 book. [incipit:] *John, the last Evangelist.*

• On the Acts of the Apostles, 1 book. [incipit:] *First, etc. — Luke the Evangelist.*

• On the Epistles of Paul, to Charles V Augustus, 14 books. [incipit:] *Among the most illustrious [gifts] of the mind.*

• On the Canonical Epistles, 7 books. [incipit:] *It is not in every respect certain.*

• From various passages of the New Testament, 8 books of *Breakfasts* [*Ientacula*]. [incipit:] *They occur first of all.*

• On the whole Old Testament, a new translation from the Hebrew.

• On the whole New Testament, an emendation according to the faith of the Greek codices.

Ambrosius Catharinus [Ambrogio Catarino Politi], Archbishop of Conza [Compsanus], of the Order of Preachers, wrote — both against the aforesaid commentaries on the Scriptures, and against the other little works of this man — six books of *Annotations*, or *Invectives*, very sharp: concerning which I leave to each his own free judgment. Likewise Antonius Lusitanus à Fonseca [Antonio de Fonseca], of the Order of Preachers, added to the same Cardinal's commentaries on the Pentateuch some elucidatory *Annotations*, not altogether to be regretted.

Tyconius [Tichonius], an African by nation — whose expositions Augustine, in the second book of the *Retractations*, preferred to the expositions of St. Cyprian on some [passages] — a man learned in divine and human letters, wrote most keenly against the Donatists, although he himself was a Donatist in some doctrines. He composed an Isagogic volume entitled *Of Rules* [*Regulae*]: in which he brought forward seven mystical rules, as it were seven keys, for opening, investigating, and finding the hidden understanding of the Scriptures[1] — [rules] very useful. Of these:

• the first is *On the Lord and his body*;

• the second, *On the Lord's twofold body*;

• the third, *On the promises and the law*, or *On the spirit and the letter*;

• the fourth, *On species and genus*, or *On the whole and the part*;

• the fifth, *On the times*;

• the sixth, *On recapitulation*;

• the seventh, *On the devil and his body*.

These rules — much praised — St. Augustine (in the 3rd book *On Christian Doctrine*), Cassiodorus (in the preface to his commentary on the Psalms), and Isidore (book 1 *On the highest good*) review and examine in many words. The book's beginning is, *I have deemed it necessary before all things.*

The same [Tyconius], as Gennadius reports, expounded the Apocalypse of John entirely, understanding nothing in it carnally, but the whole spiritually. In which exposition he said that the body is [as] an angelic station. He also removed the suspicion of a thousand years of the reign of the just on earth to come after the resurrection; nor [did he hold] that there would be two resurrections in the flesh of the dead — one of the just, the other of the unjust — but one, and once for all, in which even the abortives [stillborn] shall rise. But he showed the distinction of the two resurrections thus: that the first, which he called the revelation of the just, we should believe to be carried on now in the increase of the Church, where those justified by faith are raised from the death-corpses of their sins, through baptism, unto the reward of eternal life; but the second [is] generally [the resurrection] of the flesh of all men. These commentaries Primasius, Bishop of Utica, for the greater part transfused into the explanations on the Apocalypse published by himself; which [in turn] Bede the Venerable, the presbyter, compressed into three books: in whose preface he thus writes concerning Tyconius:

> *Tyconius both vividly and truthfully understood the Apocalypse of St. John, and expounded it sufficiently in the Catholic [manner] — except only in those passages in which, striving to defend the schism of his own party (that is, of the Donatists), he laments the persecutions which they endured (namely, as heretics) from that most religious prince Valentinian: their churches, and their peoples and men, and their possessions handed over into the hands of the Catholics, and their priests thrust into exile; and, calling these [things] martyrdoms, he boasts that they were foretold in the same Apocalypse.*

He flourished when Theodosius and his sons were reigning, in the year of the Lord 390.

Tilmann of Aachen [Tilmannus Aquensis], a German, a Carmelite, who had an excellent genius, refined in divine and human letters, lecturer of the University of Cologne, wrote on the Gospel of Matthew, in scholastic diction, one book, in the year of the Lord 1550.

Titus, Bishop of the church of Bostra in Arabia, wrote Greek commentaries on the Gospels, which Trithemius mentions in his Catalogue. He flourished under the Emperor Julian: by whose edict, driven from his bishopric, while he lived in exile, he wrote strong books against the Manichaeans, in the year of the Lord 340.

Tryphon [Triphon], a disciple of Origen, learned in ecclesiastical as well as heathen doctrines, wrote on the 15th chapter of Genesis, περὶ τῶν διχοτομουμένων, that is, *On the halved parts of the heifer, the ram, and the she-goat*, which Abraham offered to God in sacrifice together with the dove and the turtledove — one book; likewise, *On the quality of the sacrifices which are contained in the whole book of Leviticus*, 1 book. He flourished in the year of the Lord 230.

Triphyllius, Bishop of Ledra (or Leutheon) in Cyprus, when he had long given his effort at Berytus [Beirut] to the [liberal] arts, to law, and to eloquence, became the most eloquent of all of his age — but he did not lack affectation. Whence, when once, at the exhortation of many Bishops, he was making a discourse to the people, and was expounding that saying of our Savior to the paralytic, *Take up thy bed and walk*, being offended by the rudeness of the diction, instead of γραββάτῳ (that is, *grabatum*, a pallet) he said κλινίδιον, that is, *lectulum* (a little couch) — which Spyridon, taking it ill, [→]

[→ p327 (next batch): catchword "Trim" (Trim-, i.e. Spyridon of Trimythous)]

[1] Seven rules useful for understanding the scriptures.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 327 [printed folio 308, verso]. Triphyllius (concl.: Spyridon's rebuke) and Tullio Crispoldi close **letter T**; then **letter V opens** — Werner de Laer, Venantius Fortunatus, Victorinus of Pettau (Jerome's testimonies and his preface to Anatolius on the Apocalypse commentary), Victorinus of Marseilles, Williram (the* Epithalamion*), Vincent the Presbyter, and the opening of Vincent of Beauvais. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Letter T, continued — Triphyllius, concluded:]

...[which Spyridon,] Bishop of Trimythous in Cyprus, taking ill, said: *Art thou then not better than he who said "grabatum"? What shame, then, is this, that you are unwilling, sir, to use his words with [their] decorum?* And with these words, rising from his episcopal seat in the sight of all, he rebuked the pride and haughtiness of those who set themselves off with affected speech. This man [Triphyllius], therefore, among other things which he commented on the sacred Letters, also published most graceful commentaries on the Song of Songs. He flourished under Constantius Augustus, in the year of the Lord 350 (Nicephorus, book 8, chapter 42).

Tullio Crispoldi [Tullius Crispoldus] of Rieti, a very pious and learned man, a pupil of Matthew, Bishop of Verona (a man distinguished for holiness), published in the Italian tongue a treatise *On the Passion of the Lord from the four Gospels*, admirable in its meanings and style, which John — grandson of John, King of Portugal, and Duke of Aveiro — inflamed by reading it, gave to Latinity, happily attaining the style and mind of the author. He also wrote, in Italian discourse, *Commentaries on Matthew,* worthy of the highest praise and veneration: which Egidio Foscarari [Aegidius Foscararius], of the Order of Preachers, Bishop of Modena — of all the bishops of this time the most learned and most holy — showed to me at the Council of Trent. He flourished in the year of the Lord 1540.

V

Werner de Laer [Vernerus], a German [Teutonic] by nation, a Westphalian by homeland, of the Order of the Carthusians, of the house of St. Barbara in Cologne [Colonia Agrippina], most studious in the divine Scriptures and very learned, devout in life and conversation, published a great work on all the epistles of Paul, which he entitled the **DOCTRINAL OF PAUL** [*Doctrinale Pauli*]: whose beginning is, *The doctrine of Paul the Apostle.* Likewise he composed *On the praises of Paul,* seven books, whose beginning is, *As it was with Moses, so,* etc. He flourished under Maximilian, in the year from the Virgin's childbirth 1494.

Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus [Venantius Fortunatus], an Italian presbyter, wrote on the Lord's Prayer a brief exposition — pious, elegant, and fertile in various interpretations; its beginning is, *So deep a mercy of such great piety.* He flourished in the year of the Lord 700.

Victorinus, Bishop of Poitiers [so printed, *Pitauiensis*; the martyr-commentator meant is Victorinus of Poetovio, i.e. Pettau] and martyr, was very studious of the divine volumes. Jerome, granting him erudition but taking away eloquence, says in his book *On illustrious men*: *"Victorinus the Martyr, since he did not know Latin as well as Greek, wrote in the Latin tongue many works — grand indeed in their meanings, but rather poor in the composition of words."* And in his epistle to Paulinus, repeating the same, he says: *"The renowned Victorinus, crowned with martyrdom, cannot express what he understands."* But in his epistle to Magnus the Orator, he seems to take erudition from him too, saying: *"Although in the martyr Victorinus's books there is lacking erudition, yet there is not lacking the will to erudition."* Which words of Jerome, indeed, are to be understood not of sacred, but of the profane learning of the secular disciplines. He, therefore, wrote *Explanations on Genesis, on Exodus, on Leviticus, on Ecclesiastes, on the Song of Songs, on Isaiah* (as far as the vision of the four-footed beasts in the desert), *on Ezekiel, on Habakkuk, on Matthew,* and on the Apocalypse a brief commentary of annotations disposed at intervals: which now, printed in type, is circulated, with a preface of Jerome of this kind:

Jerome, to Anatolius.

> *Those who cross the perils of the sea meet with various mishaps, if the tumult of the winds be rather violent; but there is [also] fear if a gentler breeze has ruffled the back of the recumbent element — [for then] they dread ambushes. So it seems to me in this volume which you have sent, which seems to contain the explanation of*

Victorinus on the Apocalypse. And it is dangerous, and open to the barkings of detractors, to pass judgment on the little works of an excellent man. For both the earlier Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, and Nepos, a Bishop in the regions of Egypt, held [the same] concerning the reign of a thousand years as Victorinus did. But since you have adjured me by letter, I was unwilling to delay; and, lest I should scorn one who entreats, I at once turned over the books of the elders, and what I found in their commentaries I joined to the little works of Victorinus, from the iota onward — where he understood [things] according to the letter — from the beginning of the book to the sign of the cross, correcting the passages which had been corrupted by unskilled scribes; from there to the end of the volume, know that [things] have been added. Now it is yours to discern, and to approve what pleases you. If life be our companion, and the Lord grant health, our genius shall sweat for you especially in this volume, most dear Anatolius.

Pope Gelasius, in distinction 15, casts the writings of Victorinus among the Apocrypha. He flourished under the Emperors Valerian and Gallienus, in the year of the Lord 270.

Victorinus of Marseilles [Massiliensis], a Rhetor, addressing the person of his son Etherius, commented — in a continuous series of exposition — the first twenty-five chapters of the book of Genesis, that is, from the beginning of the book up to the death of Abraham the patriarch, with a pious sense indeed; but, being a man occupied with secular literature, and exercised under no master's teaching in the divine Scriptures, he framed opinions of lighter weight, as Gennadius says. He died when Theodosius and Valentinian were reigning, in the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 430.

Williram [Villeramus], a German by nation, a monk of St. Benedict by profession, Abbot of Maspurg [*Maspurgensis*], a man of elegant genius and erudition, no less strong in verse than in loose [prose] discourse, published on the Song of Songs — composed of verses of various kinds with prose interspersed — three books of commentaries, arranged with a pleasant variety, and elegantly fashioned in imitation of the books of Martianus Capella *On the Nuptials of Philology and Mercury*: which he entitled the **EPITHALAMION ON THE NUPTIALS OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH.** Their beginning is, *When the studies of the elders.* He flourished under Henry III, in the year of the Lord 1070.

Vincent the Presbyter [Vincentius], a Gaul by nation, having a tongue polished by the practice of speaking and by the reading of the elders, commented on the first several Psalms, of which he read some to the holy man of God Canatus, in the hearing of Gennadius, presbyter of the church of Marseilles — promising at the same time that, if the Lord gave him life and strength, he would labor in the same style upon the whole Psalter. He flourished under the Emperor Marcian, in the year of the Lord 450.

Vincent of Beauvais [Vincentius Bellouacensis], Bishop [*so printed; Vincent of Beauvais was a Dominican friar, not a bishop*], a Burgundian by nation, of the Order of Preachers, with an insatiable [→]

[→ p328 (next batch): catchword "bili" (inexple-bili)]

(Rich PDF p. 328 [printed folio 309, recto]. Book IV — Vincent of Beauvais (concl.; the 32-book Speculum Naturale*), Vincent Ferrer, Vitalis, Umbert of Chartres, and Ulfilas the Goth close* ***letter V****; then* ***letter Z opens*** *(the last letter): Zacharias of Chrysopolis, Zacharias of Hierocaesarea, and Zeno of Verona, after whom the alphabetical catalog of expositors ends and a* Catalogus *begins. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Letter V, continued — Vincent of Beauvais:]

...[with an insatiable] ardor of learning, teaching, reading, and writing, and never wearied by any labors and vigils of study — when he had, over a long time and with assiduous diligence, turned over the books of almost all the nations of [all] kinds, at the exhortation of friends and aided by the funds of Philip of Valois, King of the French, he gathered from the sayings of innumerable authors, both Christian and heathen, a huge volume *On the Hexaemeron,* divided into thirty-two great books, which he therefore entitled the **MIRROR OF NATURE** [*Speculum Naturale*], because in this one [work] he embraced whatever can be found worthy

of speculation, admiration, and imitation in those things which — in the visible and invisible world, from the beginning up to the end — have been done or said, or are even still to come; the names of the several authors being noted within the very lines of the text, from whose writings he patched together this work. Now the sum of the books of the present volume is this, namely:

- *On the first creation of the world* — that is, *On the Creator, and on those things which were created by Him before any day* — book 1: which begins, *Since the multitude of books.*
- On the work of the first day — 1 book.
- On the work of the second day — 2 books.
- On the work of the third day — 10 books.
- On the work of the fourth day — 1 book.
- On the work of the fifth day — 2 books.
- On the work of the sixth day — 11 books.
- On the work of the seventh day (in which God, after He rested on the seventh day, works even until now) — 4 books.

He flourished under the Emperor Frederick II, in the year of the Lord 1240.

Vincent [Ferrer] of Valencia [Valentinus], of the Order of Preachers, the most celebrated preacher of all in his time, wrote on the Gospel Lections which are read on the several days of the year in the Church, three volumes of sermons, which hold the first place among the scholastic Sermon-writers. He flourished at the Council of Constance, and died in the year of the Lord 1420 [*so printed "420"*]; and he was enrolled among the saints by Pope Callistus, the third of that name.

Vitalis, of the Order of Minors [Franciscan], Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, made a *Postil on the Apocalypse,* which begins, *With a great spirit he saw the last things.* It is kept at Bologna, in the library of the Preachers, in manuscript.

Umbert [Umbertus], Bishop of Chartres [Carnotensis], wrote against the Jews one book on that [text] of Genesis 49, *The sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah,* in the year of the Lord 1100.

Ulfilas [Wulphilas] the Goth, Bishop of the Goths — whom Socrates mentions in his Ecclesiastical History — first invented the Letters of the Goths, and first delivered to them all the divine Scriptures translated by himself from Greek into the Gothic tongue, and expounded them in the Catholic [manner], for a long time contending much against the Arians. Yet Theodoret writes that he, moved by the threats and promises of Eudoxius the Arian, at last inclined to the party of Valens Augustus, [who was] laboring under the Arian plague. He flourished in the year of the Lord 370.

Z

Zacharias, Bishop of Chrysopolis, a man most celebrated in his time, explained the four Gospels — brought by Ammonius of Alexandria into one continuous body — in four books of commentaries: which, woven from the opinions of the fathers into one chain, he fitted together with beautiful skill. The beginning of the work is, *On the excellence of the Gospel, and its difference from the law,* etc. He flourished in the year 1100 from the childbirth of the most blessed Virgin.

Zacharias, Bishop of Hierocaesarea, illustrious in the Second Nicene Synod, wrote in the Greek tongue a *Dialogue* of continuous narration, explaining the golden statue from the second chapter of Daniel, whose title is ΧΡΥΣΕΙΚΩΝ [Chryseik■n], that is, *THE GOLDEN STATUE OF MAN.*

Zeno, Bishop of Verona and martyr, is said to have written very many sermons on various passages of the divine scripture: in place of which [i.e., under whose name] Guarino of Verona, the orator, a hundred years ago published a volume of sermons of various kinds; in which the sermons pertaining to the exposition of the sacred letters are of this kind:

- On the beginning of Genesis — two sermons.
- On Genesis 12, *On Abraham* — 1 sermon.
- On Genesis 28, *On the dream of Jacob* — 1 sermon.
- On Genesis 38, *On Judah and Tamar* — 1 sermon.
- On Exodus — 5 sermons.
- On Deuteronomy 15, upon *Take heed to thyself* — 1 sermon.
- On Job — 1 sermon.
- On the beginning of Psalm 79 — 1 sermon.
- On a verse of Psalm 100 — 1 sermon.
- On Psalm 126 — 1 sermon.
- On Psalm 127 — 1 sermon.
- On Psalm 128 — 1 sermon.
- On Psalm 129 — 1 sermon.
- On Psalm 139 — 1 sermon.
- On Isaiah — 4 sermons.
- On Daniel — 1 sermon.
- On the three young men — 1 sermon.
- On Susanna — 1 sermon.
- On Jonah — 1 sermon.
- On Luke 12, *On the rich man who had a fruitful field* — 1 sermon.
- On John 11, *On Lazarus* — 1 sermon.
- On 1 Corinthians 15, upon that [text] *The first man is of the earth, earthy — On the body and the spirit* — 1 sermon.

It is agreed that these sermons were for the greater part collected from various authors, who were nearly two hundred years later than Zeno. For the sermons which expound the Psalms enumerated by us were transcribed from the commentaries of Hilary, not even a word being changed; the sermon upon that [text], *Take heed to thyself,* together with another discourse *On spite and envy,* which follow this [one] in the same volume, is [the work] of St. Basil. But the other sermons — or rather fragments of sermons — on account of the diversity of style, argue various authors; and even the author of the sermon *On continence,* which is contained in this work, affirms that he was distant from the birth of Christ by four hundred years and more. But Peter, Bishop of Equilium [Pietro de' Natali], writes that Zeno lived under the Emperor Gallienus, and that he divinely healed the daughter of that same [emperor], who was oppressed by a desperate disease — namely, in the year of the redeemed world 260.

(Here the alphabetical catalog of Catholic expositors [Book IV] reaches its last letter and closes; an asterism ■ *follows in the print, and a* **Catalogus** *begins on the next page.)*

[→ p329 (next batch): catchword "CATA" (CATA-LOGVS)]

*(Rich PDF p. 329 [printed folio 310, verso]. Book IV — the alphabetical catalog of Catholic expositors having closed, a new appendix opens: the **Catalog of the Hebrew Expositors** (the Rabbis), prefaced by Sixtus's own account of being sent by Pius V to Cremona in 1559 to destroy the Talmud; then the rabbinic commentators A–M — Ibn Ezra, Abraham Saba, Achai Gaon, Bahya, David Kimchi, Levi ben Gershon, and the opening of Menahem of Recanati. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

Catalog of the Hebrew Expositors

CATALOG OF THE HEBREW EXPOSITORS, or of the Rabbis, who expounded the divine letters in the Jewish tongue and according to the Hebrew traditions.

Pius V, Supreme Pontiff — when, before his Pontificate, he presided over the most ample and sacred Senate [tribunal] of the whole Christian Inquisition, which had been divinely conferred on him (namely, in the year of human salvation 1559) — sent me to Cremona to destroy the Talmudic books of the Hebrews, [full] of impious and monstrous doctrine, which the Jews had gathered from almost all Italy into that city, as into a common asylum of the Jewish nation. When, therefore, for that reason I had begun diligently to turn over all their libraries and printing-houses — the most copious of all that were then in Italy — I found an infinite number of Hebrew volumes; and among others, the commentaries of the Hebrew expositors, written below, on the divine Scriptures. Since I had earlier found some mention of these among our own expositors — chiefly the scholastics — it pleased me to gather their names summarily, and to append them, thus collected, at the end of this book, in the place of an appendix. And they are these:

Abraham, son of Ezra, whom the Hebrews call by the surname *Aben Ezra* [Ibn Ezra], that is, *the Wise*, a Spaniard by nation, a Grammarian, Philosopher, astrologer, and a great Theologian, wrote on the whole Old Testament 24 books. We have seen only the commentaries on Moses and the prophets, printed at Venice by Bomberg [Bambergum]. He died on the island of Rhodes, where he had lived in fame, in the year 1217.

Abraham the Spaniard wrote an exposition on the Pentateuch, which he called the **BUNDLE OF MYRRH** [*Fasciculus Myrrhae*].

Abraham Parizol [Farissol] put out explanations on Job.

Abraham Sava [Saba] composed a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is called *ZEROR AMOR* [Tzror ha-Mor].

Achai Gaon [Ahai], a very ancient interpreter, made a commentary on the whole [Pentateuch of] Moses, which is called *SHE'ELTOTH* [Seelthoth], that is, *Things Inquired.*

Ammai wrote an explanation on the nineteenth Psalm, to which he gave the title *ON HIDDEN THINGS*, Psalm 19.

Bachaiai [Bahya ben Asher] composed a great commentary on the Pentateuch, which Justinianus [the printer] recently printed at Venice. He wrote also on the five volumes which the Hebrews call *Chamesh Megilloth* [the Five Scrolls], that is, on Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song, and Threni [Lamentations].

Bereshith Rabba, or *Rabbot*, is a commentary on the Pentateuch, containing a medley of Hebrew explanations.

Baruchias [Berechiah], whom (as Jerome testifies in his commentaries on Ecclesiastes) the Jews greatly admire, wrote most praised explanations on Ecclesiastes.

Hischia [Hizkiah] put out an explanation on the five books of Moses, which is called *CHIZCONI* [Hizkuni], that is, *Hischionica.*

Chavbenaki is a coined word, meaning *A Measure [Modius] of pure flour*. Thus a certain unnamed Rabbi entitled his commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon.

David Kimchi [Radak], son of Rabbi Joseph Kimchi, wrote on the Psalms and on all the prophets succinct commentaries according to the letter: from which, recently, Thomas the Rhetor [Thomas Rhetus], an Englishman, translated into Latin the expositions on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; but Pellican [Konrad Pellikan] and Paul Fagius, heretics, [translated his] explanations on the Psalms. He also collected the *Sciarascim* [Shorashim], that is, a *Lexicon,* or *Dictionary of the roots,* or words, of the holy tongue, patched together from various Rabbis. He flourished about the year of our salvation 1380.

Hillel [Huillus] the Patriarch wrote commentaries on the Psalms and on Isaiah: which Origen, his contemporary, mentions in his exposition of Psalm 80, and on Isaiah, Tome 30, praising his explanations in the same passages of the same [prophet].

Jacob Minor put out a great prologue on the books of Moses.

Jehuda [Judah] wrote a commentary on the whole [Pentateuch of] Moses, called *MINCHATH JEHUDA* [the Offering of Judah].

Joseph the Blind [Caecus], who flourished nearly three hundred years after the second destruction of the temple (as Augustine, Bishop of Nebbio [Nebiensis; Agostino Giustiniani], testifies in his *Octaplum*), put out a Chaldaic translation on the Psalms.

Joseph Kimchi, father of David Kimchi, wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, on the Psalms, and [on] all the Prophets: which we have found written on parchments, among the other books brought to us. He flourished about the year of the Lord 1350.

Isaac Harmaa [Arama] wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, which are entitled *HEKEDATH ISCHAC* [Akedat Yitzhak], that is, *The Sacrifice [Binding] of Isaac.* He wrote also commentaries on the *Chamesh Megilloth,* that is, on the five volumes — Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song, and Lamentations.

Isaac Ben-Schola [ben Sahula] collected an explanation on the psalms, from which Augustine of Nebbio translated much in his *Octaplum* of the psalms.

Isaac Kara [Qara / Caro], a Syrian, collected a little commentary on the Pentateuch, which is called by the Jews *THOLDOTH ISCHAC* [Toledot Yitzhak], that is, *The Generation of Isaac,* in the year of the Lord 1550.

Isaac Nathan wrote Biblical Concordances, in the likeness of the Latin concordances which Hugh of Cher [Hugo Carensis; Hugh of Saint-Cher] published on the Bible. These are called by the Hebrews *IAIR NATHIB* [Yair Nativ], that is, *Illuminating the way.*

Ishmael [Ismael] wrote a commentary on the latter part of Exodus, which is called *MECHILTHA* [Mekhilta].

Levi ben Gershon [Gersonides], the last of the Rabbis, wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the Prophets, and all the historical books: which Daniel Bomberg printed at Venice.

Menahem of Recanati [Manahem à Rechanate] put out commentaries on the Pentateuch, entitled *ZIONI* [Tziyyoni]: of which, when nearly a thousand copies — filled with innumerable impieties of the Talmudists — had been brought to us, by command of the sacred Roman Inquisi-[tion →]

[→ p330 (next batch): catchword "Inquisi" (Inquisitionis)]

(Rich PDF p. 330 [printed folio 311, recto]. Book IV, Catalog of the Hebrew Expositors (continued) — Menahem of Recanati concl. (the Talmud-burning), Masoret, Midrash Tehillim, Maimonides (the Moreh Nevukhim*; "from Moses to Moses"), Nachmanides, Moses ha-Darshan, Pesikta, Saadia, Rashi, Sifra, Sifre,*

Simeon bar Yochai (the Zohar *— 2,000 copies saved from burning at Cremona), the* Yalkut, *and the Targum. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Catalog of the Hebrew Expositors, continued — Menahem of Recanati, concluded:]

...[by command of the sacred Roman] Senate of the Inquisition, [these] together with ten thousand other volumes of Talmudic writings, were burned.

Masoret [Massoreth], that is, *Traditions and corrections of the Bible*, is a work containing the emendations of various Rabbis upon the Bible.

Midrash Tehillim [Midra Theillim] is the name of a commentary, which comprises rhapsodies of explanations of various Rabbis on the Psalms. From this, Augustine, Bishop of Nebbio [Giustiniani], collected scholia in his *Octaplum* of the psalms.

Moses the Egyptian, son of Maimon [Maimonides], wrote a most learned work, which he entitled *MORE HANEVCHIM* [Moreh Nevukhim], that is, *The Guide of the Erring* [the Perplexed], in which he diligently expounded very many passages of divine Scripture. From this work both St. Thomas and the other scholastic Theologians bring forward various testimonies for the exposition of the six days. He flourished about the year of the Lord one thousand [*so printed; Maimonides in fact belongs to the later 12th century*]. Concerning him there is reported among the Hebrews a most celebrated encomium: that *FROM MOSES UNTO MOSES THERE AROSE NO OTHER MOSES LIKE THIS ONE* — that is, that from Moses the lawgiver up to Moses the Egyptian, there was none to be compared to this Moses in erudition. The Jews call him *RAMBAM*, that is, *Rabbi Moses ben Maimon*, comprising his name, his dignity, and his father's [name] in a single word, composed of the four capital letters of those same appellations — which they are wont to do also in most other titles of the Rabbis.

Moses of Gerona, ben Nachman [Nachmanides / Ramban], wrote learned commentaries on the Pentateuch and on Job. To him the Jews give the first place among the kabbalists of recent times.

Moses ha-Darshan [Hadarsan] put out commentaries on Genesis and on the Psalms: whose centos [extracts] the Bishop of Nebbio adduces in his *Octaplum* of the psalms.

Pesikta [Pesiktha], that is, *Determination*, is the name of a very ancient commentary, having an unknown author, which expounds the three latter books of Moses.

Saadia ben Gion [Saadia Gaon] wrote commentaries on Daniel, printed by Bomberg at Venice.

Solomon Jarchi [Rashi], a Gaul [Frenchman], whom the Jews call — by a name composed from the initial letters — *Rasci* [Rashi], the son of Isaac, first among the more recent [Jews] wrote commentaries on the whole Bible; and he is among his own [people] a man of great authority. He is cited here sometimes by our scholastic expositors, but especially in Lyra [Nicholas of Lyra]. He flourished about the year of the Lord one thousand.

Shir ha-Shirim [Sir Hasirim] *Perush* [Pirus] — that is, an explanation of the Song of Songs, collected by an uncertain author.

Sifra [Sipra], that is, *The Book*, is the name of an ancient commentary on Leviticus, whose author is unknown, which the common people of the Jews call *THORATH COHENIM* [Torat Kohanim], that is, *The Priestly Law.*

Sifre [Sifri] is the name of an ancient commentary on the latter part of the book of Numbers and the whole of Deuteronomy, whose author is called, by way of excellence, *RAB*, that is, *Master.*

Simeon, son of Joachai [Shimon bar Yochai], the most ancient among the Jewish expositors, wrote — before the birth of Christ — a huge volume on the Pentateuch, called *ZOAR* [the Zohar], of which we found

two thousand copies printed in a printing-house at Cremona, and, [when they were] already destined for burning by the Spanish soldiers, we preserved [them].

Simeon ben Joachim wrote a most ample volume on Leviticus, in which — discussing the natures of almost all things — he showed how Moses, according to the correspondence of the threefold world and the nature of things, ordained the ark, the tabernacle, the vessels, the vestments, the rites, the sacrifices, and the rest of the mysteries, both to appease God and the heavenly powers, and to expiate man [after] the image of these. The same [author] composed, on all the twenty-four books of the Old Instrument, the *Yalkut* [Ialcut], that is, *Collectanea* [Gleanings], which are entitled *SIMONICA* [after Simeon].

Thargum [Targum], that is, *Translation and Paraphrase* — especially from the Hebrew tongue into the Chaldaic — is of great authority among the Hebrews. For the Jews, returning from the Babylonian captivity (in which they had forgotten the holy tongue), brought back into Palestine a foreign language, namely the Chaldaic, or Syriac, which they had learned in Chaldea; and they used it in their own land, even in the time of Christ, and into it they translated the Mosaic law and the Prophets, both former and latter. The authors of this interpretation were Onkelos, who translated the Pentateuch; Jonathan, who translated both the Law and the Prophets; [and] Rabbi Joseph, who translated the Psalter, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, the Song, Ruth, Esther, etc. Francisco Ximénez [Jiménez de Cisneros], Cardinal of the holy Roman Church, affirms that this [Targum] is sincere and faithful in the Pentateuch, but in the other volumes of divine scripture full of trifles.

[→ p331 (next batch): catchword "CA" (a new "CA…")]

---

*(Rich PDF p. 331 [printed folio 312, verso]. Book IV — a third index opens: the **Catalog of the Expositors of Scripture, arranged by the order of the biblical books.** Grouped name-lists of the expositors who wrote on: the Old Testament; both Testaments; the Octateuch (Genesis–Chronicles); the Pentateuch; Genesis; and (beginning) Exodus. The page is set in three columns, read left-to-right continuously. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

Catalog of the Expositors of Scripture, by the Order of the Books

CATALOG OF THE EXPOSITORS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, arranged according to the order of the volumes of both Testaments, in which are enumerated the expositors who wrote either on some, or on individual, books [of each].

Catalog of those who wrote on the Old Testament:

Aquila; Eusebius of Caesarea; Hesychius the Monk; Josephus of Jerusalem; Justus of Tiberias; Lucian; Matthew Döring; Paul of Burgos; Patrophilus; the Seventy-two Interpreters; Sophronius; Symmachus; Theodotion.

Catalog of those who wrote on both Testaments:

Albertus Magnus; Alexander of Hales; Apollinaris the Younger; Anselm of Laon; Augustine of Nebbio [Giustiniani]; Aurelius Augustine; Bartholomew of Urbino; Bede; Dionysius the Carthusian; Francesco Giorgio; Francisco Ximénez; Godelbert; Gottfried Tilmann; Godfrey of Viterbo; Haymo; Jerome; Hugh of Cher [Carensis]; Hugh of St Victor; Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa; John Chrysostom; Isidore the Younger of Cordova; Isidore of Pelusium; Nicholas of Gorran; Nicholas of Lyra; Nicholas Zicenius; Origen; Paterius; Peter Brunaquellus; Peter Bersuire [Bertorius]; Peter the Chanter; Peter Comestor; Peter of La Palud; Peter Riga; Pontius Carbonell; Rabanus; Richard of St Victor; Rupert of Deutz; Santes Pagninus; Serafino Cumirano; Strabo; Thomas Cajetan.

On the Octateuch — that is, [those who] wrote on the eight first books of holy scripture from the beginning, namely from Genesis to Paralipomenon [Chronicles]:

Alfonso Tostado; Claudius the Monk; Gregory the Pope; Jacobus Martinus; Oecumenius; Philo Judaeus; Procopius of Gaza; Stephen the Englishman; Theodoret.

On the Pentateuch, that is, the five books of Moses, wrote:

Alan of Lille; Albert of Padua [Patauinus]; Aristobulus the Elder; Aristobulus the Younger; Augustinus Steuchus; Benedict Stendal; Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne; Cyril; Diodorus; Erardus; Eucherius; Francesco Vatablo; Jerome of Oleaster; Hugh of St Victor; Jacobus Lusitanus; John Zacharias; Matthew of Évreux [Ebroicensis]; Paul Ricius; Remigius.

ON GENESIS wrote:

Aegidius; Albinus; Alvise Lippomano; Ambrose of Conza [Compsae]; Ambrose of Milan; Anastasius the Younger; Andreas Bilius; Anselm of Canterbury; Antonius Honcala; Apion; Avitus; Aurelius Prudentius; Bruno the Ruthenian; Candidus; Clement of Alexandria; Dracontius; Eccardus; Eucherius; Eusebius of Caesarea; Eusebius of Emesa; Gennadius of Constantinople; Gregory of Nyssa; William Hammer [Hamerus]; William of Paris; William Pepin; Henricus Hassius; Henry of Langenstein; Hermann Schild [Schildius]; Girolamo Fracastoro; Girolamo Savonarola; Hilary of Arles; Hippolytus; Honorius of Autun [Augustodunensis]; John Buteo; John Duns [Scotus]; John Pico; Isotta Nogarola; Junilius; Louis the Younger; Melito; Methodius; Nicholas of Cusa; Nicholas Trivet; Novatian; Paulinus of Nola; Peter of Ailly [Aliacus]; Remigius; Richard of St Victor; Robertus Roseus; Rhodon [Rodon]; Rufinus; Salvian; Severianus; Sixtus; Strabo the Elder; Tertullian; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas Sperman; Thomas Walden [Valden]; Victorinus of Marseilles; Victorinus of Pettau [Pitabionensis]; Vincent of Beauvais; Umbert of Chartres.

ON EXODUS:

Alvise Lippomano; Ambrose of Milan; Avitus; Bonaventure; Eccardus; Ezechiel; Gregory of Nyssa; William Pepin; Gymnasius; Henricus Consueldius; Henricus Hassius; Girolamo Savonarola; Hippolytus; John Gauuer; John Ruusbroec [Rusbrochius]; Maximus the Monk; Niceas; Nicholas Alsentius; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl [Dunkelspulus]; Rober-[t →]

[→ p332 (next batch): catchword "Rober" (Rober-tus)]

(Rich PDF p. 332 [printed folio 313, recto]. Book IV — the by-book index (continued): the expositors on Exodus (concl.), Leviticus, Numbers, Kings, Ezra, Tobit, Judith, Job, and the long list on the Psalter; ends opening "On Proverbs." Three columns, read left-to-right. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)

[Catalog of the Expositors, by the order of the books — continued. On Exodus, concluded:]

...Robertus Roseus; Tertullian; Thomas Walden; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON LEVITICUS:

Hesychius the presbyter; John Nider; Nicholas Trivet; Radulph of Flavigny; Robertus Roseus; Thomas Walden; Tryphon; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON NUMBERS:

Ambrose of Milan; Hippolytus; Tryphon.

ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS:

Ambrose of Milan; Andreas Gallus; Angelomus the Monk; Aurelius Augustine; Bernard; Cornelius Magnanus; Diodorus; Eucherius; Gregory the Pope; Hegesippus; Hippolytus; John of Agen; Isidore of Cordova the Elder; Methodius; Nicholas Chenton; Procopius; Theodore of Ancyra.

ON EZRA:

John Ferus; Junilius.

ON TOBIT:

Ambrose of Milan; Friedrich Nausea; John Hoffmeister; Matthias Vindonice; Richard Lavinan.

ON JUDITH:

Cornelius Magnanus.

ON JOB:

Ambrose Alexander; Ambrose of Milan; the Greek Catena; Conrad of Halberstadt; Cyprian Montemartyr; Didymus; Francesco Titelmann; Gregory the Pope; Girolamo Savonarola; Hilary of Poitiers; John of Frankfurt; Odo; Olympiodorus; Philip the Monk; Polychronius; Richard Ampolus; Simon of Afflighem; Thomas Aquinas.

ON THE PSALTER:

Agathius; Albinus; Alexander Capgrave; Alexander of Chester; Alfonso de Castro; Ambrose Autpert [Amsbertus]; Ambrose of Milan; Anastasius of Antioch; Angelo Sangrini; Anselm of Lucca; Anselm of Mantua; Apollinaris; Aribo; Armandus; Arnobius; Asterius; Athanasius; Augustinus Steuchus; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Basil; Bernard; Bonaventure the Cardinal; Bruno the Carthusian; Bruno of Würzburg [Herbipolensis]; Charles de Bovelles [Bouillus]; the Greek Catena on the Psalms; Christianus Ischyrius; Christophorus Marcellus; Columbanus; Cornelius of Bitonto; Cosmas Indicopleustes; Didymus; Diodorus; Eynardus; Epiphanius Scholasticus; Eusebius of Caesarea; Eusebius of Vercelli; Eustathius of Antioch; Euthymius; Felix; Francesco Mileto; Francesco Ortisius; Francesco Pantiscozio; Francesco Petrarca; Francesco Puteanus; Francesco Titelmann; Francesco Visdomini; Francisco de Zamora; Friedrich Nausea; Gabriel Brebia; Walter Disseus; Walter Magolensis; Georg Witzel [Vicelius]; Germanus of Constantinople; Gilbert de la Porrée; Gregory the Pope; Gregory of Nyssa; William of Auvergne; William Gregory; William of Hirsau [Irsaugiensis]; William Pepin; William Vellius; Hadrianus Lametius; Henricus Logen; Girolamo Savonarola; Hieronymus Varlenius; Hilary of Poitiers; Hippolytus; Honorius; Jacobus Furnius; Jacobus Pantiscotius; Jaime Pérez of Valencia; Jacopo Sadoleto; Janus Vitalis; Innocent III (pope); Innocent V (pope); John Arundineus; Giovanni Battista Folengo; John Dominici; John Ferus; John Franciscus; John Gagny [Gagneus]; John Gerson; John Ludovicus; John of Mechelen; John Neouillanus; John Pico; John Fisher of Rochester [Roffensis]; John Torquemada; Iovita Rapicio; Lanfranc; Leander; Lecbertus; Ludolph the Carthusian; Louis Pittorio; Mapheus; Matthew of the Royal Court [Aulae regiae]; Matthias Bredenbach; Michele Aiguani [Angrianus]; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Nicholas of Gorran; Nicholas Herborn; Nicholas Trivet; Ninian; Nonius Marcellus; Otfrid; Othmar [Nachtgall]; Paul Ricius; Peregrinus; Peter of Ailly; Peter of Edessa; Peter of Herentals; Peter Lombard; Peter of Perpignan; Peter Rufus; Philip the Chancellor; Placido of Parma; Prosper; Rainerius; Remigius; Richard of Exeter; Richard of Hampole [Rolle]; Robert of Lincoln [Grosseteste]; Rudolph Agricola; Serapion; Sixtus; Smaragdus; Theodoric of Herxen; Theodore of Antioch; Theodore of Heraclea; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas of Wales [Gualensis]; Vincent of Lérins.

ON PROVERBS:

Alexan-[der →]

[→ p333 (next batch): catchword "Alexan" (Alexander...)]

(Rich PDF p. 333 [printed folio 314, verso]. Book IV, by-book index (continued) — expositors on Proverbs (concl.), Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, all Twelve Minor Prophets, and (opening) Hosea. Three columns, read left-to-right. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[Catalog of the Expositors, by the order of the books — continued. On Proverbs, concluded:]

Alexander Neckam; Alvarus; Ambrose of Milan; Basil; Evagrius; Eustathius of Antioch; Gilbert of Paris; Gregory Olympiades; Gregory the Pope; William of Auvergne; Henricus Hassius; Hippolytus; John Arboreus; Peter Brunaquellus; Peter Gottfried; Ralph Baynes; Salonius; Theophilus of Antioch; Thomas of Wales.

ON ECCLESIASTES:

Acacius; Albinus; Alexander Neckam; Dionysius of Alexandria; Garicus of Paris; Gerard Moringus; Gregory of Neocaesarea; William Alconas; Hippolytus; John Arboreus; John Dominici; John Ferus; Olympiodorus; Peter Brunaquellus; Rupert Holcoth; Salonius; Salvian; Sigebert; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON THE SONG OF SONGS:

Abbas Vercellensis; Aegidius; Agathius; Alan of la Roche [Rupensis]; Alexander of Exeter; Albinus; Ambrose Autpert; Angelomus; Anselm of Canterbury; Aponius; Apringius; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Bernard; Cyprian the Cistercian; Eccardus; Eulalius of Cynopolis; Gerard of Savona; Gilbert the Monk; Giselbert the Englishman; Gregory Olympiadas; Gregory the Pope; William the Abbot; William of Auvergne; Henry Herp [Harphius]; Henricus Hassius; Hermann Schild; Hilary; Hippolytus; Honorius; Jacobus Anglicus; Jaime Pérez; Innocent V; John Arboreus; John Dominici; John Gerson; John Halgrin; John Verdiacus; Julian of Eclanum; Justus of Urgell; Leonard of Giffoni; Luke the Abbot; Marbod; Methodius; Michael Picardus; Orosius; Pagano of Bergamo; Peter of Ailly; Peter Brunaquellus; Peter Nannius; Philippus Abbas; Philip Albert; Philo of Carpasia; Psellus; Remigius; Rethicius; Rupert Holcoth; Rupert of Limburg; Simon the Monk; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas the Cistercian; Thomas of Wales; Triphyllius; Victorinus of Pettau; Williram.

ON THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON:

Bellator; Eccardus; John Arundineus; Peter Nannius; Rupert Holcoth.

ON ECCLESIASTICUS:

John Alerius; Nicholas Gorran; Rupert Holcoth; Rupertus Roseus; Rupert Walsingham.

ON ISAIAH:

Adam; Alan of Lille; Aelred of Rievaulx; Ambrose of Milan; Basil; Cyril; Didymus; Eusebius of Caesarea; Francisco Foreiro; Giselbert the Englishman; Hector Pinto; Henricus Vichingan; Joachim the Abbot; Matthew of Évreux; Michael of Massa; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Procopius; Richard of St Victor; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas Hasselbach; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON JEREMIAH:

Joachim the Abbot; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas.

ON LAMENTATIONS [Threni]:

Anselm of Mantua; Hugh of St Victor; John of Königsaal; Jean Cinqarbres; Nicholas Cleynaerts; Paschasius; Richard Ampolus; Richard of Hampole; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas.

ON EZEKIEL:

Alexander Neckam; the Syriac Catena; Hesychius; Gregory Nazianzen; Gregory the Pope; Girolamo Savonarola; Hippolytus; Hugh of St Victor; John of Königsaal; Michael of Cesena; Nicholas Cabasilas; Polychronius; Proclus; Richard of St Victor; Simon of Afflighem; Theodoret; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON DANIEL:

Apollinaris; Cyril; Eusebius of Caesarea; Gennadius; Hippolytus; Joachim the Abbot; John Capgrave; John Hagen; Judas [the Syrian]; Julius Africanus; Michael Picardus; Richard of St Victor; Theodoret; Zacharias.

ON ALL THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS:

Guido the Carthusian; William of Melitona; Remigius; Stephen the Englishman; Theodoret.

ON HOSEA:

Cyril; Didymus; Pierius; Rufi-[nus →]

[→ p334 (next batch): catchword "Ruffi" (Rufinus)]

(Rich PDF p. 334 [printed folio 315, recto]. Book IV, by-book index (continued) — Hosea (concl.), Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zechariah, Maccabees; the whole New Testament; all Four Evangelists; Matthew; Mark; and (opening) Luke. Three columns, read left-to-right. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)

[Catalog of the Expositors, by the order of the books — continued. On Hosea, concluded:]

Rufinus; Theophylact.

ON JOEL: Cyril; Hugh of St Victor; Rufinus.

ON AMOS: Girolamo Savonarola; Rufinus.

ON OBADIAH: Hugh of St Victor.

ON JONAH: William Pepin; John Chrysostom; John Catardus; Theophylact.

ON MICAH: Girolamo Savonarola.

ON NAHUM: Cyprian the Monk; Theophylact.

ON HABAKKUK: Cyril; Theophylact; Victorinus of Pettau.

ON HAGGAI: Callisto of Piacenza; Georg Witzel; John Eck.

ON ZECHARIAH: Didymus; Girolamo Savonarola; Hippolytus.

ON MACCABEES: Bernard; Gregory Nazianzen; John Chrysostom; Josephus; Marius Victorinus; Simon the Englishman.

ON THE WHOLE NEW TESTAMENT:

Augustine of Ancona; Edward Leigh [Laeus]; John Baconthorpe [Bacco]; John Capgrave; John Lopis; Nicholas Zigenus; Oecumenus; Simon Atumano; Thomas Aquinas.

ON ALL FOUR EVANGELISTS:

Agrippa; Ammonius; Antonius Bruich; Apollinaris; Arnobius; Asterius; Aurelius Augustine; Bruno Archbishop of Cologne; the Greek Catena; Caesarius; Conrad; Diego de Deza; Diodorus; Dominicus Nannus; Eusebius of Caesarea; Euthymius; Fortunatianus; Gregory the Pope; Guido of Perpignan; Guittierus; Henricus Arnoldi; Hieronymus Gida; Innocent the Pope; John Abbatis; John Arboreus; John Balbus; John Castellensis; John Christophori; John Gauuer; Iuvencus; Ludolph the Carthusian; Marianus; Michael of Massa; Otfrid; Peter Isusquius; Richard Middleton; Rupert Goullet; Simon Cassian; Simon of Cremona; Simon Corroy; Tatian; Theophilus of Alexandria; Theophylact; Titus; Victor; Zacharias.

ON MATTHEW:

Alfonso Tostado; Anselm of Canterbury; Antipater of Bostra; Antonio Pucci; Arnoldus; Athanasius; Aurelius Augustine; Basil; Bonaventure; Claudius the Monk; Clement of Alexandria; Christianus; Chromatius; Cyprian of Carthage; Cyprian the Monk; Didymus; Domingo de Soto; Eccardus; Francesco Titelmann; Friedrich Nausea; Gregory of Antioch; Gregory Nazianzen; Gregory of Nyssa; William of Auvergne; Guerric; William Ludovicus of Langeac; William Pepin; James the brother of the Lord; John Chrysostom; John Doceus; John Dominici; John Ferus; John Hoffmeister; John Ludovicus; John Maitrosius; John Maria; John Regno; John of Santa Fide; John Scotus the Monk; John Soares; Jodocus; Joseph of Tiberias; Julius Africanus; Leo the Pope; Leontius; Matthew of the Royal Court; Matthias Bredenbach; Methodius; Michael Aiguani; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Pantaleon; Pantaenus; Peter of Ailly; Remigius; Rudolph Lange; Severianus; Symmachus; Theodore of Heraclea; Theodoric of Herxen; Theodore of Ancyra; Theognostus; Tilmann of Aachen.

ON MARK:

Ephrem; John de Isunio [Isdinius]; Peter of Ailly.

ON LUKE:

Aelred; Albinus; Ambrose of Milan; Amphilochius; Andrew of Jerusalem; Anselm of Canterbury; Antoninus of Florence; Asterius of Amasea; Augustine of Ancona; Aurelius Augustine; Bartholomew of Bologna; Bartholomew the Little; Bernard; Bonaventure; Claude de Seyssel; Dominicus Leonus; Egbert; Epiphanius of Salamis; Francisco de Osuna; Geoffrey Allieuant; Gregory of Nyssa; Henricus Consueldius; Henry of Langenstein; Henry of Kalkar; Hubert Leonardo; Hugh of St Victor; Jacopo Sannazaro; John of Beverley; John Dominici; John Isdinius; John Fisher of Rochester; Isidore of Thessalonica; Jodocus; Michael Aiguani; Nichol-[as →]

[→ p335 (next batch): catchword "Nicol" (Nicolaus...)]

(Rich PDF p. 335 [printed folio 316, verso]. Book IV, by-book index (continued) — Luke (concl.), John, Acts, all Pauline Epistles, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Titus, Hebrews, all Catholic Epistles, the Catholic Epistle of John, and (opening) the Apocalypse. Three columns, read left-to-right. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[Catalog of the Expositors, by the order of the books — continued. On Luke, concluded:]

Nicholas Gallus; Odo; Peter of Ailly; Theodoric of Herxen.

ON JOHN:

Albinus; Ambrose of Milan; Amphilochius; Andrew of Crete; Anselm; Augustine; Basil; Bernard; Bessarion; Bonaventure; Claude Guilliaud; Cornelius Musso; Cyril; Didymus; Francesco Titelmann; George of Trebizond; Gilbert de la Porrée; Gregory of Corinth; William of Aachen; Joachim the Abbot; John of Santa Fide; Jodocus; Joseph of Tiberias; Isaac; Lawrence Giustiniani; Nonnus of Panopolis; Peter Scala; Stephen Poloniacus; Theodore of Heraclea.

ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES:

Alexander Dolensis; Arator; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Diodorus of Tarsus; Euthalius; Joseph of Tiberias; Novatus; Peter Apian; Theodore of Ancyra; Tertullian; Thomas Walden.

ON ALL THE EPISTLES OF PAUL:

Adam; Alan of Lille; Albert of Padua; Albinus; Ambrose of Conza; Ambrose of Milan; Anselm of Canterbury; Apollinaris; Augustinus Romanus; Bruno the Carthusian; Caius Marius Victorinus; the Latin Catena on Paul; Claudius of Auxerre; Claude Guilliaud; Diodorus; Francesco Titelmann; Gilbert de la

Porrée; Gottschalk; Gregory of Rimini; Gregory Primaticius; Guttierus; Heraclius; Innocent V; John Arboreus; John Christophori; John Isdinius; John Milbach; John Pfeffer; John Vitlichius; John Zacharias; Lanfranc; Matthew of Aquasparta; Paduanus; Peter Lombard; Peter of Sens; Peter of Tripoli; Photius; Primasius; Radulph of Flavigny; Ramaldus; Remigius; Richard Middleton; Rupert Regno; Sedulius; Simon of Cremona; Simon of Speyer; Stephen Langton; Theodore of Heraclea; Theodoret; Theophylact; Thomas Aquinas; Terneus.

ON ROMANS:

Aegidius; Antonius Bruich; Asterius; Clement Araneus; Domingo de Soto; German de Brie; William Theodor.; Henricus Consueldius; Hugh of St Victor; Jacopo Nacchianti; Jacopo Sadoleto; John Arundineus; John Baconthorpe; John Cassian; John Dominici; John Duns; Matthew of Aquasparta; Nicholas Grandis; Philibert Aresches; Sixtus of Siena; Sixtus of Como; Stephen the Postillator; Theodolus; Thomas Walden.

ON CORINTHIANS:

John Dominici; John Haiton; John Hoffmeister; John Victorinus; Pierius.

ON GALATIANS:

Acacius; Alexander of Cappadocia; Apollinaris; Didymus; Eusebius of Emesa; Severianus; Theodore of Heraclea.

ON EPHESIANS:

Jacopo Nacchianti.

ON PHILIPPIANS:

John Hoffmeister; Gregory of Nyssa.

ON TITUS:

Richard Lavinan.

ON HEBREWS:

Cyril; Constantinus; Gennadius; William of Melitona; Hesychius; Jerome of Verona; John Huldarici; Nicholas Grandis; Stephen the Postillator; Thomas Sperman.

ON ALL THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES:

Ambrose of Conza; Augustine of Ancona; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Claude Guilliaud; Didymus; Francesco Titelmann; Gregory of Rimini; Giovanni Battista Folengo; John of Königsaal; John Hoblet; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Thomas Sperman; Thomas Walden.

ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE OF JOHN:

John Ferus; Girolamo Savonarola.

ON THE APOCALYPSE:

Albinus; Ambrose of Conza; Ambrose of Milan; Andrew of Caesarea; Apringius; Arethas; Ascensius [Josse Bade]; Augustinus Romanus; Aurelius Augustine; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Bernardino of Siena; Bruno of Segni; Claudius Montemartyr; Coelius Pannonius; Dionysius of Alexandria; Fridericus Genetus; Gaufredus; Gennadius of Marseilles; Henricus Hassius; Helias; Hippolytus; Jacob of Stralen; Joachim the Abbot; Ioan-[nes →]

[→ p336 (next batch): catchword "Ioan" (Ioannes...)]

(Rich PDF p. 336 [printed folio 317, recto]. Book IV — the by-book/topical index concludes: the Apocalypse (concl.), the Mass-lections, the Passion of Christ, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, and the Ferial Canticles; then a ***Second Catalog (by exegetical method)*** *opens, its first class the Abridgers. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[Catalog of the Expositors, by the order of the books — continued. On the Apocalypse, concluded:]

John Annius; John of Wales; John Haiton; John Henten; John Tacesphalus; John Torphe; Jordanus; Irenaeus; Justin; Melito; Methodius; Nepos; Nicholas Alsentius; Primasius; Serafino of Fermo; Tyconius; Thomas Suduolcas [Walden]; Ubertino of Casale; Victorinus the Martyr; Vitalis the Cardinal.

Catalog of those who wrote separately on the Gospels, epistles, and other lections of divine scripture that are read in the Masses (whether through Lent or through the circle of the year):

Albert of Padua; Albinus; Anthony of Bitonto; Antonius Bruich; Antonio Gislandi; Aurelius Augustine; Bede; Callistus; Caesarius; Cyril of Jerusalem; David; Egbert; Ericus; Eusebius of Emesa; Flavian; Francisco de Osuna; Friedrich Nausea; Fulgentius; Walter Disseus; Georg Witzel; Gerard of Stredam; Gregory the Pope; Gottschalk; Guerric; William Pepin; Haymo; Henry of Kalkar; Henricus Consueldius; Henry Herp; Henricus Helmesius; Henry of Langenstein; Henry of Friemar; Hermann Petra; Hildegard; Honorius; Jacobus of Genoa; Jacob Schöpper; Innocent III; John Arundineus; John Beethz; John Castellensis; John Doceus; John Dominici; John Ferus; John Gauuer; John Hoffmeister; John Justus; John Maria; John Nider; John Niuecellensis; John Regno; John Royaerts; John Tauler; John Torquemada; Jodocus; Maurice of Paris; Maximus of Turin; Michael of Cesena; Nicholas of Cusa; Nicholas Herborn; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Peter Chrysologus; Peter of Speyer; Peter Auriol; Sanctius; Sixtus; Smaragdus; Stephen of Paris; Sylvester; Titus; Thomas Hasselbach.

Catalog of those who wrote on the Passion of Christ, according to the history of the four Evangelists:

Antonio de Guevara; Boninus; Dominic Mancini; Francesco Zichenius; Georgius Molitoris; Gerard Lorich; Gregory Nazianzen; William of Aachen; Henricus Arnoldi; Henricus Gulpen; Henry Suso; Hieronymus Patavinus; John Benius; John Caneman; John of Capistrano; John Ferus; John Francesco Quintiano; John Tauler; Leo the Pope; Theodoric of Herxen; Tullio Crispoldi.

On the Decalogue:

Antiochus the Monk; Arnoldus; Bonaventure; Friedrich Nausea; Gerard of Stredam; Gottschalk; Henry Herp; Henry of Friemar; Hermann of Cologne; John Beetz; John Gerson; John Nider; Michael of Milan; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas Hasselbach.

On the Lord's Prayer:

Aegidius; Albertus Magnus; Bernard; Bonaventure; Charles de Bovelles; Cyprian of Carthage; Hermann of Cologne; Hermann Petra; Girolamo Savonarola; John Gerson; John Ludovicus; John Pico; Jodocus; Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl; Peter of Ailly; Theodoric of Herxen; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas Hasselbach.

On the Angelic Salutation [the Hail Mary]:

Aegidius; Bernard; Henry of Langenstein; John Isdinius; Peter of Ailly; Theodoric of Herxen; Thomas Aquinas.

On the Ferial Canticles:

Euthymius; Jaime Pérez of Valencia; Theodoret; Ludolph the Carthusian.

Second Catalog — the Expositors Distributed by Method

ANOTHER CATALOG, in which the expositors of divine Scripture are distributed into various classes, according to the variety of the methods which the sacred expositors used in expounding the holy letters.

Abridgers [Abbreviatores], who abridged the prolix commentaries of the expositors:

Aretas; Bede; Euthymius; Jerome of Stridon; Odo of Cluny; Peter Ximenius; Simon of Afflighem; Theodoret; Theophylact.

[→ p337 (next batch): catchword "ANNO" (Anno-tatores…)]

(Rich PDF p. 337 [printed folio 318, verso]. Book IV, the Second Catalog (expositors by method) continues — Annotators, Chronographers, Compilers, Collectors, Commentators (a note), Compendium-makers, Dialogue-writers, Dictionary-makers, Disputants, Eclogue-writers, Letter-writers, Geographers, Harmony-makers, and (opening) Homilists. Three columns; the method-classes run in alphabetical order. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[Second Catalog (by method) — continued:]

Annotators [Annotatores]:

Apollinaris the Younger; Anselm of Laon; Aurelius Augustine; Bernardino Gadolo; Francesco Marone; Francesco Titelmann; Jerome of Stridon; Hugh of St Victor; John Benedictus; Nicholas Zigenus; Origen; Peter Auriol [Verberius]; Richard of St Victor.

Chronographers [Chronographi]:

Bede; Eusebius; Hermann Contractus; John Driedo; Julius Africanus; Joseph of Jerusalem; Philo Judaeus; Richard of St Victor.

Compilers [Coacervatores]:

Alfonso Tostado; Gregory the Pope; Henry of Langenstein; Sixtus of Como; Thomas Hasselbach; Vincent of Beauvais.

Collectors — rhapsodists and cento-makers [Collectores, Rapsodi Centonarii]:

Alalphus; Aloysius; Arethas; Augustine of Ancona; Bartholomew of Urbino; Bede; the Greek Catena on Job; the Greek Catena on the Psalms; the Greek Catena on the Gospels; Dominicus Nannus; Epiphanius Scholasticus; Eucherius; Euthymius; Eudocia; Francesco Puteanus; Gottfried Tilmann; Werner of Paris; Haymo; Henricus Helmesius; Paterius; Patricius; Peter of Tripoli; Peter of Herentals; Primasius; Proba; Rabanus; Santes Pagninus; Seclubius; Theodolus; Thomas Aquinas.

Commentators [Commentatores]: Since there are very few expositors of divine scripture who have not elaborated something in the method of commentary; and again, since (as we advised in the third book of this work) it has come about that whatever [are] the labors of the sacred expositors are called "commentaries," we have judged it superfluous to append here a Catalog of commentators.

Compendium-makers [Conpendiarii], who drew the divine scriptures into a compendium:

Alan of Lille; Aurelius Cassiodorus; John the Monk; Peter Bersuire.

Dialogue-writers [Dialogistae]:

Apollinaris the Younger; Aurelius Augustine; Jacopo Sadoleto; John Gerson; Paduanus; Salonius; Zacharias.

Dictionary-makers [Dictionarii]:

Andreas Placus; Bede; Epiphanius; Eucherius; Francisco Ximénez; John Benedictus; John Pratus; Isidore of Seville; Mammotretus; Marcus of Ulm; Origen; Philo; Santes Pagninus.

Disputants — question-writers [Disputatores Quaestionarii]:

Aegidius; Alfonso Tostado; Albinus; Apollinaris; Antonio Gislandi; Aurelius Augustine; Bede; Cyril; Eucherius; Eusebius of Caesarea; Francesco Giorgio; Jerome; Hugh of St Victor; John Arboreus; Justin; Matthew Döring; Methodius; Paul of Burgos; Philip of Side; Philo Judaeus; Richard of Cluny; Serafino Cumirano; Tatian; Theodoret; Thomas Aquinas.

Eclogue-writers / excerptors [Eglogistae]:

Arlottus; Aurelius Augustine; Cyprian of Carthage; Defensor; John Mentolonius; John Niuecellensis; Melito; Nicholas Hanapus; Peter, bishop of Città Nuova.

Letter-writers [Epistolarii]:

Ambrose; Aurelius Augustine; Jerome; Isidore of Pelusium.

Geographers [Geographi]:

Adamnan; Albert the Patriarch; Bede; Burchard; Callisto of Piacenza; Eusebius of Caesarea; William of Aachen; Ludolf von Suchen; Matthaeus Aurogallus; Oronce Finé; Peter Apian; Rudolph Lange; Roger Bacon.

Harmony-makers [Harmonici]:

Ammonius of Alexandria; Antonius Bruichius; Diego de Deza; Dominicus Nannus; Eusebius of Caesarea; Gerard Lorich; John Gerson; Robert Goullet; Simon Corroy; Sixtus of Siena; Tatian; Theophilus of Alexandria; Victor.

Homilists & Expounders [Homiliastae & Enarratores]:

Albinus; Ambrose of Milan; Amphilochius; Anastasius; Anselm of Canterbury; Antiochus; Antonio Pucci; Aurelius Augustine; Basil; Bede; Bernard; Candidus; Cyril of Alexandria; Cyril of Jerusalem; Ericus; Eusebius of Emesa; Francesco Visdomini; Friedrich Nausea; Fulgentius; Gilbert the Cistercian; Gregory Nazianzen; Gregory of Nyssa; Gregory the Pope; Guerric; Haymo; Hilary; Hippolytus; Hugh of St Victor; Jacob Schöpper; John Chrysostom; Ioan-[nes →]

[→ p338 (next batch): catchword "Ioannes" (the Homilists continue)]

(Rich PDF p. 338 [printed folio 319, recto]. Book IV, the Second Catalog (by method) continues — Homilists (concl.), Isagogics, Index-makers, Meditators, Paraphrasers, Partitioners, Poets, Sciographers, and the long class of Scholastics. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)

[Second Catalog (by method) — continued. Homilists & Expounders, concluded:]

John Eck; John Ferus; John Hoffmeister; John Justus; John Maria Verattus; Isidore Clario; Jodocus; Maximus of Turin; Origen; Peter Chrysologus; Peter of Edessa; Philip the Chancellor; Severianus; Zeno; Peter Comestor; Philo Judaeus; Rainerius Snoy of Gouda.

Isagogics [Isagogici]:

Alanus Lymna; Alard of Amsterdam; Ambrose of Conza; Aurelius Augustine; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Bede; Bonaventure; Eucherius; Francesco Rinzius; Georg Witzel; Werner of Paris; Guido of Évreux; William Gregory; Hermann Schild; Hugh of St Victor; Jacob Gouschelius; Jaime Pérez of Valencia; John Bertramus; John Driedo; John Gerson; John Hagen; Othmar Nachtgall; Peter Bersuire; Rabanus; Santes Pagninus; Theodorus; Tyconius.

Index-makers [Indicistae]:

Conrad of Halberstadt; Euthalius; Gabriel Brunus; Hugh of Cher.

Meditators [Meditatores]:

Bernard; Bonaventure; Dionysius the Carthusian; Henry Herp; Girolamo Savonarola; John Gerson; John Louis Vives; Ludolph the Carthusian; Ninian; the bishop of the Picts; Peter of Ailly.

Paraphrasers [Paraphrastae]:

Christianus Ischirius; Francesco Titelmann; Gregory of Neocaesarea; Hegesippus; John Torquemada; Joseph of Jerusalem; Justus of Tiberias.

Partitioners [Partitores], who — the books of divine scripture being divided into parts — imposed on each of the parts its summaries and arguments:

Alexander Dolensis; Bonaventure; Cyrus Prodromus; Francesco Gothus; John Benedictus; Nicephorus.

Poets [Poetae]:

Alexander of Villedieu; Álvaro Gómez; Angelo Sangrini; Apollinaris the Elder; Arator; Avitus; Aurelius Prudentius; Bonaventure; Bonino Mombrizio; Caedmon; Cornelius Magnanus; Dracontius; Dominic Mancini; Eudocia; Eulalius; Ezechiel; Francesco Bonadus; Francesco Gothi; Francesco Spinola; Gerard of Breda; Gregory Nazianzen; Godfrey; Godelbert; Guido of Ferrara; Girolamo Fracastoro; Hieronymus Patavinus; Jerome of Stridon; Girolamo Vida; Hilary of Arles; Jacobus Furnius; Jacopo Sannazaro; John Francesco Quintiano; John Gagny; John Neouillanus; Iovita Rapicio; Iuvencus; Louis the Younger; Maffeo Vegio; Marbod; Marius Victorinus; Matthias Vindonicensis; Nicephorus; Patricius; Peter of Edessa; Peter Riga; Peter of Rosenheim; Proba; Salvian; Sedulius; Sigebert; Theodolus; Theodore the Abbot; Tertullian.

Sciographers [Sciographi]:

Albrecht Dürer; Aurelius Cassiodorus; Bede; Callisto of Piacenza; Damiano Maraffi; Eusebius of Caesarea; Jerome of Stridon; John Buteo; Oronce Finé; Peter Apian; Richard of St Victor.

Scholastics [Scholastici]:

Aegidius of Viterbo; Alan of Lille; Alanus Lymna; Alan of la Roche; Albert Magnus; Albert of Padua; Alexander Dolensis; Alexander of Hales; Alexander Neckam; Alfonso Tostado; Anthony of Bitonto; Antoninus of Florence; Ascensius the Franciscan; Augustine of Ancona; Augustinus Romanus; Bartholomew of Bologna; Benedict Stendal; Bernardino of Siena; Bonaventure the Cardinal; Clement Araneus; Conrad of Halberstadt; Conrad of Hirsau; Crisostomo Javelli; David; Dionysius the Carthusian; Eccardus; Egbert; Francesco Marone; Gabriel Brebia; Geoffrey Allieuant; Walter Disseus; Gerard of Bologna; Gerard of Savona; Gerard of Stredam; Gilbert of Paris; Gilbert of Poitiers; Gilbert the Englishman; Werner of Paris; Guido of Évreux; Guido of Perpignan; William Alconas; William of Auvergne; William of Aachen; William of Paris; William Pepin; William Vellis; Gregory of Rimini; Henry Arnoldi; Henricus Consueldius; Henry Gulpen; Henry of Kalkar; Henry of Langenstein; Henry Vichingen; Henri-[cus →]

[→ p339 (next batch): catchword "Henricus" (the Scholastics continue)]

(Rich PDF p. 339 [printed folio 320, verso]. Book IV — the Second Catalog (by method) concludes (Scholastics concl., Supplers, Thematics, Translators); then a new closing treatise opens: ***A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books*** *(why the titles/attributions of many church writings were fabricated or corrupted, and how to detect it). Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)*

[Second Catalog (by method) — continued. Scholastics, concluded:]

Henry of Friemar; Hermann Petra; Hermann Schild; Hubert Leonardo; Ubertino of Casale; Hugh of Cher; Jacobus Anglicus; Jacobus, Bishop of Christopolis; Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa; Jacobus Lusanensis; Jacobus Magnus; Jacobus Martinus; Jacob of Stralen; Ludolf von Suchen; Innocent III; Innocent V; John Annius; John Baconthorpe; John Balbus; John Beethz; John Duns; John of Frankfurt; John of Wales; John Gauuer; John Gerson; John Hagen; John Haiton; John Nider; John Noblet; Leonard of Giffoni; Ludolph the Carthusian; Matthew Döring; Matthew of Évreux; Michael Aiguani; Michael of Cesena; Michael of Massa; Nicholas Alsentia; Nicholas of Gorran; Nicholas of Lyra; Nicholas Trivet; Paul of Burgos; Peter Bersuire; Peter Gottfried; Peter of La Palud; Peter Riga; Peter Scala; Peter Auriol; Philip the Chancellor; Richard Ampolus; Richard of Exeter; Richard Lavinan; Richard Middleton; Rupert Holcoth; Rupert de Regno; Rupert Walsingham; Sancho de Porta; Sertorius; Simon of Cremona; Simon of Speyer; Stephen the Englishman; Sylvester Prierias; Thomas Aquinas; Thomas Hasselbach; Thomas Cajetan; Thomas of Wales; Thomas Sperman; Thomas Walden; Werner de Laer; Hubert Leonardo; Ubertino of Casale.

Supplers [Suppletores], who supplied and completed the imperfect commentaries of the expositors:

Gilbert the Monk; Gregory of Nyssa; Jodocus; Eudocia.

Thematics [Thematici]:

Ambrose; Gregory of Nyssa; Philo Judaeus; Vincent of Beauvais.

Translators [Translatores]:

Aquila of Sinope; Augustine, Bishop of Nebbio; Edward Leigh; Eusebius of Caesarea; Felix of Prato; Francisco Ximénez; William, Abbot of Hirsau; Hesychius the Monk; Jerome of Leopolis [Lviv]; Jerome of Stridon; James the Apostle; Jacobus, Archbishop of Genoa; John, King of Aragon; John Chrysostom; John Dietenberger; John Eck; Diego López de Zúñiga [Stunica]; John Poccanus; John Cinqarbres; Joseph of Tiberias; the Italian [Old-Latin] edition; Lucian the Martyr; Michael Adam; Origen; Patrophilus of Scythopolis; Peter Sutor; Robert Olivétan; Rudolph Agricola; Santes Pagninus; the Seventy-two Interpreters; Simon Atumano; Sophronius; Symmachus; the Syriac edition; Theodotion; Thomas Cajetan; Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths.

A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books

A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books, showing for what causes it has come about that the inscriptions [titles/attributions] of many Ecclesiastical volumes were either fabricated or corrupted, and by what conjectures one may detect the fiction or falsehood of the inscriptions.

Not without reason did the ancient expositors of illustrious writers prescribe that the inscriptions of works, and the names of the authors, be diligently inquired into at the beginning of each volume, and weighed with prudent judgment.[1] For they perceived how much it matters to know of what erudition and authority the author of each work was — especially in the writings of the sacred Fathers and of the noble Doctors of the Church: whence, as if from the oracles of the Academy of Theologians, [the theologians] receive the constancy of their assertions, and the Supreme Pontiffs take [thence] the decrees by which the Christian world is ruled. And I myself, not ignorant of this — since I have often indicated in this volume that many pseudepigrapha, adulterine, and supposititious [works] are found among the monuments of the Catholic expositors, [works] which are not [those] of the men whose titles and inscriptions they bear — it has seemed good to me, for the benefit of those who are more teachable than learned, first to explain from what causes and occasions the error of fabricated inscriptions has arisen, and then to show by what marks the fiction of such titles may be discerned.

That I may therefore begin from the first: the manner of fabricating an inscription is, in general, twofold[2] — one proceeding from the very authors of the works, the other devised by the readers. Further, the occasions of

inscribing [titles] taken up by the authors are some honorable, some base. Among the honorable, in the first place is to be reckoned the *omission* of the inscription. For it happens that the inscriptions of books are for the most part deliberately omitted by their authors, and then are inscribed by the copyists and title-writers however it seemed good to them; but of the omitted inscriptions there can be various causes.

First [→]

[→ p340 (next batch): catchword "Primùm"]

---

[1] The inscriptions of works, and the names of the authors, at the beginning of volumes, must be diligently weighed. [2] There are two causes of fabricated inscriptions.

(Rich PDF p. 340 [printed folio 321, recto]. Book IV — the Admonition on the False Inscription of Books *continues: the honorable causes of anonymous or misattributed titles (modesty; anonymous testing of judgment, per Gregory Nazianzen; Paul's Hebrews, per Jerome; avoidance of envy; humility), the pseudo-correspondences (Paul–Seneca, the Phalaris and Brutus letters, Porcius Latro's Cicero declamation), then the base causes (hoaxers and heretics; the Manichaean apostolic forgeries; Calvin as "Alcuin"), and corrupted titles from equivocation of names (Rufinus, Erasmus). Two-column prose. Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books — continued:]

First, the zeal of modesty and humility: for which reason indeed, since the author of the book *On the Cardinal Virtues of Christ* testifies, to Pope Cornelius, that he had been unwilling to prefix his own name as the title of his work — I know not who ascribed it to Cyprian and inserted it among his writings, perhaps moved by the conjecture that Cyprian [too] wrote to that same pontiff.

Then there are those who, for the sake of testing another's judgment, publish their lucubrations lacking a title, so that — as if hiding behind the tablet in the manner of Apelles — they may learn the opinions of the readers, and correct the faults of the work freely detected by them. Thus that great Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen] writes, in the preface of his book *On the Faith,* that he had begged his friend to read that same book — the author's name being removed and the person of the composer concealed — to learned and prudent men, so that, if [the friend] had prompted anyone [to object] that something there seemed less rightly stated, it might be emended by the counsel of many.

There have been also those who abstained from titles for the benefit of those by whom they wished their [works] to be read, lest by the title of a despised or little-favored name they should diminish the esteem of the work and keep readers from its usefulness. This Jerome asserts that Paul once did, writing to the Hebrews:[1] since he knew himself to be gravely hateful to them on account of the neglected traditions of the Pharisees and the Mosaic ceremonies, he was unwilling to deter them, by the prefixing of a hateful name, from the reading of a most salutary epistle. Whence it came about that certain of the ancient fathers ascribed it either to Barnabas or to Clement. Nor were there lacking those who, to avoid envy, hatred, and the perils of dangers, published their writings marked with no name, lest they should provoke against themselves those who, by the published writings, were either injured or at least thought themselves injured. To these afterwards someone, led by some slight conjecture, appended a title, such as happened then to be at hand. There have likewise been found those who — [having] certain little works of their own of very slight moment, written for the sake of rude and simple friends — were unwilling to prefix their own name, lest the rudeness of the composition and the humility of the subject should detract from the composer's authority. These then, in the progress of time, obtained a chance inscription from a chance title-giver.

From nearly the same causes flowed the custom of fabricated inscriptions, preserved by several of the ancient authors. **Salvian, Bishop of Marseilles,** for this reason put out his parenetic [exhortatory] books under the fictitious appellation of *Timothy,* [addressed] to the Church of God spread throughout the whole world, so

that — the vanity of human glory being neglected — he might render the honor of that labor to God alone. **Vincent of Lérins,** a most eloquent presbyter, upon the disputations which he composed against the profane novelties of the heretics, his own name being hidden (hateful to the heretics), imposed the title of *Peregrinus* [the Stranger], so that they might the more willingly be read by the heretics, who are greedy of strange things. There is also another reason for the authors' fabricating a title — namely, the exercise of studies: since in those [works] which are wont to be written for the sake of exercise, titles are not seriously prefixed, as in declamatory themes, which the Greeks call προγυμνάσματα, or μελέται — that is, *pre-exercises* or *meditations* — in which those who exercise themselves put not their own names, but [the name] of him whose person they attempt to represent. Of this kind are believed to be, among our own [writers], the epistles of Paul to Seneca and Seneca's Epistles to Paul, and the dialogue of Augustine and Orosius on Genesis; but among the heathen, the epistles of Phalaris of Agrigentum, and the epistles of Brutus. Thus Porcius Latro treated Cicero's argument against Catiline — playing, of course, the person of Cicero — and, whenever it fell [to him to speak], he calls himself Tullius, not Porcius. Hence the error of those who think the fictitious matter to be serious, and believe such little works to be [the works] of those under whose names they are fabricated. These, then, and [causes] like these, are the not-blameworthy causes of the varied inscriptions, to which the authors themselves — yet without their fault — seem to have given occasion.

But among the base and shameful occasions of pseudepigraphy arisen through the fault of authors — that I may not enumerate them singly — that which is the worst of all has come forth from a twofold kind of most wicked men. Of these, certain sycophants, or rascals, born to mock and impose, adorn their trifles and ditties (fabricated for jest and mockery) with illustrious inscriptions, so that, while unlearned readers take up such follies as though the offspring of noble writers, and unroll them with admiration, they [the hoaxers] meanwhile enjoy, not without laughter, their gaping credulity. But others, laboring under the heretical plague, wrap their most pestilent writings in the splendid coverings of Catholic titles, so that, under the pretext of an orthodox name, their poisons may be scattered more quickly and more widely among the common people, to the greater harm of men.[2] Hence once arose those most impudent pseudepigrapha — namely, the *Ascension of Moses,* the *Apocalypse of Elijah,* the *Gospels of Thomas, Thaddaeus, Philip, Bartholomew,* the *Acts,* [the Gospels] *of Peter, Andrew, and John,* and other trifles like these — devised by the disciples of Manichaeus the Persian, who had imposed on themselves the names of the twelve apostles.

Thus far concerning the causes of falsified inscriptions, drawn both from the probity and from the improbity of authors: now it must be said of the occasions of *corrupted* titles, which have emanated from outsiders and strangers.[3] These are chiefly two — error, and fraud (fraud looks toward error and impudence): [namely,] the equivocation of a Name; the agreement of the Argument or of the style; the similitude of the Persons to whom, or by whom, works are dedicated; also, as I have already said, the *defect* of a title; and the *simulation* of a title for the sake of exercise. From **Equivocation** it frequently happens in practice that an affinity of names, or of surnames, or of titles has given a handle for erring — as once [it did] to Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, who, deceived by the similarity of the words, inscribed the *Enchiridion* of Xystus the Pythagorean to Xystus [Sixtus] the Pontiff, and attributed the *Apology for Origen* of Pamphilus and Eusebius to Pamphilus the martyr, a devotee of Origen. Erasmus, led by a similar error, [attributed] the *Commentaries on the Psalter* of Arnobius the presbyter to Arnobius [→]

[→ p341 (next batch): catchword "Arnobio"]

[1] What moved St. Paul not to ascribe his name to the Epistle to the Hebrews. [2] Heretics within our own memory have inscribed their books with fabricated names, to deceive unlearned readers — thus Calvin called himself *Alcuin.* [3] The inscriptions of books are corrupted for two causes.

(Rich PDF p. 341 [printed folio 322, verso]. Book IV — the Admonition on the False Inscription of Books *continues: misattribution by style/subject similarity (Archytas → Aristotle; Julian of Eclanum → Jerome); deliberate fraud (profiteering booksellers; heretics disguising Apollinaris under Athanasius and a Tertullian*

tract under Cyprian; plagiarists like John Gast; forgeries out of enmity — the pseudo-apostles' false Pauline letters, 2 Thess 2:2; Origen's and Leo's complaints); and finally misattribution from excessive love of an author. Two-column prose. Running head: BIBLIOTHECAE SANCTAE.)

[A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books — continued:]

...[Erasmus attributed the *Commentaries on the Psalter* of Arnobius the presbyter] to Arnobius the Rhetor, that most flourishing [author]. From this deception it came about that not a few works of Thomas the Englishman were given to Thomas the Angelic Doctor [Aquinas]. From the omission of titles, too, and from the occasional fiction of titles (as we advised above), it happens that less-learned readers, or hasty writers, conjecture that books destitute of a title are to be ascribed to one [author] rather than another, and think that exercises with a simulated title are the compositions of those whose fictitious titles they bear. The similitude of style also, or the community of subject, or the nearness of those to whom (or by whom) the writings are sent, not rarely cause the studious, in distinguishing books lacking a title through various chances, to ascribe the name not of him whose the work is, but of him whose they suspect it to be — either because another has written on a similar matter, or [written] to the same [persons], or in a similar style and method. Thus among the philosophers there are those who affirm that the *Categories* of Archytas of Tarentum were wrongly prefixed to Aristotle's *Organon*, and marked with the Aristotelian name for no other cause than because of the similitude of the matter treated by both. Thus among the Theologians there are those who assert that that celebrated epistle, or little book, which Julian, Bishop of Eclanum — infected with the Pelagian stain — wrote to the virgin Demetrias, was on that account ascribed to Jerome, because he too wrote to the same virgin on a not-dissimilar subject. Again it sometimes happens that either a copyist or some studious person, on account of the not-dissimilar subject of the work, couples the little books of diverse authors in the same volume; then a reader too little attentive — either not finding the ascribed titles, or [finding them] shown obliterated — thinks all [the works] to be of him whose name he has beheld on the frontispiece of the volume.

There are, on the other hand, those who, of set purpose, corrupt and change the inscriptions by fraud and deceit, and that for various but most base ends. Some, for the sake of usefulness, gain, and base lucre — such as the writers, printers, dealers, and sellers of volumes — crown the offspring of common, and sometimes even of obscure, men with the titles of nobler authors, evidently by such a paint hunting the foolish credulity of hasty buyers. In this place the English have thrust upon us the *centos* of a certain collector on the volumes of Genesis and Kings, [passed off] for the *Commentaries* of Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons; and the patches of an anonymous and more recent rhapsodist on the annual Gospel-lections, [passed off] for the *Homilies* of Eusebius of Emesa; likewise they have sold the *Collections* of Theophylact on Paul, and [the collections] of a Rabbi on the Threni [Lamentations] of Jeremiah, under the more splendid names of St. Athanasius and St. Jerome. **Others,** contaminated with the plagues of divers heresies, transform the books published by the execrable doctors of their sects and — the authors' names being removed, as being hateful and condemned by ecclesiastical censure — put in their place the plausible appellations of the Catholic Fathers, by which the deceived simplicity of readers may drink the poisons of the heresies without any suspicion of danger. So once, as Rufinus writes in his *Apologeticus*, the Pneumatomachian heretics, who blasphemed the Holy Spirit, sold a little book of Tertullian thinking wrongly about the faith of the Trinity — propagated in many codices under the name of Cyprian the martyr — for a small sum of money, so that the buyers, enticed both by the greatness of the man and by the smallness of the price, might the more willingly buy it and embrace the latent errors as sacred dogmas, approved by the authority of so great a martyr. So once, as Evagrius reported in the third [book] of his Ecclesiastical History, the Nestorians and Eutychians published the writings of Apollinaris — from which they had received the seeds of their deceptions — under the title of Athanasius the Great, so that by that splendor of light they might the more easily dazzle the eyes of Catholics. So in our own age we have seen the most pestilent writings of heretics, transformed [only] as far as the title, into the labors

of holy Catholic men and of the prelates of the Church — which, since I have touched on them in the preface of the whole work and in the fourth book, I now pass over for the sake of brevity.

There are also certain slothful little thieves who — like the Aesopic little crow selling itself off with others' feathers, and in the manner of the cuckoo leaping into others' nests — steal the labors of other writers, and, the true titles being erased, impose their own names. Which it is agreed that a certain John Gast did in recent years, who impudently usurped for himself the *Collectanea* of Bartholomew, Bishop of Urbino, on both Testaments (excerpted from Augustine nearly two hundred years before), and — what is even baser — cunningly truncated and mutilatedly cut off several passages of that same work, and wrested them to the heresies of the Lutherans. To these are to be added certain most abandoned men, driven by the goads of enmity, who — for the hatred and ignominy of good authors, and to lower the authority and credit of illustrious doctors — fabricate odious volumes under their titles. Which began to happen not only in this wretched age of ours, but is agreed to have been done from the very beginnings of the Church by pseudo-apostles, who, in the person of Paul, sent false epistles back and forth, sprinkled with depraved dogmas, by which they might disturb the churches and stir up their enmities against the Apostle. This he indicates in the latter epistle to the Thessalonians, saying: *We beseech you, be not terrified by an epistle as though sent by us; for let no one seduce you in any way.*[1] Origen too complained, in his epistle to his Alexandrian friends, that fabricated disputations against the faith of the Church, prefaced with an Origenic preface, were scattered abroad by his impious detractors, to stir up the envy of pious men against him. Leo, the Roman Pontiff, grieved on the same occasion, writing to the Emperor Marcian, that the heretics had corrupted his epistles, so that from thence they might seize a handle for accusing him of the impiety of the Nestorian heresy.

Finally, there are others who, led by a contrary zeal — that is, seized by an excessive and immoderate love of some writer — claim for him the lucubrations of others, usurped without any judgment or discernment, thinking to procure for their beloved author a greater celebrity of name by the increase and multitude of [his] books. Moved by this affection — excusable perhaps, but by no means to be approved — certain lovers of Thomistic sanctity and wisdom [have ascribed] to the *Exegetics* [commentaries] of St. Thomas [→]

[→ p342 (next batch): catchword "Thomae"]

[1] 2 Thess. 2:2.

---

*(Rich PDF p. 342 [printed folio 323; the leaf stamps "325" — a misprint]. **Book IV, conclusion.** The* Admonition on the False Inscription of Books *completes the three marks for detecting false titles: **time** (anachronism — the pseudo-Gregory excerpts), **dogmas** (the pseudo-Cyril Origenist Leviticus tracts), and **style** (the touchstone; each Father's characteristic manner; the pseudo-Arnobius). Then follows **the End of the Fourth Book.** Running head: LIBER QVARTVS.)*

[A Brief Admonition on the False Inscription of Books — concluded:]

...[certain lovers of Thomistic sanctity and wisdom have inserted] into the *Exegetics* [commentaries] of St. Thomas commentaries on Genesis, on Isaiah, on Jeremiah, on Threni [Lamentations], on John, on the Catholic Epistles, on the Apocalypse, and very many others like these — [works] to be compared neither in erudition nor in acumen of judgment with his other writings.

Let these things be said concerning the causes and occasions of corrupted inscriptions; now [it remains] to pursue as briefly as possible by what marks their corruption may be detected and convicted.[1] Three things above the rest distinguish true inscriptions from false, genuine from fictitious: **time, dogmas, style.**

First, if the reckoning of times does not agree with the matters described, it becomes evident that the work is not [the work] of him whose title it bears. [Such are] the *Commentaries* which now circulate — of Ambrose

on the Apocalypse, of Jerome on the Parables of Solomon [Proverbs] and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, of Eucherius on the first book of Moses and on the four volumes of Kings, and of Junilius the African on the Hexaemeron. No one will say these to be [the works] of such authors, since he will have read in them *centos*, fragments, and whole pages excerpted from the *Moralia* of Gregory. Nor do I think anyone will be so dull or so shameless as to deny that such rhapsodies were drawn from the commentaries of Gregory, and to affirm the contrary — that they were derived by Gregory, from the sources of those doctors, into his own commentaries. For besides that the name of Gregory, frequently cited in the aforesaid volumes, openly demonstrates this, so great too is everywhere in Gregorian writings the evenness of diction, so great always the similitude of style, and the series of discourse so aptly continued, that nothing appears in them either borrowed from elsewhere or able to seem to have proceeded from another author.

Secondly, if the dogmas not only do not agree with the author's mind, but fight [with it] diametrically, it immediately follows either that the work is not the true and genuine offspring of him whose it is believed to be, or that it is adulterated and most basely corrupted by corrupters. For who would dare affirm that the sixteen tracts of Origen on Leviticus, printed under the name of Cyril by Herwagen, are Cyril's, since in them there occur everywhere [the notions that] souls were created before the world and thrust down into bodies for their crimes as into chains; that the punishments of the underworld will at some time have an end; that the demons after certain times are to be restored to their lost felicity; and very many other Origenic assertions, which Cyril everywhere, with his whole heart and with all his might, attacks and overthrows.

The third, and perhaps of all the more evident and more certain conjecture, is the *diversity of style*, which, like the Lydian stone [touchstone], distinguishes false inscriptions from true. For although it is easy for any impostor to lie about the authors' homeland, family, and times, and to follow [their] dogmas, yet nothing is more difficult than to imitate another's style.[2] But by *style* I call not that outer surface of speech, but the character of the discourse, the context of the diction, the continuity of the texture, the form of elocution, the figures of speech, the artifice of arrangement, the method of treatment, and the rest, which are proper to each eloquent author. For as each man has his own habit of body, so each has his own countenance, his own native color, his own voice, and other singular marks by which he is distinguished from other men: so in each of the writers of the Church there are certain peculiar properties, which either never or rarely suit another — such as are the plausible pomp of Antiochus, the accurate diligence of diction of Basil, the sublime buskin of Gregory the Theologian, the spontaneously-flowing atticism of Chrysostom, the most pure facility of Cyprian, the Gallic grandiloquence of Hilary, the grave and pointed abundance of brief sentences in Ambrose, in Jerome the painted variety of matters and words, in Augustine the clauses ending alike and the commata falling alike, in Gregory the numerous march of periods answering one another by turns, and other things like these — which, however much one may affect [them], he yet could by no means attain.

Nor am I ignorant that there are those who think otherwise, asserting that in detecting the impostures of titles there is no sign more fallacious than style: since the manner of speaking is not always the same even for the same [author], but changes according to the nature of the subject, or the change of age, or the progress of study, or the diversity of the affections; and often the character of two authors is altogether very similar. Which I myself do not entirely deny: for Jerome writes one way in his epistles, speaks another way in his contentions against Rufinus and Vigilantius, and [yet] another way in his commentaries on the prophets; he spoke in one manner when he was quite young and still warm with the exercise of the rhetoricians, and in another manner as an old man, when he pursued weightier things. But yet he so always writes and speaks that everywhere you recognize him to be Jerome — just as you recognize the face of a friend familiar to you (now angry, now gentle, now sad, now cheerful) to be always [the face] of the same man. I confess also that among some (though this is very rare) there can occur so great a similitude of style that it is not easy to distinguish them: yet an industrious craftsman of style will distinguish similitude from similitude no otherwise than sagacious jewelers tell apart diamonds equal in size and not unlike in splendor. But, to grant

[that the judgment of distinguishing must proceed] by dissimilitude of style and diversity of character, to notice the deceptions of false ascriptions: since [as to] those rude and unpolished commentaries, teeming with solecisms and barbarisms, which now are sold under the title of Arnobius, even one moderately exercised will perceive from the taste of the speech that they are not [the work] of that most excellent orator Arnobius, who wrote seven most eloquent volumes against the nations. Likewise the commentaries on Job and on Mark, inserted among the Hieronymian tomes, no one will ever suspect to be Jerome's, unless he thinks that Jerome unlearned the Latin tongue and was utterly ignorant of Greek and Hebrew.

Therefore the conjecture of style, in my judgment at least, is not to be ranked after the others. And let it suffice to have touched briefly on these few marks for distinguishing pseudepigrapha: which, although — to confess it frankly — they cannot openly and certainly demonstrate of what author a work is concerning which there is doubt, yet they do not obscurely indicate that the work is by no means [the work] of him to whom it is ascribed.

THE END OF THE FOURTH BOOK

*(**Libri quarti Finis.** With this, Book IV — and the whole first half of the* Bibliotheca Sancta, *Books I–IV — is complete. The catchword "F. SIX[TVS]" previews the opening of **LIBER QVINTVS** on the next leaf [rich PDF p. 343], which is out of scope for this project.)*

[1] By what reasons the true inscriptions of books may be distinguished from the false. [2] It is difficult to imitate another's style.

Sixtus of Siena, O.P. (Sixtus Senensis)

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA

Books V & VI — The Annotations on the Old and New Testaments

Combined English edition — the Preface and 264 Annotations of Liber Quintus with the 348 Annotations of Liber Sextus, cross-referenced throughout, with five unified indices

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS & INDEX

Books V and VI of the Bibliotheca Sancta, located by PDF page

 Five indices at the back of this volume: ***Subject Index*** · ***Index of Persons*** · ***Councils*** · ***Heresies*** · ***Scripture Passages***

PART I — BOOK V: THE OLD TESTAMENT

Page 17: Preface

Genesis

Page 20: Annotation I, Whether the beginning of Genesis pertains to the Trinity (Genesis 1:1)
Page 21: Annotation II, Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods (Genesis 1:1)
Page 21: Annotation III, Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (Genesis 1:1)
Page 22: Annotation IV, Augustine of Kissamos wrongly taught that the empyrean heaven was not created (Genesis 1:1)
Page 22: Annotation V, Whether an invisible world and angels were created before this world (Genesis 1:1)
Page 24: Annotation VI, Whether faith and charity are from ourselves (Genesis 1:2)
Page 24: Annotation VII, Whether the spirit that was borne over the waters was the Holy Spirit (Genesis 1:2)
Page 26: Annotation VIII, Whether angels and demons are corporeal (Genesis 1:6)
Page 27: Annotation IX, Whether there is only one heaven, as Chrysostom seems to hold (Genesis 1:6)
Page 28: Annotation X, Whether the firmament is between the upper and lower waters (Genesis 1:6)
Page 28: Annotation XI, Whether the upper and lower waters are real water, or rather Angels, as Origen held (Genesis 1:7)
Page 28: Annotation XII, Whether the binary [double] number is infamous, as Jerome held (Genesis 1:8)
Page 29: Annotation XIII, The ancients denied that there are Antipodes (Genesis 1:9)
Page 30: Annotation XIV, Whether it must be believed that the stars are fixed in the heaven (Genesis 1:17)
Page 30: Annotation XV, For the stars foreshow the future events of men, as Origen held — whom the judicial Astrologers follow (Genesis 1:17)
Page 31: Annotation XVI, Whether satisfaction is necessary for penitents (Genesis 1:19)
Page 32: Annotation XVII, Whether the angels, together with God, created man — as Origen held (Genesis 1:26)
Page 33: Annotation XVIII, Whether God is corporeal (Genesis 1:26)
Page 34: Annotation XIX, Whether the stars are animate (Genesis 1:26)
Page 34: Annotation XX, Whether, if Adam had not sinned, there would have been coitus (Genesis 1:27)
Page 35: Annotation XXI, Whether the first parents would have had children if they had not sinned (Genesis 1:28)
Page 36: Annotation XXII, Whether herbs and trees are given as food to the animals (Genesis 1:29)
Page 36: Annotation XXIII, Whether God completed his works on the sixth day (Genesis 2:2)
Page 36: Annotation XXIV, Whether the six days of the world's creation are real days (Genesis 2:2)
Page 37: Annotation XXV, Whether the Jews sacrificed in the lands of the gentiles (Genesis 2:2)
Page 37: Annotation XXVI, Whether the soul alone is man (Genesis 2:7)
Page 37: Annotation XXVII, The breath breathed into Adam is the rational soul, as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and others hold (Genesis 2:7)
Page 38: Annotation XXVIII, Whether the body was made before the soul (Genesis 2:7)
Page 38: Annotation XXIX, Whether man was created first in the species than in the individual, as Francesco Giorgio held (Genesis 2:7)
Page 39: Annotation XXX, Whether the soul was created with the angels on the first day (Genesis 2:7)
Page 39: Annotation XXXI, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Genesis 2:7)
Page 39: Annotation XXXII, Whether man, formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul, is the man whom God created to his own image (Genesis 2:7)
Page 40: Annotation XXXIII, Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
Page 40: Annotation XXXIV, Francesco Giorgio tries to prove by four arguments that there is no terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
Page 42: Annotation XXXV, Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
Page 43: Annotation XXXVI, Whether Paradise, after Adam's fall, entirely ceased to exist (Genesis 2:8)
Page 44: Annotation XXXVII, Whether the terrestrial Paradise was created before the world (Genesis 2:8)

Page 45: Annotation XXXVIII, Whether the earthly Paradise reaches up to the orb of the Moon, as Bede held (Genesis 2:8)
Page 45: Annotation XXXIX, Tertullian held that all souls are in the underworld until the day of judgment (Genesis 2:8)
Page 45: Annotation XL, Whether the places and punishments of souls after this life are only spiritual, as St. Augustine seems to hold (Genesis 2:8)
Page 46: Annotation XLI, Whether Moses and Paul saw the very essence of God with the mind, but not with the eyes of the body (Genesis 2:8)
Page 47: Annotation XLII, Whether the place of the underworld is under the earth (Genesis 2:8)
Page 47: Annotation XLIII, Whether God threatened the first man with bodily death, or rather only the death of the soul (Genesis 2:17)
Page 48: Annotation XLIV, For what cause abortion is a grave sin, even if the embryo was not [yet] animated (Genesis 2:18)
Page 48: Annotation XLV, Whether Adam was created androgynous, as Francesco Giorgio thinks (Genesis 2:20)
Page 49: Annotation XLVI, Whether Eve was formed from Adam's rib (Genesis 2:21)
Page 50: Annotation XLVII, Cajetan denies that a rib was truly taken from Adam (Genesis 2:21)
Page 51: Annotation XLVIII, Whether it is lawful for Christians to swear (Genesis 2:24)
Page 51: Annotation XLIX, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Genesis 3:7)
Page 52: Annotation L, No one's nature is harmed by another's sins (Genesis 3:15)
Page 52: Annotation LI, Whether the giants sprang from the seed of the devil, as Francesco Giorgio thought (Genesis 3:15)
Page 53: Annotation LII, Whether sin brought upon Adam the necessity of bodily death (Genesis 3:19)
Page 53: Annotation LIII, Whether the tunics of skin of the first parents were the skins of animals (Genesis 3:21)
Page 54: Annotation LIV, Whether the tunics of skin were true skins (Genesis 3:21)
Page 55: Annotation LV, Whether the letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false (Genesis 3:21)
Page 55: Annotation LVI, Whether Adam, cast out of paradise, was placed before the door of paradise (Genesis 3:24)
Page 55: Annotation LVII, Whether the Cherubim are angels, or specters (Genesis 3:24)
Page 56: Annotation LVIII, Theodoret denies that the Cherubim are spiritual and blessed minds (Genesis 3:24)
Page 58: Annotation LIX, Whether Moses died (Genesis 3:24)
Page 59: Annotation LX, Whether the Cherubim are incorporeal substances (Genesis 3:24)
Page 59: Annotation LXI, Whether Moses has yet died (Genesis 4:1)
Page 60: Annotation LXII, Whether priests bind and loose (Genesis 4:1)
Page 60: Annotation LXIII, If the first parents had not sinned, whether there would have been generation (Genesis 4:1)
Page 61: Annotation LXIV, Whether the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, enjoy the divine vision (Genesis 4:1)
Page 62: Annotation LXV, A passage from the fourth chapter of Genesis, badly translated by the Seventy (Genesis 4:7)
Page 62: Annotation LXVI, The clause "let us go out into the field," superfluously added by the Septuagint (Genesis 4:8)
Page 63: Annotation LXVII, The clause "vagabond and fugitive," badly rendered by the Septuagint (Genesis 4:12)
Page 63: Annotation LXVIII, The years of the illustrious men wrongly reckoned by the Septuagint (Genesis 5:7)
Page 66: Annotation LXIX, Whether the curse of the earth was removed under Noah, as Francesco Giorgio thought (Genesis 5:29)
Page 66: Annotation LXX, That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen (Genesis 6:2)
Page 66: Annotation LXXI, Whether the angels are aerial souls, as Philo thought; or whether the stars are animate, as the same [Philo] reckoned (Genesis 6:2)
Page 67: Annotation LXXII, Whether the angels are called "sons of God" in the sacred letters (Genesis 6:2)
Page 67: Annotation LXXIII, Whether the angels can have intercourse with women (Genesis 6:2)
Page 70: Annotation LXXIV, The clause "My spirit shall not remain," etc., badly rendered (Genesis 6:3)
Page 70: Annotation LXXV, Whether God restricted the life of man to 120 years (Genesis 6:3)
Page 71: Annotation LXXVI, Whether the giants were men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size (Genesis 6:4)
Page 71: Annotation LXXVII, Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women (Genesis 6:4)
Page 73: Annotation LXXVIII, Whether God can be seen by the angels (Genesis 6:9)
Page 73: Annotation LXXIX, The number of the years and the months of the Flood [is] corrupted (Genesis 7:11)
Page 74: Annotation LXXX, Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (Genesis 7:11)
Page 74: Annotation LXXXI, Whether the Noachic Flood could have been foreknown from observation of the stars, as Pierre d'Ailly thought (Genesis 7:11)
Page 75: Annotation LXXXII, The days of the ceasing Flood wrongly reckoned (Genesis 8:4)
Page 75: Annotation LXXXIII, Whether the raven returned into the ark (Genesis 8:7)
Page 76: Annotation LXXXIV, What kind of branch the dove brought (Genesis 8:11)

Page 76: Annotation LXXXV, Whether circumcision conferred anything to the soul's salvation (Genesis 8:21)
Page 77: Annotation LXXXVI, Of what kind was Noah's drunkenness (Genesis 9:20–21)
Page 77: Annotation LXXXVII, There was only one language for all before the tower was built, as St. Chrysostom rightly held (Genesis 11:1)
Page 78: Annotation LXXXVIII, An error in the number and the years of the generations of Shem (Genesis 11:11)
Page 79: Annotation LXXXIX, Whether Abraham lied (Genesis 12:13)
Page 81: Annotation XC, Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held (Genesis 14:18)
Page 82: Annotation XCI, Whether Melchisedech was the Holy Spirit (Genesis 14:18)
Page 83: Annotation XCII, Whether it is lawful for soldiers to take booty (Genesis 14:23)
Page 83: Annotation XCIII, Whether hell is only the conscience of sinners, as Philo held (Genesis 16:2)
Page 83: Annotation XCIV, Whether Abraham's intercourse with Hagar was adultery (Genesis 16:3)
Page 84: Annotation XCV, Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held (Genesis 16:11)
Page 85: Annotation XCVI, Whether circumcision conferred grace on infants (Genesis 17:10)
Page 86: Annotation XCVII, Why circumcision was given on the eighth day (Genesis 17:12)
Page 86: Annotation XCVIII, Whether Abraham sinned by unbelief (Genesis 17:17)
Page 87: Annotation XCIX, The dove descending upon Christ — whether it was truly an animal (Genesis 18:2)
Page 88: Annotation C, Whether this passage pertains to the Trinity (Genesis 18:3)
Page 88: Annotation CI, Whether divine grace comes before us, or is preceded by us (Genesis 18:16)
Page 90: Annotation CII, Whether the Son of God was an angel (Genesis 22:12)
Page 90: Annotation CIII, That "Sabek" is wrongly expounded as "a he-goat." (Genesis 22:13)
Page 91: Annotation CIV, Whether the Virgin Mary ever labored under unbelief (Genesis 25:21)
Page 91: Annotation CV, Whether the heavens emit a vocal sound by their motion (Genesis 26:18)
Page 92: Annotation CVI, The Septuagint wrongly translated, "We have not found water." (Genesis 26:32)
Page 93: Annotation CVII, Whether it is lawful for a good man to lie (Genesis 27:19)
Page 96: Annotation CVIII, Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held (Genesis 28:12)
Page 98: Annotation CIX, Mandrakes [rendered] for lilies (Genesis 30:14)
Page 98: Annotation CX, An error of the Septuagint interpreters (Genesis 30:42)
Page 99: Annotation CXI, Whether Jacob contended with the Angel in a bodily wrestling (Genesis 32:24)
Page 99: Annotation CXII, Many have not rightly interpreted the word "Israel." (Genesis 32:28)
Page 100: Annotation CXIII, Whether Joseph's brothers accused him of a most wicked crime (Genesis 37:2)
Page 100: Annotation CXIV, Whether Tamar, in lying with Judah, perpetrated a crime (Genesis 38:16)

Exodus

Page 101: Annotation CXV, Whether the world is the Son of God, as Philo held (Exodus 28:4)
Page 102: Annotation CXVI, Whether Moses's face was horned (Exodus 34:29)

Leviticus

Page 102: Annotation CXVII, Whether Christ suffered for the Angels, as Origen taught (Leviticus 1:5)
Page 103: Annotation CXVIII, Whether bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people (Leviticus 8:4)
Page 105: Annotation CXIX, Whether Christ still mourns our sins (Leviticus 10:9)
Page 105: Annotation CXX, Whether the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than his doctrine (Leviticus 10:14)
Page 106: Annotation CXXI, And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord (Leviticus 16:13)
Page 106: Annotation CXXII, Whether it is lawful for priests to possess temporal goods (Leviticus 25:32)

Numbers

Page 107: Annotation CXXIII, Concerning Moses's wife (Numbers 12:1)
Page 107: Annotation CXXIV, Whether the rods brought to Moses were more than twelve (Numbers 17:6)
Page 107: Annotation CXXV, The man said, whose eye is stopped up (Numbers 24:3)
Page 108: Annotation CXXVI, Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Numbers 25:4)
Page 110: Annotation CXXVII, Whether all the blessed shall see God (Numbers 26:53)
Page 110: Annotation CXXVIII, Whether the saints, immediately after the judgment, are raised to the contemplation of God (Numbers 33:1)
Page 111: Annotation CXXIX, Whether the land of promise is to be understood according to the letter (Numbers 34:2)

Deuteronomy

Page 112: Annotation CXXX, Whether from this passage the mystery of the Trinity ought to be elicited (Deuteronomy 6:4)

Joshua

Page 113: Annotation CXXXI, Whether the demons and hell shall suffer everlasting punishments (Joshua 8:28)

1 Kings

Page 115: Annotation CXXXII, Concerning free will (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:6)

3 Kings

Page 115: Annotation CXXXIII, Concerning Seba and Sceba (3 Kings [1 Kings] 10:1)

Job

Page 116: Annotation CXXXIV, Concerning the Trinity (Job 1:1)
Page 117: Annotation CXXXV, Impious dogmas concerning the Trinity are falsely ascribed to Origen (Job 1:17)
Page 117: Annotation CXXXVI, As it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done (Job 1:21)
Page 117: Annotation CXXXVII, Whether infants are punished with the punishments of the damned (Job 9:17)
Page 119: Annotation CXXXVIII, Whether the just man sins in every work [he does] (Job 9:28)
Page 119: Annotation CXXXIX, Whether the souls of the blessed see all things which are done here (Job 14:21)
Page 120: Annotation CXL, Whether the souls of Christians are blessed immediately after this life (Job 17:12)
Page 120: Annotation CXLI, Whether the fire of hell is incorporeal (Job 20:26)
Page 122: Annotation CXLII, Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal (Job 25:5)
Page 122: Annotation CXLIII, Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born (Job 38:12)
Page 123: Annotation CXLIV, The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Job 38:29)
Page 123: Annotation CXLV, Whether anyone may be certain that he does not always sin (Job 42:16)

Psalm

Page 123: Annotation CXLVI, Origen seems to have thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Psalm 1:1)
Page 124: Annotation CXLVII, Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound (Psalm 1:1)
Page 124: Annotation CXLVIII, Whether the future resurrection will be in the [self-same] individual (Psalm 1:5)
Page 125: Annotation CXLIX, Concerning the beginning of Genesis (Psalm 2:1)
Page 126: Annotation CL, I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession (Psalm 2:8)
Page 126: Annotation CLI, Whether this passage was well rendered by Jerome (Psalm 2:12)
Page 127: Annotation CLII, Concerning the Eucharist (Psalm 3:2)
Page 127: Annotation CLIII, Concerning the invocation of the saints (Psalm 4:2)
Page 127: Annotation CLIV, Whether Mary hesitated at the death of Christ (Psalm 13:3)
Page 128: Annotation CLV, Concerning the eight little verses added to Psalm 13 (Psalm 13:3)
Page 128: Annotation CLVI, In what manner the Blessed Virgin was sanctified by the entrance of Christ (Psalm 14:2)
Page 129: Annotation CLVII, Whether the Psalms speaking literally of David can be expounded literally of Christ (Psalm 15:1)
Page 129: Annotation CLVIII, Eusebius of Caesarea thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Psalm 15:2)
Page 129: Annotation CLIX, Whether a man can be made impeccable (Psalm 15:7)
Page 130: Annotation CLX, Whether the body of Christ was placed in the Sun (Psalm 18:5)
Page 130: Annotation CLXI, Whether the prayer of Christ was heard (Psalm 21:3)
Page 131: Annotation CLXII, Whether Christ truly feared and grieved (Psalm 21:3)
Page 132: Annotation CLXIII, Whether the Eucharist is to be denied to sinners (Psalm 21:30)
Page 132: Annotation CLXIV, Concerning the Eucharist, the heretics feign that St. Chrysostom thought wrongly (Psalm 22:5)
Page 133: Annotation CLXV, Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell (Psalm 30:11)
Page 133: Annotation CLXVI, Whether it is lawful to use lots (Psalm 30:16)
Page 134: Annotation CLXVII, Whether all the works of unbelievers are sins (Psalm 31:1)
Page 134: Annotation CLXVIII, Whether this passage pertains to the Holy Spirit (Psalm 32:6)

Page 135: Annotation CLXIX, Whether the souls of the saints are in heaven before the resurrection (Psalm 36:10)
Page 136: Annotation CLXX, Whether after this life all, both good and evil, shall enter the fire of gehenna (Psalm 36:14)
Page 138: Annotation CLXXI, Whether all Souls, after this life, are to be tried by fire (Psalm 36:15)
Page 141: Annotation CLXXII, Whether one ought to pray in an unknown tongue (Psalm 46:3, 8)
Page 141: Annotation CLXXIII, Whether penance is to be repeated (Psalm 50:3)
Page 142: Annotation CLXXIV, Concerning satisfaction (Psalm 50:3)
Page 142: Annotation CLXXV, Whether sacramental confession is necessary (Psalm 50:5)
Page 145: Annotation CLXXVI, Whether the royal power is to be preferred to the sacerdotal (Psalm 50:6)
Page 146: Annotation CLXXVII, Whether Adam's sin transmitted to posterity only the death of the body (Psalm 50:7)
Page 146: Annotation CLXXVIII, Concerning original sin (Psalm 50:7)
Page 146: Annotation CLXXIX, Whether the sin contracted from Adam is only the occasion of sin, and not sin [itself] (Psalm 50:7)
Page 147: Annotation CLXXX, If the first parents had not sinned, whether [there would have been] conception and generation (Psalm 50:7)
Page 147: Annotation CLXXXI, Whether Peter, in the denial of Christ, lost [his] faith (Psalm 52:4)
Page 148: Annotation CLXXXII, Whether hunger, thirst, grief, and death were natural to Christ (Psalm 53:5)
Page 148: Annotation CLXXXIII, Whether our merits are the cause of the eternal election (Psalm 64:5)
Page 148: Annotation CLXXXIV, Whether men shall rise again in the same individual [body] (Psalm 65:12)
Page 149: Annotation CLXXXV, Whether Souls, on account of sins committed in heaven, are thrust down into bodies (Psalm 65:11)
Page 154: Annotation CLXXXVI, Whether Christ's humanity was, by its own nature, capable of grief and misery (Psalm 68:2)
Page 156: Annotation CLXXXVII, Whether trading [commerce] is condemned (Psalm 70:15)
Page 157: Annotation CLXXXVIII, Whether the punishment of Hell exceeds the gravity of the sin (Psalm 71:14)
Page 157: Annotation CLXXXIX, Whether the Soul was created before bodies (Psalm 89:1–2)
Page 157: Annotation CXC, Whether the age of the world consists of only six thousand years (Psalm 89:4)
Page 160: Annotation CXCI, On the theme of Psalm 90 (Psalm 90:1)
Page 161: Annotation CXCII, On the merit of good works (Psalm 90:14)
Page 161: Annotation CXCIII, On the merit of good works (Psalm 98:5)
Page 161: Annotation CXCIV, On the Eucharist (Psalm 98:5)
Page 161: Annotation CXCV, Whether good works are meritorious (Psalm 102:4)
Page 163: Annotation CXCVI, On the Holy Spirit (Psalm 103:30)
Page 163: Annotation CXCVII, On predestination and reprobation (Psalm 108:18)
Page 163: Annotation CXCVIII, On God swearing (Psalm 109:4)
Page 164: Annotation CXCIX, On the merit of works (Psalm 114:7)
Page 164: Annotation CC, Whether the divine vocation is from the merits of those called (Psalm 115:1)
Page 164: Annotation CCI, On the number of the alphabetic Psalms (Psalm 118:1)
Page 165: Annotation CCII, Whether all the saints must be purged by the fire of the conflagration (Psalm 118:20)
Page 165: Annotation CCIII, Whether the possession of secular things befits the clergy (Psalm 118:57)
Page 166: Annotation CCIV, On the Oath (Psalm 118:106)
Page 166: Annotation CCV, Whether sins are remitted to those remaining in unbelief (Psalm 118:137)
Page 166: Annotation CCVI, On the sons of those cast out (Psalm 126:4)
Page 167: Annotation CCVII, On the correct rendering of this passage (Psalm 127:2)
Page 167: Annotation CCVIII, Whether the Soul was formed before the body (Psalm 129:2)
Page 169: Annotation CCIX, Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient (Psalm 138:6)
Page 169: Annotation CCX, The error of Origen concerning souls thrust into bodies (Psalm 141:8)

Proverbs

Page 170: Annotation CCXI, Whether Solomon was a prophet (Proverbs 1:1)

Ecclesiastes

Page 170: Annotation CCXII, Whether the stars are animate (Ecclesiastes 1:6)
Page 171: Annotation CCXIII, Whether before this world there were other worlds, and whether there will be [others] after this (Ecclesiastes 1:9)

Page 172: Annotation CCXIV, Whether after this life there is given a place from which Souls, once entered, can go out (Ecclesiastes 11:3)

Canticle

Page 172: Annotation CCXV, Whether the Angels are corporeal (Canticle 1:1)
Page 173: Annotation CCXVI, Whether the Angels desert those whom they have received into [their] custody (Canticle 1:1)
Page 173: Annotation CCXVII, On the merits of the just (Canticle 2:10, 14)

Wisdom

Page 174: Annotation CCXVIII, On the author of the book of Wisdom (Wisdom 1:1)
Page 174: Annotation CCXIX, On the author of the book of Wisdom (Wisdom 1:1)

Isaiah

Page 175: Annotation CCXX, A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy (Isaiah 2:22)
Page 175: Annotation CCXXI, On God being seen (Isaiah 6:1)
Page 175: Annotation CCXXII, On the Trinity (Isaiah 6:3)
Page 175: Annotation CCXXIII, A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters (Isaiah 9:6)
Page 176: Annotation CCXXIV, Whether angels have a soul (Isaiah 13:7)
Page 176: Annotation CCXXV, Whether the souls of the damned shall at some time have rest (Isaiah 14:19)
Page 177: Annotation CCXXVI, Every beard shall be shaven (Isaiah 15:2)
Page 177: Annotation CCXXVII, Whether it is a lighter [sin] to sin openly than to feign holiness (Isaiah 16:14)
Page 177: Annotation CCXXVIII, Whether the saints in heaven remember [their] past evils (Isaiah 65:16)
Page 178: Annotation CCXXIX, Whether the fire of hell is metaphorical (Isaiah 66:24)

Jeremiah

Page 180: Annotation CCXXX, The expiatory fire (Jeremiah 2:22)
Page 180: Annotation CCXXXI, The Oath (Jeremiah 4:2)
Page 180: Annotation CCXXXII, Whether anyone in this life is truly just (Jeremiah 13:12)
Page 181: Annotation CCXXXIII, Whether the opinion of the Chiliasts is to be condemned (Jeremiah 19:11)
Page 185: Annotation CCXXXIV, On Christ (Jeremiah 22:30)
Page 185: Annotation CCXXXV, On free will (Jeremiah 23:28)
Page 186: Annotation CCXXXVI, On souls fallen down from heaven (Jeremiah 24:5)
Page 186: Annotation CCXXXVII, The incarceration of souls (Jeremiah 28:13)
Page 187: Annotation CCXXXVIII, On the history of Susanna (Jeremiah 29:22)

Lamentations

Page 187: Annotation CCXXXIX, On hypocrisy (Lamentations 4:6)

Ezekiel

Page 187: Annotation CCXL, Whether charity once had can be lost (Ezekiel 1:12)
Page 189: Annotation CCXLI, Whether one sin is remitted without another (Ezekiel 3:11)
Page 189: Annotation CCXLII, Whether the earth is an animal capable of reason (Ezekiel 14:13)
Page 191: Annotation CCXLIII, Not only Christ is to be imitated (Ezekiel 16:16)
Page 191: Annotation CCXLIV, Whether clerics ought to have beard or hair shorn (Ezekiel 44:20)

Daniel

Page 197: Annotation CCXLV, On the Appendix of Daniel (Daniel 1:1)
Page 199: Annotation CCXLVI, On the kingdom of the Romans (Daniel 2:40)
Page 199: Annotation CCXLVII, Whether the sacred Images are to be venerated (Daniel 3:18)
Page 203: Annotation CCXLVIII, On the time of the world's destruction (Daniel 9:24)
Page 204: Annotation CCXLIX, On the calumny imposed upon St. Jerome (Daniel 9:24)
Page 204: Annotation CCL, Whether the history of Susanna is to be received (Daniel 13:1)

Amos

Page 207: Annotation CCLI, Whether the fallen, after penance, are to be restored to their former dignity (Amos 5:2)
Page 208: Annotation CCLII, Whether [there are] only two places after this life (Amos 9:2)

Jonah

Page 209: Annotation CCLIII, Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it be licit to die by one's own hand (Jonah 1:12)
Page 212: Annotation CCLIV, A passage badly translated by the Seventy (Jonah 3:4)
Page 213: Annotation CCLV, On the ivy of Jonah (Jonah 4:6)

Micah

Page 214: Annotation CCLVI, Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Micah 6:1)

Habakkuk

Page 215: Annotation CCLVII, Whether God has knowledge and providence of the least things (Habakkuk 1:13)

Zephaniah

Page 216: Annotation CCLVIII, On the power of the priesthood (Zephaniah 3:4)

Zechariah

Page 217: Annotation CCLIX, On the Trinity (Zechariah 4:3, 4)
Page 217: Annotation CCLX, Whether it is licit for Christians to swear (Zechariah 8:17)
Page 217: Annotation CCLXI, Whether the bosom of Abraham and the hell of the damned are the same (Zechariah 9:11)

Malachi

Page 218: Annotation CCLXII, Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi (Malachi 1:1)
Page 219: Annotation CCLXIII, Whether election and reprobation are from the foreknowledge of merits (Malachi 1:2, 3)

2 Maccabees

Page 219: Annotation CCLXIV, Whether the mother of the Maccabees died of joy (2 Maccabees 7:41)

PART II — BOOK VI: THE NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

Page 222: Annotation I, Sacred reading (Matthew 1:1)
Page 222: Annotation II, Thamar (Matthew 1:3)
Page 222: Annotation III, On the marriage of Mary and Joseph (Matthew 1:16)
Page 223: Annotation IV, On Matrimony (Matthew 1:18)
Page 224: Annotation V, Joseph in doubt (Matthew 1:20)
Page 224: Annotation VI, On the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:20)
Page 225: Annotation VII, Whether angels are living beings (Matthew 2:1)
Page 225: Annotation VIII, Whether the magic art is evil (Matthew 2:2)
Page 226: Annotation IX, Whether the prophecy of Numbers 24 is to be understood of the star seen by the Magi (Matthew 2:2)
Page 226: Annotation X, Whether Christ's nativity could be foreknown from genethliacal [astrological] divinations (Matthew 2)
Page 233: Annotation XI, Whether John's baptism conferred grace (Matthew 3:1–2)
Page 234: Annotation XII, Whether the Holy Spirit is conferred in baptism (Matthew 3:11)
Page 234: Annotation XIII, Whether the dove sitting upon Christ was a real animal (Matthew 3:16)
Page 235: Annotation XIV, *"I saw the Spirit of God, like a dove."* (Matthew 3:16)
Page 235: Annotation XV, On the Trinity (Matthew 3:16)
Page 235: Annotation XVI, On the Trinity (Matthew 4:1)
Page 236: Annotation XVII, Whether those baptized by heretics are to be rebaptized (Matthew 4:17)
Page 236: Annotation XVIII, Whether Christ and the apostles begged (were mendicants) (Matthew 5:3)
Page 237: Annotation XIX, Whether the wicked sin under the devil's compulsion (Matthew 5:5)

Page 238: Annotation XX, Whether man can attain to an impeccable perfection (Matthew 5:9)
Page 238: Annotation XXI, On the Eucharist (Matthew 5:22)
Page 239: Annotation XXII, On the degrees of consanguinity (Matthew 5:31)
Page 239: Annotation XXIII, Whether adultery dissolves the sacrament of matrimony (Matthew 5:32)
Page 239: Annotation XXIV, On divorce (Matthew 5:32)
Page 240: Annotation XXV, Whether an oath is a sin (Matthew 5:34)
Page 240: Annotation XXVI, Whether every oath, even in a true and just cause, is a sin (Matthew 5:34)
Page 246: Annotation XXVII, Whether it is lawful to seek redress for an injury in court (Matthew 5:39)
Page 246: Annotation XXVIII, On the unforgivable sin (Matthew 5:44)
Page 247: Annotation XXIX, On vocal prayer (Matthew 6:6)
Page 247: Annotation XXX, Whether Christ is to be called "the Lordly man" (homo dominicus) (Matthew 6:10)
Page 247: Annotation XXXI, Whether the bread we ask for in the Lord's Prayer is corporeal (Matthew 6:11)
Page 248: Annotation XXXII, On the forgiveness of injury (Matthew 6:14)
Page 249: Annotation XXXIII, On the dress of monks (Matthew 6:16)
Page 249: Annotation XXXIV, Whether anyone can hate God. Ps. 73 (Matthew 6:24)
Page 249: Annotation XXXV, Whether no creature is incorporeal (Matthew 6:25)
Page 251: Annotation XXXVI, Whether it is lawful for preachers to preach the Gospel for the sake of a livelihood (Matthew 6:33)
Page 251: Annotation XXXVII, On bodily human food (Matthew 6:34)
Page 251: Annotation XXXVIII, Whether there is sin in the Church (Matthew 7:5)
Page 252: Annotation XXXIX, On the Trinity (Matthew 7:16)
Page 252: Annotation XL, Whether all works apart from grace are sins (Matthew 7:17)
Page 253: Annotation XLI, Whether the privation of the divine glory is a graver gehenna (Matthew 7:19)
Page 254: Annotation XLII, On the Church (Matthew 7:24)
Page 254: Annotation XLIII, On justifying faith, and on unformed faith (Matthew 8:8)
Page 255: Annotation XLIV, On the Trinity (Matthew 8:9)
Page 256: Annotation XLV, Whether priests [truly] absolve, or only pronounce [people] absolved (Matthew 9:8)
Page 257: Annotation XLVI, Whether [our] calling comes from merits, or from [merits] foreseen by divine foreknowledge (Matthew 9:9)
Page 257: Annotation XLVII, Whether the suffrages made for the departed profit both the blessed and the damned (Matthew 9:24)
Page 260: Annotation XLVIII, Whether the soul alone is the man (Matthew 10:28)
Page 260: Annotation XLIX, On Pilate (Matthew 10:29)
Page 261: Annotation L, On the doubt of John the Baptist (Matthew 11:3)
Page 261: Annotation LI, Whether before Christ's coming faith in Christ was necessary for salvation (Matthew 11:5)
Page 262: Annotation LII, Whether reprobation is from God's pure good pleasure (Matthew 11:26)
Page 262: Annotation LIII, Whether the angels see God (Matthew 11:27)
Page 263: Annotation LIV, On the Law of Moses (Matthew 11:28)
Page 263: Annotation LV, Absolution (Matthew 11:28)
Page 263: Annotation LVI, On the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:32)
Page 264: Annotation LVII, On the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:32)
Page 264: Annotation LVIII, Whether the Virgin Mary was guilty of vainglory (Matthew 12:47)
Page 265: Annotation LIX, On Joseph (Matthew 12:48)
Page 265: Annotation LX, Whether heretics unwilling to repent are to be put to death (Matthew 13:30)
Page 266: Annotation LXI, That the prophecy of Psalm 77, cited by Matthew, is to be understood literally of Christ (Matthew 13:35)
Page 267: Annotation LXII, What kind of smith's craft Joseph practiced (Matthew 13:55)
Page 268: Annotation LXIII, [The error that] faith is given to us from preceding merits (Matthew 13:11)
Page 268: Annotation LXIV, Whether Joseph was twice-married (Matthew 13:55–56)
Page 269: Annotation LXV, Whether the angels fell from heaven on account of love of women (Matthew 14:3,10)
Page 270: Annotation LXVI, On the Eucharist (Matthew 15:11)
Page 270: Annotation LXVII, Whether restitution ought to exceed the [thing] plundered (Matthew 15:29)
Page 271: Annotation LXVIII, Whether the Church was built upon [the] Rock [Peter] (Matthew 16:18)
Page 273: Annotation LXIX, Whether the Church was built upon each and every one of the faithful (Matthew 16:18)

Page 273: Annotation LXX, Whether the priestly power is lost through any [and every] sin (Matthew 16:18)
Page 273: Annotation LXXI, Whether the power of binding and loosing resides in priests (Matthew 16:19)
Page 275: Annotation LXXII, Whether the supreme pontiff has the power of secular rule (Matthew 16:19)
Page 279: Annotation LXXIII, On the duration of the world (Matthew 17:1)
Page 279: Annotation LXXIV, On Moses, appearing in the Transfiguration of Christ (Matthew 17:3)
Page 279: Annotation LXXV, Whether clerics are immune from the tributes of secular princes (Matthew 17:24)
Page 280: Annotation LXXVI, Whether Christians ought to pay tributes to their [own] princes (Matthew 17:26)
Page 280: Annotation LXXVII, Whether to individual men individual angels are assigned for [their] guard (Matthew 18:10)
Page 281: Annotation LXXVIII, Whether those speaking and eating with the excommunicated sin (Matthew 18:17)
Page 281: Annotation LXXIX, On the marriage-unions lawful by the law of nature (Matthew 19:5)
Page 281: Annotation LXXX, On second marriages (Matthew 19:8)
Page 282: Annotation LXXXI, Whether it is lawful to repudiate an adulterous wife, and to marry another (Matthew 19:9)
Page 286: Annotation LXXXII, Whether plurality of wives is prohibited by natural or by divine law (Matthew 19:9)
Page 287: Annotation LXXXIII, Whether it is lawful for Christians to wage war (Matthew 19:12)
Page 287: Annotation LXXXIV, Whether every corporeal thing is evil (Matthew 19:14)
Page 288: 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 288: Annotation LXXXVI, On monastic vows (Matthew 19:21)
Page 289: Annotation LXXXVII, Whether those called by God are called on account of [their] merits (Matthew 20:1)
Page 290: Annotation LXXXVIII, On the Trinity (Matthew 20:8)
Page 290: Annotation LXXXIX, *"Call the laborers, and pay them their wage."* (Matthew 20:8)
Page 290: Annotation XC, The fruition [beatific vision] of the blessed (Matthew 20:16)
Page 290: Annotation XCI, Whether Moses died (Matthew 20:20)
Page 291: Annotation XCII, On the Son of God (Matthew 20:19)
Page 291: Annotation XCIII, On the death of John the Evangelist (Matthew 20:23)
Page 292: Annotation XCIV, On the Trinity (Matthew 20:23)
Page 292: Annotation XCV, Whether it is lawful for Christians to exercise trade (Matthew 21:12)
Page 292: Annotation XCVI, What "Hosanna" signifies (Matthew 21:9)
Page 293: Annotation XCVII, On the subtraction of grace (Matthew 21:33)
Page 293: Annotation XCVIII, Whether the Jews recognized the deity of Christ (Matthew 21:38)
Page 294: Annotation XCIX, Whether election is from merit (Matthew 22:14)
Page 294: Annotation C, On the Trinity (Matthew 22:37)
Page 294: Annotation CI, Whether the precepts of the second table can be fulfilled without the grace of God (Matthew 22:39)
Page 295: Annotation CII, Whether it is lawful to hang gospels and crosses on the neck (Matthew 23:5)
Page 296: Annotation CIII, On the Homoousion [consubstantial] (Matthew 24:7)
Page 296: Annotation CIV, Whether the true Church can be recognized by certain marks, and by which (Matthew 24:15)
Page 298: Annotation CV, Whether Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment (Matthew 24:36)
Page 299: Annotation CVI, Whether fasting and chastity without almsgiving are of any avail (Matthew 24:50)
Page 299: Annotation CVII, Whether we can be helped by the merits of others (Matthew 25:9)
Page 300: Annotation CVIII, Whether bad priests are [true] priests (Matthew 25:18)
Page 301: Annotation CIX, On the three Magdalenes (Matthew 26:7)
Page 301: Annotation CX, Whether Christ celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth [day of the] moon. / Whether Christ consecrated in unleavened [bread] (Matthew 26:20)
Page 303: Annotation CXI, With what words Christ consecrated the Eucharist (Matthew 26:26)
Page 306: Annotation CXII, On the Eucharist (Matthew 26:26)
Page 306: Annotation CXIII, Whether wine — or water — alone is to be used in the sacred mysteries (Matthew 26:29)
Page 307: Annotation CXIV, Whether Christ truly feared for himself, and truly prayed for himself (Matthew 26:37)
Page 307: Annotation CXV, Whether it is lawful for Christians to make war (Matthew 26:52)
Page 308: Annotation CXVI, On war (Matthew 26:52)
Page 308: Annotation CXVII, Whether it is lawful for exorcists to adjure demons (Matthew 26:63)
Page 308: Annotation CXVIII, Whether Peter denied that Christ is God (Matthew 26:74)
Page 309: Annotation CXIX, Whether it is possible that those who have denied Christ should return to repentance and obtain pardon (Matthew 26:74–75)

Page 310: Annotation CXX, Whether Judas died by hanging in a noose (Matthew 27:5)
Page 310: Annotation CXXI, Whether it is lawful for clerics to have possessions of temporal things (Matthew 27:6–7)
Page 312: Annotation CXXII, Whether Adam was buried on Mount Calvary (Matthew 27:33)
Page 313: Annotation CXXIII, On the oath (Matthew 27:34)
Page 313: Annotation CXXIV, Whether the darkness, at Christ's death, happened over the whole world (Matthew 27:45)
Page 314: Annotation CXXV, Whether Christ was struck by the lance before he was dead (Matthew 27:46)
Page 315: Annotation CXXVI, Whether the divinity was separated from the humanity of the dying Christ (Matthew 27:46)
Page 315: 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 316: Annotation CXXVII, The fishing of the Apostles (Mark 1:16)
Page 316: Annotation CXXVIII, On monastic traditions (Mark 6:8)
Page 317: Annotation CXXIX, *"And after six days, Jesus took Peter, etc."* (Mark 9:2)
Page 317: Annotation CXXX, On the history of those selling in the temple (Mark 11:15)
Page 318: Annotation CXXXI, Whether Christ was crucified at the third hour (Mark 15:25)
Page 318: Annotation CXXXII, Whether the last chapter of Mark is of solid authority (Mark 16:9)

Luke

Page 319: Annotation CXXXIII, Whether the Virgin Mary is rightly called "full of grace." (Luke 1:28)
Page 320: Annotation CXXXIV, Whether the soul of Christ has omnipotence equal with God (Luke 1:32)
Page 320: Annotation CXXXV, Whether the angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Luke 2:14)
Page 320: Annotation CXXXVI, Whether Mary needed purification after childbirth (Luke 2:22)
Page 321: Annotation CXXXVII, On Mary giving birth (Luke 2:23)
Page 322: Annotation CXXXVIII, Whether Mary suffered a defect of faith at Christ's death (Luke 2:35)
Page 323: Annotation CXXXIX, Whether Mary always recognized Christ to be God (Luke 2:43)
Page 323: Annotation CXL, Whether Mary always knew the divinity of [her] Son (Luke 2:50)
Page 324: Annotation CXLI, Whether Christ advanced in wisdom (Luke 2:52)
Page 324: Annotation CXLII, On the instruction, errings, and penance of the angels (Luke 3:12)
Page 325: Annotation CXLIII, Whether the generation of Cainan is superfluous in the genealogy of Christ (Luke 3:36)
Page 325: Annotation CXLIV, Whether John the Baptist doubted concerning the death of Christ (Luke 7:19–20)
Page 326: Annotation CXLV, Whether Moses and Elijah truly appeared at Christ's transfiguration (Luke 9:30–31)
Page 327: Annotation CXLVI, On the number of Christ's disciples (Luke 10:1)
Page 328: Annotation CXLVII, Whether the Apostles begged [were mendicants] (Luke 10:7)
Page 328: Annotation CXLVIII, Whether it is lawful for a Christian to have anything of his own (Luke 12:18)
Page 329: Annotation CXLIX, On the guardian angels (Luke 12:58)
Page 330: Annotation CL, Whether the good angels can be bent to virtue and vice (Luke 15:31)
Page 331: Annotation CLI, Whether those who preceded the preaching of Christ hoped for the resurrection (Luke 16:20)
Page 331: Annotation CLII, Whether anyone can attain salvation without the reading of the Divine Scripture (Luke 16:24)
Page 335: Annotation CLIII, Confession (Luke 16:31)
Page 336: Annotation CLIV, What sins are to be confessed (Luke 17:14)
Page 336: Annotation CLV, On confession (Luke 18:13)
Page 336: Annotation CLVI, Whether it is lawful for a Christian to wage war (Luke 22:36)
Page 342: Annotation CLVII, War (Luke 22:38)
Page 342: Annotation CLVIII, War (Luke 22:38)
Page 342: Annotation CLIX, The consoling apparition of the angel (Luke 22:43)
Page 342: Annotation CLX, Whether Peter denied the Godhead of Christ (Luke 22:57)
Page 343: Annotation CLXI, Whether penance profits without confession and satisfaction (Luke 22:62)
Page 344: Annotation CLXII, Whether the death of Christ is to be mourned (Luke 23:28)
Page 345: Annotation CLXIII, Whether the saints yet enjoy the divine glory (Luke 23:43)
Page 345: Annotation CLXIV, Whether the Godhead was separated from the humanity of Christ through death (Luke 23:46)

John

Page 346: Annotation CLXV, Whether the angels learned anything from the evangelical writings (John 1:1)

Page 346: Annotation CLXVI, The imprisonment of souls (John 1:1)
Page 346: Annotation CLXVII, Whether God is the form of things (John 1:1)
Page 347: Annotation CLXVIII, The stars ensouled (John 1:1)
Page 347: Annotation CLXIX, Whether the Word [was] "to God" or "with God." (John 1:1)
Page 347: Annotation CLXX, Whether Christ suffered for the angels (John 1:1)
Page 348: Annotation CLXXI, On the equality of the Father and the Son (John 1:1)
Page 349: Annotation CLXXII, On the Son, and the Holy Spirit (John 1:3)
Page 349: Annotation CLXXIII, On the true punctuation of the clause, "Without him was made nothing." (John 1:3)
Page 350: Annotation CLXXIV, Whether sin is nothing (John 1:3)
Page 351: Annotation CLXXV, Whether the Son, as regards the divinity, is less than the Father (John 1:4–5)
Page 352: Annotation CLXXVI, On the Son, and the Holy Spirit (John 1:5)
Page 353: Annotation CLXXVII, The soul of John the Baptist existing before [his] body (John 1:7)
Page 353: Annotation CLXXVIII, Whether faith alone suffices for those to be saved (John 1:7)
Page 354: Annotation CLXXIX, Whether faith is lost through [mortal] sin (John 1:9)
Page 355: Annotation CLXXX, *"And the Word was made flesh."* (John 1:14)
Page 355: Annotation CLXXXI, Whether works [done] apart from grace are sins (John 1:16)
Page 355: Annotation CLXXXII, Whether the essence of God can be beheld by any creature (John 1:18)
Page 357: Annotation CLXXXIII, *"I saw, and gave testimony."* (John 1:34)
Page 357: Annotation CLXXXIV, Whether the beginning of our salvation is from us (John 1:38)
Page 358: Annotation CLXXXV, Whether Mary always had a becoming opinion of Christ (John 2:3)
Page 359: Annotation CLXXXVI, Whether the body of Christ was first formed in the womb before it was assumed by the deity (John 2:20)
Page 359: Annotation CLXXXVII, Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (John 3:34)
Page 362: Annotation CLXXXVIII, Whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are inferior to the Father (John 4:24)
Page 362: Annotation CLXXXIX, Whether the angels insert souls into bodies (John 4:38)
Page 362: Annotation CXC, *"The man believed the word which Jesus said to him, and went his way."* (John 4:50)
Page 362: Annotation CXCI, *"Himself believed, and his whole house."* (John 4:53)
Page 364: Annotation CXCII, *"Labor not for the food which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting."* (John 6:27)
Page 364: Annotation CXCIII, On the Eucharist (John 6:29)
Page 365: Annotation CXCIV, Whether faith is from us. Rom. 10 (John 6:44)
Page 365: Annotation CXCV, Whether venial sins impede the effect of the Eucharist for those receiving [it] (John 6:49)
Page 366: Annotation CXCVI, Whether the Eucharist contains the true body of Christ (John 6:48)
Page 373: Annotation CXCVII, On the eating of the sacrament (John 6:53)
Page 373: Annotation CXCVIII, Whether the beginning of the eighth chapter of John is authentic (John 8:1)
Page 373: Annotation CXCIX, Whether [some] sins are at some time to be remitted (John 8:21)
Page 374: Annotation CC, *"If you continue in my word,"* etc. (John 8:31)
Page 374: Annotation CCI, "Beginning" [principium] (John 8:25)
Page 374: Annotation CCII, Whether priests have the power of remitting sins (John 8:34)
Page 375: Annotation CCIII, [Origen:] souls, coming into the world, bring with them seminal reasons (John 8:37)
Page 375: Annotation CCIV, Whether the soul of Christ was in heaven before [it was] in the flesh (John 8:42)
Page 375: Annotation CCV, On Thomas's exhortation to [his] fellow-disciples (John 11:16)
Page 375: Annotation CCVI, Whether Peter received the keys in his own person (John 12:8)
Page 377: Annotation CCVII, On Philip (John 12:21)
Page 377: Annotation CCVIII, Whether the Holy Spirit [is] from the Father alone (John 14:16)
Page 377: Annotation CCIX, Whether after baptism original sin, and after justification other sins too, remain (John 13:10)
Page 380: Annotation CCX, Whether all believers are certain that they are in grace (John 14:16)
Page 384: Annotation CCXI, *"The Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father,"* etc. (John 15:26)
Page 384: Annotation CCXII, Whether faith alone suffices for salvation (John 16:9)
Page 384: Annotation CCXIII, Whether Christ began to be (John 17:5)
Page 385: Annotation CCXIV, Whether only the predestined believe (John 17:6)
Page 386: Annotation CCXV, Whether all believers are certain of grace (John 17:6)
Page 387: Annotation CCXVI, *"When therefore Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished."* (John 19:30)

Page 387: Annotation CCXVII, Whether the mysteries of faith are to be proved by human reasons (John 20:19)
Page 388: Annotation CCXVIII, Whether auricular confession was instituted by Christ (John 20:22–23)
Page 388: Annotation CCXIX, Whether the care of the predestined alone was committed to Peter (John 21:17)
Page 389: Annotation CCXX, Whether it is to be read SIC ["so"] or SI ["if"] (John 21:22)
Page 390: Annotation CCXXI, Whether Peter had the keys in his own person (John 21:19)

Acts

Page 391: Annotation CCXXII, Whether Judas died by hanging (Acts 1:18)
Page 392: Annotation CCXXIII, On the oath (Acts 3:26)
Page 392: Annotation CCXXIV, On the oath (Acts 4:20)
Page 392: Annotation CCXXV, Whether the seven [of Acts 6] were true deacons (Acts 6:5)
Page 393: Annotation CCXXVI, On the true reading of this passage (Acts 9:5)
Page 394: Annotation CCXXVII, Suffrages for the dead (Acts 9:43)
Page 394: Annotation CCXXVIII, *"James answered, saying, Men [and] brethren."* (Acts 15:13)
Page 394: Annotation CCXXIX, Who Dionysius the Areopagite was (Acts 17:34)

Romans

Page 394: Annotation CCXXX, On the cause of predestination (Romans 1:1)
Page 395: Annotation CCXXXI, Whether those who scrutinize the divine mysteries are to be condemned (Romans 1:17)
Page 396: Annotation CCXXXII, Whether circumcision confers grace (Romans 2:25)
Page 396: Annotation CCXXXIII, Whether faith alone justifies (Romans 3:27)
Page 397: Annotation CCXXXIV, *"And he was not weak in faith."* (Romans 4:19)
Page 397: Annotation CCXXXV, Whether the charity by which we love God is the indwelling Holy Spirit (Romans 5:5)
Page 397: Annotation CCXXXVI, Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not [as] guilt, but [as] punishment (Romans 5:12)
Page 401: Annotation CCXXXVII, Whether the sin of Adam passed to [his] posterity not [as] guilt, but only [by] occasion (Romans 5:12)
Page 402: Annotation CCXXXVIII, Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not by propagation, but by imitation (Romans 5:12)
Page 403: Annotation CCXXXIX, Whether abstinence from an oath, and love of an enemy, are counsels or precepts (Romans 7:6)
Page 405: Annotation CCXL, Whether original sin [comes] by propagation (Romans 7:8)
Page 405: Annotation CCXLI, The exposition of this passage retracted (Romans 7:14)
Page 405: Annotation CCXLII, Whether the natural passions were in man before sin (Romans 7:14)
Page 406: Annotation CCXLIII, Whether the law of Moses commands lesser [things] than the law of nature (Romans 7:25)
Page 407: Annotation CCXLIV, Whether the flesh of Christ had an inclination to sinning (Romans 8:3)
Page 407: Annotation CCXLV, Whether the heavens were made corruptible and dissoluble on account of Adam's sin (Romans 8:20)
Page 410: Annotation CCXLVI, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Romans 8:21)
Page 410: Annotation CCXLVII, The privation of eternal glory (Romans 8:27)
Page 410: Annotation CCXLVIII, Whether all men are chosen and destined to eternal life (Romans 8:28)
Page 411: Annotation CCXLIX, Whether future things are the cause of the divine foreknowledge, or the contrary (Romans 8:29)
Page 412: Annotation CCL, Whether election and reprobation are from the foreseeing of works (Romans 8:30)
Page 412: Annotation CCLI, Whether predestination is from the merits of the predestined foreseen by God (Romans 9:13)
Page 418: Annotation CCLII, Whether God reprobates any from the purpose of his will alone (Romans 9:18)
Page 421: Annotation CCLIII, Whether Paul was equal to Peter in dignity (Romans 11:1)
Page 421: Annotation CCLIV, Expiatory fire (Romans 11:5)
Page 421: Annotation CCLV, Whether the whole life of unbelievers is sin (Romans 14:23)
Page 422: Annotation CCLVI, War (Romans 16:3)

1 Corinthians

Page 422: Annotation CCLVII, Whether the precepts of the divine law can be fulfilled by natural powers alone (1 Corinthians 1:10)

Page 423: Annotation CCLVIII, Purgatory (1 Corinthians 3:12)

Page 423: Annotation CCLIX, Whether Chrysostom acknowledged purgatory (1 Corinthians 3:15)

Page 425: 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 426: Annotation CCLXI, Whether before communion it is necessary to confess [one's] sins (1 Corinthians 11:28)

Page 427: Annotation CCLXII, Whether only the scriptures approved by the apostles are canonical (1 Corinthians 12:28)

Page 427: Annotation CCLXIII, Whether the Mass and public prayers ought to be said in the vernacular tongue (1 Corinthians 14:14-16)

Page 429: Annotation CCLXIV, Whether souls are blessed before the day of judgment (1 Corinthians 15:19)

Page 431: Annotation CCLXV, Whether all men are to die (1 Corinthians 15:51)

Page 432: Annotation CCLXVI, Whether the writings of heretics are to be read (1 Corinthians 15:51)

Page 434: Annotation CCLXVII, Whether it is lawful to strike either the living or the dead with anathema (1 Corinthians 16:22)

2 Corinthians

Page 436: Annotation CCLXVIII, Whether it is necessary to exhibit the Eucharist under both species to the laity (2 Corinthians 8:24)

Galatians

Page 437: Annotation CCLXIX, Whether Peter was superior in dignity to Paul and the rest of the apostles (Galatians 1:1)

Page 439: Annotation CCLXX, Election and reprobation from merits (Galatians 1:15)

Page 439: Annotation CCLXXI, Peter superior to the other apostles (Galatians 1:18)

Page 440: Annotation CCLXXII, *"But [I saw none of the apostles], except James, the brother of the Lord."* (Galatians 1:19)

Page 440: Annotation CCLXXIII, On the four precepts of the apostles to those who [are] of the gentiles (Galatians 2:2)

Page 440: Annotation CCLXXIV, Whether Peter and Paul used simulation, and whether by simulating they sinned (Galatians 2:11)

Page 441: Annotation CCLXXV, *"I said to Cephas before all, If thou, being a Jew,"* etc. (Galatians 2:14)

Page 442: Annotation CCLXXVI, Whether witches [Striges] can bewitch little infants (Galatians 3:1)

Page 444: Annotation CCLXXVII, Whether it is read in the sacred letters that God cursed anyone (Galatians 3:10)

Page 444: Annotation CCLXXVIII, Whether our liberty [free will] without grace can do good (Galatians 3:21)

Page 446: Annotation CCLXXIX, Whether it is lawful to call the prefects of monasteries abbots or fathers (Galatians 4:6)

Page 446: Annotation CCLXXX, Whether it is lawful to bend the sins of the saints to pious senses (Galatians 4:24)

Page 447: Annotation CCLXXXI, Whether those who live under grace are impeccable [free from sin] (Galatians 5:17)

Page 447: Annotation CCLXXXII, Whether the damned are ever to be saved (Galatians 5:22)

Page 448: Annotation CCLXXXIII, Whether the saints departed can pray for us (Galatians 6:5)

Page 448: Annotation CCLXXXIV, Whether all men are to be loved with an equal affection of charity (Galatians 6:10)

Ephesians

Page 449: Annotation CCLXXXV, Whether election [is] from foreseen merits (Ephesians 1:4)

Page 449: Annotation CCLXXXVI, Whether souls [were] created before the world, and thrust into bodies for their offenses (Ephesians 1:4)

Page 450: Annotation CCLXXXVII, Whether souls [were] created before the world, and afterward cast into bodies for their [own] faults (Ephesians 1:4)

Page 451: Annotation CCLXXXVIII, Whether penance is again to be given to the lapsed (Ephesians 1:6)

Page 452: Annotation CCLXXXIX, On the Eucharist (Ephesians 1:7)

Page 452: Annotation CCXC, Whether the punishments of the damned are to be ended (Ephesians 1:12)

Page 454: Annotation CCXCI, Whether the knowledge of souls is from reminiscence (Ephesians 1:17)

Page 454: Annotation CCXCII, The increments and decrements of angels (Ephesians 1:21)

Page 455: Annotation CCXCIII, Whether the stars are rational living beings, and purged by the blood of Christ (Ephesians 1:22)

Page 455: Annotation CCXCIV, The bodies of demons (Ephesians 2:2)

Page 455: Annotation CCXCV, Whether the demons are ever to be saved (Ephesians 2:7)

Page 456: Annotation CCXCVI, Angels purged (Ephesians 2:17)

Page 456: Annotation CCXCVII, The soul's prison (Ephesians 3:1)

Page 456: Annotation CCXCVIII, Whether the demons are to be restored (Ephesians 3:10)
Page 456: Annotation CCXCIX, Whether the angels, before the passion of Christ, knew the mystery of redemption (Ephesians 3:10)
Page 457: Annotation CCC, *"And he himself indeed gave some [to be] apostles."* (Ephesians 4:11)
Page 457: Annotation CCCI, Whether he is to be constituted a bishop, who cannot teach (Ephesians 4:11)
Page 458: Annotation CCCII, On the angels, and the demons (Ephesians 4:10.b)
Page 458: Annotation CCCIII, *"From whom the whole body [is] compacted."* (Ephesians 4:16.b)
Page 458: Annotation CCCIV, Whether song is to be used in the divine praises (Ephesians 5:19)
Page 459: Annotation CCCV, Whether sinners are members of the Church (Ephesians 5:24)
Page 459: Annotation CCCVI, The transformation of women (Ephesians 5:28)
Page 459: Annotation CCCVII, On the sacrament of matrimony (Ephesians 5:32)
Page 460: Annotation CCCVIII, Jacob, and the wrestling of the angel (Ephesians 6:12)
Page 460: Annotation CCCIX, The punishment of original sin (Ephesians 6:24)

Philippians

Page 461: Annotation CCCX, Whether the saints are to be invoked (Philippians 1:18)
Page 462: Annotation CCCXI, Whether prayer is to be made for catechumens departing without baptism (Philippians 1:23)

Colossians

Page 463: Annotation CCCXII, Whether the sacred letters attribute patience to God (Colossians 1:11)
Page 464: Annotation CCCXIII, Whether to individual men individual angels are deputed (Colossians 1:20)
Page 464: Annotation CCCXIV, Fascination [bewitchment] (Colossians 3:15)
Page 464: Annotation CCCXV, The common [vernacular] Bibles are to be read by all (Colossians 3:16)

2 Thessalonians

Page 465: Annotation CCCXVI, *"When I was yet with you, [I told you these things], etc."* (2 Thessalonians 2:5)
Page 465: 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 468: Annotation CCCXVIII, Whether it is lawful to constitute a bigamist a bishop (1 Timothy 3:2)
Page 469: Annotation CCCXIX, Bishop, and presbyter (1 Timothy 3:8)
Page 469: Annotation CCCXX, Whether God, before the incarnation of Christ, was seen by the angels (1 Timothy 3:16)
Page 469: Annotation CCCXXI, Whether clerics ought to possess anything beyond food and clothing (1 Timothy 5:18)
Page 469: Annotation CCCXXII, The punishment of blasphemers (1 Timothy 5:23)

Titus

Page 470: Annotation CCCXXIII, Angels existing long before the world (Titus 1:2)
Page 470: Annotation CCCXXIV, Whether a bishop is greater than a presbyter (Titus 1:5)
Page 472: Annotation CCCXXV, Whether a bigamist is to be chosen for bishop (Titus 1:6)
Page 472: Annotation CCCXXVI, Daily bread (Titus 2:11)

Hebrews

Page 473: Annotation CCCXXVII, Whether the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's (Hebrews 1:1)
Page 473: Annotation CCCXXVIII, Whether the Father is the cause of the Son (Hebrews 1:3.a)
Page 473: Annotation CCCXXIX, Whether in Christ there are two persons (Hebrews 1:9)
Page 474: Annotation CCCXXX, Whether the celestial bodies are to be burned up (Hebrews 1:11)
Page 474: Annotation CCCXXXI, Whether Christ was diminished from God (Hebrews 2:7)
Page 475: Annotation CCCXXXII, Whether the laity and monks are equal — [their] obligations and offenses [being] equal (Hebrews 4:16)
Page 476: Annotation CCCXXXIII, Whence the beginning of salvation (Hebrews 7:10)
Page 476: Annotation CCCXXXIV, The state and figure of heaven (Hebrews 8:2)
Page 476: Annotation CCCXXXV, Whether the souls of the saints are yet blessed (Hebrews 11:37)
Page 476: Annotation CCCXXXVI, Confession (Hebrews 12:17)

James

Page 477: Annotation CCCXXXVII, Whether the epistle of James is canonical (James 1:1)

Page 477: Annotation CCCXXXVIII, Oath (James 5:12)

Page 478: Annotation CCCXXXIX, Whether extreme unction can be ministered by any layman whatsoever (James 5:14)

2 Peter

Page 479: Annotation CCCXL, Whether the heavens are to be burned by the fire of the world-conflagration (2 Peter 3:10)

Page 483: Annotation CCCXLI, Whether air and water at the end of the world shall be wholly dissolved (2 Peter 3:10)

1 John

Page 483: Annotation CCCXLII, Trinity (1 John 5:7)

Page 483: Annotation CCCXLIII, Whether the impugning of the brotherhood is an irremissible sin (1 John 5:16)

Jude

Page 484: Annotation CCCXLIV, Whether the epistle of Jude is canonical (Jude 1)

Apocalypse

Page 484: Annotation CCCXLV, Whether the souls of the saints see God before the day of judgment (Apocalypse 6:9)

Page 492: Annotation CCCXLVI, Whether Jeremiah is dead (Apocalypse 11:3)

Page 492: 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 folio 526 [PDF p. 343], beneath a full-width title banner — the opening of **Liber Quintus (Book V): Annotations and Censures upon the interpreters of the Old Testament**, with its **Preface**. Sixtus states the book's purpose and rebukes two opposite faults in handling the Fathers: heretics who abuse their words, and critics who reject a whole author for a single slip.)*

F. SIXTUS OF SIENA, OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS — ON THE ANNOTATIONS AND CENSURES:

upon the interpreters and expositors of the divine volumes of the Old Testament.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA, BOOK FIVE.

PREFACE.

(folio 526, left column)

In the preceding book I reviewed the Catholic Expositors of the sacred volumes — all whom I was able to come to know, whether by varied reading or by sure report — together with all their exegetical writings. Now, in this fifth book of the work, I shall annotate, according to the order of the divine volumes, a number of passages worthy of annotation and censure, which I have gathered out of the various explanations of those same expositors: not because I myself desire in any part to obscure, or to render suspect, the sincere piety and admirable erudition of those most holy and most learned men, but that by the present labor I may take counsel for those who are offended by the writings of the holy expositors — whether from prudence, or from malice, or from immoderate zeal — and who likewise give offense.[1]

◊ **1. Left margin:** Heretics abuse the writings of Catholics in order to confirm their own impious dogmas.

Of their number, those who do harm maliciously, and the more [grievously], are certain perverse men addicted to detestable errors: who, while they wish to make their heresies more easily persuasive, generally snatch out of the orthodox commentaries of the ancient expositors certain opinions — either obscurely written, or put forth by [the Fathers] through carelessness — and drag them off to the confirmation of their own perfidy, lest they seem to be the first, or the only ones, to hold such things. Thus of old the most impious Arians drove the letters of blessed Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria — however much those letters resisted — to the overthrowing of Christ's divinity. Thus once the Pelagian heretics fought against original sin and against the aid of divine grace, wrongfully making use of the opinions of Chrysostom and Augustine. Thus five hundred years ago Bertram the Priest and Berengarius the Deacon, by violently wresting the sayings of Ambrose and Augustine, attempted to take away the Lord's Body and Blood from the Church of Christ. Thus too, in this wretched age of ours, Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bodius [Bucer], Calvin, Illyricus [Flacius], and very many other heresiarchs, clad in false →

(folio 526, right column)

→ arms and spoils — that is, covered over with the testimony of the holy Fathers, whether feigned, or corrupted, or falsely interpreted — assail the uncorrupted integrity of our faith. These men I judge worthy of no pardon whatsoever: whether because they do not shrink from serving up to others the poisons of heresies; or because they iniquitously defame the venerable memory of the saints, imputing to them things they never held; or because they call back into the light again — not without great harm to Christians — certain now-slumbering errors of the Fathers, which ought to have been buried in perpetual silence — following in this the footsteps of their most wicked author, Ham:[2] who not only did not cover the nakedness of his father Noah, but proclaimed it to the rest to be mocked. But contrariwise the other brothers, Shem and Japheth, far unlike their brother, endured neither to look themselves upon the father's nakedness which was to be revered,

nor to have it looked upon by others, but, turned away (as it is written), covered it — showing by such an example that the errors of the holy Fathers, if not to be approved, are yet rather to be concealed than to be published.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Heretics are imitators of Ham. Genesis 9.

There are, next, others so extreme toward the contrary side that, if they find in the catholic and ever-so-ancient commentaries of the expositors anything that has the appearance of error, at once, seized by a certain headlong severity, they cast away the whole work and condemn the author most severely. These men seem to me indeed to have a zeal for God, but — as Paul says — **not according to knowledge**.[3] For they ought with mature consideration to weigh the not-few occasions on account of which those ancient masters of the churches did at times stray somewhat from the intended mark of truth.[4] **First**, because they set out upon a road never before attempted, with no guide going before, and — the first, as the proverb has it, to break the ice — opened a way for those who came after, by which the hidden senses of the Scriptures might be tracked out; and the first attempts of any discipline are not wont to be in every part successful and free of all fault. **Secondly**, they said, dictated, and wrote things almost innumerable according to the opportunity of the times, places, and persons.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Romans 10:2. — "they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge."

◊ **4. Right margin:** By what reasons the errors of the ancients are to be excused. — the margin numbers the reasons **1**, **2** (continuing on the next folio).

[…continues on folio 527 (PDF p. 344): the further reasons by which the Fathers' occasional errors are to be excused.]

---

*(printed folio 527 [PDF p. 344] — continuation of the **Preface**. Sixtus completes his five reasons for excusing the Fathers' occasional errors, names the three kinds of reader Book V addresses (malicious heretics, over-severe critics, simple incautious readers), and states his method: to flag cautionary passages from the authors themselves and supply parallel-passage "antidotes.")*

(folio 527, left column)

→ and, as Augustine says, excusing himself by a saying of Solomon, declares: "In much speaking there is no lack of sin"[1] — especially since no one is so keen-eyed that he cannot often be deluded, and does not sometimes grow dim of sight; for even the good Homer sometimes nods. There are, indeed, certain moles even on the most beautiful bodies; and nothing in human affairs is in every part blessed. Moreover, those men of old burned with so great an ardor of sincere piety and of catholic defense that, while they strove with every effort of their powers to destroy one error, they often either fell into the opposite one, or seem in some way to have fallen — after the manner of farmers,[2] who, wishing to straighten the trunk of a tender tree bent crooked, sometimes exceed the measure by an immoderate pull, and draw the very plant into the contrary and opposite shape. Thus Dionysius, Bishop of the Corinthians — as Basil writes in his letter to Bishop Maximus[3] — while he strove too vehemently and sharply to combat Sabellius (who asserted one person of Father and Son), did not perceive that he was, by an excessive zeal for controversy, being carried into the opposite fault, and was defending a difference and inequality of the two substances. Thus the divine Augustine, while with all ardor of spirit and words he fights in defense of divine grace against the Pelagians — who exalted free will to the injury of divine grace — seems to slip, as it were, into the other pit, and at times to attribute to man's free will less than is fair. And on the contrary Chrysostom, in the heat of disputing with the Manichees and pagans — who asserted that man is either evil by nature or often driven to sin by the necessity of fate — raises the powers of our nature higher than is right.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Proverbs 10:19. — "In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin."

◊ **2. Left margin:** A most fitting simile. — the farmer over-bending the sapling.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Nicephorus, book 6, chapter 25.

[4.] Add to these that, although some lapses which cannot be dissembled exist in the books of the ancients, yet nothing is thereby taken from their sanctity and erudition: since in those times the Church had not yet either called into question, or defined by a settled determination, anything about these matters which are now condemned; and the authority of divine Scripture seemed ambiguous on either side, nor was it yet forbidden to anyone to hold an opinion about these things, and to teach what he would.

[5.] Nor should this be passed over either, which Pamphilus the Martyr, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus, and Rufinus complained of[4] — namely, that very many of the writings of Clement, Dionysius, Origen, Athanasius, and of the other noble Doctors were of old most wickedly handled by heretics: who, in order to win credit and authority for their heresies under the name of the most illustrious Fathers, corrupted, altered, and cut away much in their books, and also inserted much of their own dogmas at variance with what those celebrated men had held and taught — [men] of whom it is not credible that in the same volumes, on the same matter and at the same time, they either held or wrote contrary things, especially since they were neither mad nor utterly forgetful.

◊ **4. Left margin:** The writings of the Catholic Doctors were corrupted by heretics.

(folio 527, right column)

In the third place, finally, there are certain simple and incautious readers who, without any judgment or observation, are carried heedlessly into the reading of the illustrious expositors, and devour and gulp down everything without any distinction or selection — by no means discerning for what cause the things they read were written, to what feelings, occasions, places, times, and persons they were accommodated, whether they were said for the sake of disputing, of objecting, or of rebuking, or were confirmed under the settled definition of a fixed assertion. And while these inconsiderate readers take no notice of this, it necessarily follows that they for the most part slip into a number of errors — errors which, in the expositors' works, either the authors themselves left behind, as much by occasion as by carelessness, or heretics thrust in by fraud. Most prudently admonishing this so shameless a class of men, D. Anselm, in his commentary on the second Epistle to the Corinthians, left it thus written: "In the books of the holy doctors, which the Church reads as authentic, there are sometimes found certain depraved or heretical things: yet neither the books nor the authors are on this account condemned. Let the prudent reader read their books through, and he will find that what I say is true."

For this threefold variety of readers, then, this Fifth book is written; in which, according to the order of the volumes of both Testaments, I have gathered out of many commentaries of the divine expositors — and especially of the ancients — **passages to be read with caution**: not indeed all and every one, but only those which could not be dissembled either without offense to catholic piety or without great disturbance of the readers. And these same [passages] I have almost always indicated not in my own words — lest perhaps I should not be believed — but by the testimonies of the authors who noted such passages. I have also appended, wherever it could be done, to each suspect passage its own **antidotes** — that is, other passages and opinions of the same authors, either openly at odds with the passages cited or at least diverse and foreign to them, which by their own testimony show that those passages were either explained elsewhere more openly by the authors themselves, or wholly retracted; or were not well understood by the slanderers; or were violently wrested by heretics to the overthrow of Catholic assertions and the defense of depraved dogmas; or were falsified or adulterated by forgers, or added to; or perhaps were at first published in a disordered way by the very authors of the works, and afterward — whether by chance or by some excusable occasion — left without any correction.

Now I have gathered all these things to this end: **first**, lest the incautious reader, unrolling the commentaries of the catholic expositors, dash himself against some reef he has not noticed; **next**, that over-severe readers may recognize that the errors of the divine interpreters are to be excused with all pardon and piety, and

softened with the gentlest mildness; →

*[…continues on folio 528 (PDF p. 345): "**lastly** (postremò)…", the third and final purpose of the collection.]*

---

*(printed folio 528 [PDF p. 345], with a section banner; the **Preface** ends and the collection proper begins. **Annot. I–III** (Gen 1:1): Cajetan on the plural "Elohim" (defended against Catharinus); Philo's "heaven as dwelling of the gods" (= angels); and Procopius denying heaven is spherical or mobile.)*

(folio 528 — top, concluding the Preface [set across the two columns])

→ **lastly**, that those who abuse the explanations of the saints to their own ruin and that of others may desist from so wicked a contrivance, once they have seen these impostures and frauds of theirs to be detected. But let us now approach the work itself: in which we shall fit together annotations and censures upon the explainers of the blessed volumes, keeping the order of the books and chapters of divine Scripture, proceeding from the beginning of Genesis all the way to the last book of the New Testament.

ANNOTATIONS AND CENSURES

upon the expositors of the divine volumes of the OLD Scripture, arranged according to the order of the books and chapters of the Old Testament.

(folio 528, left column → right column)

Annotation I [contents]

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether the beginning of Genesis pertains to the Trinity.

Thomas Cajetan, Cardinal-Priest, in the beginning of his commentaries on Genesis, explaining why Moses in the first words of Genesis called God by a plural number — saying אלהים *Elohim*, that is, "Gods" ("In the beginning God created heaven and earth") — taught that God is named by Moses with a plural appellation not to signify a plurality of divine persons in the Trinity, but because the name *Elohim* lacks a singular number;[1] adding that this passage in no way favors a Trinity of persons, since — as Athanasius testifies in his Creed — a divine person can be called neither "Gods" nor "lords" in the catholic sense.

◊ **1. Left margin:** The name *Elohim* lacks a singular number.

Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa, in the fourth book of the Annotations which he published against this same Cajetan, execrates this opinion as Jewish and abhorrent from the view of the most excellent Fathers, rejecting it among the other propositions of Cajetan for which he judges him to have thought ill concerning the holy Trinity. He also derides Cajetan's argument — that from Athanasius's Creed he wished to establish that divine persons are falsely called "Gods" or "lords" — since Athanasius does not teach that, but only that "three Gods" or "three lords" cannot be pronounced in the catholic sense. Yet this reasoning does not follow: "They cannot be called three Gods, therefore not Gods [at all]" — because many things are falsely said conjointly which are truly said separately. Wherefore the Master of the Sentences [Peter Lombard], and Thomas, and the rest of the doctors admit that they can be called "Gods," but not likewise "three Gods." Thus far Ambrose.

But it was certainly not fitting for him[2] to bring his brother, for such trifling causes, under suspicion of injuring the Trinity — [a Trinity] which Cajetan not only most openly proclaims in his commentaries on this

first chapter, expounding that "Let us make man," etc., but also learnedly and piously teaches and defends in all his writings. Ambrose ought also to have noticed that Cajetan had no expositor to imitate, out of the Greek, Latin, or Hebrew writers, who expounded that word *Elohim* of the Trinity — except only Peter Lombard, who in the first [book] of the Sentences had somehow touched this interpretation in passing, and Paul of Bur→gos, the bishop, who had copied the same interpretation out of the same book of the Sentences. From whose opinions many not-ignoble men, even before Cajetan, had openly dissented without any note of heresy. Nor do I wish this to have been said by me to derogate in this part from the authority of those who expounded this passage mystically of the Trinity: for it delights me greatly — to use Augustine's words — that in the very opening of the holy book of Genesis the Trinity is commended, when it is said: "In the beginning" — that is, in the Son — "God" (namely the Father) "made heaven and earth."[3]

◊ **2. Left margin:** Cajetan is defended.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Genesis 1:1.

Annotation II [contents]

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods.

Philo the Jew — whom Origen, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine followed in most of their expositions — in his book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, narrating the present passage, says that heaven was made by God to be the most sacred dwelling of the gods, both of those not apparent [to sense] and of those obvious to sense. Lest anyone suspect this opinion to incline toward the error of the pagans, who introduce many gods, it must be known that Philo — as appears from the same work of his — understands by the name of "gods" the spiritual, rational, and heavenly substances called by us Angels:[4] of which he says some are incorporeal and invisible, but others not without bodies — such as are the stars, which appear to our eyes.

◊ **4. Right margin:** By the name of "gods" Philo understands Angels.

Annotation III [contents]

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether heaven is spherical and mobile.

Procopius of Gaza, in his commentaries on Genesis, expounding this saying, declares that the assertion of those who say heaven is of a spherical shape and is turned with a circular motion does not agree with orthodox truth, but contradicts Moses, the prophets, Paul, and Christ: who everywhere in the divine scriptures refute this opinion, teaching that heaven is neither borne in a circle nor has a spherical form, but is utterly immobile; and he repeats this same thing below in the exposition of chapter 7. This opinion Procopius seems to have taken, in almost the same words, from homilies 14 and 27 of Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews — although →

[…continues on folio 529 (PDF p. 346): the rest of Annotatio III.]

---

*(printed folio 529 [PDF p. 346]. **Annot. III–V** (Gen 1:1): Augustine's warning not to defend as faith what secular science has disproved; Kissamos on an uncreated empyrean (censured by Catharinus); and whether an angelic world was created before the visible one — affirmed by Basil and many Fathers, yet seemingly condemned by Lateran IV.)*

(folio 529, left column → right column)

Annotation III (continued)

— although Lactantius Firmianus held and wrote the same, many years before Chrysostom, in the third book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 24.[1]

◊ **1. Left margin:** Lactantius, Chrysostom, and Procopius denied that heaven is of spherical figure and moves in an orbit.

Augustine, in the first and second books of *On Genesis to the Letter*, most strongly condemns those who so defend this — and opinions like it about celestial matters, contrary to all the professors of philosophy — as [a point] of faith, that they think those who hold otherwise are not catholic.[2] For [Augustine warns that] when nature, heaven, the stars, and other things of this kind are treated, we must beware lest we shamefully err about matters that have been proved by most certain reason and most manifest experience by those skilled in secular things; and — what is worse — lest we confirm our errors out of misunderstood testimonies of Scripture. For this is exceedingly disgraceful, and pernicious chiefly for two reasons. **First**, because when unbelievers see them thus raving, and erring by the whole breadth of heaven, they will mock both us and our authors, and will reprehend and spit them out as unlearned and false. **Next**, because if they hear that the divine scriptures err so gravely in those matters which they themselves know best and have tested, they will by no means believe the other things in them that are useful and necessary for salvation, but will suppose that these too were deceitfully composed with a like vanity. *(See below, Annotation 14.)*

◊ **2. Left margin:** The teaching of St. Augustine, to be diligently observed by theologians.

Annotation IV [contents]

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Augustine of Kissamos wrongly taught that the empyrean heaven was not created.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, is reprehended by Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa, because in his *Cosmopoeia* (for so he entitled his work on the first three chapters of Genesis), in elucidating this passage, he judged that the empyrean heaven was not created, but coeternal with God — being, however, ready to recant if he thought wrongly; yet, as the same Ambrose says, it would have been better not to commit such dangerous things to writing than to offer oneself to a palinode. For who will recant in the name of that man who has already died and left his error alive in his writings?

Annotation V [contents]

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether an invisible world and angels were created before this world.

Basil, in the first homily of the *Hexaemeron*, narrating this passage, seems to hold that God, many ages before this visible world, created another invisible world, and in it founded the angelic nature long before the creation of this visible world. For he speaks in this manner: "Moses set this word in front, saying *In the beginning he made*: because even before this world there was (as is likely) something which indeed our intelligence is permitted to contemplate. But he omitted to narrate it, because that knowledge is little suited to those still being introduced [to the faith] and to babes. There was surely a certain state of the world, older in origin — suited to those powers withdrawn from the concretion of matter and more excellent than the [material] world — prior also in the condition of time; eternal, namely, and everlasting, that is, never subject to any corruption and destruction. And in it the Founder of all perfected his works: a spiritual light befitting the beatitude of those who love the Lord, rational and invisible natures, and every adornment of intelligible things which exceed our understanding, whose very names it is not possible to find. For these fill up the essence of the invisible world — as Paul teaches us, saying that *in him were founded all things, whether visible or invisible, whether thrones or dominations or principalities or powers* or might, whether the hosts of angels or the prefectures of archangels.[3] *In the beginning*, therefore, he says — [meaning] that which is

'with respect to time' — narrating, after the invisible and intelligible things, the beginning of the origin of these visible things and of the principles apprehensible by sense." Again in the second homily, explaining that *The earth was void and empty*, he confirms the same with these words: "Let us consider, then, that whatever existed before the constitution of this sensible and corruptible world was surely in light. For neither the dignities of the angels, nor all the celestial hosts, nor, in sum, anything named among the rational and ministering spirits, dwelt in darkness, but in light, and possessed a state agreeable to themselves with all spiritual gladness."

◊ **3. Right margin:** Colossians 1[:16].

These opinions, which of old among the Greeks **Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea**, and **Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus**, had refuted with many argumentations,[4] the **Lateran Council** — celebrated at Rome under Innocent III in the year 1215 — seems among the Latins to have condemned, from the words which it placed in the first chapter of its decrees.[5] They are these: "The **Creator** of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporeal, by his omnipotent power together from the beginning of time founded out of nothing both creatures, the spiritual and the corporeal — namely the angelic and the mundane."

◊ **4. Right margin:** Acacius, in his book of Select Questions; Diodorus, on Genesis, chapter [—]; Theodoret, on Genesis, question 3.

◊ **5. Right margin:** The Lateran Council seems to disapprove the opinion of those asserting that the angels were created before this corporeal world.

Thus far the words of the Council. On whose occasion one must beware not to determine anything rashly about this opinion, accusing of heresy very many illustrious men who assert it: among whom (to pass over Origen for the moment, who first asserted this in the books *Peri Archōn* [On First Principles] and in homily 4 on Isaiah) there is, foremost, **Gregory Nazianzen**,[6] who in his sermon *On the Nativity* speaks thus: "God first indeed devised the angelic and celestial powers; and the thing devised was straightway fulfilled by the Word and consummated by the Spirit; and thus subsisted the second splendors, ministers of that first Splendor. But after these had first rightly succeeded, he secondarily devised the material and visible world: this is the mingling of heaven and earth and of the things that are in between." Thus Gregory: whom his disciple **Jerome** followed, writing thus in his commentaries on the Epistle to Titus: "Six thousand years of our time are not yet complete — and how great times, and how many origins of ages, must we suppose there were, in which the angels, the Thrones, the dominations, and the other orders served God?" Coming to the same opinion, **Ambrose**, in the first book of the *Hexaemeron*, chapter 5, expounding this passage, brought forth these words: "The world therefore was made, and that which was not began to be. But the Word of God was in the beginning, and always: yet also the angels, dominations, and powers, although they began to be at some time, nevertheless were [already in being] when this world was made." Likewise in his preface to the first Psalm: "The angels praise the Lord," he says, "and before the very beginning of the world the Cherubim and Seraphim, with the sweetness of a melodious voice, were saying: Holy, Holy, Holy." To these is added **Hilary** in the twelfth book *On the Trinity*, not far from the end, and in the little book →

◊ **6. Right margin:** Gregory Nazianzen thinks the angels were created before this world.

[…continues on folio 530 (PDF p. 347): the rest of Annotatio V.]

---

*(printed folio 530 [PDF p. 347]. **Annot. V–VII** (Gen 1:1–2): more Fathers on angels-before-the-world (Cajetan and Aquinas read the Lateran decree by its intention; Augustine leaves it open); Augustine's seemingly-Pelagian words on "the void earth" (self-corrected); and the "Spirit borne over the waters" taken as wind/air (Cajetan defended).)*

(folio 530, left column → right column)

Annotation V (continued)

[Hilary] — in the little book against Auxentius, a little before the end. **Isidore**, Bishop of Seville, in the first book *On the Highest Good*, ch. 12; and **John Damascene** in the second volume of the *Orthodox Faith*, ch. 3; together with very many others, both Greek and Latin — whom, since it would be long to enumerate them, it may suffice that **John Cassian**, in the 8th book of the *Collations*, indicates that this was in his time the common opinion of all catholics,[1] in these plain words: "That before the constitution of this visible creature God made the spiritual and celestial powers — which, for this very reason, that they knew themselves to have been produced out of nothing to so great a glory of beatitude by the Creator's benefit, giving thanks to him, cling unceasingly to his praises — no one of the faithful doubts." **Bede**, in the little book of *Separate Questions*, q. 9: "The angels (he says) were created before the creation of the world; and before all creation of angels, the Devil was founded [created]: as it is written, 'He is the beginning of the ways of God.'"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Cassian asserts that in his time it was the common opinion of catholics that the angels were created before this world.

Accordingly, as Thomas Cajetan says, we ought to interpret the aforesaid opinion of the synodal decree rather according to the Council's intention than according to the sense of the words.[2] And the Council's purpose is — as St. Thomas says in his exposition of the first Decretal — to refute the error either of Origen, or of those who said that spiritual substances were first produced by God so that they might enjoy spiritual dignity, and then, when they had sinned, that all bodies were created, into which, thrust as into prisons, they might pay the penalties of their crimes. Although St. Augustine rather approves the opinion of those who assert the angels were created together with the world, yet in the 11th book of *The City of God*, chapter 32, he permits everyone to hold freely in this matter what he wishes[3] — provided only that he does not make spiritual substances coeternal with God, and affirms all things, visible as well as invisible, to have been founded by God in time. Subscribing to him, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus [Cyrrhus], in question 3 on Genesis, after disputing much against Basil, finally added this: "Further, it is necessary to know that all things whatsoever that exist, except the holy Trinity, have a nature liable to corruption. And this being granted, if anyone says that the throngs of angels were created before heaven and earth, he will not offend against the word of piety."

◊ **2. Left margin:** See St. Thomas, part 1, question 61, article 3, and Cajetan on the same place.

◊ **3. Left margin:** St. Augustine's opinion on the time of the creation of the angels.

Annotation VI [contents]

"And the earth was void and empty." — Genesis 1:2

Whether faith and charity are from ourselves.

Augustine, in the first book *On Genesis, allegorically*, chapter 3, explaining this, seems to assent somewhat to the Pelagian heresy,[4] when he says: "All men can believe God, and can turn themselves from the love of visible and temporal things to fulfilling the precepts, if they will." Which words Augustine, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 11, says are not true unless our will is first prepared by God, and charity so increased by him that we are able to accomplish the precepts.

◊ **4. Left margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation VII [contents]

"The Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters." — Genesis 1:2

*Whether the spirit that was borne over the waters was the Holy Spirit. — **Right margin:** Ambrose of Compsa does not rightly reprehend Cajetan.*

Thomas Cajetan, in his exposition of this sentence, has been gravely reprehended by Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa. For in the fourth volume against Cajetan he accuses him of having asserted that the aforesaid passage, "The Spirit of the Lord," etc., pertains not to the Holy Spirit but to some wind or other that blows — and this against the sense of the saints, against the decrees of the Pontiffs, and against the authority of the Church, which on the holy day of Pentecost sings of the Holy Spirit: "Thou who wast to be over the waters didst bear them," etc. I think that Ambrose, when he wrote this, did not have at hand Cajetan's commentaries on Genesis, in which he might read the exposition of the present passage. For he would have seen there that not a word — nay, not a syllable — is written about wind, whether blowing or not blowing. Although I do not see why Cajetan should have been so bitterly branded, even if he *had* referred this passage to wind, since many Greek and Latin expositors did the same before him. Of these, **Basil**, expounding Moses's words both of the Holy Spirit and of wind and air, in the second homily of the *Hexaemeron* writes thus: "Whether one call this a 'spirit' — namely a diffusion of air — recognize the writer [Moses] as enumerating for you the parts of the whole world; or rather (which is truer, and approved by our elders) [understand] the Spirit of God — here it is called the Holy Spirit." **Augustine**, in the unfinished book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 4, having said that three things can be understood by "the Spirit of God" — namely the Holy Spirit, and a certain vital creature by which the whole visible world is contained and moved — straightway added this: "A third opinion about this spirit can arise: that by the name 'spirit' the element of air is expressed, so that the four elements are intimated, out of which this visible world arises — namely heaven, earth, water, and air. And any one of these opinions is true." **Diodorus**, Bishop of Tarsus, judges that these words are to be fitted first to air and wind, then to the Holy Spirit, saying thus: "By 'the Spirit of God' understand the wind, which by its motion alters the nature of the waters, whence too it draws its origin. And he added 'of God' in order to ascribe the cause of this work to God. But if anyone understands 'the Spirit of God' as the Paraclete Spirit, he will not stray from the truth; for the Spirit adorns all things that are." St. John **Chrysostom**, the disciple of Diodore,[5] in homily 3 on Genesis, says that the Spirit of the Lord is a certain vital operation, implanted in the waters by God, from which the waters had not only motion but the power of procreating animals. **Theodoret**, Bishop of Cyrus, constantly affirms that Moses spoke more of air than of the Holy Spirit, writing in this manner in the *Questions* on the book of Genesis, question 8: "To some it seems to have been the Holy Spirit, who vivified and made fruitful the nature of the waters, prefiguring in a way the water of baptism. But I should reckon it truer that here you understand 'spirit' as air. For when he had said that God created heaven and earth, and had mentioned the waters under the name of 'the abyss,' he necessarily made mention also of air, permeating from the surface of the water all the way to heaven. For it is the nature of air to be borne and agitated about the lower bodies. And most fittingly that word 'was borne [moved]' indicates the mobile substance of air. But if anyone does not assent to this interpretation, because it is written 'The Spirit of God was borne over the waters,' let him hear blessed David saying of God, the Founder of all: 'His spirit [breath] shall blow, and the waters shall flow.'"[6] **Origen**, in the first book of the *Peri Archōn* [On First Principles], says that this passage →

◊ **5. Right margin:** Chrysostom was the disciple of Diodore of Tarsus.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 147:18.

[…continues on folio 531 (PDF p. 348): Origen and the rest of Annotatio VII.]

---

*(printed folio 531 [PDF p. 348]. **Annot. VII–IX** (Gen 1:1–6): Origen's allegorical reading of the Spirit; whether angels have subtle bodies (Augustine and many affirm, Aquinas and most deny — Sixtus leans incorporeal, with Bernard's confession of ignorance); and Chrysostom's single heaven, reconciled by Aquinas.)*

(folio 531, left column → right column)

Annotation VII (continued)

— [Origen says] this passage is to be understood according to allegory concerning the Holy Spirit, but according to the letter, by no means.

Annotation VIII [contents]

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether angels and demons are corporeal.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 17, in expounding the passage before us, hands down that the angels, both good and evil, have subtle bodies;[1] and in the third book of the same work, chapter 10, he shows these to be aerial, but indissoluble through death, because in them the elements more apt for acting than for suffering prevail — that is, air and starry fire (which two are more apt for acting, as earth and moisture for suffering). Agreeing with this opinion, in Epistle 115 to Nebridius he writes that angels are aerial or ethereal living beings of the keenest sense. And in the third book *On the Trinity*, chapter 1, he says they have a spiritual body — not one to which they are subject, but one which they bear as subject [to them]. In the exposition of the eighty-fifth Psalm he asserts that the bodies of the blessed after the resurrection will be such as are the bodies of the angels; and he repeats this very thing in the explanation of Psalm 145, adding that the angelic body is inferior to the soul. Likewise in the 11th book *The City of God*, chapter 23, he teaches that the bodies of demons are aerial; and in the 15th book *The City of God*, chapter 23, he asserts that demons have such bodies as they can couple with women. And in the book which is entitled (under Augustine's name) *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, chapters 11 and 12, it is most constantly affirmed that nothing is incorporeal except God, but that the angels, and all the celestial powers, are corporeal.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Several Doctors of the Church hold that angels are corporeal.

Peter Lombard (2 Sentences, distinction 8) says that Augustine brought these things forth not thinking so himself, but reporting the opinion of others[2] — though nevertheless it is not likely that Augustine spoke from another's opinion in so many places, but rather from his own, imitating namely Philo (in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*), Origen (in the first book of the *Peri Archōn*, ch. 6, and in the second book of the same work, ch. 2), Lactantius, Hilary, Basil, and the consensus of nearly all who wrote in his time. To this opinion subscribe **John Cassian** (7th book of the *Collations*, chapter 13), **John Damascene** (second book of the *Theology*, ch. 3, and the third book against the Iconoclasts), and likewise the **Second Nicene synod**, in whose fourth session the words of **John, Bishop of Thessalonica**, are approved, who writes in this manner: "Concerning the Angels and archangels, and their powers — to which our soul also is joined — the Catholic Church itself thinks thus: that they are indeed intelligible, but not entirely devoid of body, but endowed with a thin and aerial or fiery body, as it is written: 'Who makes his angels spirits, and his ministers a burning fire.'[3] And thus we have learned that many of the holy Fathers thought — among whom is Basil surnamed the Great, and blessed Athanasius, and Methodius, and those who stand [in succession] from them; but God alone is incorporeal. And although the angels are not corporeal as we are — namely [made] of the four elements and of that gross matter — yet no one would call either the angels, or the demons, or the soul incorporeal."

◊ **2. Left margin:** Lombard did not rightly answer on St. Augustine's behalf.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Psalm 103:4.

From these dissent **St. Thomas** and most professors of Scholastic Theology, following (they too) authors not to be ashamed of, especially **Dionysius the Areopagite**:[4] who in the first chapter of the *Celestial Hierarchy* names the Angels not only incorporeal and immaterial substances, but also deiform simplicities and immaterialities. With him concur Chrysostom (homily 22 on Genesis, and the homily on 1 Corinthians 17 & 32, and in the explanation of the sixth chapter of Isaiah), and Cyril (in the fourth book of the commentaries on John, ch. 10). Nor does the decree of the Lateran Council dissent from these, decreeing that one must

believe not only corporeal but also incorporeal creatures — that is, angels — to have been founded out of nothing.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The Scholastic theologians teach that the angels are incorporeal.

Although I myself think this latter opinion the stronger — because the angels need bodies neither for subsisting, nor for understanding, nor for moving themselves — yet in this part I choose to embrace the modesty of **Bernard**, who in the fifth homily on the Canticle of Canticles, leaving such a controversy undiscussed, concluded his sermon with these words:[5] "But whether these spirits have natural bodies, as men have their own, or whether the spirits themselves take up bodies when there is need, and again, the work completed, lay them aside into the same matter from which they were taken, to be dissolved — I do not wish it to be required of me. The Fathers seem to have thought diversely about such things; nor is it clear to me from what [source] I should teach either alternative, and I confess that I do not know. But I judge that the knowledge of these things does not contribute much to our progress." Thus he.

◊ **5. Right margin:** St. Bernard writes that he does not know whether the angels are corporeal or incorporeal.

Annotation IX [contents]

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether there is only one heaven, as Chrysostom seems to hold.

Chrysostom, in homily 4 on Genesis, in expounding this sentence, asserts that those who teach there are many heavens are impelled to say this not from divine Scripture, but against divine Scripture and ecclesiastical dogmas, out of their own head and out of their own violent opinions: for Moses taught us that there is only *one* heaven; and further, that what is read in the psalm, "Praise him, you heavens of heavens," is not said because there are many heavens, but because it is the custom of the Hebrew tongue to name heaven, water, and many other singular things in the plural number. He holds the same in the exposition of Psalm 148,[6] where, expounding that "Praise him, you heavens of heavens," he says: "Saying here 'heavens of heavens,' he does not show a multitude; yet the same [Scripture] also says 'the heaven of heaven.' For the language of the Hebrews names heaven in the plural number." This opinion of Chrysostom seems to be opposed to all the schools of theologians and philosophers. Expounding it in the first part of the *Summa*, question 68, article 4, St. Thomas says that by these words are not condemned the theologians and philosophers who distinguish the starry heaven — that is, that whole celestial body which encloses this lower world, or globe of elements — into many particular heavens or orbs;[7] but [what is condemned is] certain heretics and philosophers who taught that beyond this whole starry globe there are other starry heavens, and other worlds.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 148:4.

◊ **7. Right margin:** St. Thomas piously explains St. Chrysostom.

Annotation X

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Augustine →

[…continues on folio 532 (PDF p. 349): Annotatio X.]

---

*(printed folio 532 [PDF p. 349]. **Annot. X–XIII** (Gen 1:6–9): Augustine on the firmament dividing the waters (retracted); Origen's waters-above-are-angels (condemned); why "it was good" is omitted on the second day; and the **antipodes**, denied by the Fathers but now proved by the voyages to the New World.)*

(folio 532, left column → right column)

Annotation X [contents]

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether the firmament is between the upper and lower waters.

Augustine, in the 13th book of the *Confessions*, chapter 32, expounding this passage, writes that the firmament was made between the spiritual upper waters and the corporeal lower ones;[1] which — as said not considerately enough in so obscure a matter — he revokes in the second book of the *Retractations*, chapter 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XI [contents]

"He divided the waters that were under the firmament," etc. — Genesis 1:7

Whether the upper and lower waters are real water, or rather Angels, as Origen held.

Origen — as Epiphanius witnesses in his letter to John of Jerusalem, and Jerome in his letter to Pammachius — when he discussed these words upon Genesis in his *Tomes*, said that the waters which are above the firmament are not waters but holy angels, and the waters which are under the firmament are evil demons fallen from heaven. Against this opinion, which Epiphanius and Jerome condemn as an error, **Basil**, in homily 3 on the *Hexaemeron*, suppressing Origen's name, writes this:[2] "We have a word also for certain ecclesiastics concerning the divided waters — [those] who, under the pretext of a withdrawal from sensible things into the heights and of a loftier understanding, fled to allegories, saying that spiritual and incorporeal powers are figuratively signified by the waters; and that above, indeed, above the firmament, the better ones remained, but below, in earthly and material things, the malignant ones stayed. On this account, forsooth, they say that God even praises the waters above heaven — that is, that the good powers, on account of their purity of mind, complete a hymn to their Founder — but that the waters under heaven are spiritual malignities, fallen from their natural height into the depth of malice, which, being turbulent and seditious and overflowing and boiling with tumults and passions, are named 'sea.' But relegating such discourses as being on a level with dreams and old wives' fables, let us understand water [to be] water, and let us understand the division made by the firmament according to the cause we have rendered."

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Basil condemns Origen's opinion.

Annotation XII [contents]

"And it was made evening and morning, the second day." — Genesis 1:8

Whether the binary [double] number is infamous, as Jerome held. — with a running tag: Genesis 1:8.

Rabanus [Maurus], Bishop of Mainz, in his commentaries on Genesis, inquiring why after the second day's work it is not said — as of the other five days' works — "God saw that it was good," answers, on the authority of the ancient Fathers, that this came about because the binary [double] number is infamous and unclean, on account of the cause of corruption, which first proceeds from it. And this is Jerome's opinion, at the beginning of his commentary on Haggai and in the first volume against Jovinian, where he writes thus: "It must be observed, according to the Hebrew truth, that whereas Scripture, on the first, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth day — the works of each being completed — said, 'And God saw that it was good': on the second day it withheld this entirely, leaving us to understand that the double number is not good, which divides from unity and prefigures the covenants of marriage. Whence also in Noah's ark all the animals which enter two by two [in pairs] are unclean." **Nicholas of Lyra**, in the Postil on Genesis, explodes this opinion as a deception, preferring to it the exposition of Rabbi Solomon [Rashi], who says that God did not call the second day's work "good" because the work of the waters — which was afterward completed on the third day — was not

yet perfect, hinting that what is not yet perfect is not worthy of the appellation of "good." Yet Paul of Burgos, the bishop, refutes this confutation of Lyra.

Annotation XIII [contents]

"Let the waters that are under heaven be gathered together." — Genesis 1:9

The ancients denied that there are Antipodes.

Procopius of Gaza, in his commentaries, explaining this, endeavors to establish, from the testimonies of divine Scripture, that there is no land below us opposite to our globe, which Antipodes inhabit, turning their footsteps against ours. For he writes thus: "That the whole earth subsists in the waters, and that there is no part of it, situated below us, empty and denuded of waters, I reckon is known to all; for thus Scripture teaches: 'Who spreads out the earth above the waters.'[3] And again: 'For he founded it upon the seas.'[4] Understand, therefore, only the surface of the earth which is near us, when he says, 'Let the waters that are under heaven be gathered together into one place.' Nor is it fitting that we believe any land below us to be opposite to the globe of our heaven. For if there were Antipodes, certainly Christ would have gone there too, and would have accomplished there the other things that pertain to the salvation of the human race; but also Adam, the first origin of our race, and the serpent, who circumvented the human race by guile, and the flood too, would have existed over against the opposite region." Thus Procopius: before whom **Lactantius**, in the third book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 24, had held the same. And **Augustine**, in the 16th book *The City of God*, chapter 9, had constantly affirmed, on the authority of the sacred Letters, that it must by no reasoning be believed that Antipodes are found who, in the contrary part of the earth — where the Sun rises when it sets for us — press their footsteps opposite to our feet. Because, since divine Scripture testifies that men are begotten from the one Adam in this our hemisphere, it is too absurd to say that some men could have sailed from this into another hemisphere, the immensity of an impassable Ocean being crossed, so as to propagate the human race there also.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Psalm 135:6.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Psalm 23:2.

But in our own times it is so certain that there are Antipodes, that to deny them would be of the utmost madness:[5] for our merchants continually sail to them, and within a short space of time return to us, having traversed and re-traversed almost the whole Ocean. Nevertheless Procopius, Augustine, Lactantius, and the other Christian authors who thought otherwise are to be excused[6] — because the navigations of the Spanish had not yet uncovered the new worlds which have now been discovered, and it was a report, confirmed by the assent of all writers, that between this Northern region and that Southern one a vast Ocean was interposed, which no one had ever crossed, nor even could cross. These things being considered, the most prudent Fathers denied the Antipodes, lest, if they had granted them, they should at once be compelled to confess that those men did not descend from the seed of Adam. But as for what Procopius objects from the authority of Psalms 23 and 135 — that the other hemisphere is so immersed in waters that it is entirely uninhabitable — it does nothing to the point: for [the claim] that the earth is made firm, founded upon the seas and established upon the rivers (to omit other expositions for the present) →

◊ **5. Right margin:** No one of sound mind at this time can deny that there are Antipodes.

◊ **6. Right margin:** The ancients who denied that there are Antipodes are excused.

[…continues on folio 533 (PDF p. 350): the rest of Annotatio XIII.]

---

*(printed folio 533 [PDF p. 350]. **Annot. XIII–XVI** (Gen 1:9–19): "the earth founded on the seas" as a Hebraism; whether the heaven or the stars move; Origen's stars-as-signs, the root of judicial astrology (refuted); and Chrysostom seeming to say that desisting from sin suffices with God.)*

(folio 533, left column → right column)

Annotation XIII (continued)

— is the same as if you should say that the earth received a greater constancy, firmness, stability, and foundation than the sea and the waters.[1] For the Hebrews are frequently wont, in place of the comparative, to add to positives the preposition "*super*" [above], as in Psalm 118[:72]: "The law of thy mouth is good to me, above thousands of gold and silver"; and [118:127]: "I have loved thy commandments above gold and topaz"; and in the fourth [chapter] of Canticles [4:10]: "The odor of thy ointments is above all aromatics."

◊ **1. Left margin:** What it is for the earth to be "made firm upon the waters and established upon the rivers." — with scripture tags: Psalm 118[:72, 127]; Canticles 4:10.

Annotation XIV [contents]

"He set the stars in the firmament." — Genesis 1:17

Whether it must be believed that the stars are fixed in the heaven.

Chrysostom, in homily 6 and homily 13 on Genesis, expounding this, says: "When we hear 'God set the stars in the firmament,' far be it that we should think God fixed the stars in the heaven; for we see them move, and each of them accomplish its course by passing from place to place. But it is the same [to say] 'He set the stars in heaven' as that he commanded that the stars should be in heaven and should revolve — just as when he said, 'God placed Adam in paradise,'[2] not that he fixed him in paradise, but that he willed him to dwell there." And again, in homily 12 to the people of Antioch, discoursing how the stars run about through the heaven — which he says is wholly immobile[3] — he writes thus: "God made the world, neither leaving it wholly immobile, nor commanding it to be wholly moved: but the heaven indeed remained unmoved, as the prophet says: 'Who established the heaven like a vault, and stretched it out like a tent';[4] but the Sun, with the rest of the stars, is daily revolved in it." Although the professors of Scholastic Theology, together with the Peripatetics and astronomers, explode this opinion with unanimous assent, and St. Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, numbers it among the heresies,[5] yet I do not judge it contrary to the divine scriptures and to the ancient school of the theologians. For **Origen** (in the fifth book against Celsus, and book 1 of the *Peri Archōn*, ch. 7) affirms that the Sun, Moon, and stars are not parts of heaven — just as the parts of the earth are not living beings — and that each of these is moved in its own order and course. **Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa**, and **Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus** — Chrysostom's teachers — in the exposition of the present passage hand down that the stars, like travelers, accomplish their journey through the heaven, which stands wholly fixed and immobile. And **Procopius** has the same on the seventh chapter of Genesis. **Augustine** too, in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 10, affirms that it can happen that, the heaven standing immobile, the stars accomplish all those diverse and mutually contrary courses which we observe in them; and that this was shown by the most certain demonstrations of the mathematicians of his times. St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa*, question 69, article 4, strives to direct Chrysostom's opinion to the astronomical standard,[6] saying that his words are to be understood of the Planets, which, according to Ptolemy, are rotated by their own proper motion within the concavities of their orbs. Read above, annotation 3.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Genesis 2:8.

◊ **3. Left margin:** In Chrysostom's judgment the heaven is immobile.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Psalm 103:2.

◊ **5. Left margin:** The Scholastic theologians think the stars are parts of the heaven.

◊ **6. Left margin:** St. Thomas endeavors to teach that St. Chrysostom agrees with the Peripatetics.

Annotation XV [contents]

"He set the stars in the firmament." — Genesis 1:17

For the stars foreshow the future events of men, as Origen held — whom the judicial Astrologers follow.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis — as Eusebius relates in the 6th [book] of the *Preparation for the Gospel*, chapter 9 — when he expounded this particle, said that the stars were placed by God in heaven to be "for signs"; that is, that through their various aspects and conjunctions [God] might signify all and each of the causes of human affairs — though they would not effect them. For God painted in the stars the significations and reasons of all the future events of the human race, so that the powers of the supernal spirits might read in them, as in books, whatever things would come to pass among men (yet without any compulsion of free will) through the several intervals of time; and thence they might reveal to men, the observers of the stars, some part of this science, which exceeds the powers of human wit. And according to this sense Origen thought a certain opinion was to be understood, [taken] from a book whose title is *The Narration of Joseph* — once received into authority among many catholics — in which the Patriarch Jacob is introduced saying these things to his sons: "Read in the tablets of heaven whatever things are to come upon you and your sons." **Augustine**, in the fifth [book] *The City of God*, chapter 1, writes that this opinion — although it belonged to men not mediocrely learned, and although it decrees that the stars do not *make* but only *signify* — is nevertheless convicted as fallacious and false by argument and experience:[7] namely of two twins, sown in the same intercourse and at the same moment, and coming into the light at the same time — of whom, since there is the greatest diversity in their actions, events, professions, arts, honors, and the rest pertaining to human life and death, it cannot be that the same star, set in the same station of heaven, at the same time and same aspect, portends such contrary significations of diverse events. **Procopius**, in his commentaries on this chapter, reprobates Origen's opinion as by no means catholic and unworthy of a Christian, because Christians have no need of the significations of the stars in order to know what is to be followed or fled, since the divine Law admonishes whatever they must do or avoid. **St. Thomas**, in the opusculum which he entitled *On the Judgments of the Stars*, declares that they sin gravely who use the significations and judgments of the stars in those things which depend on the free will of men.[8] But an observation of nearly the like argument you have below, in Annotation 81 of this book, and in book 6, Annotation 10.

◊ **7. Right margin:** St. Augustine excellently refutes the judicial Astrologers.

◊ **8. Right margin:** They sin gravely who wish to tell, from the stars, things that depend on the free will of man.

Annotation XVI [contents]

"And it was made evening and morning, the fourth day." — Genesis 1:19

Whether satisfaction is necessary for penitents.

Chrysostom, in the sixth homily on Genesis near the end, where he expounds this very thing, exhorting his hearers to please God by the confession of sins, and not to relapse into sins after confession, says: "It suffices for God, on account of his great mercy, that we desist from sins." Explaining the same more fully in the oration on Blessed Philogonius, he says: "I testify and pledge my faith, that if each of us who are liable to sins, withdrawing from his former evils from the heart, and truly promising →

[…continues on folio 534 (PDF p. 351): the rest of Annotatio XVI (whether satisfaction is required of penitents).]

---

*(printed folio 534 [PDF p. 351]. **Annot. XVI–XVIII** (Gen 1:19–26): Chrysostom's "it suffices that we desist from sin," seized by Calvin and Oecolampadius against satisfaction and indulgences (answered); Philo's "Let us make man" with angel-cooperators; and whether God is corporeal (Melito's book vindicated as anti-anthropomorphite).)*

(folio 534, left column → right column)

Annotation XVI (continued)

[Chrysostom, on Blessed Philogonius:] "…and promise to God that he will hereafter never return to those [sins], God will require nothing else for further satisfaction: for he is benign." Which opinion **John Calvin**, in the ninth chapter of his *Institutions*,[1] cites against the "satisfactionists" (for so the impious man calls the catholics, because they teach that satisfaction is the third part of penance); and **John Oecolampadius**, once a Brigittine monk, standard-bearer of the recent heretics, in the codices of Chrysostom translated by himself, over against this same sentence, placed in the margin a heretical objection in these words: "If it suffices God that we desist from sins, where then remain satisfactions and indulgences?" Retorting this man's insane questioning upon the author himself, let us in turn ask him: If it suffices God that we desist from sins, and there is no further need of satisfactions and indulgences, why does Chrysostom everywhere preach the satisfactory works of penance?[2] Indeed in homily 10 on Matthew, showing that it does not suffice to cease from sin unless we make satisfaction through those things which are contrary to the offenses committed, he says: "Let us do penance — penance, I say — not only that we desist from former evils, but also that we be filled with the fruits of good works. 'Bring forth,' says John, 'fruits worthy of penance.' But in what way shall we be able to bear fruit, unless we do the things contrary to our sins? For example: you have stolen others' goods — begin now to give your own; you have fornicated a long time — suspend yourself from the lawful use of marriage, and meditate perpetual continence by [at least] a chastity of a few days. For it does not suffice for the wounded man, unto his safety, only to pluck the darts from his body, but it is also needful to apply remedies to the wounds," etc. Again, in the homily on Psalm 106, which is carried among the works of Chrysostom, it is thus written: "When sin has brought death, confession brings health. For confession shows penance; satisfaction wins pardon for oneself by the divine mercy." And below it follows: "It is worse not to placate God's offense by satisfaction, than to offend God's goodness by sinning." And a little after: "Let confession restore what sin had taken away; let penance lack nothing; what the stain of offenses had defiled, let the serpent's venom be cured by the antidote of satisfaction." Thus Chrysostom. Answering Oecolampadius on his authority, we say: it suffices God indeed — for granting us the remission both of guilt and of eternal punishment — that we desist from sins now confessed to a Priest; but there remain satisfactions and indulgences to expiate the temporal punishments to which, as the sacred Letters teach, after the crimes are pardoned and the eternal punishment [remitted], we are still liable, whether in this life or in another.[3] See below, Annotation 174 of this book, and 161 of the following book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Under the name of "satisfaction" St. Chrysostom thinks something is understood — by way of self-excuse. Calvin, book 4 of the *Institutes*, ch. 4, §38.

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Chrysostom everywhere inculcates satisfactory works.

◊ **3. Left margin:** By satisfactions and indulgences the temporal punishment is expiated.

Annotation XVII [contents]

"Let us make man to [our] image." — Genesis 1:26

Whether the angels, together with God, created man — as Origen held.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, narrating this proposition, writes thus: "God said, 'Let us make man' — which indicates that others were taken up as cooperators, so that both the reprehensible wills and the actions of man (when he conducts himself rightly) are, [the good ones,] referred as accepted to God the ruler of all, but the contrary ones to those others who are subject [to him]. For it behooved that the Father not be the cause of evils to his own children." By which words he seems to indicate that the first man was made partly by God, partly by the angels, God's cooperators. Which also among us Basilides and Cerinthus, heretics, held[4] — whom Chrysostom (homily 8 on Genesis) and Theodoret (question 19) refute. And the demonstration by which Philo shows this opinion of his seems to allude to those words of Plato, by which he introduces the supreme God, in the *Timaeus*, speaking to the lesser gods concerning the creation of living beings. See below, Annotation 93 of this book.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Origen's opinion, which Basilides and Cerinthus defended, is deservedly condemned by Catholics.

Annotation XVIII [contents]

"Let us make man." — Genesis 1:26

Whether God is corporeal.

Melito the Asian, Bishop of Sardis, in his book *περὶ τοὲ ὔνσωμάτου θεοῦ* — that is, *On God clothed with a body* — expounding the present passage, seems to assert that the image of God, to which man was made, is corporeal, just as God himself is corporeal, having human form, figure, and members. Which opinion Epiphanius reckons among the heresies of the Audiani, who are also called Anthropomorphites. For Theodoret writes thus about Melito, on Genesis question 20: "It must, however (as I said before), first be discussed where that 'to the image' resides — in the body, or in the soul. And first let us see what [arguments] those use who assert the former. Of whose number is Melito, who left writings in which he asserts that God is corporeal. For 'we call them the members of God,' they say, 'when we find "the eyes of God looking upon the earth,"[5] and "his ears attentive to their prayers," and "God smelled the odor of sweetness,"[6] and "the mouth of the Lord has spoken,"[7] and "the arm of God," and hands, and feet, and fingers.[8] From which they immediately infer that these things teach nothing other than the form of God.'" These things Theodoret reports about Melito according to the Latin translation of John Pico the Gaul. But since the same Theodoret, in the fourth book of *Heretical Fables*, disputing against the Audiani, the assertors of this madness, ascribes nothing of the sort to Melito, and since there is no approved writer who accuses him of this kind of error, I would never dare to believe that a man greatest in sanctity and erudition — whom Tertullian asserts was held by Christians as a prophet — fell into such madness; and especially since the aforesaid words of Theodoret stand far otherwise in the Greek copies than in the Latin translation. For what Pico translated as "of whose number is Melito, who left writings in which he asserts that God is corporeal," is read in the corrected Greek codices in this manner: *Ὧν ἐστι καὶ Μελίτων συγγράμματα καταλέλοιπε, Περὶ τοὲ ὔνσωμάτου θεοῦ* — that is, "Among which are the writings that Melito left, *Concerning what is called the attribution of a body to God*." For indeed, as Eusebius and Jerome testify, Melito wrote a book to which he gave the title *περὶ τοὲ ὔνσωμάτου θεοῦ* — that is, *On God clothed with a body*, or *On the God to whom the divine Scripture attributes a body* — in which he most powerfully confuted the arguments of those who assert God to be corporeal, and who think the image of God, to which man was made, is corporeal; as also appears clearer than light from the following words of Theodoret, set down in the same 20th question:

◊ **5. Right margin (a):** Psalm 33:16.

◊ **6. Right margin (b):** Genesis 8:21.

◊ **7. Right margin (c):** Isaiah 40:5.

◊ **8. Right margin (d):** Isaiah 51:1.

[…continues on folio 535 (PDF p. 352): the following words of Theodoret (Annotatio XVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 535 [PDF p. 352]. **Annot. XVIII–XXII** (Gen 1:26–29): Melito cleared of anthropomorphism; Philo's living stars; whether propagation in innocence would have been sexual (Aquinas: yes, without lust); and Augustine's retracted view that sin was needed for offspring.)*

(folio 535, left column → right column)

Annotation XVIII (continued)

In the book of Theodoret printed at Cologne at the expense of the widow and heirs of John Stelsius in the year 1573, there is no word about Melito — although the translator is said to be John Pico, president of the inquisitorial courts of the Parisian Senate. For thus it is written in that place: "Certain overly simple people

say that the human body was made to the image of God, because they hear the divine voice saying, 'Open your eyes and see,' and 'Incline your ear and hear,' and 'The Lord smelled the odor of sweetness,' and that, 'The mouth of the Lord has spoken these things,' and, 'In his hand are the ends of the earth,' and the like. Wherein the stupid did not observe that the Lord God speaks to men in a human manner, accommodating his discourses to the weakness of the hearers," etc.

Annotation XIX [contents]

"Let us make man to [our] image," etc. — Genesis 1:26

Whether the stars are animate.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, on that "Let us make man to the image," etc., asserts that the stars are intelligent living beings. See below, Annotation 108.

Annotation XX [contents]

"To the image of God he created him." — Genesis 1:27

Whether, if Adam had not sinned, there would have been coitus.

Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, in the book *On the Creation of Man*, chapter 28, examining an opinion of this kind, says that, if the first parents had not sinned, the generation of offspring and the propagation of the human race would not have been by coitus, but by a certain most perfect manner of multiplication, by which the Angels are multiplied; for this generation, which comes about by intercourse, was introduced through sin. These are Gregory's words: "Although among the Angels, as has been said, there are no marriages, yet they exist in infinite thousands of hosts of Angels, as the prophet Daniel intimates in his visions. Therefore, in the same manner, if no excess of sin had drawn us away from that angelic dignity, marriages would in no way have been proved necessary for us for the multiplication of the human race; but by a motion of nature — whatever it be, most perfect indeed — by which the Angels are multiplied, the Creator's will would have multiplied the human race up to the number of the predestined." And after a few words about generation introduced through sin, he added: "That great David seems to me, having compassion on human misery, to bewail his nature in such words: 'That man, when he was in honor, did not understand'[1] — calling it 'honor' that he had been like to the holy Angels in conversation and in that most sublime manner of multiplication. Therefore he was compared to the senseless beasts, and made like to them. For truly he was made like to a beast, who took upon himself, in his own nature, this animal generation, on account of the fall of his conversation, which befell him from the conformation of matter." Subscribing to this opinion, **John Damascene**, in the fourth book of the *Orthodox Faith*, chapter 25,[2] put forth in writing these things: "Wherefore, lest the human race be exterminated and consumed by death, marriages were instituted, so that by the procreation of offspring the race of men might be preserved. But perhaps they will say: What then does this mean, 'male and female'? What this, 'Increase and multiply'?[3] To which we shall say that this 'Increase and multiply' does not at all signify the multiplication [that comes] by the nuptial association. For God could have multiplied this race in another way too, if they had kept his commandment, and preserved it unbroken to the end; but God, knowing by his foreknowledge — which knows all things before they come to be — that they would be transgressors and to be condemned by death, anticipating [this], made male and female, and commanded [them] to be increased and multiplied." Thus Damascene: before whom Augustine wrote this very thing (on Genesis, ch. 1), Chrysostom, and Procopius (on Genesis, ch. 4); and after him Euthymius, on Psalm 50.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Psalm 48:13.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Damascene has the same in book 2, *On the Faith*, chapter 11.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Genesis 1:28.

Weighing this opinion, **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 98, article 2, writes thus: "But this is not said reasonably: for the things which are natural to man are neither withdrawn from man nor given to him by [reason of] sin.[4] Now it is manifest that, for man according to the animal life which he had even before sin (as was said above), it is natural to generate by coitus, just as for the other perfect animals; and the natural members, appointed for this use, declare this. And therefore it must not be said that the use of these natural members would not have existed before sin, any more than [that of] the other members. There are therefore two things to be considered in coitus, according to the present state: one, which is of nature, namely the union of male and female for generating — for in every generation an active and a passive power is required, and since in all [creatures] in which there is a distinction of sexes the active power is in the male, and the passive in the female, the order of nature requires that for generation male and female should come together by coitus. But the other thing that can be considered is a certain deformity of immoderate concupiscence, which would not have existed in the state of innocence,[5] when the lower powers were entirely subject to reason. Whence Augustine says in the 14th book of *The City of God*: 'Far be it that we should suspect that offspring could not have been produced without the disease of lust: but those members would have been moved by the same nod of the will as the other members, and without ardor and enticing stimulus, with tranquillity of soul and of body.'" Read the following Annotation, together with Annotations 63 and 80 of this book.

◊ **4. Right margin:** From man the things natural to him are not withdrawn on account of sin.

◊ **5. Right margin:** In the state of innocence there would have been generation by the union of male and female, without the disease of lust.

Annotation XXI [contents]

"Increase and multiply." — Genesis 1:28

Whether the first parents would have had children if they had not sinned.

Augustine, in the first book *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 19, on these words says that the first parents would not have had children as men [by human generation] unless they had sinned. To which opinion he wrote a not-dissimilar one in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, where, expounding that "Whosoever shall put away his wife, save for the cause of fornication," etc.,[6] he said that consanguinities and the bonds of blood and kinships came about from the sin and death of the first parents. Which opinion Guido, Bishop of Elne, in the book he wrote against heresies, numbers among the profane dogmas of the Armenians. But Augustine openly disapproves [it] in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapters 10 and 19; because, as he himself says in the 8th book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 10: "Men before sin could command their generative members for procreation, without the foul itch of pleasure; and there could have been in paradise honorable marriages, and an undefiled marriage-bed, without the ardor of lust and without the labor of childbearing."

◊ **6. Right margin:** Matthew 5:32.

Annotation XXII

"Behold, I have given you every herb." — Genesis 1:29

Augustine →

[…continues on folio 536 (PDF p. 353): Annotatio XXII.]

---

*(printed folio 536 [PDF p. 353], the last page of the first working batch. **Annot. XXII–XXVII** (Gen 1:29–2:7): retracted allegory of animal food; the LXX "sixth" vs Hebrew "seventh" day; whether the six days are literal; whether Jews sacrificed among gentiles; Giorgio's Neoplatonic soul-as-man; and the "breath of*

life" (soul, or a grace?).)

(folio 536, left column → right column)

Annotation XXII (continued) [contents]

Augustine, in book 1 *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 20, says that the green herbs and fruit-bearing trees which, in the book of Genesis, are given as food to all birds, all serpents, and every kind of beast, are to be understood in an allegorical signification only.[1] He disapproves this same [view] in book 1 of the *Retractations*, chapter 10.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether herbs and trees are given as food to the animals. — and: St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXIII [contents]

"God completed his work on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether God completed his works on the sixth day.

The **Seventy interpreters** [Septuagint], as Jerome noted in the *Hebrew Traditions*, for what is read in the Hebrew truth, "God completed" (וַיְכַל֙ בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔י), that is, "on the seventh day all his work," translated *ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἓκτῃ*, that is, "on the sixth day." And Philo and Theodoret cite and expound this passage in the same manner. But it does not much matter whether you say God completed his work on the sixth or on the seventh day: for what Moses said — that God completed [it] on the seventh day by *resting* — the Seventy said, that God completed [it] on the sixth day by *finishing*.

Annotation XXIV [contents]

"God completed his work on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether the six days of the world's creation are real days.

Philo, in the first book of the *Allegories of the Law*, expounding the same passage, says: "It is of rustic simplicity to think that the world was made in six days, or indeed in any fixed time at all, because the whole vicissitude of the world is [that] of days and nights, which the motion of the Sun, passing over and under the earth, necessarily produces. But the Sun is reckoned a part of heaven: so that it must be confessed that time is posterior to the world, seeing that it is an effect of the world. For the motion of heaven indicated the nature of time. Therefore, when you hear 'He completed the works on the sixth day,' you must not understand it of a number of some days, but of the perfection of the universe, which is signified by the perfect senary [six] number." Some catholic authors have followed this opinion of Philo: of whom, among the Latins, **Augustine** referred the enumeration of six days made by Moses not to a succession of time, but to the natural order of the works, which is attributed to days; or to the order of the revelation of the six works, which God revealed to the angels one after another. But **Procopius**, among the Greeks, said the number of days was assumed by Moses not for the sake of time, but for the sake of teaching, on account of the weakness of our understanding, which could not comprehend the order of created things in another way, because of their multitude. This dogma, therefore, although it ought by no means to be disapproved, is nevertheless not to be so rashly asserted that we should think Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and the other most learned Fathers — who taught the world was founded in the space of six days — thought rustically and unlearnedly: especially since Philo's aforesaid argumentation derogates nothing from their opinion. Dissolving which [argument], St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*,[2] says that, although before the construction of the firmament there was not that time which measures and follows the motion of heaven, yet there was a time which would measure another motion — namely that first motion, and the succession of conceptions and affections in the angelic minds, in which thoughts so numerous could not supervene except one before another and one after another; but "Before" and "After" are nothing else than distinctions of time.

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Thomas, part 1, question 66, article 4, reply to [objection] 3.

Annotation XXV [contents]

"God rested on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether the Jews sacrificed in the lands of the gentiles.

Augustine, in book 1 *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 23, hands down that the Israelite people practiced sacrifices in the lands of the gentiles. Which, said indeed of the Paschal lamb, he says (in *Retractations* 1, chapter 10) is to be understood [in that sense], since the Jews could not sacrifice among the gentiles.[3]

◊ **3. Right margin:** It was not permitted to the Jews to sacrifice among the Gentiles.

Annotation XXVI [contents]

"God formed man of the mud of the earth." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the soul alone is man.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in the first volume of the *Problems*, twists the exposition of this passage to the opinion of those who think that the soul alone is man, the body being the garment of the soul, and the soul itself created in heaven long before the body. For he writes thus, in Problem 26: "God formed man, dust, from the earth — that is, he clothed him with an earthy garment, namely the earthly body. For first God decreed to make man; then he created him in heaven; thirdly he formed his body, as a garment." And he confirms this same thing in Problem 27, where he says that man was wrapped about by God with a corporeal garment; and in Problem 159 of the same volume, when he says that man was clothed with dust in the field of Damascus. These things seem partly to allude to Origen's dogma of souls created before their bodies, partly to the tenet of those who deny that the soul is the form of the body.[4] But both were condemned in the Council of Vienne by Clement V, as the title *On the Supreme Trinity*, at the beginning of the Clementines, is witness.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The soul is not created before the body of which it is the form.

Annotation XXVII [contents]

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

The breath breathed into Adam is the rational soul, as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and others hold.

Chrysostom, expounding this in homily 12, says that that breath is the substance of the rational soul, through which man was made not only a living animal but also partaker of reason. Which assertion Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, numbers among the heresies in chapter 99 of his *Catalogue* — no author of the assertion being named, however; and he says that that breath is not the soul itself, but the inspiration of the divine spirit — that is, the grace of the Holy Spirit infused into the soul of Adam, already created and already united to the body, such as [Christ] also gave to the apostles after the resurrection, or such as God bestows on all the just. With Philastrius agrees **Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria**, who, elucidating this very passage, says: "When it is said in Genesis that God breathed into the face of man the breath of life, that man might become a living soul, we do not call that breath the soul itself; for thus the soul would be unchangeable and would not sin, because it would be of the divine essence: but Moses called it the effusion of the Holy Spirit, placed at the very beginning [as an addition] to the human soul." St. Augustine, however, in the preface of the book *On Heresies* to Quodvultdeus, writes that Philastrius numbered among heresies many assertions which are not heresies.[5] Of which number I would believe this to be one — in which he himself imprudently slipped, while [he condemned] the true and pious [teaching] of Chrysostom and of all the Catholic interpreters →

◊ **5. Right margin:** Philastrius, in St. Augustine's judgment, numbered many things among heresies which are not heresies.

[…continues on folio 537 (PDF p. 354): the end of Annotatio XXVII (which he "condemned").]

*(printed folio 537 [PDF p. 354], six annotations on Gen 2:7 and the image of God. **Annot. XXVII–XXXII**: the "breath of life" as the soul, not a grace; body and soul made together (retracted); Giorgio's superadded light; the soul created with the angels; the image lost by sin (retracted → deformed); and Philo's archetypal "man" as the divine idea.)*

(folio 537, left column → right column)

Annotation XXVII (continued)

[Augustine] condemns the opinion. Likewise also, in the 15th [book] *The City of God*, chapter 24, he derides those who believe that the breath which God breathed into Adam's face is a certain grace conferred on Adam's soul, and not rather the soul itself. But as for what pertains to Cyril, St. Thomas, in the book which he wrote against the errors of the Greeks, chapter 27, says thus: "Cyril's exposition is against the exposition of Augustine, who posits the human soul by that breath. And [Cyril] shows that it does not follow on this account that [the soul] is of the divine substance; for it is a figurative expression, that [God] is said to have breathed not corporeally, but because he made a spirit — that is, a soul — out of nothing. And what is more, [Cyril's exposition] seems to be repugnant to the sayings of the Apostle, who in 1 Corinthians 15 says: 'The first man Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a quickening spirit';[1] but not first what is spiritual, rather what is animal — where he expressly says that that life of the soul is other than the life which is through the Holy Spirit. Whence that inspiration, by which it is said 'Man was made into a living soul,' cannot be understood of the grace of the Holy Spirit. Whence it must be said that Cyril's exposition cannot be literal, but only allegorical."

◊ **1. Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 15[:45–46].

Annotation XXVIII [contents]

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the body was made before the soul.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 8, teaches that the body of man was not founded before the creation of the soul, but together with the soul itself at one and the same time.[2] He disapproves this same [view] in book 1 of the *Retractations*, chapter 10.

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXIX [contents]

"He breathed into him the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether man was created first in the species than in the individual, as Francesco Giorgio held.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in volume 1, Problem 27, in explaining this passage, brings a hard and unwonted discourse about the creation and animation of man, asserting first that man was first created in the universal and specifically — that is, as specific or common: like a certain mass of masculine and feminine power, whence every male and female would receive life; but then, when he was wrapped about with a corporeal garment, then he was made a particular man; and that into this particular man the breath of life was breathed by God. In the second place, he affirms that that breath, which God breathed into man, is a certain light which shows God to man, and always exhorts him to good and dissuades him from evil, and provides him strength for working well: of which light, when the damned are deprived, they can neither know God nor work good. By which words indeed he intimates that that breath is not the substance of the rational soul, but rather a certain light superadded to the soul. Which error Alphonsus of Castro, in book 2

against heresies, under [the entry] "Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia," condemns.

Annotation XXX [contents]

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the soul was created with the angels on the first day.

Augustine, in the seventh book *On Genesis to the Letter*, which he wrote upon this particle, chapter 24, seems to establish that the soul of the first man was created with the angels on the first day of the world's making, and then, on the sixth day, infused into the human body: which indeed is repugnant to the opinion of all the theologians. St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 90, article 4, shows that Augustine did not put this forth by asserting it, but left it to the judgment of the readers[3] — which his own words also demonstrate, when he says: "Let them believe [it], provided, however, that no authority of the scriptures, or reason of truth, contradicts." An observation of this kind you have below, in Annotation 189 of book 1 of this [work].

◊ **3. Right margin:** St. Augustine is excused by St. Thomas.

Annotation XXXI [contents]

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God].

Augustine, in the sixth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapters 27 and 28, treating this very passage, writes that Adam through sin lost the image of God, impressed in the spirit of the mind, according to which he was created. He retracts this same thing in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 24,[4] saying that this opinion is not to be so taken as though none [of the image] remained in him; but that it remained so deformed that it had need of reformation. Read Annotation 49 of this book.

◊ **4. Right margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXXII [contents]

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether man, formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul, is the man whom God created to his own image.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, in the exposition of that sentence, teaches that the first man — formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul — is not the man whom God created to his own image; because the man made to the image of God is the archetypal and intelligible man himself, or the very idea of man in the mind of God. Which words indeed seem, at first glance, to disprove that spiritual and divine image which all Catholic authors place in the mind of man, led by the authority of the divine voice saying: "Let us make man to our image and likeness."[5] It is by no means to be thought that Philo, by these words, wished to strip the mind of man of the divine image, which above in the same work he had attributed to man; but it is credible that he brought these things forth not absolutely, but by comparison — having regard to the sensible man in relation to the archetypal man in the divine mind: in comparison with whom the sensible man scarcely has any image of God; for the archetypal and intelligible man has such an image and likeness of God that in a certain manner he is God himself. For that the archetype and the idea are nothing other than the divine essence, St. Thomas is witness,[6] in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 15, article 1.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Genesis 1:26.

◊ **6. Right margin:** The idea of man in the divine mind, according to St. Thomas's opinion, is the divine essence itself.

I should like also here to note another thing about the image of man, which Philo left written not far from the preface of the same book — namely, that the whole universe reflects the divine image more than man does, who is a part of the world.[7] Which opinion seems foreign to the common consent of the theologians, who say that man surpasses the other corporeal creatures in this, that he alone was made to the image of God. But it is resolved if we say that the divine image is considered in two ways: either according to *extension and diffusion* — in which manner indeed the universe, more than man, represents the image of the divine goodness, because in its compass it embraces that whole multitude of creatures, of which Moses said →

◊ **7. Right margin:** Whether the world is more made to the image of God than man, as Philo held. — and: The divine image is considered in two ways.

[…continues on folio 538 (PDF p. 355): the second way the divine image is considered, and the rest of Annotatio XXXII.]

---

*(printed folio 538 [PDF p. 355]. **Annot. XXXII–XXXIV** (Gen 2:7–8): man as microcosm and truer image of God; Philo dissolving Paradise into allegory; Origen accused of denying an earthly Paradise; and Giorgio reviving that allegory (refuted), then Noviomagus's "Paradise = this world.")*

(folio 538, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXII (continued)

[Moses] said: "God saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good."[1] Or [the divine image is considered] according to *intension and the gathering-together of perfection* — in which manner indeed man rather presents the image of the divine loftiness, both because he is capable of divine felicity, and because in him, as in a brief compendium and in a little world [a microcosm], all the wonders of the greater world are beheld.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Genesis 1:31.

At the end of the same book, and in the first book of the *Allegories of the Law*, [Philo] so treats the things which Moses wrote about Paradise that it appears he destroys the whole history of the truth, and places that garden, the plants, and the rest which are described in it, in allegory alone. Which error Origen, and very many others of ours (as we shall indicate below), followed.

Annotation XXXIII [contents]

"God had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis, is said to have subverted the whole history of Paradise which is narrated in this second chapter.[2] Methodius, in the dialogue whose title is *Aglaophon*, and Epiphanius, in the book *Anchoratus* and in the Epistle to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, charge him with having denied that Paradise is on the earth, and with having placed it in the third heaven — understanding by the trees the angelic powers, and by the rivers the waters which are above the back of the firmament. Some strive to show that Origen was not of this mind, from certain words written by him in the thirty-first homily on Numbers. These are they: "Adam, after sin, is thrust down into the dry land; for before, he was not in the dry land, but in the [good] earth — for Paradise is not in the dry land, but in the earth." Which words, how much they avail, let those weigh who wish. Read the six following Annotations.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Whether Paradise is on the earth.

Annotation XXXIV [contents]

"God had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Francesco Giorgio tries to prove by four arguments that there is no terrestrial Paradise.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in the first volume of the *Problems*, expounding this, called back into the light Origen's error about the allegorical Paradise — now extinguished a little before our age — and endeavored to make it persuasive with these arguments. **First**, that in the sacred letters it is nowhere found that Paradise, or that garden, was planted on the earth. **Secondly**, that Moses would say in vain that this garden was planted with material plants and trees on the earth after the sixth day, since he had before written that all the plants and trees of the whole earth were produced by God on the third day. **Thirdly (item)**, that God would in vain and with idle counsel have built a terrestrial garden for the first parents — one which would not be of use to them even immediately [because of] their sins, and which after Adam's sin would be cultivated by no one. **Finally**, he brought in this too: that Jerome, having considered these things, declared that Paradise was founded by God before he made heaven and earth — namely, to signify by these words that that Paradise described by Moses is not situated on this visible earth, but in that "land of the living," which was created before this visible world in the invisible world. These things Francis wrote in many places, but especially in the first volume of the *Problems*, where, from Problem 1 to Problem 48, he contends to destroy the whole history of Paradise with long windings of allegories — yet with no valid reason adduced for it.

For what he proposed in the first place — that it is by no means established from the sacred letters whether Paradise is on the earth — is most false.[3] For Moses most clearly declares that Paradise was planted by God in a region of the Eastern land, which is called Eden. And that Eden is the proper name of a place appears from the fourth chapter of Genesis, where we read that Cain dwelt to the eastern region of Eden;[4] and in Ezekiel chapter 27 it is had that Eden was near Charran [Haran], a region of Mesopotamia.[5] But that which Moses writes — that the garden of delights was planted by God after the sixth day — by no means conflicts with what he reported before, namely that all the plants were brought forth on the third day.[6] For it can be, as Augustine judges, that the plants which had been produced on the third day according to certain seminal reasons were, after the works of the six days, again produced and completed in act; or, according to Basil's and Chrysostom's opinion, it can be said that all the plants, together with the plants of Paradise, were founded at once on the third day, but that Moses, after the works of the six days, again by way of epilogue made mention of the production of the plants of Paradise.

◊ **3. Right margin:** The 1st argument of Fr. George is answered.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Genesis 4:16.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Ezekiel 27:23.

◊ **6. Right margin:** The 2nd argument of Francis is answered.

Which Paradise, even if it were inhabited by no one after sin, no one of sound mind would call superfluous.[7] For just as (by Augustine's testimony) it must not be said that the immortality of the body was given to man in vain — which he was not going to preserve — so neither ought one to think that that Paradise was founded in vain, because human habitation is not there after sin. For although that place does not serve man for dwelling, yet it profits him for instruction: that he may recognize himself to have been cast out thence by the fault of the first parent, and that, through the things which are written to be in it corporeally, he may lift up his mind to the spiritual and invisible mysteries of the heavenly paradise. But as to that which, in the last place, he violently wrests from Jerome's words — namely, that Paradise was founded by God in that invisible world which preceded the constitution of this visible world[8] — satisfaction has been made in Annotation 37, in which this opinion of Jerome has been most exactly discussed.

◊ **7. Right margin:** The 3rd argument is answered. — and: Paradise, though it does not profit man for dwelling, is yet profitable for instruction.

◊ **8. Right margin:** The 4th argument of Francis is answered.

John Noviomagus, in the scholia published by him on Bede's book *On the Nature of Things*, himself also thinks that the whole passage about Paradise is to be understood enigmatically and allegorically — yet in a sense different from Origen and those who followed Origen's opinion. For they think Paradise to be nothing other than *this world*:[9] for just as the Gentiles call the world a dwelling and a certain temple of the Gods, from its inexplicable beauty and its work of highest veneration, so [Noviomagus] supposes that in the sacred Letters this world is to be understood [as] the "place of pleasure," than whose absolute elegance nothing more adorned can be conceived — in which adornment the mind of man, admiring the variety of nature, cannot be sated with delight. For he interprets that fountain, from which the four rivers flow, as the Ocean, whence (as pleased Homer too) all rivers and fountains take the force and beginning of their course. He thinks also that it cannot be that the Ganges, the Nile, and the Euphrates should [flow], in regions so far apart as those of Armenia, India, and Ethiopia, from one →

◊ **9. Right margin:** John Noviomagus thinks that Paradise is this world.

[…continues on folio 539 (PDF p. 356): the rest of Annotatio XXXIV (Noviomagus on the four rivers).]

---

*(printed folio 539 [PDF p. 356]. **Annot. XXXIV–XXXVII** (Gen 2:8): "Paradise = this world" refuted (the four rivers, the guarding Cherub); Ambrose defended as holding a twofold Paradise, earthly and heavenly; Kissamos's three deviations on Paradise (all excused); and Jerome on the Hebrew "Mikedem.")*

(folio 539, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXIV (continued)

[the Ganges, Nile, and Euphrates cannot proceed] from one fountain of Paradise, unless we accept that Paradise is the globe of the earth, and the fountain the sea — which, by hidden subterranean channels, poured out far and wide, supplies moisture to all the rivers. But this too is far from the truth.[1] For if Paradise is the globe of the earth, how does Moses say that Paradise was planted in the region of the East? How were the first parents expelled from it? How does the Cherub keep watch before its doors, lest the now-ejected parents return again into Paradise? Nor indeed ought it to seem a wonder to anyone if Moses writes that those rivers flow from one fountain: for thus, from the beginning of the nascent world, God willed them to flow from one and the same fountain. But after, in the universal Flood, the fountains of the abyss were burst open, it is credible that the places of the fountains and the beginnings of the rivers were so changed that one took the beginning of its course from the East, another from the South.

◊ **1. Left margin:** John Noviomagus, who thought Paradise to be this world, is refuted. — and: To be read diligently.

Annotation XXXV [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise.

Ambrose, in the book *On Paradise* — which he consumed wholly in an allegorical explanation of Paradise — seems to assert two things foreign to the common consensus of the theologians. **First**, that Paradise is not on the earth, but in the third heaven[2] (which error is attributed to Origen). For since in the preface of the book he proposes to investigate what and of what kind Paradise is, he shows the very great difficulty of this inquiry chiefly from this: that Paul, caught up into this Paradise, denies that he can remember whether he saw it in the body or outside the body,[3] adding also that he heard and saw in it things which it is not permitted to utter. And — lest you think Ambrose holds that Paul was caught up not into the heavenly but into the terrestrial paradise — the same [Ambrose], in the exposition of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, openly affirms that the Apostle was taken up to the heavens into the heavenly Paradise of God the Father. **The**

second is that, in imitation of Philo, he seems to understand Paradise, and whatever is written in it, according to allegory alone, the historical sense being rejected:[4] that is, by Paradise, the soul; by man, the mind; by woman, sense; by the serpent, delight; by the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, wisdom; and by the other trees, the virtues implanted in the soul. Which assertion he seems to express in plainer words in the epistle to Sabinus (which he also wished to be the final resolution of this matter), writing thus: "Having read the *Hexaemeron*, you thought fit to inquire whether I had suppressed Paradise, and that I should indicate what opinion I held of it — and that you wished studiously to learn this. But I, long ago (being no longer a fresh priest), wrote about it; and I have found that the opinions of very many about it are diverse. For Josephus, being a Historian, says [it is] a place of the earth filled with very many trees and shrubs, watered also by a river which is divided into four streams; others [say] otherwise. Yet all agree in Paradise, and in the tree of life rooted [there], and the tree of knowledge which discerns good and evil; and the other trees also, full of vigor, breathing full of vivification, and rational — from which it is gathered that Paradise itself cannot seem earthly, [nor to be] in any soil, but in our principal part [the soul's ruling faculty], which is animated and vivified by the soul with virtues and by the infusion of the spirit of God." These are Ambrose's words. From which, however, I cannot be led to believe that he assented either to Philo or to Origen in this part — especially since, in the exposition of the sixth chapter of the first [Epistle] to the Corinthians, he constantly affirms that **Paradise is twofold**,[5] one earthly, in which Adam was placed, the other heavenly, into which Paul was caught up. For these are his words in that place: "There is both a lower Jerusalem and a higher — which the Apostle calls our mother; there is both a lower Paradise, in which man was placed [and] received the commandment, both that he should work there and that he should keep it; and there is that heavenly one, into which the Apostle, caught up, heard secret words."

◊ **2. Left margin:** It is attributed to Origen that he held Paradise to be in the third heaven.

◊ **3. Left margin:** 2 Corinthians 12:3.

◊ **4. Left margin:** What is written about Paradise, Philo understands according to allegory alone.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Paradise is twofold.

Annotation XXXVI [contents]

"And the Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether Paradise, after Adam's fall, entirely ceased to exist.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, in the *Annotations on the Pentateuch*, while he pursues the exposition of this passage most profusely, seems to deviate in three ways from the rule of right faith. For he asserted, first, that that paradise, in which the first parents were created, began little by little to be abolished, with all its adornment, after Adam's sin; then, the Flood succeeding, [it was] so overturned by the inundation of the waters and dissipated by the most rapid whirlpools that it entirely ceased to be — no vestige of the divine place now remaining, because of the crimes of men. **Secondly**, he asserted that Enoch and Elijah were not translated into that paradise,[6] since it was, immediately from Adam's fall, destitute of cultivation and habitation, and finally, after the Flood, utterly emptied. **Thirdly**, he affirms that the fault for which the first parent was cast out of paradise brought upon man not the death of the body, but only of the soul.[7] Of these, the first assertion is repugnant to the common consensus of all the Fathers. The second not only contradicts the Fathers, but divine scripture also: which, in the book of Ecclesiasticus, says, "Enoch pleased God, and was translated into Paradise, that he might give wisdom [repentance] to the nations";[8] nor is it right to understand this testimony of the heavenly Paradise, since it does not fit that anyone should descend thence to preach penance. The third opposes not only Augustine and very many other Fathers, but also the authority of the African Council, which condemned this position, against Pelagius its author, as appears below in Annotation 52. Yet this man — well-deserving in the studies of the sacred letters — can be kindly excused, from the words which he immediately added under these positions, writing in this manner: "These things I say, not being ignorant that the gravest and most holy men hold otherwise; which, if they are too little

Christian, I retract, and readily refute." Ambrose, Archbishop of Compsa [Catharinus], also noted these things before me, in his commentaries on the book of Genesis.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Whether Enoch and Elijah are in the terrestrial Paradise.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Whether Adam's sin brought bodily death.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Ecclesiasticus 44:16. — *A later editorial note added in the margin here reads:* "See Benedict Pererius, book 7, Commentary on Genesis 9.7, where he refutes Sixtus, who teaches it to be a dogma of faith that Enoch is in the terrestrial Paradise."

Annotation XXXVII [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the terrestrial Paradise was created before the world.

Jerome, at almost the beginning of the *Hebrew Traditions*, annotating this, rejects the Seventy interpreters, who, for that which Moses said מקדם *Mikedem* — and our Vulgate edition →

[…continues on folio 540 (PDF p. 357): Jerome on "Mikedem" (from the beginning / in the East).]

---

*(printed folio 540 [PDF p. 357]. **Annot. XXXVII–XL** (Gen 2:8): the Hebrew* Mikedem *("from the beginning" vs "in the East" — Jerome defended); Paradise raised to the Moon's sphere (Aquinas: only a figure); Tertullian's souls held in the underworld till Judgment; and Augustine on the spiritual (not corporeal) places and pains of souls.)*

(folio 540, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXVII (continued)

[our Vulgate edition] has "from the beginning" (*A principio*), [the Seventy] translated Κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολάς, that is, "toward the East"; and [Jerome], following the version of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion — of whom the first translated ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, that is, "from the outset"; the second ἐκ πρώτης, that is, "from the beginning"; the third ἐν πρώτοις, that is, "among the first" — infers from their consensus a conclusion of this kind: "From which it is most manifestly proved that, before God made heaven and earth, he had beforehand founded Paradise — as it is also read in the Hebrew: 'And God had planted a paradise in Eden from the beginning.'" This inference **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, disapproving in the Annotations on Genesis, says that Jerome falsely deduced, from this word מקדם *Mikedem*, that Paradise was made before heaven and earth: because *Mikedem* in this place signifies not time but place, as is proved from another similar sentence below, chapter 3, where it is had [in Hebrew], that is, "And he placed cherubim at the eastern part of the garden of Eden." I do not think Jerome was so stupid as to have believed that Paradise was founded before all creation of heaven and earth; for human reason cannot hold this — that Paradise, a local and earthly place, indeed an adornment of the earth, existed before the earth. But I think that by his words he wished to signify that, before God perfected heaven and earth by distinguishing and adorning them, he planted Paradise on the third day. **Alcuin**, however, in the book of Questions on Genesis, judges that Jerome's opinion is to be understood just as his words sound. Moreover **Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons**, set down the same assertion, in the same words of Jerome, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis, chapter 2.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio], in volume 1, Problem 31, supposes that Jerome placed Paradise before the world for this reason: that, according to bare allegory, he believed Paradise to be nothing other than the happy state of the rational creatures, which God created before this visible world. But Jerome himself openly protests, in the tenth chapter of the commentaries on Daniel, saying thus: "Let the ravings of those be silent, who — following shadows and images in the truth — endeavor to overthrow the truth itself,

so that they think Paradise, and the rivers, and the trees must be undermined by the laws of allegory."

Annotation XXXVIII [contents]

"God had planted a Paradise in Eden." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the earthly Paradise reaches up to the orb of the Moon, as Bede held.

Bede the Priest, when he took up this passage to explain, said that Paradise is a place situated in a higher part of the earth, and raised up from the plain of the earth so far that it touches the Lunar globe. Following his opinion, the Master of the *Scholastic History* [Peter Comestor], in book 1, chapter 13, says: "Paradise is a most pleasant place, secluded from our habitable zone by a long tract of land and sea, so elevated that it reaches up to the Lunar globe; whence the waters of the Flood did not reach thither." **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 102, article 1, reply to [objection] 1, thinks this opinion false if it be understood of a loftiness of place — which is entirely uninhabitable for human nature; but true, if we understand there to be there a perpetual pleasantness and likeness of temperateness, such as is the temperateness in that Lunar region, removed from all the intemperance of this murky air.

Annotation XXXIX [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Tertullian held that all souls are in the underworld until the day of judgment.

Tertullian, in the book *On Paradise*, published by him for the exposition of the present chapter, asserts that all the souls of the deceased — both good and bad — are sequestered in the underworld until the day of judgment. See Annotation 345 of the sixth book.

Annotation XL [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the places and punishments of souls after this life are only spiritual, as St. Augustine seems to hold.

Augustine, in the 12th book *On Genesis to the Letter*, where he disputes about Paradise, chapter 22, says that the places in which souls, stripped of their bodies, are affected, whether well or ill, are not corporeal but spiritual; which — together with various likenesses of corporeal things, both glad and sad — are represented to the souls of the deceased, not otherwise than [they are] to those to whom, either set in sleep or withdrawn from the senses, now grave terrors and torments, now glad and long-desired things, are exhibited. He seems to confirm this same thing in the 21st book *The City of God*, chapter 10, where he intimates that the fire of hell, by which that rich man was tormented, is spiritual, in these words: "I would indeed say that spirits will burn thus, without any body of their own, as that rich man was burning in the underworld when he said, 'I am tormented in this flame'[1] — did I not see that it can be fittingly answered that that flame was of such a kind as [were] the eyes which he lifted up when he saw Lazarus; of such a kind the tongue, on which he desired a little moisture to be poured; of such a kind the finger of Lazarus, from whom he asked this to be done for him — where, however, the souls were without bodies. So then, both that incorporeal flame with which he burned, and that little drop which he begged, are such as are also the visions of sleepers, or of those beholding incorporeal things in ecstasy, which yet have likenesses of bodies. For man himself, too, when he is in such visions with the spirit, not the body, nevertheless then sees himself so like to his own body that he cannot at all distinguish [it]." Thus Augustine — to whom the consensus of all the recent Theologians seems repugnant: who, following the opinion of St. Gregory (explained in his fourth Dialogue), establish that the infernal places are corporeal, in which the souls suffer not imaginary and similitudinary punishments, but true ones — namely corporeal, and truly burning fires.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Luke 16:23–24.

Accordingly, **St. Thomas**, in the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 44, weighing that former opinion from book 12 on Genesis, writes thus: "Augustine's saying can be taken in this way: that that place, to which souls are borne, is said to be non-corporeal to this extent — that the soul does not exist in it corporeally, namely in the manner in which bodies exist in a place, but in another, spiritual manner, as the angels are in a place; or it must be said that Augustine speaks by way of opinion, and not by way of determination, as he frequently does in those books." **Nicholas Trivet**, in the scholia which he published on the books *On the City of God*, annotating the latter passage cited from the same books, says that Augustine did not bring forth those words to assert that the fire →

[...continues on folio 541 (PDF p. 358): whether the fire [of hell] is spiritual — the rest of Annotatio XL.]

---

*(printed folio 541 [PDF p. 358]. **Annot. XL–XLIII** (Gen 2:8–17): Augustine really held hell-fire corporeal (Trivet); whether Moses and Paul saw God's essence (yes, with the mind); whether the underworld is beneath the earth (Augustine's retracted doubt: yes); and Philo's death-of-the-soul-only reading (refuted).)*

(folio 541, left column → right column)

Annotation XL (continued)

[Nicholas Trivet says that Augustine did not bring forth those words to assert] that the fire of hell is incorporeal — which through that whole chapter he had taught to be corporeal — but to show that his own assertion about a corporeal fire could not be confirmed by the example of the rich man burning in the flame, since it would easily be eluded by one who should answer that those flames were of such a kind as were the eyes and the tongue of the rich man suffering without his [own] body. See the observations pertaining to this below, in Annotations 42, 93, 141, and 227 of this book.

Annotation XLI [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether Moses and Paul saw the very essence of God with the mind, but not with the eyes of the body.

Augustine, in the twelfth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, where he treats of Paradise, when he discourses (in chapters 27 and 28 of the same book) about those who saw God, wrote that Moses and Paul saw God not in any likeness or image of a corporeal creature, but in that essence and nature of the subject by which God *is* [as he is in himself], as far as a man is able to grasp it, withdrawn from all sense of the body; and he confirms this same thing in the book (or epistle) *On Seeing God*, to Paulina, chapters 12 and 13. This opinion the same Augustine seemed to some to have disapproved, in book 2 *On the Trinity*, chapters 17 and 18, where he reckons those to be foolish who believe that God was seen by mortals in his [own] substance. **James, Bishop of Christopolis**, who in the preface of his explanation on the Psalms noted a contradiction of this kind, settled it by bringing a distinction of a twofold vision:[1] namely, [vision] *a priori* — that is, through the light of glory, by which the blessed see God in the fatherland — and [vision] *a posteriori* — that is, from an ascent from creatures up to the divine essence: as if someone, in a circle, should arrive at the vision of the center (invisible by its own nature) through the vision of the lines going out from the center to the circumference of the circle. In which way indeed he says that Augustine thought, in the epistle to Paulina and in the 12th book on Genesis, that the divine essence was beheld by Moses and Paul — but not *a priori*, or seen through the light of glory, as the same [Augustine] left written in the second book *On the Trinity*. But if anyone will more accurately inspect both passages of Augustine in their author, he will confess that no reconciliation is needed. For what he had taught to be attributed to Moses and Paul — that with the eye of the mind they for an hour beheld that which is God — this he denied could be done with corporeal eyes, concluding thus in book 2 *On*

the Trinity, chapter 18: "For that very nature, or substance, or by whatever other name that very thing which God is must be called — whatever it is — cannot be seen corporeally."

◊ **1. Left margin:** The vision of God, in the judgment of James of Christopolis, is twofold.

Annotation XLII [contents]

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the place of the underworld is under the earth.

Augustine, in the twelfth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, in which he inquires about Paradise, chapter 33, seems to hold that the underworld [*inferi*] is not under the earth, when he proposes a question about these things in this manner: "Whence, however, [it is that] the underworld is said to be under the earth — if it is not under the earth — is rightly asked." Answering which question, in the following chapter 34, he says that the underworld is said and believed to be under the earth for a twofold reason: either because, just as a place under the earth is assigned to dead flesh, so the likeness of a subterranean place is represented to the soul dead through the sin of the flesh; or because, just as in corporeal things those are called "lower" which are heavier, so in spiritual things those are called "lower" which are sadder. Whence also, among the Greeks, the name ᾅδης [*Hades*], by which the underworld is called, took its origin from the fact that it has nothing sweet. Retracting which words, Augustine, in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 24, speaks thus:[2] "About the underworld, I seem to myself rather to have had to teach that they are under the earth, than to give a reason why they are believed or said to be under the earth — as though it were not so." See above, Annotation 40.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Augustine retracted himself. — and: Hell is under the earth.

Annotation XLIII [contents]

"In whatever day you eat of it, you shall die the death." — Genesis 2:17

Whether God threatened the first man with bodily death, or rather only the death of the soul.

Philo the Jew, at the end of the second book of the *Allegories of the Law*, asserts that God, in the proposed words, did not threaten the first parent with the death of the body, but only with the death of the soul.[3] For he writes in this manner: "God says, 'In whatever day you shall eat of it, you shall die the death.' But after eating they not only do not die, but even beget children, and become to others authors of living. What, then, must be said? That there is a twofold death: one proper to man, the other to the soul. The death of man is the separation of the soul from the body; but the death of the soul is the corruption of virtue and the assumption of vice. And therefore, not content to say 'about to die,' he says, 'By death you shall die' — indicating not this common [death], but that eternal one which by excellence is called death, which is [death] as often as the soul is buried in the affections and in all vices. When, therefore, he says, 'By death you shall die,' it must be observed that a *penal* death, not a natural one, is signified. Natural [death], moreover, is that by which the soul is separated from the body; but *penal*, when the soul dies out of the life of virtue."

◊ **3. Right margin:** Philo thinks God threatened only the death of the soul.

Eucherius, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis, following Philo's opinion, expounds this passage similarly,[4] saying: "He speaks, therefore, of the death of the soul, not of the body — because they did not die at that time when they ate. Therefore this death which God now threatened, we must not take [as] that by which the flesh is separated from the soul, but this, by which it [the soul] is alienated from God, who is its life — as if he should say, 'On the day you forsake me by disobedience, I will forsake you by justice.' For just as the body lives from the soul, so the soul, that it may live blessedly, lives from God; therefore the soul forsaken by God is rightly called dead." **Augustine**, refuting this opinion in the 13th book *The City of God*, chapter 12, speaks thus:[5] "When, therefore, it is asked with what death God threatened the first men, if they should transgress the commandment received from him and not keep obedience — whether [the death]

of the soul, or of the body, or of the whole man, or that which is called the second [death] — it must be answered: *all*. For the first consists of two, but the second is whole, [made] of all. For just as the whole earth [consists] of many lands, and the whole Church consists of many churches, so the whole death [consists] of all — since the first consists of two: one of the soul, the other of the body; so that the first death is [the death] of the whole man, when the soul, without God [and] without body, pays penalties for a time; but the second [is that] where the soul, without God, with the body, shall pay eternal penalties. When, therefore, God said to that first man, whom he had established in Paradise, concerning the forbidden food, 'In whatever day you eat of it, you shall die the death,' [he threatened] not only the prior part of the first death, where the soul is deprived [of God] →

◊ **4. Right margin:** Eucherius approves Philo's opinion.

◊ **5. Right margin:** St. Augustine refutes Philo's opinion.

[…continues on folio 542 (PDF p. 359): the rest of Augustine's refutation (Annotatio XLIII).]

---

*(printed folio 542 [PDF p. 359]. **Annot. XLIII–XLVII** (Gen 2:17–21): "you shall die the death" = every death; abortion of a formless embryo (still gravely sinful); Giorgio's androgynous Adam (refuted); Chrysostom's literal reading of Adam's rib; and Cajetan reading the rib as parable.)*

(folio 542, left column → right column)

Annotation XLIII (continued)

[that threat comprehended] not only the prior part of the first death, where the soul is deprived of God, nor only the posterior, where the body is deprived of the soul, nor only that whole first [death], where the soul, separated both from God and from the body, is punished: but whatever of death there is, up to the very last — which is called the second, and than which there is none later — that threat comprehended [it all].

Annotation XLIV [contents]

"Let us make him a help like unto himself." — Genesis 2:18

For what cause abortion is a grave sin, even if the embryo was not [yet] animated.

Procopius of Gaza, in the exposition of this saying, has these things: "Wherefore he who is the cause or author that a formless embryo is cast out by abortion, according to the divine law incurs no penalties, nor is affected with punishment; because an imperfect embryo is not yet numbered among men." Which words are to be understood not of all penalties and punishments simply, but only of those with which homicides are wont to be punished:[1] because the procured abortion of an unformed birth is not homicide. But those who procure the poisons of sterility and cast out foetuses not yet animated, Augustine affirms to sin most gravely (book 1 *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, chapter 15, and Sermon *On the Season* 244).

◊ **1. Left margin:** Exodus 21:22.

Annotation XLV [contents]

"For Adam there was not found a helper like unto him." — Genesis 2:20

Whether Adam was created androgynous, as Francesco Giorgio thinks.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio], in the first volume of the *Problems*, so explains this passage that he asserts man was, from the beginning, created androgynous — that is, a man in whom two bodies, namely of male and female, were joined around the back.[2] For he writes thus, in Problem 29: "Man was, from the beginning, twofold [*geminus*] — that is, male and female together — created; and, as Plato teaches, male and

female were joined in him by the back, and afterward cut, so that they might be joined face to face for procreating offspring. And in this Plato was taught by the most upright philosopher Moses — which Scripture also teaches, where it is had that, the side or rib of the protoplast being cut, the woman was formed; for צלע (*tsela*) signifies both, namely rib and side. The section therefore being made, the woman was the help of the man, namely as one standing face to face, as the Hebrew truth has it — for which the common edition [Vulgate] has 'like unto himself.'" **St. Augustine** refutes this opinion, in the third book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 22, saying:[3] "Again, lest in man both sexes should be thought to be — as in those whom they call Androgynes — he subjoined in the plural, 'Male and female he created *them*.'" **Strabo [Walafrid]**, agreeing with Augustine, rejects this same opinion among the condemned fables of the Jews, in these words: "'Male and female he created them' — not because he first created and established Adam himself in both sexes, as the stupid Jews fable, but because he distinguished the human race by both sexes, and willed it to subsist in a twofold person."

◊ **2. Left margin:** Genesis 1:21 [i.e. 1:27].

◊ **3. Left margin:** St. Augustine refutes that Jewish opinion which Francesco Giorgio approved. — with: Genesis 1[:27].

Annotation XLVI [contents]

"The Lord sent a deep sleep upon Adam." — Genesis 2:21

Whether Eve was formed from Adam's rib.

Chrysostom, in homily 15 on Genesis, illustrating this sentence by his exposition, brought forth these words: "'And he took,' he says, 'one of his ribs' — do not take in a human manner the things that are said, but consider that these gross words are suited to human weakness; for unless Scripture had used these words, how could we have learned such hidden mysteries? Let us not, therefore, be addicted to the words only, but let us think all things about God as is fitting; since, when it is said 'He took,' [it] and all such things are said on account of our weakness." From these words a certain **Spaniard** endeavored to bring aid to Thomas Cajetan — who (as we shall say presently) opined that the formation of Eve from Adam's rib is to be understood not according to the truth of history, but as the narration of a figurative parable — which opinion the Spaniard thinks was expressed by Chrysostom, many ages before Cajetan, in the aforesaid words. But how far this man strays not only from the truth, but from Chrysostom's mind, Chrysostom himself shows a little before, when he says: "He who is the wise and powerful Fashioner of our nature, being about to take away one of his ribs — lest, by feeling pain, [Adam] should afterward become hostile to the woman formed from him, being mindful of the pain — for this reason, sending an ecstasy, oppressed him with so deep a sleep that, as if seized by a certain heaviness, he took no perception of the thing that was being done; and he filled up flesh in place of it, lest, the sleep being shaken off, he should perceive from the emptiness what had been done. And so, that he might afflict him with sadness neither in the taking-away nor on account of the removal, he so dispensed both, that he both took it away without his torment, and, that place being filled up whence he had taken it, did not allow him to perceive the sense of what had been done." These things Chrysostom [says], manifestly demonstrating that he by no means understood by metaphor and parable those things in which he judged the danger of the sense of true pain, true torment, and true sadness to be imminent. But as for his warning — that Moses, speaking of the formation, must not be understood in a human and gross manner — he said this not to overthrow the truth of history, but to confute the madness of the **Anthropomorphites** and the **Arians**. Of these, the former thought God to be endowed with a body,[4] and to have fashioned man from mud with fleshly hands and corporeal operation and motion, after the manner of a potter or a surgeon, and the woman from the man's rib. But the **Arians**, taking a handle for cavilling from these words, "And the Lord God sent [a deep sleep]," contended that the Father alone, without the Son, formed the man, and from the man the woman;[5] because they said that in the divine Scriptures the Father alone is called "God" and "Lord," but the Son, as being less than the Father, is called only "God," not "Lord." Confuting both, therefore, Chrysostom warns [us] not to take these words either in a human and gross

manner with the Anthropomorphites, or, with the Arians, to place a distinction between "God" and "Lord": because, he says, of both [Father and Son] there is one essence, and Scripture uses those names indiscriminately. Look at the following Annotation.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The Anthropomorphites thought God to be endowed with a body.

◊ **5. Right margin:** The Arians contended that the Father, without the Son, formed the man, and from the man the woman.

Annotation XLVII [contents]

"God sent a deep sleep upon Adam." — Genesis 2:21

Cajetan denies that a rib was truly taken from Adam.

Thomas Cajetan, in his commentaries on Genesis, when in narrating he had come to this point, wrote that both the sleep of Adam and the production of the woman from Adam's rib are to be taken not according to history, and as the letter itself sounds, but according to a *mystery* — not of allegory, but of *parable*. For if it be understood according to the letter, that a rib was truly taken from Adam, one of two absurdities will follow: either that Adam was a monster before the rib was taken away, or →

[…continues on folio 543 (PDF p. 360): the second absurdity, and Sixtus's reply to Cajetan (Annotatio XLVII).]

---

*(printed folio 543 [PDF p. 360]. **Annot. XLVII–L** (Gen 2:21–3:15): Cajetan's rib-as-parable branded heretical (Adam neither maimed nor a monster — Hugh of St. Victor, Aquinas); Chrysostom seeming to forbid all oaths; Origen on losing God's image (image vs likeness distinguished); and Augustine's seemingly-Pelagian "sins harm only their own nature.")*

(folio 543, left column → right column)

Annotation XLVII (continued)

[either that Adam was a monster before the rib was taken away,] or that he was maimed after the rib was taken from him. Both of which are most absurd: because either that rib was superfluous to the man, or necessary. If superfluous, then the man was monstrous; if necessary, then, it being taken away, the man was rendered maimed. **Alfonso de Castro**, in the second book *Against Heresies*, and **Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa**, in the commentaries on Genesis and in the second book of the *Annotations against Cajetan*, assail this position[1] as a novelty unheard-of by Catholics, and heretical, and one which subverts the very foundations of our faith: because, if the truth of the present history is destroyed, it must needs be that there falls that great sacrament which Paul said is in Christ and in the Church — that is, that just as Eve was built up from the bones and flesh of Adam, so the Church [is built] from the bones and flesh of Christ. But if you destroy the first thing, which was in the letter, you overthrow also that which is contained under it. Thus they.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Alfonso de Castro and Ambrose of Compsa [Catharinus] judge Cajetan's opinion to be heretical.

But **Hugh of St. Victor**, dissolving this very argument of Cajetan's — which of old was used by those who, long before Cajetan, had scattered the seeds of this error — wrote thus in the book of *Annotations on Genesis*:[2] "But as to what certain persons ask — whether Adam previously had more ribs in that side from which that rib was taken (because if so, then Adam had it as superfluous; but if not more, [but] only as many as he had in the other side, then he was diminished [by its loss]) — [the question] is frivolous: for neither are the teeth of boys, which are afterward changed, called superfluous, nor are they themselves, although they do not yet have the [full] increase of nature, judged to be diminished." Thus far Hugh. Subscribing to whom, **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa*, question 92, article 3, says that that rib was of the perfection of Adam[3] — not as he was a certain individual, but as he was the *principle of the species*: just as seed is of the

perfection of the one generating, and yet is separated, for the procreation of children, by natural operation. Read the preceding annotation.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Hugh of St. Victor answers the argument which Cajetan earlier employed.

◊ **3. Left margin:** The rib from which Eve was formed was of Adam's perfection, as he was the principle of the species.

Annotation XLVIII [contents]

"And they shall be two in one flesh." — Genesis 2:24

Whether it is lawful for Christians to swear.

Chrysostom, in the homily on Genesis, after the exposition of this passage, exhorting his hearers at the end of the sermon to the flight from oaths, seems to take away from Christians all faculty of swearing[4] — even in just and necessary causes. For he writes thus: "Let him also who hears the sentence of Christ flee oaths in all ways: [Christ] who says, 'It was said to the ancients, THOU SHALT NOT FORSWEAR THYSELF. But I say to you, [thou shalt] not swear at all.' Therefore let no one say, 'I swear in a just matter' — for it is lawful to swear neither in a just matter nor in an unjust one." See Annotation 26 of the sixth book.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Matthew 5:34.

Annotation XLIX [contents]

"And when they knew themselves to be naked." — Genesis 3:7

Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God].

Origen, in the *Tomes* on the third chapter of Genesis, weighing these words, left it written that man, by sinning, lost the image of God according to which he had been created. This assertion Epiphanius, in the epistle to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, reckons among the chief errors of Origen. Yet it must be known that the name "image of God" in the sacred letters is taken in two ways,[5] that is, according to *substance* and according to *likeness*. Now the image of God according to substance — as Eucherius says, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis — is nothing other than the mind naturally conferred by God upon every human soul, of which privilege the other animals are devoid. But the image of God according to likeness is the conformity of a just and holy soul with God, procured from divine grace and the zeal of holy actions: concerning which St. Ambrose, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Colossians, expounding that [saying] of the Apostle — "Putting on the new man, who is renewed according to the image of him who created him"[6] — speaks thus: "This image is to be understood in good conversation [and] life, as the first epistle to the Corinthians says: 'As we have borne the image of him who is of the earth, so let us also bear the image of him who is of heaven.'[7] He, therefore, is the creator of man, whose image he commands us to bear in sanctity and good works." Thus Ambrose.

◊ **5. Left margin:** The name "image of God" in Scripture is taken in two ways.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Colossians 3:10.

◊ **7. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 15:49.

Since, therefore, the name "image" signifies these two things: if Origen understood "image" according to the first signification, he plainly erred, and Epiphanius accused him not undeservedly. For the natural [endowments], after the fall, remained entire — even in the demons — as to substance,[8] as the great Dionysius attests. But he thought piously and rightly, if he used the name "image" in the second signification, that is, for the *original justice* lost by man in sinning. And that Origen had this [latter] sense, the third book of the *Peri Archon* easily persuades — in whose sixth chapter he himself wrote these things about the image of God, as still remaining in man: "Moses, narrating before all things the first condition of man, says, 'And God said, Let us make man to our image and likeness';[9] then afterward he adds, 'And God made man to the image of God.' This, therefore — that he said, 'To the image of God he made him,' and was silent about the

likeness — indicates nothing other than that [man] received the *dignity of the image* in the first condition. But the perfection of the *likeness* was reserved for the consummation: namely, that he himself should procure it for himself by his own industry [and] zeal, from the imitation of God — since, the possibility of perfection being divinely given to him through the dignity of the image, he himself should at last, at the end, through the completion of works, consummate for himself the perfect likeness." From which words it is manifestly gathered that the image of God, received in the first condition, *remains* in man:[10] because [Origen] shows the likeness of God — which the soul receives in the consummation, that is, in beatitude — to be nothing other than the absolute and consummate perfection of the image, or of the dignity received through the image. See what St. Augustine retracted concerning this opinion above, in Annotation 31.

◊ **8. Right margin:** The natural [endowments], as to substance, remained entire even in the demons.

◊ **9. Right margin:** Genesis 1:26.

◊ **10. Right margin:** The image of God, received in the first condition, remains in man.

Annotation L [contents]

"I will put enmities between thee and the woman," etc. — Genesis 3:15

No one's nature is harmed by another's sins.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis [against the Manichaeans]* [interpreted] allegorically, chapter 29, elucidating the sense of this passage, says: "Sins harm no one's nature but their own." Because this seems able to be drawn toward the dogma of the Pelagians — who say that another's sins have not harmed little children — Augustine, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 10, wishes it to be understood of *adult just persons*:[11] because to the just man, whom [another's sin] harms, not →

◊ **11. Right margin:** St. Augustine explains himself.

[…continues on folio 544 (PDF p. 361): the rest of Augustine's self-explanation (Annotatio L).]

---

*(printed folio 544 [PDF p. 361]. **Annot. L–LIV** (Gen 3:15–21): harming a just man harms only oneself; Giorgio's five "paradoxes" on demons and giants (refuted by Augustine); Josephus and Kissamos on sin bringing only the soul's death (refuted); Origen's "tunics of skin" as real skins; and Giorgio's allegory of the tunics.)*

(folio 544, left column → right column)

Annotation L (continued)

[because to the just man, whom another's sin harms, it does] not truly harm him: since indeed it even increases his reward in the heavens; but by sinning [the sinner] truly harms himself,[1] because, on account of the very will of harming, he receives that which harms [him]. Augustine, in the same book and chapter, asserts that there is no natural evil; and because this seems to favor the Pelagian heresy, he — in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 10 — orders it to be referred to that nature which was founded utterly without any vice.[2]

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whoever harms a just man does not truly harm him.

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Augustine explains himself.

Annotation LI [contents]

"I will put enmities between thy seed and her seed," etc. — Genesis 3:15

Whether the giants sprang from the seed of the devil, as Francesco Giorgio thought.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first Tome of the *Problems*, problem 54, inquiring what the seed of the devil is — which here is called by Moses "the seed of the serpent" — decides, rather violently, that the seed of the devil, hostile to the whole human race, was the giants, begotten from the coupling of demons with women. For demons (as he himself explains in the sixth Tome, problem 330) are corporeal animals apt for generation, emitting seed: which, approaching women, condense their bodies, so that they may more easily unite with the women for the generation of giants; whom, in the first Tome, problems 74 and 75, he constantly asserts could in no way have been begotten from the intercourse of man and woman, but from the seed of demons — because it is not consonant that such huge monsters, of the kind the giants are read to have been in the sacred letters, could be produced by a natural way. And hence (he says in problem 331 of the sixth Tome) it came about that, after the coming of Christ, the giants entirely ceased to be: because, after the demons were conquered by the death of Christ, they no longer had power to enter into women and to sow giants in their wombs. You have here, excellent reader, five things foreign to the common opinions of the Theologians.[3] The first is: that demons are corporeal animals endowed with the faculty of begetting. The second, that the giants were the sons of demons. The third, that giants cannot be begotten naturally from the human intercourse of man and woman. The fourth, that demons cannot, after the coming of Christ, be mingled with women. The fifth, that the giants were, after Christ, entirely done away. All these things St. Augustine refutes in order, in book 15 *On the City of God*, chapter 23. Consult Annotations 8, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, and 77 of this book.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Five paradoxes of Francesco Giorgio.

Annotation LII [contents]

"Thou shalt return into the earth from which thou wast taken, because dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return." — Genesis 3:19

Whether sin brought upon Adam the necessity of bodily death.

Josephus, in the first book of the *Jewish Antiquities*, explaining the sense of this sentence, indicates that the offense of the first parents did not bring upon them the necessity of dying, but the shortness of life, and the hastening of old age and death.[4] For thus he introduces God speaking to them: "I had indeed provided for you, that you might live a happy life and free from all evil, all things which confer to use and pleasure coming to you of their own accord; enjoying which, neither would old age quickly oppress you, and [your] long life would be prolonged as far as possible. But you have held my judgment in mockery, my command being despised — wherefore both old age shall come the sooner, and your life shall be less long."

◊ **4. Left margin:** Genesis 3:19.

To the prior part of this opinion **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, alludes, holding that Adam's sin brought upon man not the death of the body, but only [that] of the soul.[5] Reproving their assertion, Augustine [of Hippo], in book 13 *On the City of God*, chapter 15, says:[6] "It is agreed, among Christians truly holding the Catholic faith, that even this bodily death itself was inflicted on us not by the law of nature — by which God made no death for man — but deservedly for sin: since God, avenging sin, said to the man, in whom then we all were, 'Earth thou art, and into earth thou shalt go.'" There exists also a decree of this Catholic assertion in the Acts of the African Council, chapter 76,[7] in these words: "Whosoever shall say that Adam, the first man, was made mortal, so that, whether he sinned or sinned not, he would die in body — that is, would depart from the body — not by the merit of sin, but by the necessity of nature: let him be anathema."

◊ **5. Right margin:** Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, denies that sin brought bodily death upon Adam.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Genesis 3[:19].

◊ **7. Right margin:** The opinion of Augustine of Kissamos is impious.

Annotation LIII [contents]

"God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the tunics of skin of the first parents were the skins of animals.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis, expounding these words, is reported to have said that the tunics of skin, with which God clothed the first parents, were not truly tunics of skin, but carnal and mortal bodies — with which, after the offense and the ejection from paradise, Adam and Eve were clothed. This error Methodius, in the *Aglaophon*, attributes to Origen. Epiphanius also, in the book *Anchoratus*, confirms the same, saying that [Origen] thought thus for this reason: because he reckoned it a thoroughly ridiculous thing that God should, from dead animals stripped of their hide, prepare skins and sew together tunics of skin, as if he were a tanner or a stitcher of hides.[8] I suspect that this passage was corrupted by the rivals of Origen; for he, in this matter, opens his mind catholicly in the 6th homily on Leviticus, where he writes thus: "God made tunics of skin, and clothed Adam and his wife. Those tunics, therefore, were of skins taken from animals: for with such [tunics] it behooved the sinner to be clothed — with skin tunics, I say, which were a token of the mortality which he had received for sin, and of his frailty, which came from the corruption of the flesh." By which words he manifestly confesses that the tunics were truly of skin, prepared by God's command. See the following Annotation.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Why God clothed sinful man with tunics of skin.

Annotation LIV [contents]

"And God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the tunics of skin were true skins.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first Tome of the *Problems*, contends that this passage must be understood according to bare and naked allegory alone. For thus we read in him, problem 59: "God was not a butcher, that he should kill sheep or lambs: because, since he made the animals two by two, if he killed two or four to make the tunics, then he afterward created others — which is false, since God rested on the seventh day.[9] But these things are said by allegory, that these tunics may be understood [to have been] made from the skin of that Lamb of whom it is written, 'The Lamb was slain from the origin of the world'[10] — so that by his merits all sins may be covered," etc. With this same figment of Francesco, the Origenists — the first authors of this opinion — made use, more than a thousand two hundred years ago. Wishing to meet [refute] whom, **Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea**, and **Gennadius, Bishop of Constantinople**, said that "tunics of skin" in this place signify the barks of trees.[11] For just as [the hides] of animals →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Genesis 2:2.

◊ **10. Right margin:** Apocalypse [Revelation] 13:8.

◊ **11. Right margin:** Some reckoned that the tunics of skin signify the barks of trees.

[…continues on folio 545 (PDF p. 362): the tree-bark gloss and Sixtus's reply (Annotatio LIV).]

---

*(printed folio 545 [PDF p. 362]. **Annot. LIV–LVIII** (Gen 3:21–24): the "tree-bark" gloss for the tunics disapproved (Theodoret); how they could be made without slaughter; Theodoret's "Scripture sometimes says something false" softened; the LXX settling Adam before Paradise; and the Cherubim as mere terrifying specters (against all the Fathers).)*

(folio 545, left column → right column)

Annotation LIV (continued)

[For just as the hides] of animals are called "skins," so also the barks of trees are called "skins." Therefore, from the barks of trees, fit for the composition of garments, the first parents — divine piety prompting —

made tunics for themselves, just as before they had made themselves girdles from fig-leaves, to cover the shame of their genitals. But **Theodoret**, in question 39 on Genesis, disapproving this solution, speaks in this manner: "Of those who pursue allegories, some say the skins are the mortal flesh; but certain others discuss that they were procured from the barks of trees. But I approve neither of these: for the one is too curious, the other indeed very fabulous. For since divine Scripture has said that the body was formed before the soul, how is it not fabulous to say that God gave them mortal flesh after the transgression of the commandment? But to inquire curiously whence God had the skins, and on that account to devise a new kind of clothing from the barks of trees, seems to me superfluous, since the Creator of all did not lack whence to prepare those tunics."[1] **Procopius of Gaza**, in the commentaries on Genesis, dissolving the adduced reasoning, says that those tunics could have been made in two ways without the killing of animals[2] — that is, either from the conversion of pre-existing matter into skins (for just as [God] converted the waters of the Nile into blood, so he could change the matter of the elements into skins), or from creation out of nothing. For since man, created at the beginning of the sixth day, sinned at the sixth hour of the same day,[3] and was ejected from paradise, nothing prevents [us from holding] that God, on that same sixth day, created skins out of nothing — since the seventh day had not yet come, on which he rested from all the work of creation which he had accomplished. Read the preceding Annotation.

◊ **1. Left margin:** The Creator did not lack a way of preparing the tunics of skin.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The tunics of skin could be made in two ways without the slaughter of animals.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Man was created at the beginning of the sixth day, and sinned at the sixth hour of the same day.

Annotation LV [contents]

"And God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, in question 39 on Genesis, digressing upon this little clause, after many things which he said in passing, at last brought in a certain somewhat harsh opinion, in these plain words: "One must not adhere to the bare letter of holy Scripture as [if it were] true, but must seek the treasure hidden in the letter — for the reason that the very letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false." These words, indeed, are not so to be understood that we should think the letter of divine Scripture — which is truth itself — pronounces anything false; but that, to us who consider only the bare sound of the letter and do not look into the meaning hidden in it, it seems to say something false.[4]

◊ **4. Left margin:** Scripture, to those who consider only the bare letter, seems to say something false.

Annotation LVI [contents]

"And he cast out Adam, and placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Whether Adam, cast out of paradise, was placed before the door of paradise.

The **Seventy Interpreters**, interpreting this saying, perverted the sense of the Hebrew truth, attributing that which is said of the Cherub to Adam himself — whom they write to have been placed before Paradise by God, in these words: καὲ ὶκάτῳκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς [*and he settled him over against the Paradise of delight*], "And he settled him" — namely Adam — "before, or over against, the Paradise of delights." Which indeed is not in the Hebrew.

Annotation LVII [contents]

"He placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Whether the Cherubim are angels, or specters.

Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea, weighing this clause, thinks that the Cherubim, the guardians of Paradise, were not spirits endowed with reason, but certain specters, feigned for the sake of terrifying. See the following Annotation.

Annotation LVIII [contents]

"He placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Theodoret denies that the Cherubim are spiritual and blessed minds.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, in the book of Questions on Genesis, question 40, inquiring what Τὰ Χερουβίμ [*ta Cheroubim*] — that is, the Cherubim — placed to guard the tree of life, are, answers two things. **The first**: that it must not be believed that the Cherubim, the guardians of Paradise, are spiritual and invisible powers, as some think, but [rather] certain powerful and terrible visions, and forms of animals, which would keep Adam from the entrance of Paradise. **The second** is: that the Cherubim, of which frequent mention is made in the divine Scriptures, are neither animals, nor any substance of invisible nature; but divine Scripture calls "Cherubim" everything that is endowed with great power. Thus David says in the Psalm, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim"[5] — that is, who reignest powerfully; and in another Psalm, "He ascended upon the Cherubim, and flew,"[6] etc. — that is, he came with much and great power and virtue. These things Theodoret [says]; before whom **Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea**, and after whom **Procopius of Gaza**, explaining this same passage of Genesis, wrote the same opinion, and in almost the same words. At last, in our own times, there came forth out of Greece a certain new heresiarch, **James Chyus**, who, among many heresies of the ancient heretics recalled by himself, brought this error back into the light.[7] He, when in an exposition of the Creed published by him he was making a discourse about the angels, wrote among other things these things about the Cherubim: "Cherubim, in the sacred letters, does not signify any spiritual substance, or some incorporeal animal, but a statue formed to the likeness of a boy: such as were those boyish golden statues placed upon the ark, and that statue with the fiery sword placed for the guarding of Paradise, which Moses called 'Cherubim.' For this was not an angelic spirit, but a certain manly image, of horrible form and covered about with a mask, which God had placed before the doors of Paradise to strike terror into the first parents — after the manner of farmers, who fix in their crops and gardens wooden stakes clothed with the torn rags of human garments, so that by that kind of scarecrow they may frighten off the birds from feeding on the seeds and crops. Whence, lest anyone should think the Cherubim to be living and spiritual substances, it was provided by the synodal laws of the Greeks that it should not be sung, in the Trisagion of the angels, 'Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim.'"[8] Thus far James.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

◊ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 18:10 [Vulgate 17:11].

◊ **7. Right margin:** James Chyus renewed an ancient heresy.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

Against this error is the authority of all the Fathers,[9] and especially of the Greeks, but chiefly of Dionysius the Areopagite: who, in chapter 7 of the *Celestial Hierarchy*, enumerates the Cherubim immediately after the Seraphim, in the second rank of the first and supreme hierarchy of the celestial spirits; and ascribes to these, according to the interpretation of the Hebrew name, [an] excel- →

◊ **9. Right margin:** It is the common opinion of the Fathers that the Cherubim are spiritual minds.

[…continues on folio 546 (PDF p. 363): Dionysius on the Cherubim's excellence of knowledge — the rest of Annotatio LVIII.]

---

*(printed folio 546 [PDF p. 363]. **Annot. LVIII–LIX** (Gen 3:24): the Cherubim vindicated as true celestial spirits (Dionysius, Athanasius, Nicaea II), with a digression on the **Trisagion** — its text, legendary origin,*

and heretical tamperings; then Catharinus holding Moses translated alive into Paradise.)

(folio 546, left column → right column)

Annotation LVIII (continued)

[ascribes to these, according to the interpretation of the Hebrew name, an] most excellent fullness of surpassing knowledge, drawn from the fount of divine wisdom. Consenting to whom, **Athanasius**, in the sermon upon that [text], "All things are delivered to me by my Father,"[1] says that the Cherubim are most ample living beings, than which nothing is nearer to God, who extol the majesty of God with lips never ceasing. **Chrysostom**, in the third sermon *On the Incomprehensible Nature of God*, says the Cherubim are powers superior to the seraphic spirits, and nearer to God — whose appellation signifies a full and heaped-up nature. And the same [Chrysostom], in his Liturgy, addresses God in these words: "To thee indeed stand by thousands of Archangels, and many thousands of Angels, Cherubim and Seraphim with six wings, with many eyes, sublime, feathered, singing the hymn of victory, crying aloud, clamoring and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth."[2] But even **Theodoret** himself, perhaps repenting of his error, in the book of the *Divine Decrees* placed the Cherubim among the angels by the testimony of divine Scripture, thus writing in chapter 7: "The ministry of the Angels is the praise of God and the chanting of hymns. For of the Seraphim blessed Isaiah said that they cry out, saying, 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth'; but of the Cherubim divine Ezekiel said that he heard from them, 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.'"[3] Finally, in the Second Council of Nicaea, in the fourth session, the opinion of Athanasius is approved, expounding that saying from the Psalm, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim,"[4] in these words: "The Cherubim, unknown by nature to all men, are spirit and fire, alien from all figuration of bodies and [bodily] nature; and the things which are said of them by the prophet as of corporeal beings have a symbolic sense."

◊ **1. Left margin:** Luke 10:22.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Isaiah 6:3.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Ezekiel 3:12.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

But that the Cherubim, whom Moses reports in this place, are celestial powers, not only Ambrose, Augustine, and all the Latin doctors, but also very many of the Greek doctors testify — among whom **Chrysostom**, expounding this passage, openly confesses it, saying: "God commanded that those powers, the Cherubim, should guard the way." And in the sermon *On the Ascension*, explaining this same thing more clearly, he says: "The Angels and Archangels grieved at our punishments; and when we were punished, they too were held by excessive sadness. And the Cherubim, although they guarded Paradise, yet were saddened at our punishments; and just as a good fellow-servant, when he has undertaken from his lord a fellow-servant to be guarded, satisfies indeed the lord's command, yet is worn down with excessive grief at the fellow-servant's penalty: so also the Cherubim deserved indeed to guard paradise, but grieved at the honor of the guardianship." **Gennadius**, expounding these same words of Moses, says, "Τὰ δὲ Χερουβίμ" — that is, [they] are invisible powers — "these he said received the guardianship of Paradise"; that is, the Cherubim are invisible powers, and he said that these same [powers] undertook the guardianship of Paradise.

But as to that which [James Chyus] adds about synods forbidding that there be sung in the Trisagion, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim," I confess that I have nowhere read [it] in the volumes of the councils which now exist.[5] If, beyond their number, there be some other synod of received authority in which this is found prohibited, we shall say that it was not simply prohibited by that synod that "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim" should be uttered, but that there should not be sung "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim" with the particle added, "And [upon] the Seraphim" — just as of old certain unskilled persons used to sing in the public prayers, whom Jerome, in the commentaries on the sixth chapter of Isaiah, condemns in these words: "The Lord is plainly shown to sit upon the Cherubim after the manner of a charioteer; but [that he sits] upon

the Seraphim, I know not that I have read in the Canonical Scriptures. Therefore they err who are wont to say in [their] prayers, 'Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim and Seraphim,' which Scripture has not taught." Or it must be said that that synod sanctioned this not for the reason that the Cherubim should be believed to be inanimate things, lacking reason and life, but that every occasion of corrupting that angelic Trisagion might be taken away from the heretics: for also, in the fifth Council of Constantinople, for the same cause it was decreed that there should not be sung in the same Trisagion, "Thou who wast crucified for us," which Peter, Bishop of Antioch, had deceitfully added for the confirmation of his heresy.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Whether one ought to say, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim and Seraphim."

But the Trisagion — that you may also know this, kind reader — is a Greek Canticle so named because it contains "Hagion" [Holy] three times, to designate the three persons of the divine nature;[6] which the Greeks express in these words: ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς — that is, "Holy God, Holy Strong [One], Holy Immortal [One], have mercy on us." Pope Felix, in the Epistle to the Emperor Zeno, relates that the origin of the song was of this kind.[7] When the city of Constantinople was shaken by frequent earthquakes, and the people, praying in a field, cried out "Lord, have mercy": a little child, while the whole people, together with Proclus, Bishop of the city, looked on, was caught up into heaven for one hour; and there he learned a hymn of this kind, which, descending from heaven, he made known to the people; and the people, resounding that same thing with public voice, freed the city from danger; and the Church reckoned the hymn among the celebrated songs, and the Council of Chalcedon approved it. This hymn, therefore, when divers heretics had rashly tampered with it by adding various acclamations,[8] it was provided by the synods that suspect sentences should not be added to it. Of the number of which I suspect that saying, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim," was then [reckoned]. Nor is it abhorrent from this suspicion, that John of Damascus writes, in the epistle on the Trisagion, indicating that there were certain followers of the aforesaid Peter who, from the testimony of St. Epiphanius wrongly expounded, asserted that this Trisagion hymn pertains to the Son of God alone, because he alone sits upon the Cherubim, and whom alone those four-formed animals glorified, saying, "Holy, holy, holy," etc. Which dogma seemed indeed to distinguish Christ from the Trinity, and to introduce a certain quaternity.

◊ **6. Right margin:** What the Trisagion is.

◊ **7. Right margin:** What the origin of the Trisagion was.

◊ **8. Right margin:** The heretics tried to deprave the hymn of the Trisagion.

Annotation LIX [contents]

"He placed before the Paradise of pleasure a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Whether Moses died.

Ambrose [Catharinus], Bishop of Compsa, in this passage relates that Moses, together with his body, was translated alive into the Paradise of pleasure, that he might live there, until the consummation of the age, with Enoch, Elijah, and John. He confirms the same opinion in the exposition of that Mosaic saying, "The Lord had planted a Paradise [in] Eden," Genesis 2.[9] This same thing had, long before, been thought →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Genesis 2:8.

[…continues on folio 547 (PDF p. 364): who, before Catharinus, held Moses translated alive — the rest of Annotatio LIX.]

---

*(printed folio 547 [PDF p. 364]. **Annot. LIX–LXIII** (Gen 3:24–4:1): Moses translated alive (Ambrose held it before Catharinus); Procopius on incorporeal Cherubim; Ambrose on Moses "translated, not buried" (against the Hebrew); Ambrose misquoted to deny priestly absolution (vindicated); and Chrysostom on no generation without sin → folio 548.)*

(folio 547, left column → right column)

Annotation LIX (continued)

[This same thing had, long before, been thought] before [Catharinus] by St. Ambrose, as you will be able to see below, in the sixty-first Annotation of this book, and in the ninety-first Annotation of the following book.

Annotation LX [contents]

"He placed before the paradise of pleasure a Cherubim." — Genesis 3:24

Whether the Cherubim are incorporeal substances.

Procopius of Gaza, in the exposition of this passage, teaches that the Cherubim are not any kind of spiritual and incorporeal substance. See above, Annotation 58.

Annotation LXI [contents]

"But Adam knew his wife, and she bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether Moses has yet died.

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in the first book *On Cain and Abel*, chapter 2, treating this passage, incidentally fell upon the exposition of a period from Deuteronomy: in which, according to the Septuagint edition, it is read, "AND MOSES died διῤ ἀήματος (*dia rhēmatos*)" — that is, "by the word of God," etc.[1] On the occasion of which word he asserted that Moses was not yet dead, but translated to a better life, like Elijah. For what Scripture said — that Moses died — he wished to be understood not of the destruction which happens through the separation of the soul from the body, but of the translation to a happy and blessed life. For thus he wrote: "We do not read of Moses, as of the rest, that failing he died; but that he died by the word of God. For God admits neither defect nor addition; whence Scripture also added that no one knows his burial — so that you may understand [it] rather of a translation than of a destruction. For death is a certain separation of soul and body. He died, therefore, by the word of God, says Scripture — not *according to* the word: that you may note [it was] not a message of death, but the gift of grace expressed; [he] who was translated rather than forsaken, whose burial no one has known. For who could detect anything among his earthly remains — [him] whom the Son of God, in the Gospel, showed to be with him? Finally, Elijah too was seen at the same time by certain persons — [he] who was translated in a chariot, and is read [to have been] neither buried nor dead: for he lives who is with the Son of God. But Moses indeed is read [to have] died, yet he died by the word of God, through which all things were made; through the word of God, therefore, he is not a falling-away of the work, but a firmament [support]. Not, therefore, as one fallen back into the earth is he detected by a dissolution of the body, but as one endowed, by the operation of the heavenly word, with a gift: so that his flesh received rest rather than a tomb." These things Ambrose [says]: to whom **Hilary of Poitiers** assents,[2] in canon 20 on Matthew, where these things are written:[3] "The Lord, having taken Peter, and James, and John, appeared with the habit of his glory on the mountain, [Moses and Elijah] accompanying [him]; and these same two we understand [to be] the two Prophets preceding his coming, whom the Apocalypse of John says are to be slain by Antichrist[4] — although the opinions of very many have arisen variously, whether concerning Enoch or concerning Jeremiah, [as to] whether one of them, like Elijah, must die: but we cannot corrupt the assurance of the truth — which the Lord revealed by the three witnesses above — by the opinion of our own perception, nor think that others are to come than those who were seen to have come for the pledge of the faith. And although it is not necessary to hold an opinion beyond the evangelical truth, yet, if anyone diligently considers the condition both of the death and of the sepulchre of Moses, he will understand that all things were so handled that Moses could [now] seem to be already dead." This opinion have followed, in our times, Ambrose [Catharinus], Bishop of Compsa, in the

commentaries on Genesis, and John Arboreus [Jean Arboreau], in the eleventh book of the *Theosophia* — though the truth of the Hebrew Scripture, and almost all the ecclesiastical writers, cry out against [it]. *See Annotation 59 of this book, and Annotation 91 of Book 6.*

◊ **1. Left margin:** Deuteronomy 34:5. — and: St. Ambrose denies that Moses died by death.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Hilary thinks that Moses lives.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Matthew 17:1.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Revelation 11:3.

Annotation LXII [contents]

"But Adam knew his wife, and she bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether priests bind and loose.

The testimony of **Ambrose** from the work *On Cain and Abel* — published for the exposition of the present passage — the **Master of the Sentences** [Peter Lombard] brings forward, in the fourth book, distinction 39, where, being about to demonstrate that priests neither bind nor loose sinners, but only show and pronounce [them] bound or loosed by God alone, he cites, for the confirmation of this error of his,[5] the authority of Ambrose from chapter 4 of the second book of the said work, running thus: "The Word of God remits sins; the priest is a judge: the priest indeed exhibits his office, but exercises the rights of no power." **Gratian**, in the first distinction *On Penance*, alleges the same passage in plainly the same words. It is probable that either the one [drew] from the other, or both, from some other Rhapsode [compiler] — as is the custom of the Sentence-writers — excerpted this passage without the Ambrosian codex having been inspected: in which these words are read in a sense wholly diverse, nay even contrary, in this manner:[6] "Sins are remitted through the Word of God, of which the Levite is the interpreter and, as it were, the executor; they are remitted also through the office of the Priest and the sacred ministry." Which words Ambrose brought forth for this very purpose: to show that not only God, but priests also, remit sins.[7] Just as he explained the same thing yet more openly in the first book *On Penance*, chapter 2, saying: "He who receives the Holy Spirit receives also the power of loosing sin, and of binding; for thus it is written: 'Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them; and whose you shall retain, they shall be retained.' Therefore he who cannot loose sin does not have the Holy Spirit. The office of the priest is the gift of the Holy Spirit; and the right of the Holy Spirit [is exercised] in the loosing and binding of sins." These things I judged must be noted, that I might vindicate Ambrose from this suspicion, and at the same time admonish those who delight overmuch in Rhapsodists, Compendiums, and Summists — lest they be loath sometimes to return from the streams to the fountains, and to seek out the very sentences of the Fathers in their own authors, and to weigh them diligently. For it usually happens that abbreviators and collectors — whether from carelessness, or from forgetfulness, or from too great a zeal for brevity — gather the sentences of others either mutilated or interrupted, often with the words transposed, often even so far altered that from them a new and plainly different sense arises. But these things have been said, not that I should condemn the labors of these [men], which I have so often commended in the preceding books, but that I may render studious readers much more diligent and skillful. *See what pertains to this argument below, in Annotation 71, and in Annotation 202 of the sixth book.*

◊ **5. Right margin:** An error of Peter Lombard.

◊ **6. Right margin:** John 20:[22–23].

◊ **7. Right margin:** Priests remit sins.

Annotation LXIII [contents]

"But Adam knew his wife." — Genesis 4:1

If the first parents had not sinned, whether there would have been generation.

Chrysostom, in homily 18 on Genesis, when he wished to unravel this passage, asserted that, if the first parents had not sinned, there would have been no →

[…continues on folio 548 (PDF p. 365): the rest of Annotatio LXIII — whether there would have been generation and marriage in the state of innocence.]

---

*(printed folio 548 [PDF p. 365]. **Annot. LXIII–LXVI** (Gen 4:1–8): no coitus in paradise without the Fall (Chrysostom, Procopius); Ambrose seeming to make souls "uncertain of salvation" (defended); the LXX's mistranslation of Gen 4:7; and the LXX/Vulgate's added "let us go into the field," with the Targum's impious speech of Cain → folio 549.)*

(folio 548, left column → right column)

Annotation LXIII (continued)

[there would have been no] coitus in paradise: because before sin they were not subject to these bodily necessities; for the law of the venereal matter [sexual desire] entered only after sin. For then [after sin] God granted that the human race should be increased through coitus.

Procopius, following the same opinion, in the exposition of the same passage says more openly that, had there been no human transgression, there would have been neither matrimony, nor nuptials, nor coitus, nor propagation of offspring. *You have the antidote to this opinion above, in Annotations 20 and 21.*

Annotation LXIV [contents]

"She conceived, and bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, enjoy the divine vision.

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, book 2 *On Cain and Abel*, narrating this, hints that the souls of the deceased are, until the day of judgment, uncertain of their salvation; for he says: "The soul is loosed from the body, even after the end of this life; yet it is still held in suspense, uncertain of the future judgment." More openly he has this in the book *On the Good of Death*, chapter 10, where he relates that the souls of the saints are contained under the earth in hidden receptacles, and there, until the day of judgment, await the glory of God — speaking thus: "Scripture calls the habitations of souls the storehouses of Esdras";[1] and, meeting the human complaint — that the just who have gone before seem, up to the day of judgment (that is, for a very great space of time), to be defrauded of the reward owed to them — he says, wonderfully, that the day of judgment is like a crown: for the crown[-day] is awaited by all, that within that day both the vanquished may blush and the victors obtain the palm of victory. Therefore, while the fullness of time is awaited, the souls await their due reward: for some, punishment remains; for others, glory. And in the same chapter he calls "the underworld" the place which is not seen, which all souls stripped of their bodies seek. Which words, indeed, one ought to refer to the *consummated* felicity — and misery — of soul and body [together]; for I would not believe that Ambrose held that opinion which these words at first sight present,[2] since he himself, in many places, asserts that the souls of the saints enjoy the divine sight even before the resurrection — as in epistle 59, to the Thessalonians, on the death of Acholius, where he says: "Acholius, then, is an inhabitant of those on high, a possessor of that eternal city of Jerusalem which is in heaven: he sees there the immense measure of its city, pure gold, precious stone, perpetual light without a Sun; and all these things, indeed, [were] known to him long since, but now [he sees them] face to face." And in the commentaries on the epistle to the Philippians,[3] upon that saying "I desire to be dissolved," he says of Paul: "He has the desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ — esteeming it much better, that he might now be present with God [and] enjoy the longed-for promises." And in the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 13, he says: "The saints, going

forth from this world, will find [it] more necessary [i.e. will find far more] than they now suppose — as John the Apostle said of the Savior, 'Then they shall see him as he is.'"[4] *Seek the argument of this Annotation treated more fully below, in Annotation 163 of this book, and in Annotations 264 and 345 of the following book.*

◊ **1. Left margin:** 4 Esdras 4.

◊ **2. Left margin:** St. Ambrose asserts that the souls of the saints enjoy eternal beatitude before the day of judgment.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Philippians 1.

◊ **4. Left margin:** 1 John 3:[2] ("then they shall see him as he is").

Annotation LXV [contents]

"Is it not so that, if you do well, you shall receive?" — Genesis 4:7

A passage from the fourth chapter of Genesis, badly translated by the Seventy.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, in the interpretation of that sentence of God which **Jerome** translated — "Is it not so that, if you do well, you shall receive? but if [you do] ill, shall not your sin at once be present at the doors? but its appetite [shall be] under you, and you shall have dominion over it" — threw everything into confusion, and strayed vehemently from the truth of the Hebrew context, rendering thus: **οὐκ ἀὲν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἥμαρτες· ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὰ ἡ ἐποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ** — that is, "Hast thou not sinned, if thou hast rightly offered, but not rightly divided? Be still: to thee [is] its returning."[5] Of which words there is nothing in the Hebrew, as Jerome testifies in the *Hebrew Questions*. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, indicating the cause of this error, brought forward the annotation written below: "Who would be of so keen a genius as to be able to dig out any sense from these words? What, I beseech, is 'to thee [is] its returning'? — of which [sin] it [the passage] had made no mention. For where in the Hebrew it is 'At the doors your sin lies down,' they rendered ἡσύχασον, that is, 'Be still.'" We see, therefore, how necessary Jerome's edition was. From this passage, certainly, it is also detected that the Septuagint did not so exquisitely understand Hebrew grammar; the cause, therefore, that they translated this passage so variously and so obscurely proceeded from [ignorance of] grammar.

◊ **5. Right margin:** The Septuagint badly translated [it]. [This right-margin phrase is the completion of the dispute-title at [^6], which the column break splits: the left margin carries "Periodus ex 4. Gen. cap. à," finished here by "LXX malè translata."]

For what Jerome translated — "Is it not so, if you do well" (the comma being placed here) — "Is it not so, if you make a good offering" (namely שְׂאֵת, *se'et*) — they rendered ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς [if you rightly offer]. The second part — "but if you do not rightly divide" (וְאִם־לֹא תֵיטִיב לַפֶּתַח, *ve-im lo theitiv la-pettach*) — these Hebrew words they understood in this manner: "And if you do not do well unto dividing." For this word *pettach* [פֶּתַח], since it is a verbal noun signifying a "door," they thought to be the infinitive פתה, *phata*, that is, "to open" — so that they translated, "And if you do not do well unto opening"; and it is a very great hallucination [blunder]. And that they render "you have sinned," and not "sin," happened on the same occasion: for חָטָאת, *chatath*, they thought to be the second person from חטא, *chata*, that is, "he sinned" — but *chatath* means "sin" [the noun], whereas *chatatha* is the second person, "you have sinned." And they easily fell into this error, since in their time the Hebrew codices did not have the little marks — that is, the vowels. And that they render "Be still," that is רֹבֵץ, *robetz* — which is a participle — they reckoned to be the imperative; whereas the imperative is formed thus, רִבּוּץ, *rebutz*, but the participle [is] *robetz*. But why did they not consider that there would be no sense to their words, if they were translated in that manner?

Annotation LXVI [contents]

"Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go forth abroad." — Genesis 4:8

The clause "let us go out into the field," superfluously added by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, to that which is here read, "And Cain said to Abel his brother," superfluously added of their own, **Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον** — that is, "Let us go forth into the field"; and the interpreter of our Vulgate edition, following them, said, "Let us go forth abroad" — neither of which is in the Hebrew reading: in which only this is read, "Cain said to Abel his brother"; nor is it added what he said, but it must be supplied (says Jerome) [with] those things which God himself had spoken to him. **Origen** asserts that these words, added here by the Septuagint, are had in the secret [apocryphal] scriptures of the Hebrews. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, says that the words which Cain spoke to Abel are found in the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition: in which he asserts these are read: "Cain said to Abel his brother, 'There is no justice, nor a judge, nor another world [age]; neither shall the just receive rewards, nor shall the wicked pay penalties'"; and then he slew him. But in →

[…continues on folio 549 (PDF p. 366): the rest of Annotatio LXVI — the Chaldaic version and the fratricide.]

---

*(printed folio 549 [PDF p. 366], two columns above, comparative tables below. **Annot. LXVI–LXIX** (Gen 4:8–5:29): the uncertain "Chaldaic edition" of Cain's speech; the LXX's "groaning and trembling" for Cain; the LXX's corrupt antediluvian chronology (tabulated against the Hebrew, with the Greek Fathers' divergent computations); and the naming of Noah.)*

(folio 549, left column → right column, then the full-width tables)

Annotation LXVI (continued)

But it is uncertain of which edition Augustine speaks; for that Chaldaic translation which is now circulated, in the Complutensian copies, has none of these things.

Annotation LXVII [contents]

"A vagabond and a fugitive shalt thou be." — Genesis 4:12

The clause "vagabond and fugitive," badly rendered by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, for that which is had in Hebrew נָע וָנָד, *na va-nad*, that is, "A vagabond and a fugitive shalt thou be" — translated with little consonance [inaccurately], **Στένων καὶ τρέμων**, that is, "Groaning and trembling." Hence arose among the Greek expositors an opinion — namely, that Cain, after his brother was slain, never ceased from tears and groans, but was perpetually tormented with a trembling of the body, the frame of his limbs being dissolved, on account of the fratricide committed.

Annotation LXVIII [contents]

"And Seth lived, after he begot Enos." — Genesis 5:7

The years of the illustrious men wrongly reckoned by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, since they are found corrupt in many places, are especially faulty in this fifth chapter, and most of all depraved concerning the reckoning of the years which the illustrious men lived from Adam up to the Flood: in which they entirely depart from the most true reckoning of the Hebrew context, as appears in the table set below. In it, in the first place, is set the reckoning of the years according to the Hebrew truth; in the second, the reckoning of the years of the Seventy interpreters; in the third, the difference of the years — according to the excess and defect of each reckoning.

*(In the difference column, "Desunt / Def." = the Septuagint falls **short** by that many years; "Superant / Super." = the Septuagint **exceeds** by that many.)*

Hebrew reckoning	Hebr.	LXX	Difference
Seth, after begetting Enos, lived	807	707	Desunt 100
Enos, before begetting Cainan, lived	90	190	Superant 100
Enos, after begetting Cainan	815	715	Desunt 100
Cainan, before begetting Mahalalel	70	170	Super. 100
Cainan, after begetting Mahalalel	840	740	Def. 100
Mahalalel, before begetting Jared	65	165	Super. 100
Mahalalel, after begetting Jared	830	730	Def. 100
Jared, before begetting Enoch	62	162	Super. 100
Enoch, before begetting Methuselah	65	165	Def. 100 *[sic]*
Enoch, after begetting Methuselah	300	200	Super. 100 *[sic]*
Methuselah, before begetting Lamech	187	167	Def. 20
Methuselah, after begetting Lamech	782	802	Super. 20
Lamech, before begetting Noah	182	188	Super. 6
Lamech, after begetting Noah	570	565	Def. 5
The whole life of Lamech	777	753	Def. 24

*(In the two Enoch rows the original swaps the labels: the Septuagint in fact **exceeds** by 100 before Methuselah's birth (65 → 165) and **falls short** by 100 after it (300 → 200); the printed "Def." and "Super." are transposed.)*

Two errors emerged from this depraved enumeration of the Seventy interpreters.[1] The former of these — as Jerome noted in the *Hebrew Questions* — is this: that from this reckoning it is manifestly proved that Methuselah lived fourteen years after the Flood,[2] whereas Moses writes that only eight souls (among whom he was not) were saved in the ark. Which matter gave birth to that question, famous among the ancients — "On the years of Methuselah" — and ventilated by the disputation of all the churches. The second error is the diversity — not to say the falsity — of the chronography of the Greek Fathers, namely of Julius Africanus, Origen, and Eusebius: who, in reckoning the years from the beginning of the world up to the birth of Abraham, count 3314 years; but, on the contrary, Philo and the rest of the Jews, according to the Hebrew truth of divine Scripture, compute from the founding of the world to the birth of Abraham 1955 years — so that the reckoning of the Greeks exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by one thousand two hundred and thirty-six years.[3] Augustine, in book 15 of *The City of God*, chapter 13, judges that this depravation happened in the codices of the Septuagint by the fault of those who first copied them out from the Library of Ptolemy. But, that you may more clearly know how varied and manifold a diversity of reckonings the Greek corruption of the numbers has given birth to for us, it has pleased [me] here to add, from diverse chronographers, the

calculation of the years from the founding of the world up to the happy nativity of Christ, arranged according to the series of the numbers [in ascending order].[4]

◊ **1. Left margin:** From the reckoning of the Septuagint interpreters two errors emerged.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Methuselah did not live after the Flood.

◊ **3. Left margin:** The Greek reckoning exceeds the Hebrew by 1236 years. — *[The two totals given in the text, 3314 and 1955, differ by 1359, not 1236; the discrepancy is in the original.]*

◊ **4. Left margin:** From the founding of the world to the nativity of Christ the Lord, how many years have flowed — there is the greatest disagreement about the sum.

Years	Authority (creation → the Nativity of Christ)
3707	Rabbi Naasson, in the Paschal Cycle
3754	Rabbi Abraham, in the *Cabala*
1760	the common Chronicle of the Hebrews *[sic — read 3760, the Jewish era]*
3952	Jerome and Bede
3958	Giovanni Pico della Mirandola
3960	Ioannes Lucidus
3962	the Abbot of Ursperg *(whom Sixtus follows as the more exact, in book 1, in enumerating the times of the authors of divine Scripture)*
3974	Theophilus, *To Autolycus*
3989	Charles de Bovelles (Carolus Bovillus)
4103	Josephus, son of Matthias [Flavius Josephus]
4320	Odiaton the Astronomer
4697	Cassiodorus
4830	Origen, on Matthew
5029	Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis
5049	Paulus Orosius
5195	Philo the Jew
5196	Isidore of Seville
5199	Eusebius of Caesarea
5201	Johannes Nauclerus
5328	Albumasar the Astronomer
5353	Augustine
5500	Jordanes (Iornandes)
5600	Suidas
5800	Lactantius
5801	Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia
6984	Alfonso, King of Spain

Annotation LXIX

"He called his name Noah, saying: This one shall comfort us from the works and labors of our hands, in the land which the Lord hath cursed." — Genesis 5:29

[…the body of Annotatio LXIX begins on folio 550 (PDF p. 367).]

*(printed folio 550 [PDF p. 367]. **Annot. LXIX–LXXIII** (Gen 5:29–6:2): Giorgio on the curse lifted in Noah's day (refuted; Diodore: Noah invented the plough); the LXX "angels of God" for "sons of God," breeding the fallen-angel controversy; Philo's aerial souls and animate stars; Chrysostom denying angels are called "sons of God"; and whether wicked angels can couple with women → folio 551.)*

(folio 550, left column → right column)

Annotation LXIX (continued) [contents]

Francesco Giorgio, in the first volume, Problem 58, gathers from these words that the curse which God inflicted on the earth for Adam's sin lasted until the birth of Noah, and, he living, was entirely removed.[1] This he makes persuasive from the fact that God — who never before the times of Noah willed to accept the oblation of the fruits of the earth, as may be known from Cain's gifts — at length, from Noah himself and thereafter from his posterity, received most gratefully the oblations of the fruits of the earth. But it appears that an exposition of this kind is forced and violent: both because that old curse of the earth still remains[2] — which, unless it be cultivated by many and assiduous labors of men, denies sustenance to the human race — and because nowhere in the sacred letters is it read that Noah offered to God the fruits of the earth, but only cattle and birds.[3] The true and genuine sense, therefore, of the proposed clause is that which **Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus**, brought forward — namely, that Noah, first of all, joined the beasts to the plough, and cut the earth with the ploughshare:[4] by which salutary invention he wonderfully consoled the human race from the works and labors of [their] hands, because the hands of men it freed from the hard and heavy labors of digging the earth.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether the curse of the earth was removed under Noah, as Francesco Giorgio thought.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The curse of the earth has not yet been removed.

◊ **3. Left margin:** It is not written that Noah offered to God the fruits of the earth.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Noah, first of all, cut the earth with the ploughshare.

Annotation LXX [contents]

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, in the older edition — which Philo the Jew and Eusebius of Caesarea followed — for that which is read in Hebrew, בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים *Bene ha-elohim*, that is, "Sons of God," translated **οἱ ἀγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ**, that is, "Angels of God"; which translation, as Jerome testifies, Aquila imitated, rendering "Sons of gods," understanding by "gods" the Angels. This [rendering] both very many of the Greeks (as Procopius reports) and many of the Latins — among whom Ambrose and Augustine — received and expounded. But this appellation of "Angels," wrongly set down, gave birth to the greatest questions, and drew the minds of men into various opinions, and even errors. For some thought that by the name of "Angels" are signified the holy Angels, who then first sinned with women, and on that account fell from heaven — as **Lactantius**. Some [understood] apostate Angels, or demons cast down from heaven immediately from the founding of the world, who, coupling with women, begot giants — as **Eusebius**. But of this we shall speak more fully below, in Annotations 73 and 77 of this book.

Annotation LXXI [contents]

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels are aerial souls, as Philo thought; or whether the stars are animate, as the same [Philo] reckoned.

Philo, in the book *On Giants*, explaining this, says that the sons of God — whom here Moses [calls] Angels, but the Philosophers call *Genii* [spirits] — are aerial souls which have descended into bodies. Concerning which opinion, see below. Philo in the same place asserts that the stars are animate, in these words: "Heaven has the stars; for these are wholly immortal and divine souls, and therefore are moved in a circle: because this motion is akin to mind; for the mind of each of these is most perfect." The same thing he holds in the book *On the Making of the Six Days* [*On the Creation*], and in the book *On Dreams*. On which matter, consult Annotation 108 of this book.

Annotation LXXII [contents]

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels are called "sons of God" in the sacred letters.

Chrysostom, in the twenty-second homily on Genesis, refuting those who said that by the "sons of God" whom Moses here mentions, not men but Angels must be understood, says that Angels were never in divine Scripture called "sons of God" — nay, not even "sons." Yet the contrary is found, once and again, in the book of Job: in whose second chapter it is read concerning the angels, "When on a certain day the sons of God had come, and stood before the Lord, Satan also was present among them";[5] and in the same volume, chapter 38, concerning the Angels it is added, "When the morning stars praised me, and all the sons of God jubilated."[6] It appears that Chrysostom was in this deceived by the Septuagint edition: in which, for that which we have according to the Hebrew truth — "When the sons of God had come" — it is written ἦλθον οἀ ἰγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, "The angels of God came"; and where Jerome, from the Hebrew source, translated "And all the sons of God jubilated," the Septuagint rendered ὅτε ᾔνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου, that is, "When all my angels praised me with a loud voice." Nor does that favor Chrysostom which Paul writes to the Hebrews, "To which of the angels did he ever say, Thou art my Son?"[7] — since there he does not deny that the angels are called sons of God by grace, but only [denies it] by nature.[8] For in this manner Christ alone is called, and is, [the] Son.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Job 2:1.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Job 38:7.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Hebrews 1:5.

◊ **8. Right margin:** The Apostle, Hebrews 1, denies that the Angels are sons of God by nature — for this is proper to Christ the Lord.

Annotation LXXIII [contents]

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men, took to themselves wives." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels can have intercourse with women.

Chrysostom, in the twenty-second homily on Genesis, elucidating this passage, seems to teach that it is not only absurd, but even impossible, that wicked angels should exercise coitus with women — writing thus: "It is full of madness to say that angels cast down from heaven had commerce with women, and that that incorporeal nature is coupled to bodies; for it is not possible that that incorporeal nature should ever have concupiscence." And a little after: "He would be very insane who should approve such words, full of madness — that an incorporeal and spiritual nature should bear the embrace of a body." **Cornelius Agrippa**, a follower of the Lutheran heresy,[9] in that book which he published entitled *Against the Inquisitors of Witches*, twists this opinion of John [Chrysostom] against those who persecute and punish malefic women for this reason — that it has been discovered that they have venereal commerce with demons. Which matter he himself mocks as fabulous, and as sprung from the dreams and imaginations of raving old women: who,

since they are often deceived while sleeping through dreams, and sometimes also, while awake, are deluded by the imagination of vehement lust, nevertheless think that those things truly happened to them which were performed by imagination alone. This error the same author strives to establish, by adding some testimonies of ancient authors who seem to agree with Chrysostom. Among these the chief is **John Cassian**, a disciple of Chrysostom,[10] in whose twelfth book of the *Conferences*, chapter 8, this is had: "In no way is it to be believed that spiritual natures →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Cornelius Agrippa, a Lutheran.

◊ **10. Right margin:** Cassian was a disciple of Chrysostom.

[…continues on folio 551 (PDF p. 368): the rest of Cassian's testimony and Sixtus's reply (Annotatio LXXIII).]

---

*(printed folio 551 [PDF p. 368], the whole page on **Annot. LXXIII** (Gen 6:2, whether angels/demons couple with women). Cassian, Philastrius, Cyril, and the Canon Episcopi (the night-riding Diana delusion) are marshalled; Sixtus turns the tables on Agrippa (Augustine on incubi; Innocent VIII's bull) and gives the Church's teaching: demons transfer a man's seed, so any child is his → folio 552.)*

(folio 551, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIII (continued)

[Cassian: "In no way is it to be believed that spiritual] natures can naturally couple with women; since, if at some time this could have happened according to the letter, how does it now also come to pass — whether frequently or rarely — that this same thing does not occur, and that some are born without seed or the coitus of a man? Similarly we should discern [some] conceived of women by [the agency of] demons."

A similar force have the things which **Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia**, in chapter 108 of his *Catalogue against Heresies*, recounts in this manner: "There is another heresy, which asserts concerning the Giants that Angels mingled themselves with women before the Flood, and that thence the giants were born. But if anyone shall think that the Angels so sinned, transformed into flesh, and remained in it — or shall believe them to have been made carnal in this way — he decrees the history by a violent reasoning, just as the lies of the pagans and poets also assert that gods and goddesses, transformed, committed nefarious marriages: for if it was ever done, it will not be doubtful that it is done now also; but what was never done, neither is it manifest that it is done now." Nor from these do those things dissent which **Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria**, discoursed to nearly the same opinion, in the second book of the *Allegories on the Pentateuch*, sermon 1. To these is added the authority of the **Council of Ancyra**, detesting the insane opinion of certain poisoning women, who assert that by night, through long spaces of lands, they are led by wicked spirits to certain places, where they indulge with demons in various pleasures, feasts, and lusts. The words of this council are related in the Decrees of the pontiffs, cause 26, question 5,[1] in this order: "This also must not be omitted — that certain wicked women, turned back after Satan, seduced by the illusions and phantasms of demons, believe and profess that in the nocturnal hours they ride with **Diana**, the goddess of the pagans, or with **Herodias**, or with an innumerable multitude of women, upon certain beasts, and pass over the spaces of many lands in the untimely silence of night, and obey her commands, and are summoned to her service on certain nights. Wherefore let the priests, through the churches committed to them, preach to the people of God that they may know all these things to be false, and that such phantasms are inflicted upon the minds of the faithful by the malignant spirit. For Satan himself transfigures himself into an Angel of light, and, when he has seized the mind of any woman and subjugated her to himself through unbelief, he immediately transfigures himself into the appearances and likenesses of diverse persons, and, deluding through dreams the mind which he holds captive — showing now glad, now sad things, now known, now unknown persons — leads it through byways; and since it is only the unbelieving spirit that suffers this, [the woman] thinks that

this happens not in the mind but in the body. For who, in dreams and nocturnal visions, is not led outside himself, and sees many things while sleeping which he had never seen while waking?"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Read Augustine, book 18 of *The City of God*, chapter 18.

With these testimonies, therefore, **Agrippa** uses for the defense of the Witches. Whose error, indeed, **Augustine** most openly refutes, in book 15 of *The City of God*, chapter 23, in these words: "That Angels have appeared to men in such bodies that they could not only be seen but even touched, the sacred Scripture most truly testifies. And since it is a very frequent report — and many affirm that they have experienced, or have heard from those who had experienced (of whose credibility there is no doubting) — that **Sylvans and Fauns**, whom [people] commonly call *incubi*, have often been wicked toward women, and have desired and accomplished intercourse with them; and that certain demons, whom the Gauls name **Dusii**, assiduously attempt and accomplish this uncleanness: so many and such [persons] affirm it, that to deny it would seem impudence." There is also extant a decretal epistle of **Pope Innocent VIII** against the heresy of malefic women, in which these words are read: "Not without great trouble has it come to our hearing that very many persons of both sexes, unmindful of their own salvation and deviating from the catholic faith, abuse themselves with Demons, incubi, and succubi. Wherefore, lest the stain of this heretical depravity diffuse its poisons to the ruin of souls, wishing (as it lies upon our office) to provide with fitting remedies, we decree that the inquisitors deputed by us execute the due office of inquisition against persons of this kind."

This is the undoubted determination of Augustine, of Innocent, and of the whole catholic Church: from which the authorities adduced by Agrippa in no way dissent. For neither Chrysostom nor Philastrius deny that women can couple with demons,[2] but they only refute those who asserted that women were loved by the good and blessed Angels, and entered into with foul unions — since it is impossible that those incorporeal minds, the divine love being cast off (in which they had once been immovably confirmed through the grace of God), should have lowered themselves to the impure lust of women, the Angelic nature being changed into human form according to the fables of the poetic transformations. But as for what **Cassian** wrote — that it is in no way to be believed that spiritual natures couple with women — this is not to be so taken that we should understand that Demons can in no way at all mingle with women, but [only] not in the natural manner of animals,[3] that is, by emitting seed of their own substance: as he himself openly indicated, by adding that word "Naturally." For demons can, as Augustine says, not only couple with women, but even generate from them true human sons — not by the power of their own seed (which they have none of from themselves), but by the aid of some seed which they, foully lying under [as succubi] to men, have received, and, lying upon [as incubi] women, have poured in the seed received; so that, as Augustine says in the third book *On the Trinity*, God so disposing, he who is born may not be the son of the demon, but the son of that man from whom the seed was taken.[4] But to that which is brought forward from the Council of Ancyra, we respond: that the sect of women condemned by the command of the Synod is different from that which is defiled by intercourse with Demons. For that [former sect], as is said in that decree, thought that it was summoned by night — by beasts carrying [them] — to the cult of Herodias and Diana, and that the creatures of God could be transformed by another than by God the Creator into various forms of living things; but of intercourse with demons the synod makes no mention. Moreover, that Agrippa contends that that sect is the same with this one matters either little or nothing. This suffices: that that Synod does not decree that those carryings and transportations of women cannot happen corporeally, nor does it define that they happen always by imagination alone and never in the body; but it only affirms that those women are deceived by false imaginations — which we also do not deny, among →

◊ **2. Right margin:** Chrysostom and Philastrius do not deny that women can couple with demons.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Demons cannot mingle with women so as to emit seed of their own substance.

◊ **4. Right margin:** He who is born from the mingling of a woman and a demon is the son of that man from whom the seed was taken.

[…continues on folio 552 (PDF p. 369): the rest of Sixtus's reply on the witches' transportations (Annotatio LXXIII).]

---

*(printed folio 552 [PDF p. 369]. **Annot. LXXIII–LXXVII** (Gen 6:3–4): the demon-intercourse question closed; the Hebrew of Gen 6:3 ("my spirit shall not judge... forever") as clemency; the "120 years" as a lifespan-cap (refuted); Origen's giants as merely impious men (Theodoret: truly huge); and Ambrose on giants begotten of angels and women → folio 553.)*

(folio 552, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIII (continued)

[which we also do not deny] sometimes happens; nay, we assert that women of this kind have sometimes lain motionless at home, while they believed themselves carried off into remote regions.

Annotation LXXIV [contents]

"My spirit shall not remain in man." — Genesis 6:3

The clause "My spirit shall not remain," etc., badly rendered.

The **Latin** interpreter of our Vulgate edition, for that which is had in Hebrew לֹא־יָדוֹן רוּחִי—, *Lo yadon ruchi* — translated, "My spirit shall not remain in man, because he is flesh"; which the **Septuagint** rendered, οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις [my spirit shall not abide among men]. Which version **Jerome**, in the *Hebrew Questions*, rejects in these words: "In the Hebrew it is written, 'My spirit shall not judge these men forever, because they are flesh.' That is: because the condition in man is fragile, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but will here repay them what they deserve. Therefore it sounds not of severity, as is read in our codices, but of the clemency of God — while the sinner is here visited [chastised] for his own crime; whence [God], angry, also speaks to certain ones: 'I will not visit your daughters when they have fornicated, and your spouses when they have committed adultery' [Hosea 4:14];[1] and in another place: 'I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes; nevertheless I will not scatter my mercy from them' [Psalm 88:33]."[2] These things Jerome [says]: with whom **Rabbi Salomon** [Rashi] agrees, who expounds this to mean "My spirit shall not dispute, shall not contend in judgment." But the Chaldaic [Aramaic] interpretation agrees with our edition, in which it is had: "This most wicked generation shall not persist before me."

◊ **1. Left margin:** Hosea 4:14.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Psalm 88:33 [Vulgate; = Psalm 89:32].

Annotation LXXV [contents]

"Their days shall be a hundred and twenty years." — Genesis 6:3

Whether God restricted the life of man to 120 years.

Josephus, in the first book of the *Antiquities*, explaining this passage, says that God, angry with the human race, circumscribed the life of men within a shorter span, and — the longevity of living which they had before the Flood being abrogated — restricted it within a hundred and twenty years. This same opinion, expounding this very [text], **Lactantius Firmianus** followed, in book 2 of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 14; and **Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus** — which opinion **Chrysostom**, in homily 20, disapproves, and **Jerome**, in the book of *Hebrew Questions*, refutes by the example of the many who lived far more years after the Flood, such as **Abraham**, whose life reached up to the hundred and seventy-fifth year.[3]

◊ **3. Left margin:** Genesis 25:7.

Annotation LXXVI [contents]

"But there were giants upon the earth." — Genesis 6:4

Whether the giants were men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size.

Origen — as Gennadius, Bishop of Constantinople, reports in the Greek *Catena on the Octateuch* — weighing this passage in the *Tomes on Genesis*, judged that the Giants were not men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size, but certain wicked and impious men, despisers of God, and plainly atheists. This opinion, Origen's name being suppressed, **Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus**, disapproves, in question 48 on Genesis, in these plain words: "Some say that the Giants are haters of God, and men who are adversaries of God — [those] who have understood these things thus do not say that they had bodies larger than other men. But I, when I hear Scripture saying of **Og** that he was descended from the Giants, and that his bed was of iron, having a length of nine cubits and a breadth of four cubits [Deuteronomy 3:11];[4] when I hear the explorers narrating that they were, in the sight of the Giants, as locusts [Numbers 13:33];[5] and of **Goliath**, that he had a length of six cubits and a span [1 Samuel 17:4][6] — I judge that there were certain very-huge men, God wisely dispensing this: that they might know God, as omnipotent, to have distributed so great a measure to men. For it was very easy for him to create even larger men; but, that he might cut off pride and restrain arrogance, he did not give men the greatest bodies. For if, endowed with small bodies, they lift themselves up not only against one another but against God the Creator, what would they not have committed, if they had been allotted the greatest bodies?" These things Theodoret. We have written more fully on this matter in the volume of *Physical Questions* which we have gathered upon the divine scriptures.[7]

◊ **4. Left margin:** Deuteronomy 3:11.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Numbers 13:33.

◊ **6. Right margin:** 1 Samuel 17:4.

◊ **7. Right margin:** The author's book of *Physical Questions* has not yet come to light [been published].

Annotation LXXVII [contents]

"But there were giants upon the earth." — Genesis 6:4

Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women.

Ambrose, in the first book *On Noah and the Ark*, chapter 4, narrating this passage, seems to hand down that the Giants who preceded the Flood were procreated from the intercourse of Angels and women. Which opinion **St. Philastrius**, Bishop of Brescia, in chapter 108 of his *Catalogue*, reckons among the heresies. But these are Ambrose's words: "The founder of divine Scripture does not wish those Giants to be seen, in the manner of the poets, as sons of the earth; but asserts them to have been generated from Angels and women, etc." And elsewhere too Ambrose indicates that the cause of the Angelic ruin, and of the fall from the heavens, happened from this — that angels coupled foully with women — as in the first book *On Virgins*, not far from the end: in which place, comparing among themselves the merits of the continence of virgins and the incontinence of the Angels, he says: "Why should I pursue the praise of chastity with more [words]? For chastity made the Angels. He who kept it is an Angel; he who lost it is a Devil. How illustrious it is, moreover, that Angels, on account of their intemperance, fell from heaven into the world, [while] virgins, on account of their chastity, passed from the world into heaven." From this Ambrosian opinion **Chrysostom** does not much differ, in the homily delivered on the feast of the beheading of John the Baptist, when he says: "Woman laid low not only men, but even Angels from heaven." There are those to whom it seems that Ambrose took this from **Philo**, **Lactantius**, and **Eusebius** — of whom the first, in the book *On Giants*, has it thus: "'The Angels of God saw the daughters of men,' etc. — whom other philosophers [call] *genii*, Moses is wont to call Angels. These are souls flying through the air; nor is there [any reason] why anyone should think this fabulous: for it is necessary that the whole world, in all its parts, should have animate beings — the earth, terrestrial [ones]; the sea, aquatic [ones]; fire, [beings] born of fire, of which very many are reported to be

born in Macedonia; likewise heaven, the stars — for these are wholly immortal and divine souls. Accordingly it necessarily follows that the air too is full of its own living beings, which are invisible to us. Certain of these, therefore, descended into bodies." Thus Philo writes. But **Lactantius**, in the se[cond book] →

[…continues on folio 553 (PDF p. 370): Lactantius and Eusebius on the angels-and-giants opinion (Annotatio LXXVII).]

---

*(printed folio 553 [PDF p. 370]. **Annot. LXXVII–LXXIX** (Gen 6:4–7:11): the "angels sinned with women" view (piled from many Fathers but recoiled from by Ambrose — the fall was pride, not lust; Sixtus resolves "sons of God" = the godly line of Seth); Chrysostom on the Cherubim not beholding God (abused by the Armenians); and the LXX's corrupt Flood date → folio 554.)*

(folio 553, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXVII (continued)

[But **Lactantius**], in the second book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 15, speaks of this matter thus: "When, therefore, the number of men had begun to increase, God — foreseeing lest the Devil (to whom from the beginning he had given power over the earth) should either corrupt or scatter the men whom he had made in the beginning — sent Angels for the protection and cultivation of the human race; to whom he enjoined, before all, that they should not, defiled by the contagion of the earth, lose the dignity of their heavenly substance. And so, while they dwelt among men, that most deceitful ruler of the earth, by very habit, gradually enticed them to vices, and polluted them with the embraces of women; then, not received back into heaven on account of the sins in which they had immersed themselves, they fell to the earth. Thus the Devil made them, from Angels of God, his own satellites and ministers." These things Lactantius: before whom, many years [earlier], the same had been held by **Justin Martyr**, in the Apology to the Roman Senate, and in the apology to Antoninus Pius; and by **Clement of Alexandria**, in the third and fifth volumes of the *Stromata* — writing most clearly that the angels sinned with women. To both subscribed **Tertullian the African** and **Methodius, Bishop of Olympus**. Of whom the former, in the book *On the Dress of Women*, says, "The Angels rushed from heaven to the daughters of men, and, after the exhausted moments of their lusts, sighed for heaven"; and here, in the sermon *On the Resurrection*, he says: "The Devil was made wicked concerning the administration of the things committed to him, and conceived envy against us — just as also those who afterward loved flesh, [and] on account of intercourse consorted in love with the daughters of men." Agreeing with these, **Eusebius of Caesarea**, in the fifth volume of the *Evangelical Preparation*, set down these words: "Which matter **Plutarch** the more confirms, saying that the fabulous discourses about the gods signify certain things done by Demons in most ancient times, and that the things sung of the Giants and Titans were operations of Demons. Whence a suspicion has sometimes fallen upon me, whether these be not the very things which, done before the Flood by the Giants, the divine scripture touched upon — concerning which it is said: 'But when the angels of God had seen the daughters of men, that they were beautiful, they chose for themselves wives out of them, from whom were procreated the most famous Giants of the age.' For someone will suspect that they, and their spirits, are those who were afterward called Gods by men, and that their conflicts, tumults, and wars are those which are fabulously written of the gods." Thus far Eusebius: from whose opinion I judge that **Ambrose** recoiled — because in many places, but most of all in the exposition of Psalm 118, sermon 7, in which, speaking of the cause of the Angelic fall, he demonstrates that it was not lust, but pride,[1] saying thus: "The devil himself, through pride, lost the grace of his nature; for when he says, 'I will place my throne above the clouds, and I will be like the Most High' [Isaiah 14:14],[2] he fell from the fellowship of the Angels." And in epistle 84, to Demetrias, showing that the devil fell through

pride before man's fall, he says: "Pride took its beginning from the devil, who — since he was pleased with his own power and dignity, which he had received from the Creator, and compared himself to the glory of his author — together with those Angels whom he had drawn into the consent of his impiety, was cast down from the heavenly sublimity. And therefore he was able to harm the first men, because he persuaded them, ill-believing, that they would become better if they leaped out into the liberty of their own will, than if they remained in the custody of the given law."

◊ **1. Left margin:** The cause of the Angelic fall, in St. Ambrose's judgment, was pride.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Isaiah 14:14.

Accordingly, lest the aforesaid words of Ambrose move anyone, one must know that he understood, by "Angels," not spiritual and heavenly substances, but illustrious men and worshippers of the one God, descending from the holy stock of Seth[3] — whom, because they had remained until that day in the faith and worship of the one God (as we have already said), Moses called בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים: *Bene elohim*, that is, "Sons of God"; [and] the older edition of the Seventy interpreters said τοὺς ἀγγέλους Θεοῦ [the angels of God]; the Italic edition — which Augustine expounded in the fifteenth book *On the City of God*, chapter 23 — called [them] "Angels of God"; and Ambrose, following this, called the parents of the Giants "angels." Which his own words also show, when, in the book *On Noah and the Ark*, in that place which we cited above, he added: "Scripture usually calls the sons of God, or faithful men, 'Angels,' because souls are generated from no man." To this exposition **Augustine** assents, in the *Questions on Genesis*, question 3, in this manner: "It is asked how the Angels could lie with the daughters of men, whence the Giants are reported to have been born — although some codices, both Latin and Greek, do not have 'Angels' but 'Sons of God': whom certain [interpreters], for solving this question, believed to have been just men, who could also be called by the name of 'Angels.' For of the man John it is written, 'Behold, I send my Angel,' etc.[4] Whence it is more credible that just men — called either 'Angels' or 'sons of God,' [and] fallen through concupiscence — sinned with women, than that Angels, not having flesh, could have descended to that sin; although concerning certain Demons, who are troublesome to women, so many things are said by many, that it is not easy to define an opinion on this matter."

◊ **3. Right margin:** St. Ambrose, by the name of "Angels," understood illustrious men and worshippers of the one God.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Malachi 3:[1].

Annotation LXXVIII [contents]

"Noah a just man, and perfect." — Genesis 6:9

Whether God can be seen by the angels.

Chrysostom, at the end of the 23rd homily on Genesis, explaining this, has this proposition: "The flashing majesty of the divine glory neither the Cherubim nor those incorporeal powers can see; but they cover their opposed faces, their wings being set against [it]." The **Armenian heretics**, who taught that God is not seen by the blessed, used this and very many other similar sentences of Chrysostom;[5] the elucidation of which you have in Annotation 182 of the following book.

◊ **5. Right margin:** The Armenians denied that God is seen by the blessed.

Annotation LXXIX [contents]

"In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life." — Genesis 7:11

The number of the years and the months of the Flood [is] corrupted.

The **Septuagint** interpreters — where we, according to the Hebrew truth, have "In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month," etc. — are faulty, and depraved in the number both of the years and of the months. For it has ἐν τέ ᾧνέ ἰξακοσιοστἔ ᾧτει ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ Νῶε, τῷ

δευτέρῳ μηνί, ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός — that is, "In the six-hundred-and-first year in the life of Noah, in the second month, on the twenty-seventh of the month." There is therefore here a twofold error. For first there is made an addition of one year, whereas the sacred letters most openly attest that Noah entered the ark in the six-hundredth year of his life, and that in the same year the Flood inundated. Then [there] is an error in the number of the days of the month, an addition of ten days being made →

[…continues on folio 554 (PDF p. 371): the rest of the Septuagint's Flood-date error (Annotatio LXXIX).]

---

*(printed folio 554 [PDF p. 371]. **Annot. LXXIX–LXXXIV** (Gen 7:11–8:11): the LXX's Flood-date errors; Procopius on an immovable heaven; the constellations as causes of the Flood (d'Ailly, William of Auvergne, the Jupiter–Saturn conjunction condemned as heretical); the LXX's ten-day error at the ark's resting; the raven's "did not return"; and the dove with the olive branch.)*

(folio 554, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIX (continued)

[an addition of ten days being made] above the seven and ten [seventeen] days which are reckoned in the Hebrew. The first error arises because, a little below, in chapter 8 — when now one year had been completed — it is said, ἐν τέ ᾧνὶ καέ ἰξακοσιοστᾖ ᾧτει, etc., that is, "In the six-hundred-and-first year of Noah's life, in the first month, on the first day of that month, the water failed" [Genesis 8:13].[1] The second error similarly arises because, below in the same chapter 8, it is written, "In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dried" [Genesis 8:14].[2] Chrysostom, however, and Procopius follow the number of the Greek codices.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Genesis 8:13.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Genesis 8:14.

Annotation LXXX [contents]

"The floodgates of heaven were opened." — Genesis 7:11

Whether heaven is spherical and mobile.

Procopius of Gaza, explaining this, speaks thus: "Accordingly, those think wrongly who imagine heaven [to be] spherical and mobile; for heaven stands immovable, and it is the path of the stars running their course in it." See what we noted above on this, in the first chapter of Genesis, Annotation 14.

Annotation LXXXI [contents]

"The floodgates of heaven were opened." — Genesis 7:11

Whether the Noachic Flood could have been foreknown from observation of the stars, as Pierre d'Ailly thought.

Peter of Ailly [Pierre d'Ailly], Cardinal-Priest, disputing in the questions on Genesis upon this sentence, asserts that, although Noah foreknew the coming Flood by prophetic revelation, God announcing it, yet he could have foreseen this same thing long before it happened, from Astronomical rules — namely, from the knowledge of the constellations, which not only presignified that universal cataclysm, but even, by God's command, effected it — not as primary causes, but as handmaids and ministers, applying, in obedience to their omnipotent Lord, the powers and faculties which they had received from him for inundating and submerging the globe of the earth. These constellations, the producers of the inundations, Moses called "the floodgates of heaven," signifying, through their opening, that time in which God released all the inundating

powers and influences — enclosed in the aforesaid constellations — as if, the barriers being unlocked, to the flooding of the whole earth. This same assertion he confirms, in the volume *On Sects and Laws*, and in the book *On the Concordance of Astronomy and Theology*, by the example of the Rainbow: which, just as God willed to be a sign, for the security of men, of a universal Flood no more to come, so it is probable that God, from the prognostics and signs of the stars, foretold the Flood for the penitence of sinners.

In this very opinion had been, long before, **William [of Auvergne], Bishop of Paris**, who, in the first part of his work *On the Universe*, expounding this passage, wrote thus: "Moses, the Prophet of the Hebrews, called 'floodgates of heaven' those parts of heaven which are generative of rains and inundations of waters — such as are the watery signs, like Cancer and Pisces, the Pleiades, the Hyades, and Orion among the stars, and Mars, and Venus, and the Moon among the Planets. The floodgates of heaven, therefore, are understood [to be] then opened, when causes of this kind are loosed and confirmed, by the nod of the Creator, unto the operations of rains and inundations." These things William: with whom agreeing, **Henry of Mechlin**, a disciple of Albert the Great, in the commentaries which he published on the great *Conjunctions* of Albumasar, reports that he found, from Astronomical reckonings, that a certain conjunction of the stars preceded the Noachic Flood, inducing a general flooding of waters — namely [the conjunction] of Jupiter and Saturn at the end of Cancer, in the region of the Argive ship [the constellation Argo], by which also Noah's ark is signified. This opinion — proposed forty years ago by **Tiberio Calabro**, a philosopher, in public disputations, and also defended in writings — **Jerome Armellini**, a Dominican, confuted in a particular volume published against him, and condemned as heretical.[3] See an annotation of nearly this same argument above, Annotation 15, and in book 6, Annotation 10.

◊ **3. Right margin:** He who attributes the Noachic inundation to conjunctions of the stars is refuted by Jerome Armellini.

Annotation LXXXII [contents]

"The ark rested in the seventh month." — Genesis 8:4

The days of the ceasing Flood wrongly reckoned.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, for that which is had in Hebrew — "The ark rested in the seventh month," יוֹם בְּשִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר [be-shiv'ah asar yom], that is, "on the seventeenth day" — rendered ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι, that is, "on the twenty-seventh day of the month," an addition of ten days being made. This error our interpreter too, in the Vulgate edition, followed: nor is it fitting to believe that the Hebrew codices are corrupt, since that number agrees with the hundred and fifty days in which the Flood devastated the lands, and the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition attests the same.

Annotation LXXXIII [contents]

"The raven, going forth, did not return." — Genesis 8:7

Whether the raven returned into the ark.

The **Septuagint**, translating that which is read affirmatively in the Hebrew concerning the raven sent out by Noah וְיָצֹא יָצוֹא וָשׁוֹב — [va-yetze yatzo va-shov], that is, "And going forth it went forth and returned" — expressed [it] negatively, καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐκ ἀνέστρεψεν, that is, "And going forth it did not return" — which our Vulgate edition also follows. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, in his Annotations, writing against this interpretation, says: "This error caused expositors to weave in here most fabulous questions, asking in what place the raven was absent for so many days outside the ark, and where it settled when the waters were not yet dried up, and whether the raven returned to Noah into the ark after the drying of the waters: because Moses, according to the depraved Scripture, says, 'And it did not return until the water was dried up.' The negation, therefore, must be removed both from our and from the Greek codices; and, according to the Hebrew truth and Josephus's interpretation, it must be read that the raven returned into the ark." **Aloysius**

[Ludovico], Bishop of Verona, in the *Catena on Genesis*, harmonizes the Vulgate Septuagint edition and ours together with the Hebrew truth, in these words: "This passage is not badly translated, as some think; for, when it is said in the Hebrew or Chaldaic edition, 'The raven went forth, by going forth and returning, until the waters were thus wanting upon the earth,' this negative is included — that, after the waters were dried, it did not return: so that at its first going-out it flew about around the ark, as if it wished to return, until the waters should be dried; thence, having gone forth completely, it did not return — as our text sounds, with the Greek and with Josephus."

Annotation LXXXIV

"The dove returned, bearing a branch of olive." — Genesis 8:11

[…the body of Annotatio LXXXIV begins on folio 555 (PDF p. 372), with Chrysostom.]

---

*(printed folio 555 [PDF p. 372]. **Annot. LXXXIV–LXXXVIII** (Gen 8:11–11:11): Chrysostom's "dry olive-leaf" (a translator's slip on κάρφος); Chrysostom on circumcision conferring nothing; Giorgio allegorizing Noah's drunkenness; Chrysostom's single primeval tongue before Babel; and the LXX's twofold error in Shem's genealogy → folio 556.)*

(folio 555, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXXIV (continued) [contents]

"The dove returned, bearing a branch of olive." — Genesis 8:11

Chrysostom, in homily 26 on Genesis, seems to read and expound in a contrary sense that which our Vulgate edition has — "The dove RETURNED, bearing a branch of olive with green leaves" — saying, "The dove RETURNED, having a dry olive-leaf in its mouth."[1] But it appears that Chrysostom's translator was deceived,[2] no less by a tautology than by the ambiguity of the word, which in this place is found as much in Chrysostom as in the Septuagint interpreters and among the Hebrews. For the Hebrew codices have it thus: וְהִנֵּה־עֲלֵה־זַיִת טָרָף בְּפִיהָ [ve-hinneh aleh zayit taraf be-fiha], that is, "And behold, an olive-leaf, a branch, in its mouth." But **Aben Ezra** [Ibn Ezra] asserts that here there occurs an apposition and a certain *tautology*; for he says that "olive-leaf" and what is immediately subjoined, *Taraf*, that is, "branch," are the same — as, he says, often in the scriptures (as in "dust and ashes"). Therefore the Septuagint, changing nothing, translated καὶ εἶχε φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς, that is, "And it had an olive-leaf, a twig, in its mouth." Following these, Chrysostom too applied to "olive-leaf" the word *κάρφος*, which is ambiguous to the Greeks and signifies two things — namely "dry" and "a twig," or a little branch. His translator, therefore, not considering the repetition of the synonymous word, translated *κάρφος* — which in this place signifies "a twig" — as "dry," the sense of Chrysostom plainly protesting against it, who a little after adds words of this kind: "This tree is ever-green, and it is probable that, when the waters had receded, this tree still had a head of leaves." By which words he shows that he spoke not of a dry olive-leaf, but rather of a green one — although the Hebrew truth indicates that the olive-leaf was neither dry nor green. The Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition translated this passage more correctly than the Septuagint, saying: "And behold, an olive-leaf plucked with its mouth." For טָרָף *taraf* signifies to the Hebrews both "a twig" and "seized" or "plucked."

◊ **1. Left margin:** What kind of branch the dove brought.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Chrysostom's translator was deceived.

Annotation LXXXV [contents]

"The Lord smelled the odor of sweetness." — Genesis 8:21

Whether circumcision conferred anything to the soul's salvation.

Chrysostom, homily 27 on Genesis, expounding this, seems to assert that Circumcision, in the old law, conferred absolutely nothing to justice and the salvation of the soul — the opposite of which Augustine, with the rest of the theologians, holds. See below, in the centuries, chapter 17, Annotation 96.

Annotation LXXXVI [contents]

"Noah planted a vineyard, and drinking the wine was made drunk." — Genesis 9:20–21

Of what kind was Noah's drunkenness.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first volume, Problem 101, so explains these words that he seems to subvert the truth of the history, affirming that Noah was not made drunk from the wine of the vine which he had planted (as Moses seems to indicate) — because from a pure drunkenness of wine so many evils would not have followed. But he was drunk either from an excessive affection for his own [people], or from the wisdom of earthly things, which in very many places is designated by "wine." For those who pursue this [earthly wisdom] go so far away from God that they many times rush into scandal — as happened to **Balaam**, **Ahithophel**, and **Solomon**.

Annotation LXXXVII [contents]

"And the earth was of one lip [language]." — Genesis 11:1

There was only one language for all before the tower was built, as St. Chrysostom rightly held.

Chrysostom, in homily 30 on Genesis, narrating this, says that before the building of the tower of Babel there was one natural language of all men, and that all mortals used the same speech. Which opinion — the author's name being omitted, however — **Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia**, in the *Catalogue of Heresies*, chapter 106, reprobates as heretical,[3] asserting that it must be firmly believed that even many ages before the building of Babel there were several varieties of speech and of languages, the knowledge of which all men had from God's gift up to the construction of the tower and the confusion of tongues; but that Moses says the earth was "of one lip," he thinks was said because, although there were several kinds of languages, yet all understood one another — and there was to all one language and the same speech, not according to the same use of words, but according to the same understanding of meanings. **Alphonsus [de Castro] of Zamora**, in book 9 *Against Heresies*, is so far from this censure of Philastrius that he judges *it* [Philastrius's view] to be heretical: because Moses most openly teaches that, before the times of Babel, there was only one language of all — when he says, "And the earth was of one lip, and of the same words"; and when, a little after, he adds that in the building of Babel the lip of the whole earth was then first confounded — that is, then first began to be divided, and various, and manifold, which before had been simple, undivided, and one. It must be held, therefore, according to the true explanation of Chrysostom, that there was only one speech of all mortals before the building of the tower; and Philastrius is, on this point, to be rejected — who, it appears, was deceived by a light consideration of the words of Moses: who, before he began, in chapter 11, to describe the building of the tower, had first, in chapter 10, narrated how the seven sons of Japheth divided the islands of the nations in their regions, each according to their languages and their kindreds. Which words, not noticing that they were said by *anticipation* [prolepsis], Philastrius thought that there were already then several languages before Babel was built. For it is, according to the rule of **Tyconius**, the custom of divine Scripture to narrate some things by anticipation — namely, that before they are done they should be somehow, and cursorily, narrated, so that afterward each thing done should be described more fully in its own order. And that this is the true interpretation of this passage, **Augustine** teaches, in book 16 *On the City of God*, chapter 4, writing thus: "When, therefore, those nations are reported to have been in their own languages, the narrator nevertheless returns to that time when there was one Language of all, and thence now expounds what happened, so that a diversity of languages should arise. 'And,' he says, 'all the earth was one lip, and one

voice to all.'"

◊ **3. Right margin:** An error of Philastrius.

Annotation LXXXVIII [contents]

"And Shem lived, after he begot Arphaxad, etc." — Genesis 11:11

An error in the number and the years of the generations of Shem.

The **Septuagint**, in the present genealogy of Shem, have a twofold error: one in the number of the generations by which the genealogy is woven, the other in the number of the years by which the authors of these generations lived. →

[…continues on folio 556 (PDF p. 373): the two errors detailed (Annotatio LXXXVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 556 [PDF p. 373], with a comparative table. **Annot. LXXXVIII–LXXXIX** (Gen 11:11–12:13): the LXX's inserted second **Cainan** (which entered Luke 3's genealogy) and its ~280-year inflation of the patriarchs' ages (tabulated); then Chrysostom on Abraham's "sister" ruse, branding it a "fiction" or "lie" → folio 557.)*

(folio 556, left column → right column, with a full-width table between)

Annotation LXXXVIII (continued)

The first [error] is that, whereas Moses numbers only nine generations from Shem to Abraham, the Septuagint reckon ten,[1] a Cainan generation being added immediately after Arphaxad the son of Shem, in this manner: "Shem lived, after he begot for himself Arphaxad, thirty-five years, and begot sons and daughters, and died; and Arphaxad lived a hundred and thirty-five years, and begot Cainan; and Arphaxad lived, after he begot Cainan, 430 years, and begot sons and daughters, and died; and Cainan lived a hundred and thirty years and begot Shelah; and Cainan lived, after he begot Shelah, 330 years, and begot sons and daughters, and died" — all of which are redundant, and the Hebrew truth entirely ignores, setting down that Arphaxad himself begot Shelah, and not Cainan. And this same error crept into the genealogy of our Savior, described in the third chapter of the Gospel according to Luke: who, as in other things, so also in this, followed the Septuagint edition, in his times most received throughout the whole world. Which indeed **Jerome**, greatly wondering at, says: "I especially marvel, and — on account of the slowness of [my] understanding, struck with most vehement stupor — I do not know how to search out by what reasoning, whereas in the Hebrew, from the Flood (that is, from Noah) up to Abraham ten generations are found, Luke himself (who, the Holy Spirit guiding his pen, could in no way write anything false) preferred to set down in the Gospel eleven generations, according to the Septuagint interpreters, Cainan being added." **Aloysius [Ludovico], Bishop of Verona**, says it could have happened that the Holy Spirit, by some hidden reason, moved the mind of Moses to pass over the Cainan generation in the series of this genealogy — just as the Evangelist Matthew too wrapped up certain [names] in silence in the genealogy of the Savior.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Moses numbers only nine generations from Shem to Abraham, but the Septuagint ten.

The second error is in the enumeration of the years of the life of those contained in this genealogy: for the reckoning of the Seventy interpreters exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by nearly two hundred and eighty years,[2] as appears in the three little columns written below — of which the first contains the reckoning of the years according to the Hebrew truth, the second the reckoning of the Septuagint, the third the difference of each reckoning according to the excess and defect of each number.

◊ **2. Right margin:** The reckoning of the Septuagint interpreters exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by nearly 280 years.

*(In the third column, "Desunt" = the Septuagint falls **short** by that many years; "Redundant / Redund." = the Septuagint **exceeds** by that many.)*

Hebrew reckoning	Hebr.	LXX	Difference
Shem, after begetting Arphaxad, lived	500	335	Desunt 165
Arphaxad, before begetting Shelah, lived	35	130	Redundant 95
Arphaxad, after begetting Shelah	403	330	Desunt 73
Shelah, before begetting Eber	30	130	Redund. 100
Shelah, after begetting Eber	403	330	Desunt 73
Eber, before begetting Peleg	34	134	Redund. 100
Eber, after begetting Peleg	430	370	Desunt 60
Peleg, before begetting Reu	30	130	Redund. 100
Reu, before begetting Serug	32	130	Redund. 98
Serug, before begetting Nahor	30	130	Redund. 100
Nahor, before begetting Terah	29	79	Redund. 50
Nahor, after begetting Terah	119	129	Redund. 10
Sum of the whole reckoning	**2075**	**2357**	**difference 282**

To these generations, if you add the 460 years of the life of Cainan superadded by the Septuagint interpreters, the difference of the years of each reckoning is increased up to the number of 742 years. See book 6, where we wrote concerning the superadded generation of Cainan, Annotation 143; and book 7, heresy 4.

Annotation LXXXIX [contents]

"Say therefore, I beseech you, that you are my sister." — Genesis 12:13

Whether Abraham lied.

Chrysostom, homily 32 on Genesis, upon these words, extols Sarah with many praises — that, her husband being brought into the danger of death, she consented to [him] persuading simulation and adultery, and promptly presented herself to both. For he writes thus: "Therefore the just man consents to the adultery of his wife, and, as it were, serves the adultery to the dishonor of the woman, that he may escape death. Have you seen the bond of the charity of the man and the woman? Have you seen the man — what things he dared to suggest to the woman; and what counsel the woman received, and did not refuse, nor bears it grievously, so that that fable and fiction is hidden?" And a little after: "Who would not be astonished at this readiness to obey? Who could sufficiently praise her, that — after so great continence, and at such an age — in order to keep the just man [safe], so far as it lay in her will, she exposed herself even to adultery, and bore the embrace of barbarians?" Thus far Chrysostom, who in this part seems to differ, in three ways, from the common opinion of the other Fathers. **First**, that he calls this consultation of Abraham and Sarah not only in this place a fable and a fiction, but in other places also a fabrication, a scene, a comedy, a tragedy, a deception, a hypocrisy, and a lie. In homily 45 on Genesis, expounding those words by which God accuses King Abimelech, who had taken away Sarah from Abraham her husband, he speaks in this manner: "But God said to Abimelech, I know that they themselves contrived this fable, and that, deceived, you did this by their

words"; and a little after he adds: "He too, fearing lest he be killed by you, contrived this comedy, and, as it were, cooperated in the dishonor of Sarah." And in the second book *On the Providence of God* he says: "Abraham then came into such great necessity that he even submitted to hypocrisy — than which, what more miserable [thing] can be said?" And in the epistle to Olympias he says: "Did not Abraham, on account of the fear of death, prefer to give his own wife to barbarian pleasures and to the Egyptian tyranny? For he himself composed the fable [with] injury, and asked his wife to simulate with him so horrendous a tragedy — does he not blush, bringing forward the cause of such a scene? 'For it will be,' he says, 'that when they see you beautiful of face, they will kill me and will keep you. Say therefore that you are my sister, that it may be well with me on account of you, and that my soul may live for your sake.' Do you see the fear? do you see the trembling agitating that lofty and philoso[phical soul]" →

[…continues on folio 557 (PDF p. 374): the rest of Chrysostom's censure, and the second and third ways he differs from the Fathers (Annotatio LXXXIX).]

---

*(printed folio 557 [PDF p. 374]. **Annot. LXXXIX–XC** (Gen 12:13–14:18): Chrysostom on Abraham's ruse — praising licit "frauds" for others' good (verging on Priscillianism) and Sarah's self-exposure (Augustine rejects both; the stricter view: die rather than betray chastity); then the famous question over Melchisedech's person (Angel, Son of God, Holy Spirit, a higher power, or Shem) → folio 558.)*

(folio 557, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXXIX (continued)

— [do you see the fear? do you see the trembling agitating] that lofty and philosophical soul? — and he lied about the very kind [of relationship], bringing forward one person in place of another."

The **SECOND** [way in which Chrysostom seems to differ] is that he judges this fiction and dissimulation of Sarah and Abraham to be worthy of praise, admiration, and imitation, departing in nothing from that opinion which he most openly professes in all his writings — namely, that it is licit, indeed even fitting, for a perfect man to use frauds, wiles, and impostures, not only in his own necessities but also for the advantages of others, for the purpose not of harming but of helping,[1] as you will be able to see clearly below, chapter 27, Annotation 106. These two assertions — just as (Augustine being witness, in the book *Against Lying*, chapter 2) they seem to incline toward the heresy of the Priscillianists — so are they opposed to Augustine himself, and to the rest of the theologians, especially the Scholastics, who assert that all dissimulation, whether harmful or officious [well-meant], and every fraud, is a vice contrary to truth and belonging to the crime of lying. For whether by speech, or by any deed whatever, out of a zeal either to harm or to help, someone lies, he is a liar; and every lie is either a sin, or is not without sin. Accordingly **Augustine**, in book 22 *Against Faustus*, chapter 24, denies that Abraham lied: since, being asked what Sarah was to him, he declared her a sister, he did not deny her a wife — keeping silent about something true, not saying anything false; for she was truly his sister on his father's side, though not on his mother's. **Chrysostom** himself acknowledges this same thing, in homily 45 on Genesis, where he openly confesses that Abraham's fiction had in it nothing of a lie, when he says: "*See* how diligently the just man acts, to show *that not even in this did he lie.*" But concerning Chrysostom's opinion on the assertion of officious fraud we have written more fully below, in Annotation 107 of this book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether it is lawful to lie in order to help [another].

There **REMAINS** the **THIRD** [point], which is contained as asserted in the aforesaid words of Chrysostom — namely, that Sarah is chiefly to be praised and imitated in this, that for the sake of saving her husband she exposed herself to the adultery of barbarians, the husband nevertheless consenting to her adultery, indeed

even persuading it.[2] From this opinion **Augustine** dissents, denying that Abraham either persuaded or conceded adultery to his wife, writing thus in book 22, chapter 33, against Faustus: "*For Abraham did not consent to the disgrace of his wife, but committed to God the chastity of his spouse — about whose mind he had no doubt — being sure of his God, that he would not allow anything so base and disgraceful to be suffered. Nor did his faith deceive him: to whom first Pharaoh, terrified by portents, and then Abimelech, warned by a dream, both restored his wife unharmed and with honor.*" Thus Augustine.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Whether a wife ought, in order to save her husband, to expose herself to adultery.

There are also those who affirm that neither to the husband nor to the wife is the remedy of adultery lawful for the sake of avoiding the death of either; but that they ought to await death — indeed, rather to seek death of their own accord — than to betray chastity, for the preservation of which many most chaste women not only endured to be killed by others, but even laid hands upon themselves:[3] as **Sophronia**, wife of the prefect of the city of Rome, who — as Eusebius relates in book 8 of the *History* — noticing that her husband, terrified by fear of death, had betrayed her chastity to the tyrant Maxentius, when she had first prayed to God on bended knees, as though about to immolate her chastity to Christ, transfixed her breast with a seized sword. Following whose example, several holy virgins, whose martyrdom the Church celebrates, slew themselves lest they take on a stain upon their chastity.[4] But concerning these we have written more at length in the censures upon the expositors of Jonah, Annotation 253.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it is lawful to perish by one's own hand.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The Church celebrates the martyrdoms of certain virgins who brought death upon themselves lest they lose their chastity.

Augustine, in book 22, chapter 37, against Faustus, and in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 29, calls into doubt whether Sarah's chastity could have been subjected to the lust of the barbarians without any crime of adultery[5] — as if, for the husband's life, it were lawful, with his consent, to lie with another man; as once, in the time of the Emperor Constantius, was done at Antioch, where, when the prefect **Acindynus** was keeping a certain man in prison to be put to death — because he did not have a pound of gold which he owed to the treasury, whence he might pay it — the wife, moved by love of her husband, sold (the husband himself consenting) one night's intercourse to a certain rich man who anxiously demanded it and promised a pound of gold as the price, that at that price she might redeem her husband's life from the prefect. And this deed of Acindynus having been set forth at length, [Augustine] leaves it free for each to judge as he will — although he seems more inclined to that side, that this may by no means be done.

◊ **5. Right margin:** St. Augustine doubts whether Sarah's chastity could be exposed to peril without the crime of adultery.

Annotation XC [contents]

"But Melchisedech, king of Salem [brought forth bread and wine]." — Genesis 14:18

Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held.

Origen, discoursing about Melchisedech the priest, asserted that he was not a man but an Angel. This error Jerome attributes to him in the Epistle to Evagrius, writing thus: "*Straightway, at the very front of Genesis, in the first homily of Origen, I found [something] written concerning Melchisedech; in which, disputing with manifold discourse, he slid down to this — that he called him an Angel; and with almost the same arguments by which your author (who makes Melchisedech the Holy Spirit) [argues], I passed over to Didymus, his follower, and I saw that the man went on foot into the opinion of the master.*" Thus Jerome — understanding, perhaps, by "the first homily" the first tome; for in the first homily of Origen, which is now had on Genesis, there is no mention of Melchisedech. Origen can be excused by the diversity of opinions which existed on this matter among the ancients — among whom, as Jerome, writing to Evagrius, is witness, there was a most famous question concerning the person of the priest Melchisedech. For indeed, as **Epiphanius** relates in book 2 against heresies, heresy 55, certain unnamed heretics said that Melchisedech was the Only-begotten

himself, and the natural Son of God, who appeared in human form to Abraham.[6] **Hierax the Egyptian**, who composed learned but heretical commentaries, in Greek and in Egyptian [Coptic], on the *Hexaemeron*, thought him to be the Holy Spirit. The **Melchisedechian** heretics, whose author was **Theodorus the money-changer [Argentarius]**, reckoned him to be a certain great power superior to Christ, from which Christ himself received the order of his eternal Priesthood.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Some heretics thought Melchisedech was the natural Son of God; others said he was the Holy Spirit.

The **Samaritans** judged him to be the same as **Shem**, the firstborn son of Noah,[7] and [held] that at the time when Abraham was born he had three hundred and ninety years of age, and that to Abraham, his own great-great-grandson [*abnepos*], he →

◊ **7. Right margin:** The Samaritans thought Melchisedech was Shem, the firstborn of Noah.

[…continues on folio 558 (PDF p. 375): the rest of the opinions on Melchisedech's person (Annotatio XC).]

---

*(printed folio 558 [PDF p. 375]. **Annot. XC–XCIV** (Gen 14:18–16:3): the Melchisedech survey closed (Shem; a just priest; Jerome's Salim); pseudo-Augustine making him the Holy Spirit incarnate (refuted); booty in a just war (Aquinas); Philo's hell-as-conscience; and whether Abraham's union with Hagar was legitimate matrimony (yes) → folio 559.)*

(folio 558, left column → right column)

Annotation XC (continued)

survived by forty years — [Abraham,] his own great-great-grandson [*abnepos*] of the tenth degree.

The **Jews** handed down that he was indeed a just man, and priest of God Most High (as the divine Scripture has it), but begotten of an impure harlot and a fornicating man, and that on this account his parents are not mentioned in the sacred letters.[1] **Irenaeus** and **Hippolytus** wrote that he was king of Jerusalem — which was first called Salem, then Jebus, and at last named Jerusalem.[2] Leaving their opinions aside, **Jerome**, in the aforesaid epistle to Evagrius, affirms that Melchisedech was not king of the Salem which was afterward called Jerusalem, but that he reigned in the town of Salim near Scythopolis, in the region of Shechem, in the tribe of Ephraim: where that Melchisedech's palace was magnificent is gathered from the magnitude of its ruins.[3]

◊ **1. Left margin:** The opinion of the Jews concerning Melchisedech.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The opinion of Irenaeus and Hippolytus concerning the same.

◊ **3. Left margin:** What Jerome thought concerning Melchisedech.

Annotation XCI [contents]

"But Melchisedech, king of Salem." — Genesis 14:18

Whether Melchisedech was the Holy Spirit.

Augustine, in the book of *Questions of the Old and New Testament*, question 109, strives with many arguments to prove that Melchisedech was not a mere man, but a certain Power of God — namely the Holy Spirit — who then appeared in human form, just as afterward the Son of God appeared in the flesh. Weighing this error, **Alphonsus de Castro**, in the 10th book *Against Heresies*, denies that the book which is entitled *On the Question of the Old and New Testament* is Augustine's, although it is circulated under his name.[4] And besides the other arguments which he brings to prove this, he judges this one most effective: that Augustine, in the book *On Heresies* to Quodvultdeus, sets down this very opinion in the thirty-fourth place, attributing it to the heretics whom he calls Melchisedechians. It is not likely that Augustine was so stupid as to teach a

heretical assertion, and one condemned by himself; and had he ever taught it, he ought to have recanted the same in the books of the *Retractations* — which, however, is nowhere found done by him in the whole course of that work.

◊ **4. Left margin:** The book *On the Questions of the Old and New Testament* is not St. Augustine's.

Annotation XCII [contents]

"I will not take anything of all that is thine." — Genesis 14:23

Whether it is lawful for soldiers to take booty.

Ambrose, in the first book *On Abraham*, chapter 3, explaining this, makes booty licit to soldiers in these words: "*When booty is in the power of the victor, military discipline requires that all things be kept for the king.*" This passage **St. Thomas** annotated, as opposing the opinion of Augustine, who in the book *On the Words of the Lord according to Matthew*, sermon 19, forbids booty to soldiers, saying: "*To be a soldier is not a sin; but to be a soldier for the sake of booty is a sin.*"[5] Removing this dissonance, the same author [Aquinas], in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 66, article 8, says that Ambrose's opinion is true when the war has been just — in which whatever is acquired by arms becomes [the victor's] by the best right; yet the victors can, in this just acquisition of booty, sin through greed for booty and a depraved intention of mind — namely when they fight principally not for the sake of justice, but for the sake of certain [gains]. In which sense Augustine judged it a sin to serve as a soldier for the sake of booty.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Whether to serve as a soldier for the sake of booty is a sin.

Annotation XCIII [contents]

"Go in to my handmaid, that perhaps I may have children by her." — Genesis 16:2

Whether hell is only the conscience of sinners, as Philo held.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On the Meeting for the Sake of Seeking Erudition* [*De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia*], expounding this passage, seems to insinuate that the place and punishment of hell is nothing else than the conscience of a wicked man, saying thus: "*God scatters the unjust and impious soul, put to flight from himself, most far off into the place of lusts and of crimes — which place is more aptly called the [place] of the impious than that fabled one among the infernal regions. For in truth hell is nothing else than the life of a wretched, wicked, and execrable man.*" This same error is attributed to Origen, as you will be able to see below, Annotation 229 of this book.

Annotation XCIV [contents]

"She took Hagar the Egyptian, her handmaid, and gave her to her husband." — Genesis 16:3

Whether Abraham's intercourse with Hagar was adultery.

Ambrose, in book 1 *On Abraham the Patriarch*, chapter 4, excusing Abraham's intercourse with the handmaid Hagar, seems to hint at two things beyond the common opinion of the theologians: first, that that intercourse was adultery; second, that adultery in Abraham's times was not illicit, because the Law had not yet forbidden and condemned it. His words are these: "*But perhaps someone will say: How does Abraham propose himself to us for imitation, since he took a son from a handmaid? Or, what is the meaning of this, that so great a man was liable to this error? But let us first consider that Abraham was before the Law of Moses and before the Gospel, when adultery did not yet seem forbidden. The penalty of a crime is from the time of the law which prohibited the crime, nor before the law is there any condemnation of the matter. Therefore Abraham did not offend against the Law, but anticipated the Law. God, though in paradise he praised marriage, did not [there] condemn adultery.*"[6] **Chrysostom**, **Augustine**, and the rest of the theologians think otherwise, and assert in the first place that Abraham's intercourse was neither adultery nor

fornication, but legitimate matrimony, free from all suspicion of baseness: because Abraham did not sleep with the handmaid except after he had received her from Sarah as a wife — as Moses too openly manifests, saying, "*And Sarah gave her to her husband as a wife.*" They add, then, that adultery and fornication were licit at no times;[7] whence **St. Thomas** too, from their general assent — rejecting the opinion of Rabbi Moses the Egyptian [Maimonides], who says that fornications and adulteries before the promulgation of the Law were not sins — decrees that both fornication and adultery are against the law of nature, and at no time, neither of themselves nor by dispensation, were licit: because both are contrary to the first precepts of the law of nature, which do not admit dispensation. These things being considered, there are those who think that Ambrose brought forward the solution of the aforesaid doubt not from his own mind, but from the mind of others, and that on this account he at once subjoined the second and third solution of his question as though from his own opinion. →

◊ **6. Right margin:** Whether before the Law was given adultery was a crime.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Adultery and fornication were always sins.

[…continues on folio 559 (PDF p. 376): the next Annotatio.]

---

*(printed folio 559 [PDF p. 376]. **Annot. XCV–XCVII** (Gen 16:11–17:12): Philo making the rational soul God's work but the sensible soul the angels'; Chrysostom seeming to make circumcision a bare sign conferring no grace (refuted); and Giorgio's astrological reasons for eighth-day circumcision. (The source misprints XCV as "XCI"; corrected here.) → folio 560.)*

(folio 559, left column → right column)

Annotation XCV [contents]

Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held.

(The printed text misprints this annotation XCI; corrected here to XCV, its proper place in the sequence.)

"Thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael." — Genesis 16:11

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Fugitives* [*De profugis*], which he published on the sixteenth chapter of Genesis, incidentally explaining that saying, "Let us make man to our image," etc., wrongly asserts that only the rational soul of the first parent was created by God, but that its sensible and vegetable soul was made by the angels. His words run thus: "*Moses, when he philosophizes about the fashioning of the world, after he had said that God created all other things, taught that man alone was formed with others also cooperating. 'God said,' he says, 'Let us make man to our image'[1] — by this word 'Let us make' signifying a multitude. Therefore that Father of things addresses his own powers, to which he gave this mortal part of our soul to be fashioned, imitating his art, when he was forming the rational [part] in us; deeming it just that the principal part should be fabricated by the Prince of things, but the subordinate part by the subordinate powers. And he used these powers not only for the reason just mentioned, but because man's soul alone was going to possess an understanding of goods and evils, and to choose one or the other, when it cannot [have] both. He judged it necessary, therefore, that the making of evils be attributed to other makers, but of goods to himself alone. Wherefore, when he had first said 'Let us make man,' as of many, soon he speaks as of one: 'God made man.' For of the true man — who is a most pure mind — God alone is the maker; but of him who is vulgarly so called, mixed and tempered out of the senses, [the makers are] many. For which reason that excellent man is indicated by the article: for it is read, 'God made THAT man' — that [man] lacking, in kind, the mixture of the [sensible] intellect. But the vulgar man is set down without such an addition. For when he says 'Let us make man,' he signifies [one] woven together out of the brute and the rational soul.*" This same, already-reprobated opinion Philo repeats in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, as you have above,

Annotation 17.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Genesis 1:26.

Annotation XCVI [contents]

"Let every male among you be circumcised." — Genesis 17:10

Whether circumcision conferred grace on infants.

Chrysostom, homily 29 on Genesis, discussing this passage, seems to indicate that Circumcision, in the old Law, conferred nothing of virtue, or of justice, or of grace on the circumcised infants, but was merely a sign by which the infants of the Jews might be distinguished from the other nations. For thus he speaks: "*That you may clearly learn, beloved, that Circumcision confers nothing to the soul's virtue, can be seen from these things which are done. For why is an eight-day-old infant circumcised? For two causes, I think: one, that at an immature age he may more easily bear the trouble of Circumcision in the flesh; the other, that from the facts themselves we may learn that it confers nothing to the soul, but that this is done only for the sake of the sign. For immature children, since they are ignorant of the things done and have no perception of them, what utility can they thence receive in their soul? For those things are truly the good of the soul which are done by choice; but to receive a sign in the flesh — what sort of good work would that be?*" And in homily 27 on Genesis, confirming the same opinion, he says: "*Attend how God willed Circumcision to be established as a law — not that it could effect anything for the soul's salvation, but that the children of the Jews might carry this about [as] a mark of gratitude, as it were a sign and a seal, and that it might not be lawful for them to be mingled by the minglings of the [other] nations.*" Hence blessed Paul calls this a sign, saying, "*And he gave the seal of circumcision*"[2] — for to justice Circumcision itself confers nothing. Likewise homily 40 on Genesis, chapter 17: "*There was no other utility from Circumcision,*" he says, "*than this alone: that by this sign they might be recognizable, and set apart from the other nations — the Jews.*"

◊ **2. Right margin:** Romans 4:11.

To this assertion all the theologians, as many ancient as more recent, are opposed; and they say that Circumcision — except for entrance into the kingdom of heaven — conferred all the effects of grace, both privative and positive, which baptism now furnishes: not indeed by its own power, but by the power of faith in Christ.[3] For Augustine, in the second book *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, the last chapter, says: "*Circumcision, in the people of God — which was a seal of the faith of the justice of God — availed, for great and little ones, unto the sanctification of the purgation of original and old sin, just as baptism began to avail from the time at which it was instituted.*" Bede too, in the commentaries on the second chapter of Luke, says: "*The same [help of the healthful cure] Circumcision in the Law wrought against the wound of original sin which baptism has been wont to work in the time of revealed grace — except that they could not yet enter the gate of the heavenly kingdom, but, consoled after death by a blessed rest in Abraham's bosom, awaited with happy hope the entrance of the supernal peace.*" These are their [words]; against which it is no obstacle that Chrysostom above infers that Circumcision profits infants nothing, because in them there is neither knowledge nor choice: for, as Bernard says, just as now Baptism, without any use of will, confers salvation on infants, so then Circumcision, without any choice of judgment, brought salvation to infants. St. Thomas has this same [teaching] in the third part, question 62, article 6. Perhaps it can be said that Chrysostom's words are to be referred to the highest increment of perfect justice, and to the ultimate consummation of eternal salvation — which indeed Circumcision could not furnish, since Christ was not yet dead and the heavenly kingdom was not yet opened.[4] Or it must be said that Chrysostom perhaps spoke of Circumcision apart from faith in Christ to come, which of itself furnished no help. For Circumcision did not confer grace by its own power, but by the power of faith, which the ancients professed in the seal of the received circumcision. Read Annotation 232 of the sixth book.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Circumcision, by virtue of faith in Christ — except for entrance into the kingdom of heaven — conferred all the effects of grace which Baptism now furnishes.

◊ **4. Right margin:** St. Thomas piously explains St. Chrysostom.

Annotation XCVII [contents]

"The infant of eight days shall be circumcised." — Genesis 17:12

Why circumcision was given on the eighth day.

Francesco Giorgio, in the sixth Tome, Problem 337, inquiring into the reason of this precept, assigns certain superstitious causes drawn from Talmudic fables and from the ravings of the nativity-casters [astrologers], saying that the mandate of circumcision was given for this reason: that by that effusion of blood the "northern powers" — which demand blood for offense — might be appeased. And the Law commanded this effusion of blood to be made especially on the eighth day, so that the infant's little body, through the space of seven days, might be able to receive favor from each of the seven planets — each one, namely →

[…continues on folio 560 (PDF p. 377): the rest of Francesco Giorgio's astrological reasons, and Sixtus's refutation (Annotatio XCVII).]

---

*(printed folio 560 [PDF p. 377]. **Annot. XCVII–C** (Gen 17:12–18:3): Giorgio's planetary rationale for the eighth day (one of his many "planetary divinations," refuted); Chrysostom on Abraham's laughter as doubt (defended — it was joyful thanks); Procopius on OT theophany-bodies as unreal; and Cajetan on "Lord/my lords" (defended) → folio 561.)*

(folio 560, left column → right column)

Annotation XCVII (continued)

each one, namely, on its [own] day, from one of the planets [that is] lord of that day — until, the seven-day course being completed, the infant returned to the same planet which had presided over the day on which the infant had been brought forth. To planetary divinations of this kind the same author turns aside in almost innumerable places.[1] For in the first tome, Problem 150, he asserts that Abraham foresaw the sterility of his wife Sarah from astrological prognostications. In Problem 240 of the same tome he affirms that the Israelite family grew quickly, because, when it had arranged its encampments according to the aspect of the twelve signs of heaven, it received the sidereal influences most copiously from all twelve signs. Likewise in Problem 335 of the same tome he asserts that Aries, the first of the signs, predominates over Egypt, and that all the power of that province depends on the star of Aries. We have confuted trifles of this kind above, Annotation 15.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Francesco Giorgio is much given to planetary divinations.

Annotation XCVIII [contents]

"Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed in his heart, saying: Shall a son, thinkest thou, be born to him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old bring forth?" — Genesis 17:17

Whether Abraham sinned by unbelief.

Chrysostom, homily 40 on Genesis, for the explanation of this passage [writes]: "*Abraham, seeing the excellent promise, and considering the greatness of him who had promised, fell upon his face and laughed.*" A Greek codex of Chrysostom — a most ancient one, which we saw at Lyon in the library of Santes Pagnino — had, immediately after this passage, certain words which are not read in the other common volumes.

These are they: "*God, that he alone might be without sin, sometimes permitted the just, according to their own choice, to fall into sin: whence holy Abraham too sinned by unbelief, and received punishments from God, so that his seed should serve four hundred years. Moses also, when he did not glorify God — who bestowed on him water from the rock — was ungrateful, and God said to him, 'You shall see the land of promise, and you shall not enter into it.*"[2] Thus far the Greek copy: whose words, since they by no means cohere with the following narration — in which [the author] testifies that Abraham burst out into those thoughts and words not from unbelief but from immense joy, not knowing what he said — I suspect that the aforesaid words were taken elsewhere out of Chrysostom by some studious [reader], and set in the margin of the present passage, and at last (as often happens) by the carelessness of copyists carried over into the text. For at the end of the sixth homily *On Penance* a passage not unlike the aforesaid is found, in plainly the same sense and the same words, in this manner: "*But, since God was the same, and alone without sin, he permitted the just to be bent by human errors according to their own choice — not himself now impelling to sin, but by [their] choice permitting [them] to walk according to their own inclination. And so holy Abraham sinned by unbelief; on that account he did not escape punishment from God, so that his seed should serve for four hundred years. And again Moses, not glorifying God when he gave water from the rock, was ungrateful, and therefore God said to him, 'You shall see the land of promise, and you shall not enter into it.*"" The same opinion Jerome embraces, book 3 *Against Pelagius*, in these words: "*Abraham did not believe what God promised, but laughed in his heart, thinking to conceal it from God, and not daring to laugh openly. Finally, expounding the causes of his incredulity, he says in his heart: How can it be that a hundred-year-old should beget a son from a ninety-year-old? 'Let Ishmael live,' he says, 'in your sight, whom you once gave: I do not seek difficult things; I am content with the benefit I have received.' Whom God, rebuking with a hidden response, says: 'Let even that be done which you think will not be; and from your error, by which you laughed, your son Isaac shall receive the name "laughter."*""

◊ **2. Left margin:** Deuteronomy 32:52.

Paul seems altogether opposed to this assertion, since, writing to the Romans, he says: "*And he was not weakened in faith, neither did he consider his own body now dead, when he was almost a hundred years old, nor the dead womb of Sarah; in the promise also of God he did not hesitate through distrust, but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God, most fully knowing that whatsoever God has promised he is able to perform: therefore it was reputed to him also unto justice.*"[3] Expounding this sentence, **Ambrose** and **Theophylact** hold that Abraham did not hesitate at all, but rather, against hope, believed most fully in hope. Moreover **Augustine**, book 16 *On the City of God*, chapter 26, writes that Abraham's laughter was the exultation of one giving thanks, not the derision of one distrusting; and he says that those words too — "Shall a son be born to one a hundred years old, and shall Sarah at ninety bring forth?" — were the words not of one doubting, but of one wondering. **John Arboreus**, in the first book of his *Theosophia* (Θεοσοφία), settling a controversy of this kind, says that Abraham somewhat doubted, and hesitated in mind at the beginning, when he laughed in his heart, saying, "Shall a son be born to a hundred-year-old?"; but that the words of the promise which God subjoined raised up his mind — engaged as it was in a doubtful judgment — and thus freed it from all doubt, so that thereafter he leaned upon the divine promises with a most certain and immovable faith.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Romans 4:19–22.

Annotation XCIX [contents]

"There appeared to him three men." — Genesis 18:2

The dove descending upon Christ — whether it was truly an animal.

Procopius of Gaza, examining the apparition of the Angels to Abraham, seems to assert that the dove in which the Holy Spirit appeared at Christ's baptism was not truly a dove, saying thus: "*God, in the old*

testament, was seen in a bodily form; yet that body did not have the property of a mortal body, for it consisted neither of flesh nor of blood. In the same manner 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." See Annotation 13 of book 6.

Annotation C [contents]

"Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight." — Genesis 18:3

Whether this passage pertains to the Trinity.

Thomas Cajetan is gravely reprehended by **Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa**, because he took away from the present chapter an excellent passage from which — according to the doctrine of the saints, and the very voice of the whole Church — the mystery of the Trinity is elicited: namely, when Abraham in the valley of Mamre saw three, and adoring one said, "Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight," [Cajetan] himself, changing the singular voice into the plural, translated and expounded it, "My lords, if I have found favor in your sight." But it appears that Ambrose is — as the adage runs — seeking a knot in a bulrush, and deliberately hunting occasions for calumny: for Cajetan, by this change of number, in no way derogates from the Trinity of the divine [Persons]; nay rather he establishes [it]... →

[...continues on folio 561 (PDF p. 378): Sixtus's defense of Cajetan (Annotatio C).]

---

*(printed folio 561 [PDF p. 378]. **Annot. C–CII** (Gen 18:3–22:12): Cajetan on Adonai establishing the Trinity's unity (Kimhi); Chrysostom praising Abraham's virtue before grace (seized by Oecolampadius; answered as concerning habitual, not prevenient, grace); and Origen on the Angel who spoke to Abraham as the Son of God → folio 562.)*

(folio 561, left column → right column)

Annotation C (continued)

— nay rather he established the unity of the Trinity: he shows that the name **Adonai**, which contains a number of multitude, is [here] to be referred to the number of unity. Thus you will say: "*Although Adonai is of plural number, signifying 'my Lords,' yet that it is here used for the singular the pronoun 'thy' makes manifest.*" Thus he [Cajetan]. **Rabbi David [Kimhi]** says that the name אֲדֹנָי *Adonai*, which is of plural number, whenever it is written with qametz [*cameza*], is attributed to God the Creator for the sake of honor and excellence.

Annotation CI [contents]

"When therefore the men rose up from thence." — Genesis 18:16

Whether divine grace comes before us, or is preceded by us.

Chrysostom, homily 42 on Genesis, commending Abraham because he possessed all virtues most absolutely, has certain words near the beginning of the sermon on account of which — and many others like these, expressed in various places — **John Oecolampadius**, professor of the Lutheran heresy, turns it to his fault that he is excessive in the assertion of Free Will (drawn from the schools of worldly philosophy), and quite violent in exacting the powers of human nature, which are nothing, together with the preparation of our will. These are Chrysostom's words: "*What excuse, therefore, is left to us after these things, when one man possesses all virtues in himself, but we are so devoid of them that we do not strive to perfect even one? For that we are estranged from all good things not because we cannot, but because we will not, this very thing*

plainly indicates: that the Patriarch — who was before the time of grace and before the Law — by himself, and by the knowledge which is implanted by nature, reached so high a summit of virtue that it suffices to confute all our excuses. But perhaps some will say that that man obtained much grace from God, and that the Lord of all had a singular care of him. I too confess that it is so: but unless he had first himself done what was his own, he would not have obtained so much from the Lord. Attend, therefore, how he first exhibited in all things the token of his virtue, and so merited divine protection — he who neither received the seed of faith from his forefathers, and yet of himself offered a most religious and pious mind." And a little after he adds: "*You have seen how from the beginning he brought forward the things that were from himself, and therefore daily received divine [gifts] abundantly?*" This same opinion he inculcates in very many places, especially in homily 17 on the second chapter of John, where he speaks thus: "*Hence we can be admonished that [God] does not anticipate our wills by his benefits toward us, but that the beginning must be from us; and when he has seen us with a prompt and ready mind to receive grace, then he offers us many occasions of salvation.*" By which words indeed Chrysostom seems to hint that the beginning of our salvation is so placed in us that, without the help of prevenient grace, by the proper powers of nature we can merit the divine gift of justifying grace — which is the error of the Pelagians.

But it appears that Chrysostom did not wish, by these words, to derogate from prevenient grace (which he so often extols), but to reprove the laziness of his hearers, and to render our sloth inexcusable[1] — which the very opening of the aforesaid oration openly manifests, when he says: "What excuse, therefore, is left to us after these things?" etc. For this is Chrysostom's fixed and everywhere immovable opinion: namely, that we, whatever good we have, we have from the kindness of prevenient, calling, and ever-beginning grace, and that there is no merit of ours which is not a gift of God — whose goodness is so great that he wills those to be our merits which are his own gifts. And lest anyone, moved by the unjust calumny of Oecolampadius, suspect that Chrysostom did not think as we say, let it suffice to adduce two or three passages out of so many of his, in which he himself speaks thus for the defense of divine grace. Homily 12 on the fourth chapter of First Corinthians: "'*What you have, this you have received*' — and not only this, but also that, '*But whatever you have*' — for these are not your merits, but the grace of God. Though you bring forward faith, you received it from [your] calling; though you bring forward pardon of sins, though thanksgivings, though virtues, all came to you thence. What, therefore, do you have that you have not received? Have you yourself, by yourself, done rightly? Not indeed, but you received [it]; for that gift is not yours, but the giver's. For if you have received, you received from him; if from him, you received what is not yours; if not yours, why do you grow insolent, as though you had what is your own?*" And homily 38 to the people of Antioch, which is entitled* On Humility and Quiet*: "*Let us not be exalted, but let us call ourselves useless, that we may be made useful. For if you call yourself worthy, though you be worthy, being made [presumptuous] you are rendered useless. On that account it is necessary to forget one's merits; for the safe treasury of merits is the forgetting of merits.*" And a little after he adds: "*Do not, therefore, reckon yourself worthy of reward, that you may receive reward; confess that you are saved by grace, that he himself may confess himself your debtor. For we too, having servants, hold them most acceptable then, when — after they have ministered everything benevolently — they judge themselves to have done nothing great. And so, if you too greatly wish to render your merits [great], provided you do not think them great, then they will indeed be great.*" Thus Chrysostom: who, if he sometimes seems to say something different, is to be interpreted thus — that we refer his aforesaid words, and others like them, not to that motion of prevenient and exciting grace, which always so anticipates us that it cannot be anticipated by us, but to that gift of subsequent grace which in the schools of the theologians is called* habitual* grace. For this no one — as Chrysostom piously and holily judges — obtains, unless he has offered a mind rightly prepared for the reception of so great a gift.[2] Or it must be said — as Anianus too noted in the preface of the commentaries of Chrysostom on Matthew — that Chrysostom sometimes extolled the powers of our nature more than is fair, out of the heat of disputing with the Manichees and the Gentiles, who asserted that man is compelled to sin either by nature [being] evil or by the violence of fate. See

Annotations 184, 194, and 257 of book 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** St. Chrysostom does not derogate from prevenient grace, but reproves the sloth of his hearers.

◊ **2. Right margin:** The adult obtains habitual grace [only when] he prepares his mind for the reception of it.

Annotation CII [contents]

"Now I know that thou fearest God." — Genesis 22:12

Whether the Son of God was an angel.

Origen, in the eighth homily on Genesis, is accused of having thought that the Angel speaking to Abraham was the Son of God himself, who had first been made an angel before he became man. For thus he wrote: "*It must be considered that this Angel is reported to have spoken to Abraham, and that in what follows this Angel is evidently shown [to be] the Lord. Whence I think that, just as among men*" →

[…continues on folio 562 (PDF p. 379): the rest of Origen's opinion on the Angel/Son of God (Annotatio CII).]

---

*(printed folio 562 [PDF p. 379]. **Annot. CII–CV** (Gen 22:12–26:18): Origen's "angel" read as office, not nature (the Son as "Angel of great counsel"); Eusebius's "he-goat" for the LXX's* Sabek*; Chrysostom seeming to charge the Virgin with unbelief (defended); and Philo's "music of the spheres" → folio 563.)*

(folio 562, left column → right column)

Annotation CII (continued)

[just as among] men he was found in habit as a man, so among the Angels he was found in habit as an angel." I think that Origen in this place wished, by "the habit of an Angel," to signify not the nature of an Angel, but the office — so that the sense of his words is that the Son of God, before he was found in habit as a man (that is, before he assumed the nature of our humanity), was in the habit of an Angel (that is, in [angelic] ministry), when he appeared to the ancient fathers in manifold ways and spoke in many manners. According to which understanding, St. Augustine (Tome 6, in the tractate on "I am who I am"[1]) judges that it can safely be believed and said that the Son of God not only appeared to Abraham and to Moses, but that he can also rightly be called an Angel — whom the prophet named the "Angel of great counsel"[2] — by office, namely, not by nature.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Exodus 3:14.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Isaiah 9[:6].

Annotation CIII [contents]

"He saw behind his back a ram amongst the briers sticking fast by the horns." — Genesis 22:13

That "Sabek" is wrongly expounded as "a he-goat.".

The error of **Eusebius of Emesa** — though a slight one — Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*, thought should be pointed out: namely, that while he was expounding the present passage according to the Septuagint edition (in which is read, "A ram was held fast in the thicket *Sabek* by its horns"), he wrote a ridiculous thing, saying that "*Sabek*" means "a he-goat," which is lifted up on high by its straight horns to crop the foliage of the tree. Occasion for this error was given him by the Septuagint interpreters, who left in their edition the noun סבך *Sabek* — which signifies "entanglement" [perplexity] — as if it were the proper name of some place, or animal, or plant: Ἰδοὺ κριὸς εἷς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ σαβὲκ τῶν κεράτων, that is, "Behold, one ram caught at the tree *Sabek* by its horns." Therefore Eusebius, placing a mark of distinction [a stop] before the word *Sabek*, thought it should be read appositively, σαβὲκ τῶν κεράτων — that is, "a *he-goat* of horns," or "the

horned one." To which he was perhaps also led by the likeness of the word, which some among the Syrians report signifies "he-goat," and which the Italians too call *Becco*, and the Germans *Steinbock*.

Annotation CIV [contents]

"Isaac besought the Lord for his wife." — Genesis 25:21

Whether the Virgin Mary ever labored under unbelief.

Chrysostom, homily 49, after the narration of this sentence, seems to brand the Virgin Mary with a mark of incredulity, because she did not believe the announcing angel that the conception of Christ in her womb would come to pass without human intercourse. For thus he introduces the angel speaking to Mary: "*And because you are so incredulous, believe through this.*"[3] And after a few [words] he adds: "*Plainly, through everything, he led her by the hand to believe the annunciation; and see how great skill Gabriel uses: for he does not recall to her memory Sarah or Rebecca, who were barren and old, because these were ancient narrations, but he leads her to that which recently happened in Elizabeth, to provoke her mind to believe.*" This same defect of faith Chrysostom seems to ascribe to her at the death of her Son, when in [the homily on] Psalm 13 he speaks thus: "*When Christ was crucified, there was none who did good; all the disciples fled; John withdrew naked; Peter denied; the sword of doubt passed through the very soul of Mary his mother.*"[4] Not unlike this opinion is what others write concerning the doubt of Mary — Origen (homily 17 on Luke), Theophylact (on Luke 2), and Augustine (in the Questions on Luke) — as you will be able to see below in the censures on the Gospel of Luke. There are those who wrongly judge that Chrysostom's temperament — by its own nature hostile to feminine ways — could not restrain itself from attributing something womanish even to Mary, whom elsewhere too, in the commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John, he censures as importunate and ambitious. But since Chrysostom, among Mary's other virtues, everywhere celebrates also her faith with wondrous praises,[5] it is necessary to refer his words not to any kind of doubt or incredulity of hers (which would be placed under the crime of unbelief), but to a certain hesitation arising from vehement admiration and astonishment — such as [arises] whenever unusual appearances of events, beyond the measure and order of nature, first present themselves to us. Which he himself indicates clearly enough, when in that place he describes Mary as struck with amazement, in the highest admiration, at the words of the angel. Read Annotations 58, 138, 139, 140, and 185 of book 6.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Luke 1[:34].

◊ **4. Left margin:** Luke 2[:35].

◊ **5. Right margin:** St. Chrysostom everywhere celebrates Mary's faith with wondrous praises.

Annotation CV [contents]

"Again he dug other wells, which the servants of his father Abraham had dug." — Genesis 26:18

Whether the heavens emit a vocal sound by their motion.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Dreams*, allegorically treating the history of the wells found by [the patriarch], when he had incidentally fallen upon a discourse of those things which praise God, asserted that the celestial spheres — by the sound of the vocal harmony which is produced from their revolution — continually celebrate God. His words are of this kind: "*Heaven, by the perpetual concord of its motions, renders a most sweet harmony, which, if it could reach our ears, would excite in us uncontrollable loves and an insane desire, by which, being stimulated, we should forget the things necessary for [our] sustenance — not fed by food and drink sent down through the throat, but as the candidates of immortality [are fed], by divine and consummate musical songs. Such [songs], when Moses, rapt out of the body, had heard them, he is reported [to have passed] forty days and as many nights, and to have tasted neither bread nor water. And so heaven, the archetypal instrument of music, seems to me to have been so elaborated for no other [reason] than that the hymns of the Parent of things might be sung skillfully and musically.*" To the same opinion there is no

doubt that St. Ambrose alluded, in the preface of the commentaries on the Psalms, in these words: "*The Angels praise the Lord, the Powers of the heavens sing psalms to him, and before the beginning of the world the Cherubim and Seraphim, with the sweetness of the singing of their voice, say, 'Holy, holy, holy.' A more express discourse relates that the very axis of heaven turns with a certain sweetness of perpetual concord, so that its sound may be heard in the farthest parts of the earth, where there are certain secrets of nature; nor does this seem foreign to the use of nature.*" **Licentius**, speaking to Augustine his teacher about God, briefly comprised this very thing in most elegant verses, saying:

> *He fitted numbers to the heavens, and bade [them] ply sonorous measures, and lead equal dances.*

St. Anselm, in the first book *On the Image of the World*, approving the exposition of these, declares it in plainer speech in this manner: "*The orbs of the seven heavens are turned with a sweet-sounding harmony, and by the most sweet concord of their revolution*" →

[…continues on folio 563 (PDF p. 380): the rest of Anselm's exposition, and Sixtus's judgment (Annotatio CV).]

---

*(printed folio 563 [PDF p. 380]. **Annot. CV–CVII** (Gen 26:18–27:19): the spheres' harmony (beyond our hearing, but listed among Marcosian errors and despised by Basil and Ambrose); the LXX's reversed "we have not found water"; and Origen and Chrysostom holding the "officious lie" sometimes lawful → folio 564.)*

(folio 563, left column → right column)

Annotation CV (continued)

[the orbs of the seven heavens are turned with a sweet-sounding harmony, and] by the most sweet concord of their revolution are [sounds] produced; which sound, for this reason, does not reach our ears, because it is beyond the air, and its magnitude exceeds our narrow hearing. For no sound is perceived by us except that which is produced in the air; but from the earth up to the firmament the celestial music is measured, to the exemplar of which our music was invented." But to these things it seems to stand in the way that **Epiphanius** (in the first book of the *Panarion*) and **Irenaeus** (in the book *Against Heresies*) place this assertion among the condemned dogmas of the Marcosians; and **Basil** (on the *Hexaemeron*, homily 2) and **Ambrose** himself (on the *Hexaemeron*) despise the same as, so to speak, cavilling, and resting on a most feeble foundation — unless perhaps we should say that these most grave men reject not the very assertion of celestial sounds, but the ridiculous reasonings by which certain inept philosophers strove to defend it, or certain prodigious fictions which the heretics (especially the Marcosians) deduced from it. We have written more fully on this matter in the book *On Physical Questions upon the divine Scriptures.*[1]

◊ **1. Left margin:** This book has not hitherto been published.

Annotation CVI [contents]

"The servants of Isaac came the same day, telling him of the well, saying: We have found water." — Genesis 26:32

The Septuagint wrongly translated, "We have not found water.".

The **Septuagint**, for what is read in the Hebrew — "The servants of Isaac came the same day, telling him of the well which they had dug, saying, *We have found water*; whence its name was called *Abundance*" — translated entirely the opposite: "The servants of Isaac came and told him of the well which they had dug, saying, *We have NOT found water*; whence its name was called *Oath.*" Which interpretation **Jerome**, in the book *On Hebrew Traditions*, condemns as corrupt, saying: "*For what etymology is it, that it should be called 'Oath' because they had not found water? — since the contrary is in the Hebrew, and Aquila and Symmachus*

agree that they DID find water, and that on that account the well itself was called Abundance, or Satiety."

Annotation CVII [contents]

"I am Esau thy firstborn." — Genesis 27:19

Whether it is lawful for a good man to lie.

Origen, in the sixth book of the *Stromateis*, incidentally touching this passage, taught that simulations and lies are sometimes profitable to Christians, and that a prudent and wise man can use an officious lie no otherwise than a medicine, when it is necessary. For thus Origen, when comparing our dogmas with the dogmas of Plato, left written in that place: "*Plato, in the third book On the Republic, says: 'Truth is greatly to be pursued; for if — as we were most rightly saying a little before — a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, [but] sometimes useful to men, so that they use it as a kind of condiment and medicine, there is no doubt that license of this kind is to be given to physicians and to be removed from the imprudent: therefore also the rulers of cities, if it is granted to any others, ought sometimes to lie, either against enemies or for the fatherland and the citizens; but from the rest, who do not know how to use a lie, all lying must be taken away.' Thus far we have reviewed the words of Plato. We too, therefore, mindful of that precept, 'Let each one speak the truth with his neighbor,'[2] ought not to say, 'Who is my neighbor?' but to consider how the philosopher cautiously said that a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, [yet] not always unuseful to men — and that God is not to be thought to lie sometimes, even for [the sake of] a dispensation. But if the advantage of the hearer requires it, [the wise man] speaks in ambiguous words, and utters through enigmas what he wishes, so that the dignity of truth may be preserved with him, and that what could be harmful, if uttered nakedly, may be put forth to the multitude under a certain covering. But let the man on whom the necessity of lying lies diligently attend, so to use a lie sometimes — as a condiment and a medicine — that he keep its measure, and not exceed the bounds which Judith used against Holofernes,[3] when she conquered him by a prudent simulation. Let him imitate Esther, who long corrected the sentence of Artaxerxes, the truth of her nation being kept silent;[4] and above all the patriarch Jacob, whom we read to have obtained the blessings of his father by an artful lie. From which it is evident that, unless we have so lied that some great good is sought by us thereby, we are to be judged as, so to speak, enemies of him who says, 'I am the truth.'*"[5] These things Origen [wrote] in the sixth book of the *Stromateis*. But in the tenth book of the same work, confirming this very thing by an apostolic example, he said that Peter and Paul, the princes of the Apostles, contended with each other at Antioch not in a true but in a feigned dispute,[6] so that by that kind of simulation they might recall the Jews and the Gentiles — at variance among themselves about the legal observances — to concord.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Ephesians 4:25.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Judith 11[:5–19].

◊ **4. Right margin:** Esther 5.

◊ **5. Right margin:** John 14:6.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Galatians 2[:11–14].

Into the same opinion **Chrysostom** seems to go, at the end of the first book *On the Priesthood*, where he most openly teaches that frauds, wiles, deceptions, and impostures — which are done not with the zeal of harming, but for the sake of some great good, and from a right judgment of the mind — are so far necessary that very many have oftentimes undergone punishments for this very thing, that they did not employ frauds. Which he confirms with many examples adduced: first of Emperors, for whom it is more honorable to have conquered enemies by fraud than to have vanquished them in open battle; then of physicians, who circumvent by frauds the sick who either refuse medicines or flee the cutting of the knife, and — remedies being administered by guile — lead them back to health; finally by the example of holy men: among whom Jacob craftily claimed for himself the right of the firstborn;[7] Moses, by deception, transferred the wealth of the Egyptians into the camps of the Israelites;[8] Michal, her father being circumvented and deceived, delivered from death her husband David,[9] whom a little after his kinsman Jonathan preserved from the wrath

of Saul by the same arts;[10] Paul, as a salutary medicine, often employed impostures — as when, for the favor of the Jews (whom he desired to allure to Christ), he circumcised Timothy,[11] and submitted himself to many other ceremonies of the Law, which, after faith had been given to Christ, he knew to be deadly. Again, in homily 53 on Genesis, expounding that, "I am Esau thy firstborn," he asserts that Jacob, in saying these things, did lie — but that a lie of this kind is not to be blamed, because he lied not for the sake of temporal advantage or avarice, but that he might procure for himself the father's blessing. Likewise in homily 32 on Genesis, upon those words, "Say that you are my sister," and in the epistle to Olympias, he pronounces the simulation of Abraham and Sarah — by which (as he himself says) "they lied about the kind [of relationship], and brought forward one person in place of another" — worthy of praise and of imitation. →

◊ **7. Right margin:** Genesis 27:19.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Exodus 12:35.

◊ **9. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 19.

◊ **10. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 20; 28.

◊ **11. Right margin:** Acts 16:3.

[…continues on folio 564 (PDF p. 381): John [of Damascus?] and Sixtus's own response on the officious lie (Annotatio CVII).]

---

*(printed folio 564 [PDF p. 381]. **Annot. CVII–CVIII** (Gen 27:19–28:12): the "officious lie" debate closed — Cassian and Jerome allow pious "hypocrisy," but Augustine, Innocent III, and the Scholastics condemn every lie (Sixtus sorts the biblical cases into those who only* seemed *to lie and those who did); then Philo on the stars as rational beings → folio 565.)*

(folio 564, left column → right column)

Annotation CVII (continued)

John Cassian, deacon and disciple of Chrysostom, drawing the metaphor of the medicine and the lie — borrowed from Plato by Origen — to the confirmation of the same opinion, says that a holy man is so to use a lie as if there were in it by nature [something] of hellebore. For just as hellebore, if it be taken when a deadly disease is imminent, is wholesome, but if it be drunk without the necessity of the greatest peril, is deadly: so too a lie is profitable when danger is imminent from the confession of the truth, but deadly when no necessity of concealing the truth presses. This necessity he reduces to two occasions: namely, either when some great loss is to be avoided and some excellent gain to be obtained, or when one must lie for the sake of humility — that is, that one may hide his virtues, under [the guise of] a lie, to avoid vainglory. The former part of this assertion he builds up in book 17 of the *Conferences*, from chapter 17 to 21, by the examples of: Jacob, invading the paternal inheritance by fraud and lie;[1] Joseph, deterring his brothers with lying words;[2] Rahab, lying for the safety of the spies;[3] David, speaking falsely before the priest Ahimelech;[4] [and] James, Peter, and Paul, descending to the fictions of simulation for the peace of the Church.[5] The latter part of the same assertion he proves from chapter 21 to 25, several testimonies of Scripture being adduced.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Genesis 27.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Genesis 42:9.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Joshua 2:4–5.

◊ **4. Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Galatians 2.

Jerome too seems to have acceded to this Origenic dogma, in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians; where, when he treated of Peter (reproved by Paul), he judged that hypocrisy is to be assumed by good men in [due] season, in imitation of many illustrious men — of whose number [is] Jehu, king of Israel,

who under the false promise of worshiping Baal slew the priests of that same Baal;[6] David, who by feigned madness fled the danger of Achish, king of Gath;[7] [and] Paul, who by a simulated rebuke reproved Peter (guilty of no fault) for the correction of the Judaizers,[8] and — that he might gain the Jews for Christ — circumcised Timothy, and himself shaved his head at Cenchreae, and, the tonsure being made, offered an offering in Jerusalem.[9]

◊ **6. Left margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 10.

◊ **7. Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.

◊ **8. Left margin:** Galatians 2.

◊ **9. Left margin:** Acts 16:3; 21:26.

This assertion Augustine condemns, in chapter 2 of the book *On Lying* to Consentius, among the Priscillianist heresies; and in the epistle to Jerome he grieves that it was once defended by Jerome, writing thus: "*I have read certain writings, said to be yours, on the epistles of Paul; and when you wished to unravel one of them — [that] to the Galatians — that passage came into [my] hands where the Apostle Peter is recalled from a pernicious simulation. That a patronage of lying was there undertaken by you — such a man — I confess I grieve not moderately. For it seems to me most destructive to believe that those men, through whom the divine Scripture was ministered and written for us, lied in anything.*" Thus Augustine. There is also an open determination of the Church against this opinion in the Decretals, under the title *On Usury*, chapter *Super eo*, where Pope Innocent, the third of that name, constantly affirms that it is forbidden by the precept of the divine word that anyone should lie even to save another's life[10] — which determination all the Scholastic theologians follow, most plainly decreeing that not only is every lie a sin, but also that every simulation and fraud, whether harmful or officious, is a vice contrary to truth and pertaining to the crime of lying; for whether by speech, or by any deed whatever — out of a zeal either to harm or to help — someone lies, he is a liar, and every lie is either a sin, or is not without sin.[11]

◊ **10. Left margin:** To lie is on no account lawful.

◊ **11. Right margin:** Every lie is either a sin, or not without sin.

But to those things which are objected by the defenders of the contrary opinion, they easily respond from the doctrine of Augustine, distributing into two classes the multitude of those who are produced as an example of profitable simulation and officious lying. In the **first** they place those who, though they lied in nothing, nevertheless seem to have been liars. Of these, some are thought to have lied because they spoke figuratively and mystically — like Jacob, who, though in those words, "I am Esau thy firstborn," he seemed to lie, nevertheless spoke true things: because, according to the divine providence (which had chosen him for Esau's birthright), he truly was the firstborn. But others fell into the suspicion of deceit and lying because, the counsels of their mind being concealed, they were unwilling to open the truth — as Abraham, answering the one who asked about his wife that she was [his] sister, seemed to have uttered a lie and denied the truth, when nevertheless he in no way lied, but only concealed the truth: keeping silent that she was his wife, and indicating what was true, that she was his sister; for she was truly his sister on the father's side, but not on the mother's. To this rule of *concealing* the truth the theologians refer all warlike stratagems and military ambushes, and the other simulations of governors, judges, and physicians, which — every crime of falsity being removed — consist in the sole concealment of truth. Among these can be reckoned the fictions of: Moses, despoiling Egypt;[12] Judith, beheading Holofernes;[13] David, feigning madness;[14] Peter, dissembling that he ate; and Paul, chiding Peter by a feigned rebuke[15] — which fictions indeed, since they are wholly devoid of any lie, are brought forward in vain for the patronage of lying. But in the **second** class the Scholastics place those who, without doubt, are agreed to have lied: such as David before the priest Ahimelech;[16] Jonathan before Saul;[17] Jehu the king with the priests of Baal;[18] Rahab, for the spies of the Jews;[19] [and] Michal, for David's safety.[20] But these, they assert, are not to be alleged in favor of falsity and lying, since their lies were nowhere approved by God. For although we read that some of these were, after these lies, praised in the sacred letters, and even rewarded by God with temporal goods, nevertheless it is not

to be thought that in them the deceit and lie was praised and rewarded, but the piety and charity and faith with which they embraced those for whom they did not fear to lie.

◊ **12. Right margin:** Exodus 12:35.
◊ **13. Right margin:** Judith 11:8–10, etc.
◊ **14. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.
◊ **15. Right margin:** Galatians 2.
◊ **16. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:2.
◊ **17. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 20:28.
◊ **18. Right margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 10:18.
◊ **19. Right margin:** Joshua 2:4–5.
◊ **20. Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 19:14.

Annotation CVIII [contents]

"And Jacob saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth." — Genesis 28:12

Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Dreams*, intent on the elucidation of this vision, says: "*In heaven there are stars, which severally are not only living beings [but rational]*" →

[…continues on folio 565 (PDF p. 382): the rest of Philo on the stars and the ladder (Annotatio CVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 565 [PDF p. 382]. **Annot. CVIII–CIX** (Gen 28:12–30:14): whether the stars are animate — Philo and Origen affirm rational, vice-capable minds (Jerome and Cajetan lean so, Augustine doubts), Basil and Damascene deny; Aquinas distinguishes an informing from an assisting soul, and the Fifth Synod anathematizes animate heavens; then Giorgio faulting Jerome's "mandrakes" → folio 566.)*

(folio 565, left column → right column)

Annotation CVIII (continued)

[the stars] are not only called living beings, but are also most pure minds." Explaining which opinion more clearly in the book *On the Making of the Six Days*, he wrote this: "*Of the things which are in nature, some are considered participant neither of virtue nor of vice, as plants and brutes; others, likewise endowed with virtue alone, have nothing at all of vice, as the star: for these are living beings, and indeed intelligences — or rather singular minds — wholly good, and not capable of any vice; again, others [are] mixed of both, as man, who is capable of contraries.*" And lower in the same book he adds: "*The stars are rational, and of a divine nature, partly intelligible and incorporeal, partly indeed corporeal.*"

Origen followed Philo, dissenting from him in this one [point]: that [Philo] believes the nature of the stars devoid of all vice, but [Origen] judges the same [nature] capable of no less vice than virtue. For thus he spoke of the stars in the first Tome of the commentaries on John: "*For it is absurd to say that Christ died only for human sins, and not also for something else besides man which was in sin — as, for instance, for the stars; since not even the stars are wholly clean before God, as we read in Job: 'The stars are not clean in his sight.'*"[1] Again, disputing more fully about the animation of the stars in the first [book] περὰ ὶρχῶν [*On First Principles*], chapter 7, he shows that the stars are living beings endowed with reason, which advance and fall short in virtues; and that a spirit was infused into them from without by God, so that within the body of the stars they may exercise the ministry of illuminating, for the utility of men, until the end of the world — in which, when the saints of God shall have attained [their] consummated glory, then these too shall be freed from the servitude of this ministry. And this very thing he frequently inculcates in the last homily on the

[book of] Numbers, and in very many other places.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Job 25:5.

To the same opinion Jerome seemed to allude, in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes, where, weighing that which is read at the beginning of that book — "The spirit goeth circling round about"[2] — he brought forward these things: "*That he says, 'The spirit goeth circling round about, and returneth in its circuits,' [means] either that he named the Sun itself 'spirit,' because it animates, and breathes, and is vigorous, and completes the yearly courses of the orb, as the poet says: 'Meanwhile the Sun rolls round the great year'; and elsewhere: 'And the year rolls round in its own footsteps'; or because: 'The shining globe of the Moon, and the Titanian stars, a Spirit within nourishes, and, infused through all the members, Mind moves the mass and mingles itself with the great body'*" — he speaks not of the annual course of the Sun, but of its daily paths.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Ecclesiastes 1:6.

Not far from these seems to stand **Cardinal Cajetan**, who, expounding on Psalm 135 that [saying], "He made the heavens in understanding," says: "*In understanding — that is, [made them] intellectual: which is true either as to the substance of the heavens, if they are animate (as many philosophers reasonably think), or as to [their] motion, because their motion is doubtless intellectual, that is, from an intellect.*" And in another place, incidentally expounding what is sung in the preface of the divine sacrifice — "The heavens, and the Powers of the heavens, celebrate together in fellowship of exultation" — he judged that this can be understood of the heavens which, since they are animate, they too, together with the other angels, praise God. Nor did **Augustine** altogether shrink from this opinion, who — not daring to disapprove it — left it in doubt,[3] thus writing in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 18: "*It is also wont to be asked whether the luminaries of the heavens are only conspicuous bodies, or whether they have certain governing spirits of their own; and if they have [them], whether they are vitally animated by them (as the flesh is animated by the souls of animals), or [are present] alone, without any mixture. Which, though it cannot easily be comprehended at present, I judge nevertheless that, in the course of treating the Scriptures, more opportune places may occur, where it will be permitted us — concerning this matter, according to the letters of holy authority — even if not to show anything certain, yet to believe [something].*" And in the *Enchiridion* to Laurentius, [chapter] 58, repeating the same, he adds: "*But neither do I hold this as certain: whether to the same society of the Angels there pertain the Sun, and the Moon, and all the stars — although to some they seem to be luminous bodies, [but] not with sense and intelligence.*"

◊ **3. Left margin:** St. Augustine doubts whether the stars are animate.

On the opposite side, **Basil**, surnamed the Great, in the third homily on the *Hexaemeron*, refuting this opinion, says: "*For neither are the heavens animate [merely] because they declare the glory of God, nor is the firmament a sentient animal [merely] because it announces the works of his hands. For thus also dew, and frost, and cold would be a spiritual and rational nature, because in Daniel they seem to praise God,*" etc. Agreeing with whom, **John Damascene**, book 2 *On the Orthodox Faith*, chapter 6, says: "*Let no one think the heavens or the luminaries animate; for they are inanimate and insensible. Wherefore, if Scripture says, 'Let the heavens rejoice,' it calls the Angels who are in heaven to joy. Scripture also knows how to employ prosopopoeia and the fiction of persons, and to speak of inanimate things as of animate: as, 'The sea saw and fled.'*" **Jerome** likewise, in the epistle to Avitus, among the heresies which he warns must be guarded against in Origen's books *On First Principles*, enumerates also the assertion about stars endowed with a rational soul.

But **St. Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 70, article 3, settles this controversy by adducing a distinction of this kind:[4] "*That the stars and the other celestial bodies are animate, or living beings, can be understood in two ways: either univocally — that is, by an* informing *soul, which is the form of the body (such as are the souls of plants and animals); or equivocally — that is, by an* assisting *soul, which is united to the body not as a form, but as a mover to a movable thing.*" And so Basil, and Damascene, and Jerome in the epistle to Avitus, do not reprehend those who, according to the *latter* understanding,

believe the stars to be animate or living beings — as it is likely that Philo thought, and Jerome himself in the book on Ecclesiastes, and perhaps even Origen; but they refute only those who taught the stars [to be] animate and the heavenly bodies [to be] living beings according to the *former* mode of understanding. Whether Philo and Origen are to be reckoned among these is not sufficiently clear — although Nicephorus, book 17 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, among the anathematisms hurled against Origen in the Fifth Synod, sets down this one too: "*If anyone says that heaven, and the Sun, and the Moon, and the stars are certain animate and mobile powers, let him be anathema.*"

◊ **4. Right margin:** In what sense the stars are called animate, St. Thomas explains.

Annotation CIX [contents]

"Rachel said: Give me part of thy [son's] mandrakes." — Genesis 30:14

Mandrakes [rendered] for lilies.

Francesco Giorgio reprehends **Jerome**, in the first Tome, Problem 215, because →

[…continues on folio 566 (PDF p. 383): the charge against Jerome's rendering of the mandrakes (Annotatio CIX).]

---

*(printed folio 566 [PDF p. 383]. **Annot. CIX–CXIII** (Gen 30:14–37:2): Giorgio's "*Dudaim *= lilies, not mandrakes"; an LXX flock-marking error; Jacob's wrestling as bodily (Theodore) vs spiritual (Jerome, Origen); the true etymology of* Israel *("Prince of God," not "man seeing God"); and Aquila's reversed reading of Joseph and his brothers → folio 567.)*

(folio 566, left column → right column)

Annotation CIX (continued)

because, for the word which in this place is read in Hebrew דודאים *Dudaim*, he translated "Mandrakes," when he ought to have expounded [it as] "Lilies." For how can it be that Rachel, being barren, should so greatly have desired mandrakes out of a longing to conceive[1] — [mandrakes] which are most cold, and especially hostile to conceptions, indeed even lethal to those who take them, as Dioscorides sets forth in a long discourse? Hence the mandrake itself is also called *Andraclon*, because it kills a man — although others would have it called *Andricelon*, from a man's image; which experience proves false. Unless perhaps the translator understood [it] of another kind of mandrake, which they call *Circaea* [Circe's herb], whose root serves for love-charms; yet the root of this, as Dioscorides himself relates, brings heaviness of head to shepherds who chew it, and induces stupor. Likewise of another kind of mandrake, which is called *Morion*, the same author narrates that a dram of it, taken in drink, induces madness. Therefore the *Dudaim* are lilies, which are warm and very proper for conception. An error of this kind is also found in the Song of Songs, where it is said, "The MANDRAKES gave their odor,"[2] whereas the mandrake is wholly odorless, and emits no odor at all.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Mandrakes are hostile to conceptions.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Canticles 7:13.

Annotation CX [contents]

"The beasts that were of the later coming became Laban's." — Genesis 30:42

An error of the Septuagint interpreters.

The **Septuagint**, for what is in the Hebrew — "The beasts that were of the later [season] became Laban's, but those of the first time [season], Jacob's" — translated in a different sense: "But the beasts that were not marked became Laban's, and the marked ones, Jacob's." [So] Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*.

Annotation CXI [contents]

"And behold, a man wrestled with him until morning." — Genesis 32:24

Whether Jacob contended with the Angel in a bodily wrestling.

Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea — as appears from the Greek Catena of Oecumenius — elucidating the present passage, asserts that Jacob fought against the angel in the embrace of a true and bodily wrestling, [an angel] who, a manly form being assumed for the time, provoked the patriarch himself to the wrestling. Although almost all the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin expositors follow this opinion, **Jerome** nevertheless seems to have disapproved [it] in the third book of the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, where, explaining that [saying], "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places,"[3] he indicated that Jacob did not fight bodily against him who appeared to him in [the form of] a man, but rather contended spiritually with the help of him who appeared to him in a man — not against human temptations, but against the greatest and superhuman temptations of the wicked demon, which Paul called "wrestlings not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places." And he expressed this sense in these words: "*These things we have brought forward, that we may beat back the opinion of those who think that all vices are of flesh and blood, and that the demons have no power to incite us to sin. Such a wrestling we think Jacob's also to have been — namely, that he contended not against flesh and blood, when he remained alone, and a man wrestled with him, helping and strengthening him against another struggling with excessive sweat. And at the same time see, lest perhaps those be ridiculous who think that Jacob wrestled the whole night in the manner of wrestlers. For what is there great, if — as they say — while wrestling he either overcame or was overcome? But according to a reasonable wrestling befitting the patriarch, it must be believed that his struggle was such as they have who can say, 'Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places.'*"

◊ **3. Left margin:** Ephesians 6:12.

Thus far the words of Jerome, who in this part follows the judgment of **Origen** — who earlier had written thus on the same matter in the third [book] *On First Principles*: "*Whence also the Angel is said to have wrestled with Jacob. Which we do not so understand, as that it be the same [to say] that the Angel wrestled with Jacob and [that it was] against Jacob; but that he who was present to him for the sake of [his] salvation, and imposed on him the name Israel, that same one wrestles with him — that is, is with him in the contest, and helps him in the struggle — since without doubt there was another against whom he fought, and against whom the contest was waged for him. And indeed Paul too did not say that we have a wrestling* with *the principalities and powers, but* against *the principalities and powers. Whence, if Jacob wrestled, without doubt he wrestled against some of these powers, which Paul declares to be especially adverse to the human race and to the saints, and to stir up contests. Therefore Scripture finally says of Jacob that he wrestled with the Angel and prevailed unto God — so that, if there be indeed a contest of the struggle, [Scripture], sustained by the Angel's help, may lead the victor, by the palm of perfection, unto God.*" **Procopius of Gaza**, in the commentaries on this chapter, says: "*Some — as we have received from a certain learned man — profess that the Devil, in the appearance of Esau, contended with Jacob, wishing to overcome him; but that an auxiliary Angel stood by Jacob, by whose help the Devil could effect nothing. Therefore, lest Jacob should think that he had vanquished the adversary by his own strength — [rather than] helped by the Angel's strength — the sinew was touched for him, and lameness followed.*"

Annotation CXII [contents]

"Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel." — Genesis 32:28

Many have not rightly interpreted the word "Israel.".

Philo (in the book on Abraham), and — in the book *On the Interpretation of Hebrew Names* — **Eusebius**, **Chrysostom**, and **Hilary**, wrongly interpreting the name "Israel" imposed on the patriarch Jacob, **Jerome** censures in the book of *Hebrew Questions* in these words: "*But that which in the book of Names is interpreted 'Israel, a man seeing God,' worn threadbare by the speech of almost all, seems to be interpreted not so much truly as forcibly. For here 'Israel' is written by these letters* ישראל, *which is interpreted 'Prince of God' or 'Upright of God'; but 'a man seeing God' is written by these letters* אישראל, *of which* איש *signifies 'man,'* ראה *'seeing,'* אל *'God.' Although, therefore, they be of great authority and eloquence, and their shadow oppress us — [they] who translated Israel 'a man' or 'a mind seeing God' — we are led rather by the authority of Scripture, and of the Angel (or of God) who called him Israel, than by any secular eloquence whatever.*"

Annotation CXIII [contents]

"But Joseph accused his brothers to his father of a most wicked crime." — Genesis 37:2

Whether Joseph's brothers accused him of a most wicked crime.

Aquila, the second interpreter of the divine volumes, where we — according to the Hebrew truth — read that Joseph accused his brothers to his father [of a most wicked crime], →

[...continues on folio 567 (PDF p. 384): Aquila's variant reading and Sixtus's discussion (Annotatio CXIII).]

---

*(printed folio 567 [PDF p. 384]. **Annot. CXIII–CXVI** (Gen 37:2 → Exodus): the brothers' slander of Joseph; Chrysostom self-contradicting on Judah and Tamar (acquittal vs condemnation); Philo allegorizing the high priest's vestment as the world, God's "most perfect Son"; and Jerome's "horned" face of Moses → folio 568.)*

(folio 567, left column → right column)

Annotation CXIII (continued)

of a most wicked crime — [Aquila] translated [it], as Procopius testifies, in a contrary sense: κατήνεγκαν δὲ κατ᾽Ι ἀωσὴφ ψόγον πονηρὸν Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν, that is, "The brothers, namely, brought a wicked reproach concerning Joseph to their father." In the same way, before Aquila, the Seventy interpreters too translated this very [passage]; following which version, Chrysostom, according to the same sense, expounded these words in homily 61 on Genesis, saying: "*Seeing the father's benevolence toward him, they were stirred to envy against him; for they brought [an accusation] against Joseph of a most wicked crime, before Israel their father. See the eminence of [their] malice: they attempted even to disturb the father's charity; and things which were not, they feign — accomplishing so great an evil against him, only that they might satisfy their envy.*" Agreeing with this same edition are the explanations of Theodore of Heraclea, Isidore of Pelusium, and Theodoret.

Annotation CXIV [contents]

"Judah, going in to her, said: Suffer me to lie with thee." — Genesis 38:16

Whether Tamar, in lying with Judah, perpetrated a crime.

Chrysostom, examining the intercourse of Judah and Tamar — namely, of a father-in-law with [his] daughter-in-law, described in the present chapter — seems to think diverse and plainly contrary things to his

own words. For in homily 62 on Genesis, freeing both the father-in-law and the daughter-in-law from all crime, he writes thus: "*Tamar wished to steal intercourse with her father-in-law, and from that to procreate children — not desiring to satisfy lust (far be this!), but it was a dispensation, what was done.*" And after a few [words], adducing three reasons for this opinion, he says: "*Let no one, hearing these things, condemn Tamar: for, as I said, she ministered to a dispensation; and therefore she neither merits any reprehension thence, nor was Judah liable to crimes. For behold, proceeding by this way, you will find that from the children born to Judah, Christ, according to the flesh, draws [his] lineage. Moreover, these two sons born through him were a figure of two peoples, and a certain prediction of the Jewish and the spiritual life.*" By these three reasons Chrysostom in this place defends Judah and Tamar, whom in other places he openly condemns — her indeed as incestuous, him as a fornicator. For, in the first homily on Matthew, making mention of the intercourse of that same Tamar, he says thus: "*Why did Matthew, in the generation of Christ, bring forward only those women who were noted for some vice*[1] *— that is, if any was an adulteress, or a harlot, if any was also not legitimately coupled in marriage, if any was foreign or barbarian? For the Evangelist commemorates not only the wife of Uriah, but also Tamar and Ruth: of whom one indeed was foreign, as Ruth; another a prostitute, as Tamar, who had dealings with a kinsman — not only not joined to him by the law of marriage, but [having] stolen the intercourse, and concealed under the habit of a harlot.*" To which question the same [Chrysostom], satisfying [it] in the third homily on Matthew, assigns three causes of this deed: the first, that he might show that Christ — who had come to extinguish our reproaches — deigned to have sinners as ancestors,[2] blushing at nothing on account of our evils; the second, to demonstrate to us that we are not to [glory] in [our] parents, even in the foul filth of the disgrace of fornication and adultery, if we are adorned by our own virtue (which is not discolored by the reproaches of a parent); the third, to repress the arrogance of the Jews, who gloried too insolently in the virtues of [their] ancestors — teaching that their own patriarch Judah, from whom the Jews take [their] name, committed no small offense in the fornication with Tamar.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Matthew 1:3, 5.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Christ, who was to extinguish our reproaches, deigned to have sinners as ancestors.

Thus far Chrysostom: whose former opinion Ambrose follows (book 3 of the commentary on Luke), and Theodoret (question 94 on Genesis); but the latter assertion of the same [Chrysostom] Jerome embraces (in the *Hebrew Questions*), and St. Augustine — who, meeting the reasons adduced for Chrysostom's first assertion, says, in book 22 against Faustus, that not all the deeds of men are to be approved by us,[3] [even those] from which certain good things, according to the dispensation of divine providence, either follow or are signified. For divine providence, everywhere preserving its own goodness, and drawing good as much from the evil as from the good works of men, willed — from the lust of Judah, who, overcome by concupiscence, went in to Tamar — not only to effect something of good, but to signify prophetically certain future goods. For to signify certain goods, it matters nothing whether those deeds, by which they are signified, be good or evil. **Aloysius [Ludovico], Bishop of Verona**, in the Catena of explanations on Genesis, says: "*Judah is not to be excused from the sin of fornication, nor is the fornication to be approved, as [that] of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman: for he sinned in manifold ways — and in others, by lying, by betrayal, and by hatred.*" **Rabbi Simeon [bar Yohai]**, in the commentaries on the Pentateuch which bear the title *Zohar*, frees her from all crime, because she did this not for the sake of satisfying lust, but by a certain pious instinct — namely, that she might conceive from Judah the awaited Messiah.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Not all the deeds of men — even those from which good things follow or are signified — are to be approved by us.

Annotation CXV [contents]

"And these shall be the vestments which they shall make." — Exodus 28:4

Whether the world is the Son of God, as Philo held.

Philo the Jew, book 3 *On the Life of Moses*, opening the allegory of the priestly vestment — in which the whole world was represented — says that the world is the most perfect Son of God, in these words: "*In this manner the high priest, [thus] adorned, is sent to the sacred [rites], so that, whenever he is about to make vows according to the ancestral rite, he may bring in the whole world under the figures which he bears upon [his] garments. For it was necessary that the priest, about to supplicate the omnipotent Father, should employ as advocate the world — his [the Father's] most perfect Son — to obtain pardon for [our] errors, and abundant grace for the time to come.*" I suspect that these words are to be understood metaphorically, according to the common usage of speaking, by which we are sometimes wont to call the artificial works of craftsmen [their] "offspring" and "births."

Annotation CXVI [contents]

"He knew not that his face was horned." — Exodus 34:29

Whether Moses's face was horned.

Augustine, **Bishop of Kissamos**, marvels at Jerome, because — against the Hebrew truth and the Septuagint edition — he put in his translation that Moses's face was "horned." For thus that bishop writes in the Annotations on Exodus: "*For the ambiguous word made an error in the edition — although there is also a difference between*" →

[...continues on folio 568 (PDF p. 385): the ambiguity of qaran/qeren and the defense of Jerome (Annotatio CXVI).]

---

*(printed folio 568 [PDF p. 385]. **Annot. CXVI–CXVIII** (Exod 34:29 → Lev 8:4): the Hebrew — קרן Moses's face "radiant," not "horned"; Origen on Christ suffering for the angels too (a "double victim"); and Origen seeming to have bishops elected by the people (Bodius's use of it answered) → folio 569.)*

(folio 568, left column → right column)

Annotation CXVI (continued)

between the noun "Horn" and that which signifies "Radiant." For "horn" is called קרן *Kerren* with a double segol; but "radiant," קרן *Karran*. Therefore it is not had in the Hebrew context that Moses's face was horned, but radiant. Which is most clearly understood from the words themselves, which in Hebrew have this form ומשה לא ידע כי קרן עור פניו בדברו אתו —, *Mosche lo iadacha chi Karan or panaiu bedabero ito* — that is, "And Moses knew not that the skin of his face was radiant." It is not written, therefore, that his face was horned, but that his skin was radiant. From this, then, the depraved custom of the common people can be corrected, who paint Moses with two horns: for horns did not come forth from [his] forehead, but [his] forehead, and nose, and mouth, and chin were radiant. And it is a wonder that Jerome, not having considered the Hebrew truth, did not even notice what the Septuagint had translated — who rendered this passage well: καὶ Μωϋσῆς οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι δεδόξασται ὃ ἡψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, "And Moses knew not that the appearance of the skin of his face had been glorified." And so the Jews laugh at us and execrate us, whenever they see Moses depicted in our temples with a horned face — as if we (as they foolishly interpret) thought him to be some Devil. From this passage of the Septuagint edition it is known that that ancient edition which the Church used before Jerome was that of the Septuagint themselves. For in the office of the Transfiguration of the Savior is sung, "The face of Moses was glorified" — which is taken from the Septuagint edition, which the Latins used, and whence they also took [their] Antiphons.

Annotation CXVII [contents]

"They shall pour the blood round about the altar, which is before the door of the tabernacle." — Leviticus 1:5

Whether Christ suffered for the Angels, as Origen taught.

Origen, in the first homily on Leviticus, narrating this passage, indicates that Christ suffered not only for the sins of men, but also of the Angels, writing in this manner: "*The blood of Jesus was poured out not only in Jerusalem, where the altar was, but also upon that altar which is in the heavens, where is the Church of the firstborn; there the same blood was sprinkled — just as the Apostle also says, 'Making peace through the blood of his cross, whether the things that are on earth, or the things that are in heaven.'*[1] *For Jesus was offered as a victim not only for earthly [beings], but also for heavenly ones: and here, indeed, for men, he shed the very corporeal matter of his blood; but in the heavens he immolated the vital power of his body, as a certain spiritual sacrifice. Do you wish to know that there was in him a double victim — suitable for earthly [beings], and apt for heavenly ones? The Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says 'through the veil, that is, his flesh';*[2] *and again, the inner veil is interpreted [as] heaven, which Jesus penetrated, that he might now stand before the face of God for us. If, therefore, two veils are understood, which Jesus — as a high priest — entered, consequently a double sacrifice too must be understood, by which both earthly and heavenly things are reconciled.*" To the same opinion he alludes in homily 2 on Leviticus, where, explaining that [passage] from Leviticus chapter 4, "The high priest shall offer a calf for his own sin,"[3] he says thus: "*See, therefore, lest perhaps Jesus — whom Paul says to have made peace through his blood, not only [for] the things which are on earth, but [for] those which are in heaven — be himself that calf, which in the heavens was offered not for sin, but as a gift; but on earth, where sin reigned from Adam to Moses, he suffered for sin.*" This same thing he expresses more openly in the first Tome of the commentaries on John, saying thus: "*Our great high priest offered himself as a victim — a victim not for men alone, but also for every [being] which is participant of reason. For, except God, he tasted death for all: not only for men, but also for the rest which use reason did he endure death. For it is absurd to say that he died for human sins, and not for some other [being] besides man which was in sin — as, for instance, for the stars, since not even the stars are wholly clean before God, as we read in Job.*"[4] He has a similar assertion also in the first book of the commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, where, explaining that [saying] from the first chapter of the same epistle, "He subjected all things under his feet," he speaks thus: "*In that he says 'all things,' he seems to raise a question. For as to that which is said, 'He must reign until he put [his] enemies under his feet,' you do not greatly seek an interpreter: because those things which are hostile, when they have been overcome, will be subjected under his feet, and will come into the power of the victor. But how all things — that is, angels, thrones, dominations, powers, and the other virtues, which were never contrary to God — will be subjected to 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 dreads the coming of the Creator; whence also the cross of the Savior is reported to have purged not only those things which were on earth, but also those which were in heaven.*" **Rufinus**, in the first book of the *Invectives*, imputes this very dogma to Jerome — by a conjecture plainly invalid — because he [Jerome], in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, inserted Origen's aforesaid words, without the author's name, into his own explanation, no confutation of them being added. See Annotations 170 and 292 of the following book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Colossians 1:20.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Hebrews 10:20.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Leviticus 4:3.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Job 25:5.

Annotation CXVIII [contents]

"Moses, all the multitude being gathered together before the door of the tabernacle, said," etc. — Leviticus 8:4

Whether bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people.

Origen, in homily 6 on Leviticus, seems to deduce from this passage that Bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people. For thus he writes: "*Although, therefore, the Lord had given command about constituting a high priest, and the Lord had chosen [him], nevertheless the multitude is convoked. For in ordaining a priest the presence of the people too is required, that all may know and be certain — because he who is more excellent out of all the people, who [is] holier, who more learned, who more eminent in every virtue, that one is chosen for the priesthood; and this with the people standing by, lest afterward any retraction remain to anyone, lest any scruple remain.*" **Hermann Bodius**, in his *Collectanea*, uses this testimony against us; to which he subjoins the words from the fifth epistle of Cyprian to the people and clergy, saying: "*In ordaining clerics, dearest brothers, we are accustomed to consult you beforehand, and to weigh the character and merits of individuals by common counsel.*" He confirms Cyprian's authority also by the example of Matthias, who was chosen not by the Apostles alone, but by the whole assembly of Christians; and as is said to have been done in the times of Pope Leo.

But if the words of each Doctor are rightly weighed, neither of them attributes to the people the right of electing a Bishop;[5] rather they indicate only that this was granted to the people by the rulers of the Church — namely, that [the candidates], in the presence of the people, might be chosen under the eyes of all, so that, as worthy and fit, they might be approved by public judgment, lest any [scruple] after the ordination →

◊ **5. Right margin:** The Doctors do not attribute to the people the right of electing a bishop, as the heretics trifle.

[…continues on folio 569 (PDF p. 386): Sixtus's full answer on the election of bishops (Annotatio CXVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 569 [PDF p. 386]. **Annot. CXVIII–CXX** (Lev 8:4–10:14): bishop-election reserved to the metropolitan and clergy (the people only approve); Origen's "Christ still mourns our sins" (recalled to a pious sense); and Origen making Christ's flesh and blood mere "word and doctrine" (used by Bodius against the Eucharist) → folio 570.)*

(folio 569, left column → right column)

Annotation CXVIII (continued)

lest, after the ordination, any occasion of retracting [it] should remain. Whence also **Lampridius**, a writer foreign to our religion, in the Life of Alexander [Severus] Augustus relates that it was the custom for the names of those who were to be set over the Church to be first proposed publicly, so that, if the people had anything against him, they might bring it forward.[1] And this same custom is preserved in our times — not entirely, yet in some part. For first, [the candidate] to be elected is wont to be examined concerning [his] faith and morals by the most approved men; then, when excellent testimonies have been received about him, before he is placed in the government of the Church the people are wont to be called, and in their presence [the election] is declared — so that the election may be approved by the people's favor, and the multitude may much more willingly obey him whom it knows to have been raised to that dignity by its own consent also. But the election of a Bishop itself is forbidden to the people by the decrees of the ancient Councils,[2] as appears from the Council of Laodicea, in whose twelfth canon it is forbidden that the election of a Bishop take place except by the metropolitan Bishop, together with the comprovincial bishops, or the college of priests. To no one, therefore, is it lawful to elect Bishops, except to those who hold the helm of the Church — and especially to the supreme vicar of Christ — and only to those princes and peoples to whom, by a certain peculiar prerogative, it has been granted by the Supreme Pontiff himself to nominate the Bishops whom they have judged fit for governing (as now some peoples do by his authority, and did once in the time of Pope Leo, and in the times of the Apostles in the election of Matthias[3]). For then this was easily [granted] to the

multitude of the faithful, [when] the people was moderate, grave, and most zealous for the public utility; but now, since the common people is a beast of many heads, always intent on factions and seditions, this very thing could not be granted except with the greatest disturbance of the Church. St. Cyprian too, in the same epistle cited by the heretics, openly asserts that it is not necessary that [the one] to be elected be inquired of the people concerning [his] merits, where the divine suffrages, brought forth through the bishops, go before.

◊ **1. Left margin:** See Thomas Stapleton, in the *Demonstration of Doctrinal Principles*, Controversy 2, book 5, chapters 12 and 13.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The election of bishops is forbidden to the people.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Acts 1.

Annotation CXIX [contents]

"You shall not drink wine, nor anything that may make drunk, when you enter into the tabernacle of the testimony." — Leviticus 10:9

Whether Christ still mourns our sins.

Origen, homily 7 on Leviticus, expounding the sense of this passage, writes this: "*My Savior even now mourns my sins, and my Savior cannot rejoice, so long as I remain in iniquity. For how can he be in joy, to whom the grief of my sins always ascends? For if the Apostle mourns certain of his own who have sinned before, what shall I say of him who is called the Son of charity? For, since the Lord is merciful and compassionate, he himself, with greater affection than the Apostle, weeps [for] his own, and much more mourns those who have sinned and have not done penance. For it is not to be thought that Paul mourns for sinners, but that my Lord Jesus abstains from weeping, when he approaches the Father and offers propitiation for us.*" **St. Bernard**, in the sermon which is entitled *On the Words of Origen*, most copiously confuted this passage.[4] Yet we can easily recall Origen's words to a pious understanding, if we say that Christ mourns our sins — not that he himself, who is devoid of all grief and weeping, mourns in any way or can mourn, but because he still mourns our sins in his members,[5] when he infuses into his elect weeping and compassion for another's iniquity. In which sense the Apostle said that "the Spirit of God prays for us with unspeakable groanings,"[6] because he provokes us to groans and tearful prayers. Nor do the following words of Origen — which discuss most amply concerning the Church and the spiritual members of the body of Christ — differ from this understanding.

◊ **4. Left margin:** St. Bernard confuted Origen.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Christ mourns our sins in his members.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Romans 8:26.

Origen also has certain things in this homily which seem to allude to the opinion of those who hold that the souls of the saints do not enjoy the beatitude of the divine vision until the final resurrection of the flesh.[7] These you will be able to see on the second page of the present homily, in those words: "*For the saints have not yet received their joy, nor even the Apostles: but they too await, that I may become a partaker of their joy,*" etc. — which are to be interpreted of the full consummation of completed felicity, which the saints have not yet received in [their] bodies. But of these [we treat] more copiously in Annotation 345 of the following book.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Whether the souls of the saints enjoy the glory of God [before the resurrection].

Annotation CXX [contents]

"The breast also that is offered, you shall eat in a most clean place." — Leviticus 10:14

Whether the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than his doctrine.

Origen, in the seventh homily on Leviticus, running out into an allegory of this passage, pronounces two things which **Hermann Bodius**, in his *Collectanea*, brings forward to undermine the truth of the Eucharist.

The first is, that the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than the discourse and doctrine of Christ. The next to this is, that that sentence of the Savior — "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you," etc.[8] — is to be understood figuratively of the doctrine of Christ, and not according to the letter, of the real body and blood of Christ. For these are Origen's words: "*Our Lord and Savior says, 'Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall not have life in yourselves: my flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink.' Jesus, therefore — because he is wholly clean from the whole — his whole flesh is food, and his whole blood is drink: because every work of his is holy, and every word of his is true; therefore his flesh too is truly food, and his blood is truly drink. For with the flesh and blood of his Word, as with clean food and drink, he gives drink and refreshes the whole race of men.*" And a little after he adds: "*Recognize that the things which are written in the divine volumes are figures; and therefore examine them as spiritual, and not as carnal, and understand the things which are said. For if you follow according to the letter that which was said, 'Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood' — this letter kills.*" To the same [sense] he seems to allude in homily 9 on Leviticus, where, discussing that [passage], "And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord," etc., he says: "*You, who have come to Christ, the true high priest — who by his blood made God propitious to you and reconciled you to the Father — do not cling to the blood of the flesh, but learn rather the blood of the Word, and hear him saying to you, 'For this is my blood, which shall be shed for you unto the remission [of sins].*'" →

◊ **8. Right margin:** John 6:53.

[…continues on folio 570 (PDF p. 387): Sixtus's answer to Bodius on Origen and the Eucharist (Annotatio CXX).]

---

*(printed folio 570 [PDF p. 387], a dense page of short textual notes, Leviticus into Numbers. **Annot. CXX–CXXVI** (Lev 16:13 → Num 25:4): Origen and the Sacramentarians on the Eucharist; clerics and temporal goods; Moses's "Ethiopian" wife (= Zipporah); Aaron's rod; Balaam's "open" eye; and Origen on our guardian angels being judged with us at the Last Day. (The source misprints CXXVI as "CXXVII," skipping CXXVI; corrected here.) → folio 571.)*

(folio 570, left column → right column)

Annotation CXX (continued)

of sins: he knows [this], who is imbued with the mysteries, and [knows] the flesh and blood of the Word of God. Let us not, therefore, dwell on these things, which are both known to those who know, and cannot lie open to the ignorant." To this opinion Augustine has [something] not unlike, on the third Psalm, and in book 3 *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 16 — with whom **Thomas Cajetan** agrees, in the commentaries on the sixth [chapter] of John. The right understanding of these propositions you will be able to attain in Annotation 196 of book 6.

Annotation CXXI [contents]

"And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord." — Leviticus 16:13

The words of **Origen** from homily 9 on Leviticus, brought forward for the exposition of this passage, are cited by the Sacramentarians in confirmation of the heresy which denies that the true body of Christ is in the sacrament of the altar. Read Annotation 196 in the following volume.

Annotation CXXII [contents]

"The houses of the Levites, which are in the cities, may always be redeemed." — Leviticus 25:32

Whether it is lawful for priests to possess temporal goods.

Origen, near the beginning of homily 15 on Leviticus, seems to think that Christ forbade to clerics the possession of temporal things, saying thus: "*The law of Christ, if we follow it, permits us to have neither possessions on earth, nor houses in the cities. And why do I say houses? It grants [us] not even several tunics, nor to possess much money. For 'having food and clothing,' he says, 'let us be content with these.*"[1] Consult Annotation 106 of book 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** 1 Timothy 6:8.

Annotation CXXIII [contents]

"Miriam spoke against Moses, because of his wife the Ethiopian." — Numbers 12:1

Concerning Moses's wife.

Josephus, in the second book of the *Antiquities*, describing this history, is refuted in the Annotations of Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, in these words: "*Josephus reports that Moses married this Ethiopian woman on this occasion: that, while he was being brought up in Pharaoh's court, he was chosen general against the Ethiopians, and thence carried off the woman as a captive, and made her his wife — the daughter of the king of the Ethiopians — and that Moses had two wives, this one and Zipporah; which I judge to be most fabulous. Apollinaris also lies, that Moses had two wives. For who does not see that these things are invented by them? For it is clear that this [woman] is Zipporah, the daughter of the priest of Midian — not that Midian is [that] Ethiopia which is beyond Egypt, but that Ethiopia which is joined to Arabia. For the sons of Israel fought against the Midianites, coming into Palestine; and the Midianites came down from those places into Egypt.*"

Annotation CXXIV [contents]

"And there were twelve rods, besides the rod of Aaron." — Numbers 17:6

Whether the rods brought to Moses were more than twelve.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, refutes Jerome's translation in this passage, writing this in the Annotations on the Pentateuch: "*Here is omitted what was most necessary — namely,* וַמַּטֵּה־אַהֲרֹן בְּתוֹךְ־מַטֹּתָם; ve-matteh Aharon betoch mattotam, *that is, 'And the rod of Aaron was placed in the midst of their rods' — inasmuch as he had been chosen priest by God, and held the principate among the rest. This is omitted by the Septuagint,* καὶ ἡ ἰάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἀναμέσον τῶν ῥάβδων αὐτῶν, *that is, 'And the rod of Aaron in the midst of their rods.' But in the place where Jerome substituted for this sentence 'Besides the rod of Aaron,' I know not whether it is truly said — since it is neither had in the Hebrew context, nor is it even true that there were twelve rods* besides *the rod of Aaron, but rather [twelve]* together with *the rod of Aaron: for each rod represented a tribe, and there were twelve tribes; wherefore the rods could not be more than twelve. Therefore 'besides the rod of Aaron' is superfluous; but in its place must be put, 'And in the midst [was] Aaron's rod, the rod of Aaron.' For neither among the Septuagint is there that exception.*"

Annotation CXXV [contents]

"The man said, whose eye is stopped up." — Numbers 24:3

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, weighing Jerome's version in this part, thus admonishes in his Annotations: "'*The man said, whose eye is stopped up.*' הגבר שתם העין, ha-gever shetum ha-ayin — *that is, 'The man whose eye is* open,' *as the Hebrews interpret, and as the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition translates; wherefore it was taken in the contrary [sense] by Jerome. And I wonder why the Septuagint did not follow the Hebrew — [the Seventy] who translated according to the Hebrew,* Φησὶν ἄ ὀνθρωπος ἀ ὁληθινός, *that is, 'The true man said.' Whence it comes about that I suspect Jerome did not render it in that way [deliberately], but that a negation is missing in our codices: so that it must read, 'The man said, whose eye is* not *stopped up.' For otherwise Balaam would be saying things contrary to himself, who a little after protests that he is a hearer of*

the words of God."

Annotation CXXVI [contents]

Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment.

(The printed text misnumbers this annotation CXXVII, skipping CXXVI; it is corrected here to CXXVI, its proper place in the sequence — the following annotation on folio 571 is correctly numbered CXXVII in the source.)

"And the Lord being angry, said to Moses: Take all the princes of the people, and hang them up against the sun." — Numbers 25:4

Origen, in homily 20 on Numbers, applying an allegorical interpretation to this passage, teaches that the angels, our guardians, are to be judged by God on the day of judgment — whether they have guarded us with accurate diligence or not — and will receive, for the care expended toward us (well or ill), either punishments or rewards, which now they themselves, anxious about their own salvation, await between hope and fear. His words are these: "*The angels will come to judgment with us, and will stand for us before the Sun of justice — lest perhaps something also of that which we do amiss be from them, lest perhaps they have expended less of work and labor toward us to recall us from the stain of sins. For unless there were also something in them which might seem blameworthy in our cause, Scripture would never say to the angel of this or that Church, 'You who have, for example, certain [persons] holding the doctrine of Balaam';*[2] *or, 'Because you have forsaken your first charity,'*[3] *or 'your patience,' or other things of this kind, for which, in the Apocalypse, the angels of each single Church are blamed. For if an Angel — for example, he who received me, sealed, from God, for the things which I have done well — hopes for a reward, it is certain that he will also fear to be blamed for the things which have been done ill by me; and therefore they are said to be 'hung up against the Sun,' that it may appear, without doubt, whether [these things] were committed through my disobedience, or through his negligence.*" And in homily 24 on Numbers, expounding that [passage] from the 20th chapter of the same book, "The woman, if she shall know anything," etc., repeating the same, he says: →

◊ **2. Right margin:** Revelation 2:14.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Revelation 2:4.

[…continues on folio 571 (PDF p. 388): the rest of Origen on the angels' judgment (Annotatio CXXVI).]

---

*(printed folio 571 [PDF p. 388]. **Annot. CXXVI–CXXVIII** (Num 25:4–33:1): the guardian-angels-judged teaching completed (Origen on Luke, Jerome on Micah, Aquinas: angels as witnesses, not defendants); a twofold order of the blessed; and Origen's staged ascent of souls to God's vision after the resurrection → folio 572.)*

(folio 571, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXVI (continued)

says: "*We have often said that a care and administration is had, through the Angels, of the souls which are in the Church of God; and we have shown that these [Angels] too come to judgment together with men, so that by that divine examination it may be established whether men have sinned by their own sloth, or by the negligence of their monitors and guardians,*" etc. Again, in homily 13 on Luke, narrating that [passage] from chapter 2, "There was made a multitude of the heavenly host,"[1] etc., he treats the same thing more fully, writing thus: "*If it is expedient to speak boldly, following the sense of the Scriptures, for each single Church there are two bishops: the one visible, namely a man; the other invisible, who is an Angel — the former*

manifest to the sight of the flesh, the latter to the [inward] sense. And in what manner [the man], if he has well administered the stewardship committed to him, is praised by the Lord, [and] if ill, is subject to fault and blame — so also the Angel. For it is written in the Apocalypse of John: but you have there a few names [of those] who have defiled this or that; and again you have there [those] who teach the doctrine of the Nicolaitans; and then you have those [others] committing this or that sin. And the Angels are accused, whose Churches have opposed [them]. But if the Angels have [such] solicitude how the Churches are governed, what need is there to speak of men — how great a fear they must have, that, laboring together with the laboring Angels, they may obtain salvation? I think that both an Angel and a man, [both] good, can be found together [as] Bishops of the Churches, and in a certain manner participants of one work: which since it is so, let us ask the omnipotent God that the Angels and the men [who are] bishops of the Churches may be a help to us; and let us know that both are judged by the Lord on our behalf. For if they be judged, and the fault and the sin be found not in their neglect but in our negligence, we shall be accused and punished; for when they do all things and strive for our salvation, we shall nonetheless not be free from our sins. Moreover it frequently happens that, while we labor, they do not fulfill their office, and are in fault." Again in homily 35 on Luke, upon that [passage] of chapter 12, "When thou goest with thy adversary,"[2] etc., he speaks these things more openly to the same sense, saying: "*It is written elsewhere that double Angels attend a man, whether unto the good or unto the evil part. For of the good ones the Savior makes mention, saying, 'Their Angels always see the face of the Father.'*[3] *At the same time inquire whether the Angels of the little ones in the Church always see the face of the Father, and the Angels of the others have not liberty to attend upon the countenance of the Father: for neither is it to be hoped that the Angels of all see the face of the Father, who is in heaven. If I be of the Church — however least I may be — my Angel has liberty, and confidence, of always seeing the face of my Father; but if [I be] outside, and not of that Church which has not spot nor wrinkle, or any such thing, and I am reprobate [and] alien from such a congregation, my Angel has not confidence of looking upon the countenance 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 lead [us] through unto salvation, they too may have confidence of seeing the face of the Father. In what manner also, if through their care and industry salvation is procured for men, they always attend the face of the Father — so, if through their negligence a man falls, they are not ignorant that there is peril to themselves also. And as a good Bishop and the best steward knows it to be of his own merit and virtue if the sheep of the flock committed to him have been kept, so understand also concerning the Angels: it is a disgrace to an Angel if a just man committed to him has [nevertheless] sinned; as, on the contrary, it is a glory to an Angel if [even] the least [man] committed to him be [kept] in the Church. For they shall see the face of the Father, who is in heaven — not sometime, but always — while others shall never see [it]: for according to the merit of those whose Angels they are, the Angels shall contemplate the face of God either always, or never, or less, or more.*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Luke 2:13.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Luke 12:58.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Matthew 18:10.

Thus far Origen: to whose opinion Jerome seems to subscribe, in book 2 of the commentary on Micah, where, expounding those words of the 6th chapter of the same prophet,[4] "Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc., he left this written: "*By the mountains he signifies, I think, none other than the angels, to whom the administration of human affairs has been committed — the Canticle of Deuteronomy agreeing to the very same [point]:*[5] *'When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he appointed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God.' And contend in judgment, that — whether they be reckoned mountains or hills — it may appear that they have not worthily administered the peoples; or that it may seem to be my [charge], who have set forth such [rulers]; or that the fault may be taken away from the people and referred to the Angels. We read the Apocalypse of John, in which the Angels of the Churches are praised and accused for the virtues and vices of those over whom they*

are said to preside. For just as sometimes it is the Bishop's fault, sometimes the people's; and often the master sins, often the disciple; and sometimes it is the father's fault, sometimes the son's, that they are well or ill instructed — so in the judgment of God the crime is either referred to the Angels, if they have not done all the things which pertained to their office, or to the people, if — [the Angels] doing all things — they themselves have scorned to hear [them]." These things Jerome [spoke], more (as I judge) from another's opinion than from his own.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Micah 6:1.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Deuteronomy 32:8.

Divus Thomas, in the first part of the Theological Summa, question 113,[6] kindly and benevolently — as he is always wont — excusing the errors of the Fathers, says that Origen wished to infer nothing else from the aforesaid words, except that the Angels were to be brought into judgment for the sins of men — not indeed as defendants, but as witnesses,[7] to convict the sloth of those who have neglected to acquiesce in the admonitions of the angels. Nor does that seem to be discordant from this pious interpretation of Thomas which Origen brought forth in homily 11 on Numbers, in these words: "*Therefore each single one of the Angels will be present at the judgment in the consummation of the age, bringing forth with him those over whom he presided. And I think there will be an inquiry there also — not indeed whether the Angel was wanting to the care of the men, but whether the Angelic care met with no worthy response from human sloth.*"

◊ **6. Right margin:** St. Thomas, part 1, question 113, article [8], to the 4th [objection].

◊ **7. Right margin:** The Angels are brought into judgment not as defendants, but as witnesses.

Annotation CXXVII [contents]

"To these shall the land be divided for a possession, according to the number of the names." — Numbers 26:53

Whether all the blessed shall see God.

Origen, in homily 21 on Numbers, upon these words, says that there is a twofold kind of the blessed: one higher and more perfect, which shall see God face to face; the other lower, which shall only inherit the land of the living — that is, [shall possess] only immortality, sublimity, and power. Origen has an opinion alluding to this in homily 35 on Luke. See Annotation 345 of the following volume.

Annotation CXXVIII [contents]

"These are the mansions of the children of Israel." — Numbers 33:1

Whether the saints, immediately after the judgment, are raised to the contemplation of God.

Origen, in homily 27 on Numbers, expounding these things, indicates that souls after the resurrection are not immediately raised to the vision of God, but are led step by step to the contemplation of God through the ascents of many illuminations. For he says: "*It is treated, therefore, of the ascent from Egypt to the land of promise, through which* →

[...continues on folio 572 (PDF p. 389): Origen on the soul's gradual ascent through its many "mansions" to the vision of God (Annotatio CXXVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 572 [PDF p. 389]. **Annot. CXXVIII–CXXX** (Num 33:1 → Deut 6:4): Origen's "mansions" as the soul's staged ascent (Sixtus objects with 1 Thess 4 — souls see God at once); Jerome's promised land as heavenly allegory; and the Trinity elicited from "the Lord our God is one God" (Kissamos dissenting, with Maimonides' mockery) → folio 573.)*

(folio 572, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXVIII (continued)

through which — as I said — we are taught, by mystical descriptions, the ascent of the soul to heaven by the sacrament of the resurrection from the dead. And the names of the mansions too are set down." And a little after: "*Such, therefore, shall be the ascent of the blessed soul, when all Egypt, and the Amalekites, and all who assailed it, shall have been submerged; and, departing through each single mansion — those many, namely, which are said to be with the Father*[1] *— it is illumined more and more, coming from one to another, and always acquires greater increases of illumination, until it be made accustomed to the very true Light itself (which illumines every man), [able] to endure its gaze, and to bear the splendor of [its] wondrous majesty.*" These things Origen: to whom it is objected, that Paul says, "*The DEAD, who are in Christ, shall rise first: then we, who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them to meet Christ in the air; and so shall we be always with the Lord.*"[2] By which words he shows that the souls of the saints are to be caught up to the gaze of God, without any delay, immediately after the resurrection.[3] But the mansions which Origen says are in the Father's house are to be referred not to diverse times of ascent, but to diverse grades of rewards.

◊ **1. Left margin:** John 14:2.

◊ **2. Left margin:** 1 Thessalonians 4:16–17.

◊ **3. Left margin:** The souls of the saints are caught up to the contemplation of God immediately after the resurrection.

Annotation CXXIX [contents]

"When you shall have entered into the land of Canaan, it shall be bounded by these limits." — Numbers 34:2

Whether the land of promise is to be understood according to the letter.

Jerome, in the epistle to Dardanus, explaining the bounds of the holy land comprehended in the present chapter, indicates that he was unjustly condemned by a certain inept heretic, [on the charge] that he took away the historical truth of the promised land — teaching that those things which God promised concerning the land of promise in the sacred letters pertain most especially to the naked allegory, that is, are to be referred to that land of the living only, which is in heaven; since the whole region of the Jews is so narrow in circuit[4] that it scarcely has a length of a hundred and sixty thousand paces, and a breadth of forty [thousand]; and in these [bounds] too — though the regions, places, cities, and towns are very many — [they were] never occupied by the Jews, but only held out by the divine promise. And in book 13 [of the commentary] on Isaiah, writing things consonant to these, upon that [passage] of Isaiah 49, "And Sion said, The Lord hath forsaken me,"[5] etc., he says: "*From which we learn that Jerusalem is by no means to be sought in the region of Palestine — which is the worst of the whole province, and is roughened with rocky mountains, and suffers a penury of water, so that it uses the rains of heaven, and consoles the scarcity of springs by the building of cisterns — but in the hands of God, to whom it is said, 'Thy builders have made haste,'*" etc. To this calumny Jerome, at the close of that same epistle, meets [the accuser] with these words: "*Neither do I say this in disparagement of the land of Judea, as the heretic sycophant lies, nor that I take away the truth of the history — which is the foundation of the spiritual understanding — but that I may strike down the haughtiness of the Jews, who prefer the straitnesses of the Synagogue to the breadth of the Church. For if they follow only the killing letter, and not the life-giving spirit, let them show [me] the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey.*"

◊ **4. Left margin:** How great is the length and breadth of the region of the Jews.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Isaiah 49:14.

Annotation CXXX [contents]

"The Lord our God is one God." — Deuteronomy 6:4

Whether from this passage the mystery of the Trinity ought to be elicited.

Anselm of Laon, author of the interlinear Gloss, hints that Moses therefore called the one God by three names, that he might signify that God is one in majesty, and three in persons — having neither division, nor admitting solitude. This exposition seems taken either from **Augustine**, who expounds this passage concerning the unity of the Trinity in the third book against Maximinus, bishop of the Arians, chapter 23; or from the first epistle of **Alexander, Pope and martyr**, who — from a divine sentence similar to this one, showing the mystery of the Trinity in unity — argues in this manner: "*If there is no Trinity, why in Deuteronomy did he say, 'The Lord our God, this is God'? If there is no unity, why did he say 'This is,' and not 'These are,' designating [it] by the plural number? If there is no Trinity, why in the same book is it said, 'The Lord thy God is a great and mighty God'? If there is no Unity, why is he not named 'great and mighty' in the plural?*" These things Alexander. I pass over — for brevity's sake — **Idacius Clarus**, an ancient author, repeating these same words of Alexander in the book which he wrote against Varimandus. But **Gregory, bishop of Nyssa**, too, in the book *On the Knowledge of God, against the Jews*, adducing this same testimony for the unity of the Trinity, says: "*Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God.*" That [word] "LORD, and GOD, and GOD," shows three persons; but that [word] "is one," [shows] one divinity and one nature. **Theodoret**, in the second book *On the Cure of Greek Affections*, expounding to the same effect, says: "*Moses, when he says, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is one,' both teaches unity and signifies trinity. For, the Lord being once set forth, and twice repeated with 'Lord,' he intimates the Trinity; and when he added, 'is one,' he brought forward a doctrine congruent to the Jews, and taught that there is one and the same divinity and substance in three.*"

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos — perhaps ignorant that this is the explanation of the great fathers of the Church — reproves it in his Annotations as insipid. His words are these: "*It is not to be passed over in silence in this place, that Rabbi Moses the Egyptian, the foremost writer of the Hebrews, carps at the Christians and derides them with a long mockery. 'The Christians,' he says, 'gather the Trinity from this passage: for first three persons are expressed, when it is said, "Lord, God, God" — for there the divine name is thrice repeated; afterwards the Trinity is intimated, when it is said, "is one."' Having produced these words, he inveighs against us with many reproaches. It could indeed be that someone more insipid than [certain] of ours — of whom very many are found — said this to that Jew. Now many, unskilled in the divine letters, gather the Trinity from these passages, from which it cannot be gathered; and again, where that divine matter is most clearly expressed, nothing of it penetrates into their minds. This happens chiefly from the preachers, who often wrest the divine letters, while they will have this [word] to be a figure of one thing, and that of another; and it has come to pass that we are made a laughing-stock to the sharp-eyed Jews. A middle [course] must at all events be held: that those things which bear a figure be interpreted figuratively; but those which look to no other [meaning] be not wrested thereto; and it must be diligently searched out, so that where [Scripture] speaks of the Messiah we may attentively recognize [it], but where nothing of this kind is foretold we may not violently drag [it]. For it comes about, from this cause, that we infect the divine letters with most foul fables — a thing which Gregory Nazianzen greatly censures. For there was among the Greeks a race of men, such as [there is] among ours, and which flourished many days before, who →*

[…continues on folio 573 (PDF p. 390): Augustine of Kissamos on the Greek allegorizers, and his objection to eliciting the Trinity from this passage (Annotatio CXXX).]

---

*(printed folio 573 [PDF p. 390]. **Annot. CXXX–CXXXI** (Deut 6:4 → Josh 8:28): the Trinity-from-Deut debate closed (Kissamos on the Greek allegorizers; the ELOHIM/YHWH grammar); then Origen's*

apokatastasis — *the restoration of demons and the damned — detested by many Fathers, but defended by Merlinus's* Apology *as an interpolation → folio 574.)*

(folio 573, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXX (continued)

[a race of men, such as there is among ours,] who heaped up a certain infinite pile of figures, and use it to show that all things — not so much the greatest as the least — were foreshown by figures. I certainly would say that this is not only most foolish, but also most impious. For neither do we say this, imitating the impudence of certain Germans, who have usurped to themselves the license of maligning all things — both gods and men, both human and divine matters — but [we speak so] that we may censure the things worthy of censure, and praise the things worthy of praise. For as he is a Christian who follows neither the Arian division nor the Sabellian conjunction, so [he is] truly a Christian who neither follows the impudence of those men, nor yet fails to reprehend the things which are worthy of reprehension. It could therefore be that some Christian said those things to Rabbi Moses. But this too is not to be ignored: that the Hebrews are wont, for the most part, to fabricate false charges against us, and to accommodate our affairs to [their] vituperation; and we find many things among them which they falsely assert to be ours; and by that nation this has been done throughout — that they might contaminate our dogmas with most impious lies, and [so] are the slower to take up the faith of Christ: for they have their own writers, to whom they give credence, and they find among them our [teachings] mangled with the utmost vituperations, and corrupted with most wicked lies. It is said, therefore, in this passage, 'The Lord God,' because in the divine letters God is wont to be named by these two names joined together at once — namely ELOHIM and IHVH [YHWH] — of which the second is the Tetragrammaton name, that is, signifying the divine essence; but the first is that divine name by which his might is signified, for I think EL and ELOHA to be almost the same. But where it is said, 'God is one,' it is plain that a repetition of [the name] God is made, [and] that [this 'God'] is not co-numbered with those two." But others also may interpret [this] better than we.

Annotation CXXXI [contents]

"Joshua burned the city of Hai, and made it an everlasting heap." — Joshua 8:28

Whether the demons and hell shall suffer everlasting punishments.

Origen, composing an allegory of the present passage, seemed to assert that after the day of resurrection neither the demons, nor hell — the place of the demons — shall be forever, but that after certain spaces of time the Demons, together with the rest of the damned who are detained in hell, shall come to celestial beatitude. For thus he wrote in homily 8 on Joshua: "*There is in this also a mystery of the future resurrection; for even then, thereafter, there shall be no Devil at all, because there shall then be no death. For, speaking of the Devil, the Apostle says:* ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος, *that is, 'The last enemy, death, is destroyed.'*[1] *But let us see what things follow in what comes after. 'And Jesus,' he says, 'burned the city of Hai, and the city was made [one] which shall not be inhabited forever.' You see that these things which follow pertain more to the truth of the mystery than of the history. For that place of the earth is not uninhabitable forever in the [same] way as the place of the Demons shall be uninhabitable — then, namely, when now no one shall sin, nor shall sin reign in anyone, when the Devil and his Angels shall be delivered to the eternal fire, Christ saying to those who have conquered, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father,' etc., but to the others, 'Go into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his Angels'*[2] *— until he provide by remedies for every soul which he himself has harmed, and all Israel be made safe.*" Into the same opinion he speaks in the first book περὰ ὶρχῶν [*On First Principles*], chapter 6, where, treating from the beginning of the wicked spirits who have sinned, he brings forth these things: "*These [beings] indeed, [fallen] from the state of the first beatitude, are moved, yet not moved irremediably; [but] to those whom we have described*

above they are subjected, to be governed by the holy and blessed orders; and, using their assistance, and reformed by salutary institutions and disciplines, they can return and be restored to the state of beatitude." Again, in Tome 18 on John, expounding that [passage] of John 8, "Whither I go, you cannot come,"[3] he says: "*If anyone shall have spoken blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be remitted to him, neither in this world nor in the [world] to come — [yet] not [absolutely] so; but if in the future age it is not remitted, [it does not follow that] therefore neither in the [still later] future ages shall it be remitted.*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 15:26.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Matthew 25:34, 41.

◊ **3. Right margin:** John 8:21.

That Origen betrayed this same [error] more openly in the exposition of the first and second chapters of the epistle to the Ephesians, Jerome is a witness, in the commentaries on that same epistle. Theophilus also, bishop of Alexandria, in the 2nd Paschal book; Augustine, in the book *On Heresies*; and Jerome, in the epistle to Avitus, and in very many other places of this kind, detest this error in Origen. Rufinus, however, in book 1 of the *Invectives*, had asserted that Jerome, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians, approved this dogma; to which [view] Erasmus also, in the *Origenic Annotations*, indicates that Ambrose subscribed, in the exposition of the third chapter of the same epistle. But of this we shall speak below, in Annotation 298 of the sixth book.

Now it is pleasing to append certain testimonies of Origen, diametrically opposed to the higher [preceding] passages — from which **Jacobus Merlinus**, in the *Apology for Origen*, contends that the aforesaid opinions were inserted into the Origenic works not by Origen himself, but by rivals of Origen, with a malicious mind — in these words: "*The dogma concerning the reparation of the demons and of the damned, into which they think Origen declined, is refuted by many of his [own] sayings. For upon Ezekiel, homily 14, he says: 'The Angels, not keeping their principality, but deserting their own habitation, [God] will keep in the judgment of the great day, under darkness, in everlasting chains.' In homily 14 upon Joshua, expounding how many kings were gathered together against Joshua — to whom the Lord says, 'Fear not before their face, for tomorrow, at this hour, I will deliver them into thy hands' — [Origen writes]: 'I see,' he says, 'that today we cannot oppress them, nor slay them all, but tomorrow they shall be destroyed' — that is, after the consummation of this age. For then every contrary power shall be destroyed, and then it shall be utterly conquered, when it shall be said to those who are on the left hand, 'Go into the eternal fire, which God has prepared for the Devil and his angels.*[4] *The same [Origen] asserts [it] in homily 14 on Numbers, expounding that [passage], 'They were beseeching the Lord that he would not torment them before the time.' The same, in the fifth book, in the explanation of the epistle to the Romans, asserts [it], alleging the epistle of Jude. But if he asserts that they are to be punished for eternity, and afflicted with perpetual fire, then he does not assert that they are at length liberated. Moreover, he uses these words in book 5 of the aforesaid explanation, expounding that [passage] of Paul, 'Death shall no more have dominion over him,*[5] *etc.: 'Whence I wonder that certain [persons], against this most evident sentence of Paul, will assert that in future ages either the same or similar things must be suffered by Christ [again], so that even those may be liberated whom, in the present life, the medicine of his dispensation could not heal. For they say: Can there be any age in the future, wherein neither anything of good nor of evil is done, but the matter stands amazed, and a profound silence remains?' Again, expounding that [passage] of Paul, 'Have they so stumbled that they should fall?',*[6] *he says: 'Israel shall be saved; but of this [Israel]* →

◊ **4. Right margin:** Matthew 25:41.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Romans 6:9.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Romans 11:11.

[…continues on folio 574 (PDF p. 391): the rest of Merlinus's Apology, and Origen on the salvation of "all Israel" (Annotatio CXXXI).]

*(printed folio 574 [PDF p. 391]. **Annot. CXXXI–CXXXV** (Josh 8:28 → Job 1:17): Merlinus's anti-restoration Origen texts; Augustine's over-generous free will (self-corrected); the Queen of Sheba as Arabian, not Ethiopian (סָבָא vs שְׁבָא); the pseudo-Origen Job commentary's Arianizing and "unbelievers' virtues are sins" (Luther); and its "three troops" allegory of the* Homoousians *→ folio 575.)*

(folio 574, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXI (continued)

[of this Israel] which is said to have fallen from heaven; nor, at the end of the age, shall there be any turning back. Concerning the damned he thinks the same, upon Isaiah, where, expounding those words, 'They shall rise again, they who are in the sepulchres,' etc., he says: 'It is therefore better to say that we shall all indeed rise again, so that the impious too may come into that place where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth, and [the just to that place] where each one shall receive, in his own order, according to the merit of his good deeds, when the body of their humility shall be transformed.' Likewise in homily 18 on Numbers he says thus: 'If the soul have not virtues, the flesh shall not come [into the inheritance], nor the soul unto the inheritance, but only unto the judgment of him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.' Likewise in homily 4 upon Ezekiel, expounding that [passage], 'Sodom shall be restored,' etc. — understanding by Sodom the sin of the soul — he blames some of the Hebrews who assert that Sodom shall at some time be restored. Likewise in the exposition of Psalm 37, he exhorts the sinner to prepare himself in this age against the scourges, lest he be consumed [re-wrought] with eternal fires: from which it is known that, according to his opinion, the fire shall be eternal. Finally, if anyone should desire to know how scrupulously Origen spoke concerning Gehenna, let him read the book of Joshua, where — comparing it in diverse places — he brings in, concerning the land of promise, [the wish]: 'Would that, in the things which we have said, we might not seem to have spoken rashly and perilously.' And in the book *Periarchon* [*On First Principles*], where he speaks concerning the consummation, he says: 'These things indeed are said by us even with great fear and caution — as by those discussing and treating [them], rather than establishing [them] for certain and definite.'" Whence, how manifest it is that Origen affirmed the restoration of the lost creatures never to be made, the sagacious reader (I think) sufficiently understands.

Annotation CXXXII [contents]

"And the spirit of the Lord came upon Saul." — 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:6

Concerning free will.

Augustine, in the book of *Questions to Simplician*, question 1, expounding these things, seemed to attribute to free will more than is fair, when he said: "*Although it be in each one's power what he wishes, yet it is not in each one's power what he can do to anyone, or suffer from anyone.*" This opinion Augustine himself, revising [it] in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 1, [says]: "*This,*" he says, "*was said by us because we do not say that a thing is in [our] power except what we do when we will [it], where first and chiefly is that very willing itself. For without any interval of time the will itself is present, when we will; but this power too — of living well — we receive from above, when the will is prepared by the Lord.*"

Annotation CXXXIII [contents]

"The Queen of Sheba, having heard the fame of Solomon, came," etc. — 3 Kings [1 Kings] 10:1

Concerning Seba and Sceba.

Josephus, in the eighth volume of the *Antiquities*, illustrating this passage paraphrastically, says that the Queen of Sheba had her kingdom in Ethiopia, and thence came to Solomon. Which thing **Augustine, Bishop**

of Kissamos, noting, left this written in the Annotations on Genesis: "*There are two regions which by the same name are called Saba, by us and by the Greeks; among the Hebrews, however, there is a notable distinction: the one is in Ethiopia, the other in Arabia. That which is [in] Ethiopia is written among the Hebrews with the thin s — that is,* סְבָא *Seba; but that which is in Arabia, with the thick s — thus* שְׂבָא *Sceba.*" Which is also noted by Jerome in the *Hebrew Questions*. The Queen of Sheba, therefore, was not an Ethiopian, but an Arabian Sheba queen. But Josephus is deceived (in my judgment), who writes that the Queen of Sheba [came] from that [Saba] which is written in the books of Kings — [holding] that it was not that which is in Arabia, but that which is in Ethiopia, since at that time she ruled Egypt and Ethiopia. But from all the passages it is certainly gathered that she was a queen of Arabia. And therefore, by Isaiah, in that same passage where he said, "All shall come from Saba,"[1] is placed, "Every flock of Cedar shall be gathered to thee, the rams of Nabaioth shall minister to thee"; and all among the Hebrews know Cedar to be a part of Arabia. The Nabaioth, too, are peoples of Arabia, who by the Greeks and Latins — the name a little loosened — are called Nabataeans. So also David sings: "The kings of the Arabians and of Saba,"[2] etc.; and there the neighboring regions are placed together. In Arabia, moreover, aromatics are reported to be, which she brought to the king. Furthermore, when we shall have said that "Seba" with the thick s signifies that which is in Arabia, it is plain that this woman was a queen of that [region]; because in the third [book] of Kings it is written וּמַלְכַּתְ שְׂבָא; *ve-malchath Sceba* — that is, "And the queen of Saba" — which name is written with the thick s. Wherefore we cannot approve the opinion of Josephus; nor let it move us that in the Gospel she is called "the queen of the South,"[3] for the Sabaeans, in respect to Judea, are placed toward the South, and that region is sometimes named "the Southern." These things have therefore been noted, because very many among us and among the Greeks have been deceived by the amphibology of these names. But in the same verse both Sabas are, in this place, commemorated.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Isaiah 60:6.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Psalm 71:10 [72:10].

◊ **3. Right margin:** Matthew 12:42.

Annotation CXXXIV [contents]

"And [that] man was simple and upright." — Job 1:1

Concerning the Trinity.

The commentaries wrongly ascribed to **Origen**, in the exposition of this passage, have two propositions, the former of which Erasmus judges to savour of something Arian, on this account, that its words run thus: "*All things whatsoever men do, they do in vain, if they have not done [them] in faith; they act without cause, save in the acknowledgment of the one unbegotten God the Father, and in the confession of the one only-begotten Son of him, our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the glorious and venerable Paraclete,*" etc. In these words the name of God is added to the Father alone, and he alone is called unbegotten, because he alone had no beginning; the Son is called Lord, not God; but the Spirit [is called] neither God nor Lord, but the venerable Paraclete: for by these expressions the Arians were wont to signify, in the Trinity, that the Holy Spirit is great, the Son greater, but the Father greatest.

The **second** proposition Luther took up in the articles disputed by him, when he asserted that all the virtues of unbelievers are sins.[4] The words of this proposition are these: "*That I may say [it] briefly and boldly: All things whatsoever men do — whether in virginity, or in abstinence, or in chastity of body, or in the distribution of their goods — they do all in vain, if they have failed in faith. For all the sanctity, and all the justice, which anyone does outside the true faith of God, he does in vain, he does unto perdition; it profits him not, it aids him not in the day of wrath: to which Paul is witness, saying, 'Everything which is not of faith is sin.'*"[5] Of the same opinion seem to be Ambrose, Augustine, and Anselm — whose mind, catholically expressed, you have in Annotation 255 of the book which next follows this.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Whether the virtues of unbelievers are sins, as Luther held.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Romans 14:23.

Annotation CXXXV [contents]

"The Chaldeans made three troops, and fell upon the camels." — Job 1:17

Impious dogmas concerning the Trinity are falsely ascribed to Origen.

Origen — in book 1 of the commentaries on Job, forging an allegory with these words — [treats of] the Homoousians, that is, those who rightly [hold] concerning the consubstan- →

[…continues on folio 575 (PDF p. 392): the pseudo-Origen allegory of the "three troops" and the consubstantiality of the Trinity (Annotatio CXXXV).]

---

*(printed folio 575 [PDF p. 392]. **Annot. CXXXV–CXXXVII** (Job 1:17–9:17): the Arian forger slandering the orthodox "Homoousians"; a one-line pointer on Walafrid Strabo's gloss; and the long crux on unbaptized infants — Gregory and Augustine hold real (though lightest) torment, which Aquinas mitigates to the mere privation of the divine vision → folio 576.)*

(folio 575, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXV (continued)

[those who rightly hold concerning the con]substantiality [of the Father and the Son], he assails with these words: "*Three horns, or three troops, the Devil made as a type, and equal to that three-named sect of his, and to the heresy of the three Gods, which filled the whole globe of the earth in the manner of darkness — [the heresy] which sometimes worships the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit as three [gods], sometimes adores [them as] one, in the manner in which the language of the Greeks commemorates the Triad and the Homoousion. Therefore that most crafty Devil, designating from afar, long ago, this sect and heresy of the Trinity, and its wickedness, sent three horns to plunder Job. For thus also the aforesaid three-named heresy — now especially — plunders and storms the Church.*" Thus far the author of these commentaries, which we have already shown to be falsely inscribed with the title of Origen, when in the preceding volume we set out the catalogue of Origen's works.

Annotation CXXXVI [contents]

"As it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done." — Job 1:21

Strabus [Walafrid Strabo], author of the Gloss which is called the *Ordinary* — what kind of gloss he applied to this passage — you will see below, in the exposition of the words of Jerome, in Annotation 227 of this book.

Annotation CXXXVII [contents]

"He hath multiplied my wounds, even without cause." — Job 9:17

Whether infants are punished with the punishments of the damned.

Gregory, in book 9 of the Explanations on Job, chapter 16, from these words seems to gather — against the common consensus of Theologians — that infants dying without baptism are punished, sensibly, with the perpetual torments of the damned. For there he left this written: "*Some are withdrawn from the present life before they attain to the bringing forth of good or evil active merits of life; whom — because the sacraments of salvation do not free [them] from the fault of [their] origin, and here they did nothing of their own — [yet] they come thither also, unto torments: and because after this death an eternal death also follows, by a hidden*

yet just judgment upon them, even without cause the wounds are multiplied. For they suffer perpetual torments, who sinned nothing of their own will. Job says, therefore, 'In a whirlwind he shall break me, and shall multiply my wounds, even without cause,' as if, openly considering the losses of the human race, he should say: The strict Judge — with what aversion he slays those whom he condemns by the fault of their own action, so also he smites in eternity those whom the guilt of [free] choice does not condemn."

This Gregory [holds], following, no doubt, the decree of Augustine, who in the book *On Faith, to Peter*, chapter 27, decreed concerning this matter in these words: "*Most firmly hold, and by no means doubt, that not only men now using reason, but also little ones — who, whether they begin to live in the wombs of their mothers and there die, or, born of their mothers, pass out of this world without the sacrament of holy baptism, which is given in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit — are to be punished with the everlasting punishment of eternal fire: because, although they had no sin of their own action properly [committed], they nevertheless drew the damnation of original sin by carnal conception and nativity.*" And in the same book, chapter 3, he more openly expresses that infants of this kind are smitten with the same quality of punishment as the Demons and the rest of the damned, saying: "*The evil quality of life begins from unbelief, which takes its beginning from original sin; in which [life] whosoever begins so to live, that he ends [it] before his life be loosed by his [Christ's] obligation — if that soul lived in the body for the space of one age or of one hour, it is necessary that it sustain, with that same body, the interminable punishments of Gehenna, where the Devil with his Angels shall burn forever; where, together with him, [there shall be] also the fornicators who serve idols, the adulterers, the effeminate, the thieves, the avaricious, and all who do the works of the flesh — [all these], if before the end of this life they have not been converted, shall be burned with eternal fires.*" Again, in the sermon *On the Baptism of little ones*, confirming this his opinion by the argument of Gospel authority, he says: "*Since the Gospel speaks [of] two parts, Christ made a right hand and a left; being about to say to those on the left, 'Go, ye cursed, into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his Angels,' [and] about to say to those on the right, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom' — no middle place is here left, where you might set the infants; and in the final sentence he says, 'These shall go into eternal burning, but the just into life eternal.' Behold, he has expounded to you what the kingdom is, and what the eternal fire: so that, when you confess the little one [is] not to be in the kingdom, you may confess [he is] to be in the eternal fire.*"[1] And this same thing he repeats — in fuller words, but plainly in the same sense — in the fifth book of the *Hypognosticon*, showing that by the same kind of punishment the little ones not baptized, and adults, and demons, are afflicted.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Matthew 25:34, 41.

But as to what pertains to the *quantity* of the punishment, everywhere he teaches that the torments of infants are the lightest[2] — but especially in the fifth book against Julian the Pelagian, speaking thus: "*But I do not say that the little ones dying without the baptism of Christ are to be smitten with so great a punishment that it were rather expedient for them not to be born — since the Lord said this not of any sinners whatsoever, but of the most wicked and most impious. For if — as [is plain] because he says it of the Sodomites, and surely willed [it] to be understood not of them alone — one shall be punished more tolerably than another in the day of judgment, who would doubt that the little ones not baptized, who had only original sin and are not aggravated by their own vices, shall be, in the damnation of all, the most lightly [punished]?*" This same thing he has also in book 1 *On the Merits and Remission of sins*, chapter 16, and in the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 93, where he speaks thus: "*Most mild, surely, of all, shall be the punishment of those who, besides the sin which they drew as original, added none in addition; and, among the rest who added [sins of their own], each one shall have there a damnation the more tolerable, the less iniquity he had here.*" **Gennadius**, priest of Marseille, thinks that Augustine in this part erred through much-speaking. For in the *Catalogue of Illustrious Men* [he says]: "*Augustine, although he treated the doubt concerning aborted [infants] with less capacity, yet his error — exaggerated (as I said above) by much discourse, [and] by the*

struggle with enemies — has not yet given [material for] a heresy-question." These things Gennadius.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Of what sort the future punishment of little ones dying without baptism shall be, in the judgment of St. Augustine.

St. Thomas, in the *Disputed Questions*, in the question *On the Punishment of Original Sin*, article 2, mitigating the propositions of Gregory and Augustine, said that they wished to signify, by "fire," "Gehenna," and "torments," nothing else than the privation of the divine vision — which alone the infants not yet reborn lack; but this privation those fathers called by such harsh names, through a certain excess of speaking, that they might render much more execrable the error of the Pelagians, who preached that in little ones there is no sin at all. But Gregory [of Rimini] →

[…continues on folio 576 (PDF p. 393): Gregory of Rimini and the other scholastics on the punishment of unbaptized infants (Annotatio CXXXVII).]

---

*(printed folio 576 [PDF p. 393]. **Annot. CXXXVII–CXLI** (Job 9:17–20:26): Gregory of Rimini's literal severity on infants; Luther on "sinning in every work" (answered by Fisher); whether the blessed see earthly things (Gregory vs Augustine); souls blessed at once (Bunderius on purgatory); and whether hell-fire is incorporeal (Gregory's text shown corrupt — "corporeus") → folio 577.)*

(folio 576, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXVII (continued)

But Gregory of **Rimini**, in the second [book] of the Sentences, distinction 31, question 3, tenaciously holding the sayings of each doctor, judges that they are to be understood according to that rigidity which the severity of the words conveys.[1]

◊ **1. Left margin:** The Pelagians taught that in little ones, even before baptism, there is no sin.

Annotation CXXXVIII [contents]

"I feared all my works." — Job 9:28

Whether the just man sins in every work [he does].

Gregory, in book 9 of the Explanations on Job, explaining this, says: "*By the holy man Job it is rightly said, 'I feared all my works,' as if it were said, with humble confession: What I have done openly, I see; but what may lie hidden in these [works], I know not.*" Luther, in the compendium of the Articles of his perfidy, article 35, uses these words for the confirmation of his perverse dogma, whereby he teaches that no just man is certain that he does not always sin mortally in every work [he does]. **John [Fisher], Bishop of Rochester**, writing against Luther, demonstrates that he adduced these words truncatedly and beside the point; by which [words] indeed we are admonished to fear concerning good works — not that those good and holy works are (as Luther affirms) evil, and annexed to sins, but lest, from the consideration of them, we be either lifted up into pride, or slip into sloth and torpor.[2] And that this was Gregory's meaning, the preceding words of his — craftily omitted by Luther — most openly indicate.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Concerning good works we must fear, lest from their consideration we be either lifted up into pride, or slip into sloth and torpor.

Annotation CXXXIX [contents]

"Whether his sons be noble, or ignoble, he shall not understand [it]." — Job 14:21

Whether the souls of the blessed see all things which are done here.

Gregory, in book 12 of the commentaries on Job, chapter 13, speaking concerning the knowledge of the blessed, seems to disagree from the opinion of Augustine, saying that the souls of the saints, seeing God, behold all things which are done here among us. For thus he speaks: "*The dead know not how the life in the flesh, [lived] after them, is disposed — because the life of the spirit is far from the life of the flesh; and as corporeal and incorporeal things are diverse in kind, so also [they are] distinct in cognition. Yet concerning the holy souls this is not to be thought; because those who within behold all things by the charity of the omnipotent God, it is in no way to be believed that outwardly there is anything of which they are ignorant.*" But **Augustine**, in the book *On the care to be had for the dead*, chapter 13, writes diversely, affirming that the dead — even the saints — know not what the living do, even their own children, as among Isaiah the Israelites complain, saying, "*Abraham hath not known us, and Israel hath been ignorant of us.*"[3] Which he confirms also by the example of his own mother Monica, saying: "*If the souls of the dead were present in the affairs of the living — to say nothing of others — my own pious mother would in no way desert me, [she] who followed me by land and sea, that she might live with me; for far be it that she has been made, by a happier life, cruel. But if parents are not present, who are those other of the dead who [might] know what we do, [or] what we suffer?*" **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the Summa of Theology, question 89, article 8, judges that Augustine brought these things forth by way of doubting, not of asserting — which Augustine himself also indicated, when he said, "*Let each one take, as he will, what I [shall] say.*"

◊ **3. Left margin:** Isaiah 63:16.

Annotation CXL [contents]

"After darkness I hope for light." — Job 17:12

Whether the souls of Christians are blessed immediately after this life.

Gregory, in book 13 of the Explanations on Job, chapter 20, writes these things: "*Because by the grace of our Author we have been redeemed, this we now have as of a heavenly gift: that, when we are withdrawn from the inhabitation of our flesh, we may at once be led to the heavenly rewards; because, while our Creator and Redeemer, penetrating the bars of hell, leads forth thence the souls of the elect, he does not suffer us to go thither — whence he has already, by descending, freed others.*" That this passage has been distorted by the Lutherans to overthrow the faith of purgatory, **John Bunderius** is a witness, in title 18 of his *Concertations*, where, refuting these same heretics, he says: "*Gregory did not wish, by these words, to deny Purgatory — which in the fourth [book] of the Dialogues, and elsewhere, he so diligently confirmed through the Scriptures and histories; but he wished to insinuate this: that we are not now excluded from the kingdom of heaven, when migrating from life, as the Fathers of the Old Testament were excluded before Christ's passion. For they, however much purged, were nevertheless still excluded; but this is now not so. And that this was his intention is plain from what follows: for he adds, 'Those who, before his coming into this world, departed — however much justice-virtue they had — being led out of [their] bodies, could in no way at once be received into the bosom of the heavenly fatherland, because he had not yet come who by his descent should loose the bars of hell, and place the souls of the just in [their] perpetual seat.'*"

Annotation CXLI [contents]

"A fire that is not kindled shall devour him." — Job 20:26

Whether the fire of hell is incorporeal.

Gregory, in book 15 of the *Morals*, seems from these words to deduce that the fire of hell is incorporeal, and diverse in kind from this fire of ours — which indeed Jerome, writing to Avitus, reckons among the condemned assertions of Origen. The words from chapter 15 of the *Morals* run thus: "*'A fire that is not kindled shall devour him': in a very wonderful manner, in few words, is the fire of gehenna expressed. For our fire is corporeal, and, that it may avail to be fire, needs corporeal fuel; and, when it must be maintained,*

is without doubt nourished by heaped-up wood — nor can it be [fire] unless kindled, nor subsist unless refreshed. But, on the contrary, the fire of gehenna, since it is incorporeal, and burns corporeally the reprobates cast into it, is neither kindled by human effort, nor nourished by wood, but, once created, endures inextinguishable; and needs no kindling, and lacks no heat." Of this opinion of Gregory's seem to have been **Augustine**, in book 12 *On Genesis to the letter*, where he taught that the place to which souls are borne after death is not corporeal but spiritual; and **John Damascene**, who concluded the end of book 4 *On the Orthodox Faith* with these words: "*And the Devil shall be delivered, and his Demons, and his man — that is, Antichrist — and the impious, and sinners, into the eternal fire: not material, such as is with us, but such as God knoweth.*"

But that Gregory did not think so is clearly demonstrated in book 4 of the *Dialogues*, chapter 29, where, to Peter asking whether he would confess the fire of gehenna to be incorporeal or corporeal, he answers: "*That the fire of gehenna is corporeal I do not doubt, in which it is certain that bodies are tormented.*" Wherefore it is to be known that these words of Gregory, in all the Lyons codices of Hugh à Porta, and in some manuscript exemplars, are read corruptly:[4] for where in these is had, "The fire of gehenna, since it is *in*corporeal," the syllable "*In*" ought to have been deleted, so that, in place of the word "*Incorporeus*," might be read "*Corporeus*"[5] — for the following words of Gregory openly show this; and in this manner St. Thomas cites them, in the fourth volume of the *Sentences*, distinction 44, question 3, saying: →

◊ **4. Right margin:** The passage of St. Gregory is corrupt.

◊ **5. Right margin:** The fire of Gehenna is corporeal.

[…continues on folio 577 (PDF p. 394): Aquinas's citation of Gregory, and the corporeal nature of hell-fire (Annotatio CXLI).]

---

*(printed folio 577 [PDF p. 394]. **Annot. CXLI–CXLV** (Job 20:26–42:16): hell-fire shown corporeal (Aquinas softening Damascene; Durandus blunter); whether Angels and souls are corporeal (Faustus abusing Jerome, refuted by Claudianus Mamertus); whether the Son is "always born" (Gregory vs Origen, reconciled by Peter Lombard); the pseudo-Origen Job commentary again censuring the orthodox; and whether anyone can be sure he does not always sin (Gregory) → folio 578.)*

(folio 577, left column → right column)

Annotation CXLI (continued)

saying that from this passage it cannot be deduced that the fire of hell is of another nature and species than this [our fire] is: "*for although in these fires certain diverse properties may be found, yet of both the nature, form, and substance is the same.*" But as to that which was brought forward from Damascene, **Durandus of Saint-Pourçain**, in the fourth [book] of the Sentences, freely pronounces that that author erred, thinking wrongly in this part.

But **St. Thomas**, as is his custom, treating Damascene urbanely and benignly, says that his mind can be interpreted in a twofold manner: first, that we understand him not simply to have denied the material fire of Hell, but [to have denied] that it is material in the same way as ours, which is distinguished from that fire by several properties. Secondly, that we understand him not to have denied the fire of Hell to be material as to substance, but as to the effect of punishment: for it punishes bodies by a certain spiritual action,[1] which it neither dissolves nor consumes, and torments the souls themselves much more spiritually. What is to be answered to Augustine's opinion, you have above, Annotation 40.

◊ **1. Left margin:** In what manner the fire of Hell punishes bodies.

Annotation CXLII [contents]

"The stars are not clean in his sight." — Job 25:5

Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal.

Jerome, in the commentaries inscribed with his name, treating this passage, says: "*For if the Angels, and even the bodies of the heavens, are said to be unclean in comparison to God, what do you think man is to be esteemed, since he himself is rottenness?*" **Faustus**, a bishop in Gaul around the year of the Lord 430, elicits from these words that Jerome was of the opinion of those who taught that the nature of Souls and Angels is corporeal. For thus he wrote at the beginning of his book *On [the nature of] creatures*: "*The most learned of the Fathers define that whatever is created is a body, and assert that the nature of Souls and Angels is corporeal, for the reason that in its beginning it is circumscribed by [place] and space. For, as we read in a certain treatise of St. Jerome: 'They think,' he says, 'that the globes of the stars are embodied spirits.' And likewise, 'If the angels — the heavenly bodies too — in comparison to God are said to be unclean, what do you think man is to be esteemed?'*" **Claudianus [Mamertus]**, bishop of Vienne in Gaul, in the second book *On the State of the Soul*, refuting Faustus (who asserted all created things to be corporeal), shows that this testimony was rashly and wrongly usurped by him — inasmuch as it makes nothing to the point, nor serves Faustus's aim. But what the Fathers thought concerning this matter, you have below, Annotation 35 of book 6.

Annotation CXLIII [contents]

"Didst thou, after thy rising, command the daybreak?" — Job 38:12

Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born.

Gregory, at the beginning of book 29 on Job, undertaking the explanation of this passage, indicates that it cannot rightly be said that the Son of God is always begotten by the Father and always being born, writing thus: "*The Lord God Jesus, in that which he is the virtue and wisdom of God, was born of the Father before the ages — or rather, because he neither began to be born nor ceased, let us say more truly: [he is] always born; but we cannot say [he is] always being born, lest he seem to be imperfect. Yet, that he may be able to be designated eternal, let us say [he is] both perfect and always born — inasmuch as 'born' pertains to perfection, and 'always' to eternity. Although, by this very [word] which we say, 'perfect,' we deviate much from the expression of that truth — because what is not made cannot properly be called perfect; but, stammering as we can, let us echo the excellencies of God, [seeing that] the Lord, condescending to the words of our infirmity, says, 'Be perfect, as your heavenly Father also is perfect.'*"[2]

◊ **2. Right margin:** Matthew 5:48.

These things Gregory: against whom **Origen** seems to cry out, in the second homily on Jeremiah, showing that the Son of God is perpetually born, in these words: "*Our Savior is the wisdom of God; the wisdom is the splendor of eternal light; our Savior therefore is the splendor of charity. But the splendor is not born once and ceases: rather, as often as the light from which the splendor arises has arisen, so often does the splendor of charity also arise. So therefore the Savior is always born. Whence he says in the book of Wisdom, 'Before all the hills the Lord begets me' — not, as some read badly, 'he begot me.'*"[3]

◊ **3. Right margin:** Proverbs 8:25.

Peter Lombard, in the first book of the Sentences, distinction 9, settles a controversy of this kind, speaking in this manner: "*But, lest such great authors seem to contradict themselves in so great a matter, let us interpret those words of Gregory benignly. 'The Lord Jesus,' he says, 'was born of the Father before the ages — or rather, because he neither began to be born nor ceases, let us say more truly: he is always born.' But how is this said more truly — namely, that the Son is always born — than that [other], that he was born of the Father before the ages? For the sincere and catholic faith holds and preaches that [latter], as [it does]*

this. Why then does he say 'let us say more truly,' since both are equally true, unless because he wished this to be understood as said unto a greater evidence and expression of the truth than that? For by these words all approach is barred to heretics of every calumnious turn, by which [words] Christ, according to [his] deity, is shown to be a generation without beginning and without end, and perfect; whereas the truth is not so openly manifested when it is said, 'The Son was begotten of the Father before the ages,' or 'The Son is always born of the Father.' And therefore Gregory said that we cannot say 'he is always being born' — not, I say, so conveniently, not so congruously to the explanation of the truth. Yet it can be said, if it be soundly understood: for the Son is always born of the Father, as Origen says — not that that generation is repeated daily, but because it always is; therefore he is always born, that is, his nativity is eternal."

Annotation CXLIV [contents]

"Out of whose womb came the ice? and the frost from heaven who hath begotten it?" — Job 38:29

The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

The explanation falsely inscribed under Origen's name, expounding this sentence (under pretense of elucidating it), seems to censure the Homoousians — that is, those who believe the Son consubstantial with the Father — in very ambiguous and obscure words, saying: "*Read these things thou, with judgment, among the Homousiasts,*" etc.: read, and weigh what it means.

Annotation CXLV [contents]

"He died an old man, and full of days." — Job 42:16

Whether anyone may be certain that he does not always sin.

Gregory, at the end of book 35 of the *Morals*, says: "*What place of safety remains among these things, when even our evils are more evil [than we suppose], and our good things — which we believe ourselves to have — can by no means be pure goods?*" →

[...continues on folio 578 (PDF p. 395): the rest of Gregory on whether anyone can be certain he does not sin (Annotatio CXLV).]

---

*(printed folio 578 [PDF p. 395]. **Annot. CXLV–CXLVIII** (Job 42:16–Ps 1:5): Luther on whether one always sins (vs. Fisher); Origen's γενητόν/γεννητόν Trinity slip (Epiphanius); Ambrose on angels before the world; and Origen making the risen body rise only in the same species → folio 579.)*

(folio 578, left column → right column)

Annotation CXLV (continued)

Martin Luther, in the book of his Articles, article 35, strives by this testimony to show that no one is certain that he does not always sin mortally: because no pure good is ever done by us, nor can it be done. **John [Fisher], Bishop of Rochester**, in the confutation of that same article, says that Gregory does not speak of all our good works, but only of those which we ourselves approve as good, and in which we take complacency; and for this reason (he says) [Gregory] said that the goods which we believe ourselves to have cannot be pure goods, because in them we applaud ourselves, and vainly glory in their goodness.

Annotation CXLVI [contents]

"Blessed is the man who hath not walked [in the counsel of the ungodly]." — Psalm 1:1

Origen seems to have thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

Origen, about to expound this Psalm, when in the very preface he implored God as the helper of the future work, says: "*Since nothing can be good without God — and especially the divinely-inspired Scripture of understanding — let us ask the Father of all, the God, through our Savior and high priest the begotten [γεννητόν] God, that it be given us first that we may rightly seek,*" etc. **Epiphanius**, in the second book against heresies, charges Origen that, whereas he could and ought to have called Christ God γεννητόν [*begotten*] with a double *n* (for that signifies "begotten"), he preferred to name him γενητόν [*made*] with a single *n* — which indeed sounds "made": namely, so that from this one word he might maliciously alienate Christ from the essence of the paternal deity, and declare him to be a fashioning and a creature. Epiphanius's censure I myself, for the present, neither approve nor disapprove; but concerning this very error — which others also, men of great name, attribute to Origen — I shall more conveniently write below.

Annotation CXLVII [contents]

"Blessed is the man who hath not walked." — Psalm 1:1

Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound.

Ambrose, at the beginning of the preface on the Psalms, says that the Angels existed before this visible world — which most of the Fathers do not approve. He asserts also that the heavens, by their rotation, produce a perpetual sound — which Basil and Epiphanius reject as a fabulous thing, and worthy of laughter. We have written on both assertions in the Censures on the book of Genesis, Annotation 5 and Annotation 105.

Annotation CXLVIII [contents]

"The wicked shall not rise again in judgment." — Psalm 1:5

Whether the future resurrection will be in the [self-same] individual.

Origen, in the commentaries on the Psalms — as Methodius, bishop of Olympus in Lycia, in the dialogue whose title is *Aglaophon*, and Epiphanius in the second book of the *Panarion* report — examining this little verse, taught that the resurrection of our body will be not in the [self-same] individual, but only in the same species; and this he tried to establish by the testimony of Paul, who, in the epistle to the Corinthians, depicted the image of the body to rise again by the example of a sown grain, saying: "*Thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain — as, for instance, of wheat; but God gives it a body as he wills.*" By which likeness the Apostle wished to signify that, just as the ear of corn, rising from the grain, differs from it in magnitude, figure, and reality, although it partakes the same species with it: so the body in the resurrection shall rise as another from that which is sown in death — although the same species remains in it. To this testimony of Paul he added also a reasoning of this kind: "*Since in the present life we do not carry about the same body even for the space of two days, how can it be that in the future life we should rise again with this very body?*" And that not even for a brief time does the same body remain in us — and that the same material substance of the body [does not remain] — the proof (he says) is mortal living beings, which, as the lost flesh and humors of the body decay, restore [them] with new food daily taken in, and, the old being changed into new flesh, replace and renew the body. Wherefore the animal body was not undeservedly called by the Greeks ῥεῖθος,[1] that is, a river or stream, because — just as in a river, the prior waves departing, others succeed continually one after another — so in our body, in place of that substance of flesh and humor which is perpetually separated off and flows away, new material of flesh and blood is superinduced, though the same species always remains. But also, in the commentaries on Psalm 65,[2] weighing that sentence, "We have passed through water and fire," etc., he expressed this very change of the body by the example of a wineskin: which, if anyone gradually empty and gradually fill — always adding as much water as is poured out — it is necessary that the water contained in the skin never be the very same, but always vary, although the same

figure and species of the skin always remains. These things of Origen [report] Methodius and Epiphanius. But since the blessed martyr **Pamphilus**, in the *Apology* which he published for Origen, in the seventh proposition most copiously shows that Origen, in very many places — and chiefly in the exposition of this Psalm and verse — openly and magnificently preached the resurrection of our body in the same individual, it will be credible that these [contrary] things were either furtively intruded into this passage by the malevolent, or were written by the author himself not from his own person, but from that of an adversary.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Why the animal body is called ῥεῖθος [a stream] by the Greeks.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Psalm 65:12.

To that [argument], therefore, which is set forth against the right faith of the resurrection, **Methodius**, in the *Aglaophon*, briefly responds: that the likeness of Paul is not to be accommodated to the resurrection of bodies in every way, but only in this part — that, just as wheat is not reborn, nor rises into a new life, unless first, cast into the earth, it be corrupted (Christ saying, "*Unless the grain of wheat, cast into the ground, die, it beareth no fruit,*" etc.),[3] so also our bodies, unless they first have died and been dissolved into the earth, do not rise again, nor revive unto an easier life. But when, from the assiduous transmutation of nourishment into the body, a change of the [self-same] individual body is inferred, Methodius judges this to be wrongly concluded: because, although the nutriments daily taken are turned into new flesh, which fill the place of the lost flesh, nevertheless the man does not cease [to be] the same →

◊ **3. Right margin:** John 12:24.

[…continues on folio 579 (PDF p. 396): the rest of Methodius's answer, and the identity of the risen body (Annotatio CXLVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 579 [PDF p. 396]. **Annot. CXLVIII–CLIII** (Ps 1:5–4:2): Methodius defends the identity of the risen body; Hilary vs. Jerome on "In the beginning" (*Bereshith*); "Kiss the Son"; Bodius against the Eucharist and the Lutherans against invoking the saints → folio 580.)*

(folio 579, left column → right column)

Annotation CXLVIII (continued)

the same [man] in number who he was before. For it suffices, for the preserving of the [self-same] individual identity of the same man, that his more powerful and more excellent parts persist without any vicissitude of change,[1] and that the other fluxible parts, which continually flow into the body, preserve the figure, site, order, and other qualities of the departing parts. Wherefore, since the soul — the nobler and better portion of man — always remains the same, and the other parts, coming in as reinforcements to the body, retain the site, figure, order, and pristine qualities of the passing parts (indeed, even the very scars of wounds, and the traces of ulcers, and the mutilations of members, endure in bodies through every age): it follows that the [self-same] individual subsistence of man is the same in number up to the end of mortal life — after which the soul, again, in the consummation of the age, shall by divine power return to the body [that is] the same in number, beyond every law and order of nature, resuming its own proper body.

◊ **1. Left margin:** For the preserving of the same man's individual identity, it is enough that his more excellent parts be not changed.

Annotation CXLIX [contents]

"Why have the nations raged," etc. — Psalm 2:1

Concerning the beginning of Genesis.

Jerome censures **Hilary**, at the beginning of the book *On the Hebrew Traditions*, because, in the exposition of this little verse, he asserted that, for that which we have at the exordium of Genesis, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth,"[2] there is had in the Hebrew "In the Son God made," etc. — which indeed to be false the truth of the matter itself proves: for in the Hebrew it is not written בבר *Babar*, which signifies "In the Son," but בראשית *Berescith*, which signifies "In the beginning." Hilary seems to have been deceived in this by the authority of **Tertullian**, who asserted this very thing in the book against Praxeas.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Genesis 1:1.

Annotation CL [contents]

"I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession." — Psalm 2:8

Hilary, in the elucidation of this little verse, among other things wrote these: "*Christ received the possession of the ends of the earth — that is, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of the heavenly, the earthly, and the infernal,*[3] *etc.: not the earthly [things] alone, but the supernal and the infernal also are given [him], and those things by which the earth is enclosed. And in the glory of God the Father he is today begotten, being born — that is, remaining before in the form of God, the servile form is honored through the reward of the death-form.*" **Erasmus**, in the Annotations which he appended to the margins of Hilary's commentaries, asserted that these words of Hilary savour of something Origenist; but since he himself brings no reason for his suspicion, nor can any such thing be deduced from Hilary's words, let others more learned than I see how much Erasmus's judgment is to be valued.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Philippians 2:10.

Annotation CLI [contents]

"Embrace discipline, lest at any time the Lord be angry," etc. — Psalm 2:12

Whether this passage was well rendered by Jerome.

Rufinus, priest of Aquileia, reprehends **Jerome** in the interpretation and exposition of the present little verse; to whom Jerome, responding in the first Apology against the same man, wrote these things to Pammachius: "*Rufinus is also said to carp at this: that, interpreting the second Psalm, for that which we read in the Latin, 'Embrace discipline,' and in the Hebrew volume is written* נשקו בר *Nashku bar, I said in my little commentaries, 'Adore [kiss] the Son'; and again, turning the whole Psalter into the Roman [Latin] sound, as if forgetful of the ancient exposition, I put 'Adore purely' — which [two renderings] to be contrary to each other is plain to all. And truly he is to be pardoned, if he be ignorant of the truth of the Hebrew tongue, who sometimes hesitates even in the Latin.* נשקו *Nasku, that I may render it word for word, [is]* κατεφιλήσατε *— that is, 'kiss ye' [adore ye]; which I, unwilling to translate coarsely, followed rather the sense, so as to say 'Adore': for those who adore are wont to kiss the hand and bow the head — which the blessed Job denies that he did to the elements and to idols, saying, 'If I saw the Sun when it shone, and the Moon walking in brightness, and my heart rejoiced in secret, and I kissed my hand with my mouth*[4] *— which is the greatest iniquity, and a denial against the most high God.' And the Hebrews, according to the property of their language, put 'kissing' for 'veneration': this I translated as they themselves understand it, whose word is* בר *Bar. But Bar among them signifies diverse things: for it is said [to mean] 'son' — as in that, 'Bar-Jona,' 'son of the dove,' and 'Bartholomew,' 'son of Ptolemy'; 'Bartimaeus,' and 'Barchisui,' and 'Barabbas'; [Bar] also [means] 'wheat,' and 'a sheaf of ears,' and 'chosen,' and 'pure.' What, therefore, have I sinned, if I turned an ambiguous word by a diverse interpretation? And I who, in the little commentaries — where there is liberty of discussing — had said 'Adore the Son,' in the [body] itself, lest I should seem too violent an interpreter and give place to Jewish calumny, said 'Adore purely,' or 'electly' — which Aquila also and Symmachus translated. What, therefore, does it harm ecclesiastical faith, if the reader be taught in how many ways a*

single little verse is explained among the Hebrews?"

◊ **4. Right margin:** Job 31:26–27.

Annotation CLII [contents]

"Lord, how are they multiplied that afflict me," etc. — Psalm 3:2

Concerning the Eucharist.

Augustine, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this verse, says: "*In the history of the New Testament, so great and so wonderful was the patience of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he admitted Judas to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to the disciples the figure of his body and blood.*" **Hermann Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, gathered from these words that the sacrament of the Eucharist is nothing else than a figure and type of the body of Christ. See what we have noted against this man, Annotation 146 of the following book.

Annotation CLIII [contents]

"When I called upon him, the God of my justice heard me," etc. — Psalm 4:2

Concerning the invocation of the saints.

Chrysostom, in the preface of the exposition on this psalm, has some things which are brought forward by the Lutherans against the invocation of the saints. These are they: "*Thou canst not say, 'I fear to approach and to pray to God'; but thou canst always and assiduously call upon him, and no difficulty is present: for there is no need of doorkeepers to introduce thee, nor of stewards, procurators, guards, or friends; but when thou thyself, through thyself, hast approached, then most of all will he hear thee — then, when thou hast asked no one [to intercede]. For we do not so appease him when entreated through others, as [when] through ourselves; because, when he shall have seen us doing this through ourselves, then most of all does he assent. So he does also in [the case of] the Canaanite woman;*[5] *and when Peter indeed and James approached, he did not assent — but when she herself persevered in that which was asked, he gave [it].*" Chrysostom repeats these same things in many other places also →

◊ **5. Right margin:** Matthew 15:23.

[…continues on folio 580 (PDF p. 397): Sixtus's answer to the Lutheran misuse of Chrysostom on the invocation of the saints (Annotatio CLIII).]

---

*(printed folio 580 [PDF p. 397]. **Annot. CLIII–CLIX** (Ps 4:2–15:7): the eight verses inserted into Psalm 13; Arnobius on Mary's cleansing; Cajetan's David/Christ rule; Eusebius of Caesarea's Arian-leaning subordinationism; and Origen opens Ps 15:7 → folio 581.)*

(folio 580, left column → right column)

Annotation CLIII (continued)

the same [things], whose meaning piously explained you have in Annotation 310 of the book which follows next to this.

Annotation CLIV [contents]

"There is none that doth good, no not [even] one." — Psalm 13:3

Whether Mary hesitated at the death of Christ.

Chrysostom — or someone else, whose exposition on Psalm 13 is inserted in Chrysostom's commentaries — narrating this sentence, indicates that the Virgin Mary, at the death of Christ, hesitated in faith. For these are his very words: "*There was none who did good, when the disciples, all abandoning him, fled; John withdraws naked; Peter denies; the disciples flee; and the sword of doubt passed through the soul of Mary his mother.*" You have the interpretation of this sentence above, Annotation 104, and below, Annotations 138, 139, 140, and 185 of book 6.

Annotation CLV [contents]

"Their throat is an open sepulchre." — Psalm 13:3

Concerning the eight little verses added to Psalm 13.

Jerome, in the commentaries on the Psalter which are believed to be his, admonishes that those eight verses — which [go] from this passage up to that, "There is no fear of God before their eyes" — are had in the vulgate edition, but are not in the Hebrew exemplars; rather [they were] collected by Paul from various passages of divine Scripture, and, in that epistle which is to the Romans, taken up in testimony of his own opinion.[1] The same [Jerome], in the preface of the sixteenth [book] of the commentary on Isaiah, responding to Eustochium — who asked whence Paul had borrowed the aforesaid little verses — says that he took the two first verses ("Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they dealt deceitfully") from the fifth Psalm; the third ("Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness") from the ninth Psalm; the fourth ("The venom of asps is under their lips") from Psalm 139; the fifth, sixth, and seventh ("Their feet are swift to shed blood") from the fifty-ninth chapter of Isaiah; the eighth ("There is no fear of God before their eyes") from the fifth Psalm. Finally he adds that these eight little verses were inserted into the thirteenth Psalm by an unknown author, because he could not find a fit place to which to refer this testimony of Paul, since in these Hebrew codices it is not had. **John Cochlaeus**, in the book *On Canonical Scripture and the authority of the Catholic Church*, disapproving this opinion of Jerome, thinks the Hebrew exemplars to be in this passage mutilated and diminished. For thus he speaks: "*In the epistle to the Romans, chapter 3, Paul alleges many little verses [that are seen among the Hebrews to be omitted]: but we rather think that the Apostle Paul is to be believed than the Bibles of the Jews. I know indeed that St. Jerome, in the prologue of the sixteenth commentary on Isaiah, responded to the sacred virgin Eustochium about the passage cited from the epistle to the Romans; but I have shown elsewhere that — saving his glory and honor — he did not [fully] satisfy this question.*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Romans 3:11, 12, etc.

Annotation CLVI [contents]

"He that walketh without blemish," etc. — Psalm 14:2

In what manner the Blessed Virgin was sanctified by the entrance of Christ.

Erasmus cautiously admonished that **Arnobius**, explaining these words in the commentaries on the Psalter, is to be read [warily], as though he seems to hint that Mary, when Christ entered her womb, was cleansed from the stains with which she had been infected before Christ's conception — when he says: "*Every stained one enters the tabernacle of the Lord, and there is made immaculate; but Jesus alone, immaculate, entering the virginal hall, freed that very tabernacle from its carnal stains, and gave it sanctification.*" And yet it is manifest from the following words that he does not speak of the stains which had been in Mary before Christ's entrance, but of those which are wont to be in other women — from which Christ preserved his mother immune. And that which he adds — "[the tabernacle] sanctified by the entrance of Christ" — is not so to be understood as though it then first began to be sanctified when it conceived Christ, but that Christ, entering into her, brought her greater increments of sanctity. Read Annotations 136 and 137 of the book which follows next to this.

Annotation CLVII [contents]

"Preserve me, O Lord, for I have hoped in thee." — Psalm 15:1

Whether the Psalms speaking literally of David can be expounded literally of Christ.

Thomas Cajetan, when in his commentaries he prefaced [an introduction] to this psalm, wrote these things: "*From this Psalm we gather a general rule of understanding the Psalms: that every Psalm which cannot be expounded literally of David is to be expounded of Christ — as the Apostle [expounds] the words of this psalm, 'Thou shalt not give thy holy one to see corruption,' which he adduced [as] written of Christ, because they could not agree to David; and another rule can also hence be had, by the opposite: namely, that every Psalm which can be expounded literally of David is not to be expounded literally of Christ.*" **Ambrose, Bishop of Compsa**, in the second book of the Annotations on Cajetan, weighing these words, writes in this manner: "*The first rule is altogether true, but the second false, and received (unto the extinction of the spiritual sense) from the doctrine of the Jews, and against all the catholic Doctors whom I have read, who did not know that rule; nor is the second elicited from the first, as he himself thought — [it is] false, [drawn] by a fallacy which the Logicians call 'the Consequent.' And these things are premised to the reader, that he may know my judgment concerning [Cajetan's] commentaries which he published upon the psalms, in which I scarcely anywhere see Christ, unless when he is so compelled by the authority of Scripture that he cannot, without manifest perfidy, tergiversate. But how many errors, and how great, he has incurred on account of that given rule, it was not worth the leisure to gather: for in those commentaries upon the Psalms there is this perpetual error; some grave ones, however, [there are] in these [Psalms] which I have embraced in this second book, and which I have marked with annotations.*"

Annotation CLVIII [contents]

"I said: [O Lord,] thou art my God." — Psalm 15:2

Eusebius of Caesarea thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, in the commentaries on the Psalms, brought forward, for the interpreting of these words, certain things favoring the Arian dogma concerning the inequality of the Father and the Son; and these are they: "*By the law of nature, the father of any son whatsoever is also his lord; on that account, of the only-begotten Son of God, he who begot him is also his father, and Lord, and God, and Father.*" This opinion the same Eusebius, repeated in a prolix discourse, explains in the epistle to Alexander, the preceptor of Athanasius, whose beginning is, "With how great labor and diligence I have entered upon these letters." Epiphanius the Deacon noted this in the sixth action [session] of the Second Synod of Nicaea.

Annotation CLIX

"Moreover, even till night my reins have corrected me." — Psalm 15:7

Origen →

[…continues on folio 581 (PDF p. 398): Origen on Psalm 15:7 (Annotatio CLIX).]

---

*(printed folio 581 [PDF p. 398]. **Annot. CLIX–CLXII** (Ps 15:7–21:3): Origen's impassible holy men (root of Pelagian impeccability); his allegory of Christ's body in the sun's globe; whether Christ's prayer on the cross was heard; and whether he truly feared and grieved → folio 582.)*

(folio 581, left column → right column)

Annotation CLIX (continued) [contents]

Origen, when he had come thus far in explaining, asserted that holy men, when they have come to the summit of the virtues, do not — not even at night — suffer those things which are of men [human passions], nor are tickled by any thought of vices. Jerome, in the epistle to Ctesiphon (which begins "Not boldly"), says that this passage is one of the fountains whence the Pelagians drew their error, teaching that a man can be made ἀναμάρτητον — that is, *impeccable*,[1] or able to be without any sin. See Annotation 232 of this book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether a man can be made impeccable.

Annotation CLX [contents]

"He hath set his tabernacle in the sun." — Psalm 18:5

Whether the body of Christ was placed in the Sun.

Origen is accused by Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis (writing against the Manichees), [on the ground] that in the allegorical elucidation of this little verse he taught that Christ, when he ascended into heaven, left his body in the globe of the Sun, but thence carried up his soul alone with himself above all the heavens to the right hand of the Father; and hence [Serapion] says that the Manichees were persuaded to adore the Sun as the tabernacle and perpetual domicile of the body of Christ.[2] Augustine, in book 20 against Faustus — no mention being made of the Origenic name — reports that the Manichees, from this psalm-testimony wrongly understood, fell into the adoration of the Sun. Whence it can easily be believed that Origen's commentaries were in this passage falsified by the heretics — and this especially because Pamphilus the martyr, in the *Apology*, demonstrates that this opinion was, by set purpose, attacked by Origen, in this very explanation of the present psalm and verse, in these words plainly taken from Origen's own commentary: "*What is it that David said, 'He hath set his tabernacle in the sun'? Some indeed were saying that our Savior, ascending from the earth to heaven and assuming his body, came up as far as that circle which is called the Zone of the Sun; and there, they say, he set the tabernacle of his body — for it was not possible to advance beyond. But they think these things thus because they will not receive allegory in the divine Scripture; and therefore, describing [it] as pure history, they compose fables and figments of this kind. But we pray the omnipotence of God, that he may deign to hear us, and to open to us the secret things of spiritual understanding. What, therefore, is understood by us in this passage is this: 'In the sun he hath set his tabernacle.' I ask, what is the tabernacle of Christ, and what is the habitation in which the tabernacle of Christ is placed? The habitation of the tabernacle is said to be the Sun. But the tabernacle of Christ I understand [to be] the Church. And the Sun — whom else must I understand, unless that true light which enlightens every man coming into this world?*[3] *I see the Sun himself, of whom it is said, 'To you that fear my name the Sun of justice shall arise.'*[4] *Therefore 'in the sun he hath set his tabernacle' — that is, 'In the Sun of justice he hath placed his Church.'*"

◊ **2. Left margin:** The Manichees adored the Sun as the tabernacle of the body of Christ.

◊ **3. Left margin:** John 1:9.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Malachi 4:2.

Annotation CLXI [contents]

"My God, I shall cry by day, and thou wilt not hear." — Psalm 21:3

Whether the prayer of Christ was heard.

Jerome, in the commentaries on the Psalms which are said to be his, treating this verse, says: "*Christ cried on the cross, and prayed for his own: he was heard, and he was not heard. He was heard for the predestined — as in the eight thousands, or for those hundred and twenty and five hundred brethren; and he was not heard — that is, for those who were not predestined, concerning whom the Evangelist said, 'His blood [be] upon us and upon our children.'*"[5] **St. Thomas**, in the third volume of the theological Summa, question 21, article 4, judges that it is wrongly said or believed that Christ — who says of himself, "Father, I knew that thou always hearest me,"[6] etc. — was at some time not heard, and especially crying out on the cross; since of

him, crying on the cross, Paul says, "With a strong cry and tears offering [prayers], he was heard for his reverence."[7] Accordingly he judges that Christ prayed neither for all the crucifiers, nor even for all who were going to believe in him, but for those only who were predestined to eternal life,[8] and that for these he was heard. But as to what the psalm says, "I shall cry, and thou wilt not hear," he thinks it is to be understood not in respect to the desire of reason (which was always heard), but in respect to the affection of the flesh, refusing death. **Thomas Cajetan**, to the solution of St. Thomas, adds this also: that every prayer of Christ — both according to reason and according to the will of the flesh — was heard; because what the flesh sought, it demanded not with a fixed determination, but on this condition, "if it should so seem to the Father": so that, if [it seemed] otherwise to him, then at last it asked to fulfil the Father's will, saying, "Thy will be done."[9] Therefore, according to this last condition proposed by the flesh, Christ's prayer was most fully heard.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Matthew 27:25.

◊ **6. Right margin:** John 11:42.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Hebrews 5:7.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Christ did not pray for all the crucifiers, nor for all who were going to believe in him, but only for the predestined.

◊ **9. Right margin:** Matthew 26:42.

Annotation CLXII [contents]

"Far from my salvation are the words of my sins." — Psalm 21:3

Whether Christ truly feared and grieved.

Augustine, in the commentaries on the Psalms, in the second exposition of this psalm, seems to think that Christ did not truly fear, nor had true sadness. For the Master of the Sentences, in book 3, distinction 15, reports his explanation — with some words permuted and transposed, for a clearer understanding of the sense — in this manner: "*How does he say this, 'Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth'?*[10] *Concerning us — his body — he says this: for he bore the person of his body, that is, the Church; as also elsewhere, when he said, 'Let this chalice pass from me,'*[11] *he speaks for us — unless perhaps he be thought to have feared to die. But he did not truly fear to suffer, [he] who was to rise on the third day, when Paul burned to be dissolved and to be with Christ.*[12] *For a soldier is not braver than the emperor: for the soldier, about to be crowned, rejoices to die — and would the Lord, about to be crowned, fear death? But, representing our infirmity, he said this for his own weak ones, who fear to die: for it was the voice of those [members].*" He has a similar opinion in the epistle to Proba, *On the grace of the New Testament*, chapters 6 and 7; likewise in the exposition of Psalm 103. But it is clear that Augustine did not think thus, from those things which he brought against this opinion in the exposition of Psalm 93, in these words: "*Be unwilling to think that the Lord was not sad; for if we should say this — that he was not sad, whereas the Gospel says, 'My soul is sad even unto death'*[13] *— then, when the Gospel says 'Jesus slept,' [we might say] 'Jesus did not sleep'; 'Jesus ate,' 'he did not eat'; and thus nothing sincere is left, so that it be said, 'And now the body was not real, and he did not have true flesh.' Whatever, therefore, is written of him is done, is true: therefore he was sad — altogether sad — but taking on sadness by [his] will, just as [he took on] flesh by [his] will.*" →

◊ **10. Right margin:** 1 Peter 2:22.

◊ **11. Right margin:** Matthew 26:39.

◊ **12. Right margin:** Philippians 1:23.

◊ **13. Right margin:** Matthew 26:38.

[…continues on folio 582 (PDF p. 399): the Master of the Sentences and the resolution on Christ's true sadness (Annotatio CLXII).]

*(printed folio 582 [PDF p. 399]. **Annot. CLXII–CLXVII** (Ps 21:3–31:1): Christ's fear as mere "propassion"; denying the Eucharist to sinners (public, not secret); a "table = figure" text abused by Oecolampadius; Cusa on Christ bearing hell's pain; and Augustine on lawful vs. superstitious lots → folio 583.)*

(folio 582, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXII (continued)

The **Master of the Sentences**, in book 3, distinction 15, says that Augustine — in [the exposition of] Psalm 3 — signified that Christ did not truly fear according to [his] passion, but in Psalm 93 showed that Christ, according to fore-passion [propassion], truly feared. You will see below the things which pertain to this argument, Annotation 186 of this book.

Annotation CLXIII [contents]

Whether the Eucharist is to be denied to sinners.

(The printed text misnumbers this annotation CLVIII; it is corrected here to CLXIII, its proper place in the sequence — it stands between CLXII above and CLXIIII below.)

"All the fat ones of the earth have eaten and adored." — Psalm 21:30

Strabus [Walafrid Strabo], in the gloss to the exposition of this little verse, brings a sentence under the title of Augustine, thus: "*Let not the dispenser prohibit the fat ones of the earth to eat at the table of the Lord, but let him warn [them] to fear the exactor.*" **Gratian**, *De consecratione*, distinction 2, cites these same words from an unnamed and uncertain passage of Augustine, and from these gathers that sinners are not [to be excluded] from the communion of the Lord's table. **St. Thomas**, in the third volume of the Summa, question 80, indicates that this sentence is not to be understood of public sinners, living in open crime, but of hidden and latent ones. For to those [public sinners], however earnestly demanding, he judges the sacrament of the Eucharist is not to be granted;[1] but to these [secret ones] he indicates it is not to be denied in public. Yet he desires that the minister of the Sacrament, if perhaps he be conscious of their crime, should dissuade them — by some hidden kind of admonition — from the reception of the Lord's body.

◊ **1. Left margin:** The sacrament of the Eucharist is to be denied to public sinners.

Annotation CLXIIII [contents]

"Thou hast prepared a table before me." — Psalm 22:5

Concerning the Eucharist, the heretics feign that St. Chrysostom thought wrongly.

Chrysostom, in a certain homily on Psalm 22 (which, however, is not believed to be his), has these words: "*The table is the consecration of the altar of the Lord; and because the divine wisdom prepared that table for his men-servants and maid-servants in their sight, so that daily, in the likeness of the body and blood of Christ, he might show us bread and wine according to the order of Melchisedech in the sacrament: therefore he says, 'Thou hast prepared a table in my sight.'*" John Oecolampadius brought forward this passage against the truth of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, so that, under the name of Chrysostom, he might build up the faith of his own heresy. But since the phrase and the character of the explanation openly prove that the homily is not [the work] of him under whose title it is prefixed, there is no need that we answer anything to Oecolampadius for the defense of Chrysostom — whom it is agreed to be the keenest defender of this sacrament. Yet whosoever these words may be, they do not render the sense which Oecolampadius falsely gathered from them. For nothing prohibits — indeed it is necessary — that, together with the true body and blood of Christ, there be in the sacrament of the altar the accidents of bread and wine,[2] which here are called "bread and wine." And these bear the likeness and figure of the mystical body of Christ, which is the Church

— Paul saying: "*We, being many, are one bread, one body, all we who partake of the one bread and of the one cup.*"[3]

◊ **2. Left margin:** In the Eucharist, together with the body and blood of Christ, are the accidents of bread and wine.

◊ **3. Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 10:17.

Annotation CLXV [contents]

"For my life is spent in sorrow," etc. — Psalm 30:11

Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell.

Nicholas of Cusa, in a sermon which he published on the present little verse, both on account of those things which in this passage are said by the Prophet, and on account of many other things, believed that Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell. Augustine, Bishop of Nebbio, noted this opinion, in the scholia on the Octapla appended to this psalm, asserting that the opinion of this most learned man — and most eminent in all knowledge — is neither to be embraced nor to be spurned.

Annotation CLXVI [contents]

"My lots are in thy hands," etc. — Psalm 30:16

Whether it is lawful to use lots.

Augustine, in the second exposition on this psalm, when he discoursed concerning the lots here commemorated by David, seemed to approve the use of lots, when he says: "*A lot is not something evil, but a thing which, in human doubt, indicates the divine will: for the Apostles too cast lots, when Judas, having betrayed the Lord, perished, and the lot fell upon Matthias.*"[4] To the same opinion he subscribes in the epistle to Honoratus, thus speaking: "*If among the ministers of God there be a dispute — [as to] which of them should remain in the time of persecution, lest by the flight of all the Church be deserted, and which should flee — if this dispute cannot otherwise be terminated, as far as it seems to me, which should remain and which should flee are to be chosen by lot.*" And in the first book *On Christian Doctrine*, confirming this same thing, he says: "*If something abounded which ought to be given to those who did not have [it], and it could not be given to two, if perhaps two occur to thee of whom neither excelled the other either in indigence or in some urgent necessity, thou wouldst do nothing more just than to choose by lot to whom must be given that which cannot be given to both.*"

◊ **4. Right margin:** Acts 1:26.

There are those who think that a decree of Pope Leo III is opposed to these sayings of Augustine — [namely] that which, in the epistle to the bishops of Britain, is written in the Decrees of the pontiffs, cause 26, question 5: "*Lots, by which you decide all things in your provinces — which the Fathers condemned — we decree to be nothing other than divinations and sorceries. Wherefore we wish them altogether to be condemned, and no longer to be named among Christians; and, lest they be practised, we forbid [them] by the interdict of anathema.*" **St. Thomas**, in the Second [part] of the Second, question 95, article 8, settling a controversy of this kind, shows that by Leo's decree those lots are not forbidden which Augustine approved — namely, those which are treated piously and religiously[5] — but those which are wont to be exercised superstitiously and impiously, those five conditions being spurned which the pious exercise of lots requires.[6] Of these, the first is, that the division or consultation of the proposed matter be looked for from God alone, the director of lots. The second, that lots be not sought except when necessity compels. The third, that they be not attempted except when prayers to God have first been sent up. The fourth, that we abuse not divine oracles for the inquisition of lots. The fifth, that we use not lots in ecclesiastical elections, which ought to be done by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit alone. For although once Matthias was chosen by lots,[7] now — the fullness of the Spirit being poured out — it ought no longer to be permitted; because what was permitted before the effusion of the Holy Spirit was [done] while the splendor of the evangelical light had not yet flashed forth.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Lots which are treated piously and religiously are not forbidden.

◊ **6. Right margin:** The exercise of lots requires five conditions.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Acts 1:26.

Annotation CLXVII

"Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," etc. — Psalm 31:1

Augustine →

[…continues on folio 583 (PDF p. 400): Augustine on Psalm 31:1 (Annotatio CLXVII).]

---

*(printed folio 583 [PDF p. 400]. **Annot. CLXVII–CLXIX** (Ps 31:1–36:10): Calvin's "all works are sins" drawn from Augustine (answered); Catharinus vs. Cajetan on the Trinity from Ps 32:6; and Augustine's ambiguous texts on whether the saints see God before the resurrection → folio 584.)*

(folio 583, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXVII (continued) [contents]

Augustine, in the preface of this psalm, seems to favor the Lutherans, asserting that all works preceding faith are evil, and that all the actions and thoughts of unbelievers are sins.[1] For thus he reasons: "*Let no one reckon his good works before faith: because where faith was not, the good was not; for the intention makes the good work, but faith directs the intention.*" And again below he adds: "*Believe in him who justifies the impious, that thy good works may be [truly] good works: for I would not call those [works] good which do not proceed from a good root.*" And again, after a few [words], he subjoins: "*Before the grace of faith thou didst nothing of good, and remission of sins shall be given to thee. Let thy works be attended to, and all shall be found evil; if God gave to those works what is due to them, he would surely damn [them]. For the wages of sin is death: but thou wast found in evil works.*" Finally, concluding at the end of the preface, he says: "*And if thou seem to do good things — yet, because thou doest [them] without faith, they are not even to be called good.*" Thus far Augustine's words, cited by John Calvin in the tenth chapter of the Institutes, for the confirmation of his impious doctrine, by which he teaches that all works, however good, are sins. The **Master of the Sentences**, book 2, distinction 41, noticing this passage, says that Augustine here called that an "evil work" which is invalid and useless for the merit of eternal life.[2] For although, before faith, all the virtues of unbelievers — measured according to the rule of right reason — are good for living well in the present life, yet for obtaining the beatitude of the future life, without faith (which directs the intention), they are so unfit that they ought rather to be called evil than good. Consult Annotation 235 of book 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether all the works of unbelievers are sins.

◊ **2. Left margin:** That is called an evil work by which a man does not merit eternal life.

Annotation CLXVIII [contents]

"By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their power by the spirit of his mouth." — Psalm 32:6

Whether this passage pertains to the Holy Spirit.

Ambrose, Bishop of Compsa, in book 4 of the Annotations on the same [Cajetan], condemns **Thomas Cardinal Cajetan**, [on the ground] that he alone of all denies that this passage pertains to the person of the Holy Spirit — from which all catholic expositors gather the mystery of the divine Triad, saying that by "the Lord" is to be understood the Father, by "the Word" the Son, and by "the Spirit of his mouth" the Holy Spirit the Paraclete. But if you attentively read Cajetan's commentaries, you will recognize that an explanation of

this kind is neither impugned, nor rejected, nor denied, but only passed over in silence. And it is far another thing to deny and to be silent, than to impugn and to omit. Nor is it to be wondered at, if Cajetan — who in the commentaries on the Psalms professes only the elucidation of the letter — omitted the exposition of the Trinity (which almost all confess to be mystical); or if, expounding according to the bare letter, he said that "the Spirit of the Lord's mouth" is called the very Word of God, and the command [of God] named after the human manner. For the Greek interpreter **Euthymius** also — who illustrated this passage from the various and diverse interpretations of the Greek Fathers — before he touched the mystical sense, expressed the historical understanding (which Cajetan followed) in these words: "*These expressions seem to signify the same: 'By the word of the Lord' and 'by the spirit of his mouth.' For God said, 'Let it be,' and it was made; and it was done. Moreover, the word of the mouth is the breath [spirit] beating the air; and such as is the breath of the mouth, beating the air, such is the word itself.*" Then, subjoining the mystical sense, he says: "*But, according to a higher sense — whereby we may say that blessed David here philosophizes concerning the holy Trinity — by 'the Lord' understand the Father, and the Son by 'the Word,' and by 'the Spirit of his mouth' the Holy Spirit.*"

Annotation CLXIX [contents]

"Yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be." — Psalm 36:10

Whether the souls of the saints are in heaven before the resurrection.

Augustine, in the exposition of the proposed little verse, seems somewhat to decline toward the error of the Armenians, the Greeks, and the Anabaptists, who assert that the souls of the saints are confined, until the day of judgment, in hidden receptacles, far from the gaze of the divine vision; writing in this manner: "*After this life thou shalt not yet be there where the saints shall be, to whom it shall be said, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom which is prepared for you from the origin of the world.*[3] *Thou shalt not yet be there — who knows [it] not? But now thou canst be there where that once-ulcerous poor man [reposed], whom the proud rich man, in the midst of torments, saw far off reposing:*[4] *in that repose, certainly, secure, thou shalt await the day of judgment — when thou shalt receive [thy] body, when thou shalt be sent in, that thou mayest be equalled to the Angels.*" To this opinion the same [Augustine] seems to allude in the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 108, where he says: "*The time which is interposed between the death of man and the final resurrection holds souls in hidden receptacles, according as each is worthy of repose or of affliction, for that which it obtained in the flesh while it lived.*" And in book 12 *On the City of God*, chapter 9: "*That part of the city of God which is to be joined to the immortal Angels is gathered out of mortal men; [and] now [it] either sojourns mortally on earth, or, in those who have died by death, rests in the secret receptacles and seats of souls.*" And again, in book 12 [of the commentary] *On Genesis to the letter*, chapter 35, he seems to indicate that the souls of the saints, before the resumption of the body, cannot enjoy the divine vision, in these words: "*If anyone show what need there is for spirits to receive their bodies in the resurrection, if that highest beatitude can be furnished to them even without bodies — it is by no means to be doubted that the mind of man, snatched from the senses of the flesh, and (after death, the flesh being laid aside) cannot so see the incommutable good as the holy Angels see [it].*" And in book 1 of the Retractations, chapter 14, when he had treated this question professedly, he left it undiscussed and in doubt, writing thus: "*That [saying] makes us most blessed which the Apostle says, 'But then face to face; and then I shall know, as also I am known.*[5] *Those who have found this are to be said to consist in the possession of beatitude. But who those most blessed are, who are now in that possession, is a great question. And that the holy Angels are there, is no question; but concerning holy men already dead, whether they too may be said to consist already in that possession, is deservedly asked. For now they are stripped of the body, by which the soul is weighed down; but they still themselves await also the redemption of their body, and their flesh rests in hope, [and] does not yet shine in future incorruption. But whether they have anything the less on this account for contemplating the truth with the eyes of the heart, face to face — it is not [the place] here, by disputing, to*

inquire." These passages, and others similar to these — often repeated in the diverse writings of Augustine — must be interpreted charitably, especially since among Augustine himself certain testi- →

◊ **3. Right margin:** Matthew 25:34.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Luke 16:22–23.

◊ **5. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 13:12.

[…continues on folio 584 (PDF p. 401): Augustine's opposite testimonies, that the saints do enjoy the vision of God before the resurrection (Annotatio CLXIX).]

(printed folio 584 [PDF p. 401]. ***Annot. CLXIX–CLXX*** *(Ps 36:10–36:14): Augustine's counter-texts prove the saints do behold God before the judgment (his doubt was only of place and grade); then Origen's teaching that all pass through a purging fire after death (confuted,* City of God *XXI) → folio 585.)*

(folio 584, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXIX (continued)

testimonies which establish that the souls of the saints, even before the day of judgment, behold God face to face — of which number one is had in the fourth sermon on the solemnity of the saints, where, expounding those words from the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse, "I saw under the altar of God the souls of the slain, and there were given to them each a white robe,"[1] etc., he speaks thus: "*By the white robes we ought to understand the reward of baptism, the prize of martyrdom, the reward of the eternal [goods], and the joy of the heavenly fatherland. For the saints have, before the resurrection, single robes, because they enjoy as yet, in the soul alone, the eternal beatitudes; but afterward they are to receive double [robes], when — [their] bodies being received — they shall be immutable in soul and incorruptible in body.*" And a little after: "*Whence John says, 'They stood before the throne, in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands';*[2] *[they] stand, then, even now before the throne of God, crowned — [each] stands in the sight of the Lamb, in no way to be there separated from contemplating his glory.*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Revelation 6:9, 11.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Revelation 7:9.

There are, therefore, the passages cited a little before — [which are] in appearance conflicting with the present passage and those similar to it — to be interpreted in this sense: that we say Augustine did not doubt concerning the glory of souls before the judgment,[3] but concerning the place of glory, and concerning the grades (or the quantity, or the consummation) of glory before the judgment. For since souls, wheresoever they behold the glory of God, are there blessed, Augustine was sometimes uncertain in what places, and seats, or receptacles, the souls might see God. Similarly, concerning the quantity of glory, Augustine often asked whether the Souls of the Saints, before the judgment, were equal to the Angels in the vision of God, or saw something less. Which the words of the aforesaid passages plainly indicate — especially from the testimony of the first [book] of the Retractations, where it is said, "Souls stripped of their bodies do not so see God as the Angels see [him]," that is, [not] with a consummated and perfect vision; and from book 12 on Genesis, where it is read: "*Whether Souls have anything the less on this account for contemplating, with the eyes of the heart, the truth — it is not [the place] here, by disputing, to inquire.*" Read Annotation 345 of the sixth book.

◊ **3. Left margin:** St. Augustine did not doubt concerning the glory of souls before the judgment, but concerning the place and grades of glory.

Annotation CLXX [contents]

"The sinners have drawn out the sword." — Psalm 36:14

Whether after this life all, both good and evil, shall enter the fire of gehenna.

Origen, in the third homily on Psalm 36, seems to think that all — both good and evil — are, after this life, to enter the fire of gehenna: from which the good and holy shall escape unharmed, and without any injury; but the evil, [in order] that they may fulfil the purgation of their crimes, shall remain immersed in it. His words are these: "*If, placed in this life, we make sin to perish in us — so that in no way at all, neither by thought, nor by work, nor by word, the sword of sin be brought forth from us — we shall not need the punishment of eternal fire; we shall not be condemned to the exterior darkness, nor shall we be subject to those punishments which threaten sinners. But if in this life we contemn the words of divine Scripture admonishing us, and are unwilling to be cured or amended by its corrections, it is certain that a fire remains for us which is prepared for sinners; and we shall come to that fire, in which the work of each one — of what sort it is — the fire shall prove. And, as I judge, it is necessary that we all come to that fire: even if [one] be some Paul, or Peter, yet he comes to that fire. But such [persons] hear [this]: 'Even if thou pass through, the flame shall not burn thee.' But if anyone be some sinner like me, he will indeed come to that fire, as [did] Peter and Paul; but he will not pass through, as Peter and Paul passed through. And in what manner the Hebrews came to the Red Sea, the Egyptians also came; but the Hebrews indeed passed through the Red Sea, whereas the Egyptians were drowned in it. In this manner also we — if we are Egyptians, and follow Pharaoh the devil, obeying his precepts — shall be drowned in that river or lake of fire, when sins shall be found in us. But if we are Hebrews, and are redeemed by the blood of the immaculate Lamb — if we carry not with us the leaven of wickedness — we do indeed enter the river of fire; but, as to the Hebrews the water was a wall on the right hand and on the left, so also the fire shall be a wall to us, if we do that which is said of them: 'Because they believed God and Moses his servant*[4] *— that is, his law and commandments — and if we so follow the pillar of fire and the pillar of cloud.*" He explains this opinion more clearly at the end of book 8 of the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, where he has these things word for word: "*All indeed who are blessed — whether they be of Israel or of the gentiles — the Evangelical word of the present time purifies, that they may be such as those were to whom the Lord said, 'Behold, now you are clean because of the word which I have spoken to you.' But whoever shall have spurned the purifications of the word of God and of the Evangelical doctrine reserves himself for the sad and penal purifications, that the fire of gehenna may purge [him] in torments — [him] whom neither the apostolic doctrine nor the Evangelical discourse purged; according to that which is written: 'And I will purify thee by fire unto purification.'*[5] *But this very purgation, which is applied through the punishment of fire — for how great times, or for how many ages, it exacts torment from sinners — he alone can know to whom the Father delivered all judgment; who so loves his creature, that for it he emptied himself of the form of God, and took the form of a servant, humbling himself unto death, willing that all men be saved and come to the acknowledgment of the truth. But nevertheless it behoves [us] to remember that the Apostle wished to have the present passage as, so to say, a mystery — namely, that the faithful and perfect, each within themselves, cover such senses, as it were a mystery of God, with silence, and bring [them] not everywhere forth to the imperfect and less capable.*" And again, repeating the same in homily 13 on Jeremiah, he thus speaks: "*If thou hast sinned, and art polluted with the filth of sins, the Lord will wash the filth of the sons and daughters of Sion; but if it be a mortal sin, we cannot be cleansed by nitre and soap, but by the spirit of judgment, [and] by the spirit of burning, and by punishment. Perhaps Jesus also baptizes with the Holy Spirit and with fire*[6] *— not because he baptizes the same [person] in the Holy Spirit and in fire, but that the holy [person] is baptized with the Holy Spirit, while he who, after faith and the teaching of God, is again turned to crimes, is purged by the torment of burning. Blessed [is he] who received the laver, and needs not the laver of the Holy Spirit and of fire; but miserable, and worthy of all weeping, [is he] who, after the laver of the Holy Spirit, must be baptized with fire. Blessed [is he] who has part in the first resurrection: if anyone has kept the laver of the Holy Spirit, that one has part in the first [portion] of the resurrection; but if anyone is [only] saved in the second resurrection, that one is a sinner, who needs the baptism of fire, [and] who is purged by burning,*

so that whatsoever he had of wood, hay, and stubble, the fire may consume."[7]

◊ **4. Right margin:** Exodus 14:28–29.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Malachi 3:3.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Luke 3:16.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Revelation 20:6.

Augustine, in book 21 *On the City of God*, chapters 26 and 27, confutes this dogma; do thou see whether Origen['s] →

[…continues on folio 585 (PDF p. 402): Augustine's refutation, and how far Origen's purgatorial fire may be reconciled with Catholic teaching (Annotatio CLXX).]

---

*(printed folio 585 [PDF p. 402]. **Annot. CLXX–CLXXI** (Ps 36:14–36:15): Origen's universal fire closes; then a chain of Fathers (Ambrose, Hilary, Basil, Jerome, Lactantius) who seem to hold that all souls but Christ's are tried by fire after death → folio 586.)*

(folio 585, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXX (continued)

[do thou see whether] Origen's words can be interpreted of the fire of the final conflagration, which on the day of judgment shall purge certain elect not yet purged, and shall sweep up [enfold] all the reprobate. See the following Annotation.

Annotation CLXXI [contents]

"Let their sword enter into their own hearts." — Psalm 36:15

Whether all Souls, after this life, are to be tried by fire.

Ambrose, in the commentaries on the Psalter, disclosing the understanding of this clause, is believed to consent to Origen — saying that all who are, who have been, and who shall be men (one Christ excepted) are to be examined, proved, and in some manner burned by the fire of the world's conflagration on the day of judgment. For he transferred from Origen's explanation into this psalm almost all the following words: "*'By fire thou hast examined us,' David says:*[1] *therefore we shall all be examined by fire. And Malachi says, 'Behold the omnipotent Lord comes: and who shall endure the day of his entrance? For he himself shall enter in, like a refining fire; and he shall sit refining and purging, like gold and silver, and he shall purge the sons of Levi.'*[2] *By fire, therefore, shall the sons of Levi be purged; by fire Ezekiel, by fire Daniel. But even if they shall be examined by fire, yet they shall say, 'We have passed through fire and water';*[3] *others shall remain in the fire. To these the fire shall be as dew — as [it was] to the Hebrew boys, who were cast into the burning of the fiery furnace; but the avenging fire shall burn up the ministers of impiety. Woe is me, if my work shall have burned, and I suffer the loss of this labor! And if the Lord shall save his servants, we shall be saved by [our] faith — yet so saved, as if by fire; and if we be not burned up, yet we shall be burned. But in what manner some remain in the fire, and others pass through, the divine Scripture teaches us: namely, in the Red Sea the people of the Egyptians was drowned, [while] the people of the Hebrews passed through before, [and] Moses passed through; Pharaoh was cast down, because, when heavy sins drowned [them], in that manner the sacrilegious are cast down into the lake of burning fire. Let us, therefore, placed here, follow the pillar of fire, which may illumine us in this body, and show [us] the way, that in the future the cloud may cool us, so that we may be able to relieve [ourselves from] the savage burnings of the night.*" Again, in the exposition of Psalm 118, upon that [verse], "See my humiliation, and deliver me," etc., he says: "*All, [as many] as desire to return to paradise, must be proved by fire: for not idly is it written that — Adam and Eve*

being cast out of the seat of paradise — God placed at the exit of paradise a fiery turning sword; all must pass through the flames, even if [one] be that John the Evangelist, whom the Lord so loved that he said of him to Peter, 'So I will [him] to remain: what is that to thee? follow thou me.' Concerning his death some have doubted; concerning [his] passing through the fire we cannot doubt. Even if [one] be Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he must say, 'We have passed through the fire.' But for John the fiery sword shall be quickly turned aside, because iniquity is not found in him whom equity loved: if there was anything of vice in him, divine charity burned it away. He shall be examined as silver; I shall be examined as lead — until the lead melt away, I shall burn. If nothing of silver shall be found in me, woe is me! I shall be thrust down into the lowest [part] of hell; or, as stubble, I shall be wholly burned up. If anything of gold or of silver shall be found in me — not through my [own] acts, but through the mercy and grace of Christ — [I shall say], perhaps, 'For they who hope in thee shall not be confounded.' One [alone] could not feel that fire — [he] who is the justice of God, Christ, who did no sin: for nothing of the fire found in him anything which it could burn up. Therefore, since we are to be examined, let us so act, that in the judgment we may deserve to be proved by the divine [examination]. Let us hold, placed here, humility — so that, when each one of us shall come to the judgment of God, to those fires which we are to pass through, he may say, 'See my humiliation, and deliver me,' etc."

◊ **1. Left margin:** Psalm 16:3.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Malachi 3:1–2.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Psalm 65:12.

Hilary, together with Ambrose, following his own Origen, in the commentaries on Psalm 118, upon that verse, "My soul hath coveted to desire thy judgments,"[4] etc., thus wrote: "*The prophet remembers that it is arduous to desire the judgment; for since no living [man] is clean in his sight, how can the judgment be desirable, in which that unwearied fire must be undergone by us — in which those grave punishments, [needing] to be expiated from sins, must be undergone by the soul? The sword passed through the soul of the blessed Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed. If, therefore, that Virgin of God — subject [to it] — is to come to the severity in the judgment, who shall dare to desire to be judged by God?*" And in the canon on Matthew 3, explaining that [passage], "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire":[5] "*Baptized in the Holy Spirit, it remains that we be consummated in the fire of judgment.*"

◊ **4. Right margin:** Psalm 118:20.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Matthew 3:11.

To the same [purpose] seem to pertain those things which **Basil** noted on the fourth chapter of Isaiah, in those words of the prophet, "He shall purge Jerusalem in the spirit of judgment and in the spirit of burning," etc., saying: "*But this — 'In the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning' — is referred to that probation, or examination, which shall be made through fire in the future age.*" And a little after: "*Those who, after having received the knowledge of life, deliberately and by [their own] zeal render themselves obnoxious to blood — such surely need to be purged by fire; and these are to be purged by the spirit of burning, or of examination.*" And again, in the same commentaries, weighing that [passage] of Isaiah 9, "In the indignation of the wrath of the Lord the earth is burnt up,"[6] etc., he says: "*The prophet declares that the earthly [region] itself is delivered to be consumed by a punitive fire, unto the grace and benefit of the soul; for he threatens not an utter destruction and extermination, but hints at a purgation according to the sentence of the Apostle: 'Because, as any man's work shall have burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'*"[7]

◊ **6. Right margin:** Isaiah 9:19.

◊ **7. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 3:15.

To the same opinion **Jerome** appears to have alluded, in the third book on Amos, where, expounding that [passage] from the seventh chapter, "And behold he shall call for fire to judgment, and it shall devour the abyss, and it shall eat up at the same time a part,"[8] etc., he thus speaks: "*The calling of fire to judgment first*

devours the abyss — that is, all kinds of sinners: wood, hay, stubble;[9] *and afterward it eats up at the same time a part — that is, it comes to those saints who are in the peculium of the Lord, and are reckoned in his part. For it is the time that judgment begin from the house of the Lord; and in Ezekiel it is commanded to those who are to bring the punishments, 'Begin ye from my sanctuary.'*[10] *And in the Apostle we read, 'If any man's work shall have burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'*[11] *And when we shall all have been in sin, and shall have lain against the truth of the sentence, the Lord will have mercy on us, and will raise us up in the time of the resurrection.*"

◊ **8. Right margin:** Amos 7:4.

◊ **9. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 3.

◊ **10. Right margin:** Ezekiel 9:6.

◊ **11. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 3:15.

Lactantius Firmianus, speaking of this fire long before Jerome and Hilary, in the seventh [book] of the *Divine Institutes*, chapter 21, left this written: "*The same divine fire, therefore, by one and the same force and power, shall both burn the impious and shall renew them; and as much as it shall consume from the bodies, so much shall it restore, and shall furnish for itself eternal fuel. But when God shall have judged the just, he will also examine them by fire: then those whose sins shall have prevailed, either by weight or by number, shall be singed by the fire, and shall be scorched; but those whom full justice and the ripeness of virtue has thoroughly seasoned*" →

[…continues on folio 586 (PDF p. 403): the rest of Lactantius, and Sixtus's Catholic resolution of these Fathers on the fire (Annotatio CLXXI).]

---

*(printed folio 586 [PDF p. 403]. **Annot. CLXXI–CLXXIV** (Ps 36:15–50:3): the fire-trial resolved (the living at judgment pass through it, not the dead saints); Cassiodorus on praying "with understanding"; and Chrysostom's "a thousand times repent" (vs. the Novatians) and on mercy → folio 587.)*

(folio 586, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXI (continued)

shall not feel that fire; for they have something of God in themselves which repels and casts back the force of the flame. So great is the force of innocence, that from it that fire flees away harmless — [the fire] which receives from God this power, that it may burn the impious [and] obey the just."

From the opinions of these authors, those things appear to be sufficiently diverse which all the Scholastic Theologians teach concerning the fire of the final conflagration: who, although they confess that all mortals whom the time of judgment shall find living shall enter this fire[1] — and that certain elect, needing expiation, are to be purged in it with pain, but certain [others], in whom there will be nothing to be purged, shall escape from it without any torment, [while] the reprobate, together with that very fire, are rolled down and drowned into hell — yet they refuse [to hold] that the saints who died before the judgment are to be purged by that fire; especially the Apostles, purified by the Holy Spirit, and Mary the Mother of God, sanctified in the womb and assumed into heaven with a most pure body: both because the dead do not rise again until after that fire shall have ceased from the office of purgation, the faculty of purging being laid aside; and because the bodies of the saints after the resurrection shall be so spiritual and impassible that they are no longer capable of the fiery purgation. Nor does Augustine much dissent from the Scholastics, in book 20 *On the City of God*, chapter 8, where he says that the future saints [shall be] in the higher parts of the world, into which the flame of that burning shall not ascend — just as neither of old [did] the wave of the flood; for such bodies shall be theirs, that they may be there where they shall have willed to be. But, made immortal and incorruptible, they shall not dread the fire of that conflagration — just as the corruptible and mortal bodies of

the three men were able to live unharmed in the burning furnace. See the preceding Annotation.

◊ **1. Left margin:** All mortals whom the time of judgment shall find living shall enter the fire of the final conflagration.

Annotation CLXXII [contents]

"For God is the king of all the earth: sing ye wisely." — Psalm 46:3, 8

Whether one ought to pray in an unknown tongue.

Cassiodorus, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this little verse, says: "*Not only must we sing, but [sing] understanding: for no one does anything wisely which he does not understand.*" The heretics use this testimony against those who sing or pray Psalms and prayers not understood before God, asserting that those prayers are of no fruit which — in a foreign and unknown tongue — are offered by the simple and unlearned to the divine majesty: because no one obtains the benefits of prayer unless first, with attentive thought, he has diligently considered what he prays; and he will not be able to consider [it] unless he first has understood it; nor will he be able to understand those things which must be uttered in a tongue foreign and unknown to him. To these [heretics] it must be answered, that there is a twofold attention of praying:[2] one, peculiar and proper to those who understand only, which looks to the words and the sense of the words, lest anything be erred on either side; but the other far more excellent, and accessible to those who understand as [well as] to those who do not understand, which directs the point of the mind unto the end and scope of prayer — namely, unto God, whom [one] prays, and then unto the very thing which [one] prays for. And it happens that an attention of this kind is sometimes stretched so far that the mind, lifted up in the meditation of God, forgets sometimes the words, and the meanings, and itself. Nor is it doubtful that David and Cassiodorus looked to this attention, when they admonished that one should sing wisely and understandingly. For he undoubtedly sings wisely, and prays, who tastes the savor and fruit of divine contemplation in prayer; and he truly prays understandingly, who contemplates, with intent mind, God whom he prays.[3] You have some things pertaining hither in book 6, Annotation 263.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The attention of praying is twofold.

◊ **3. Right margin:** An excellent teaching.

Annotation CLXXIII [contents]

"Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy great mercy." — Psalm 50:3

Whether penance is to be repeated.

Chrysostom, in homily 2 on Psalm 50, when from the words of this little verse he encouraged every most desperate sinner to penance, burst forth into that voice — repeated by him very often, also in many homilies: "*Thou hast sinned? Repent. A thousand times [hast thou sinned]? A thousand times repent — nay, repent even still.*" Which voice there were not lacking of old [some] who condemned, as a certain seed-plot of intemperance and unbridled license. But among others, **Socrates** of Constantinople, in the sixth book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 21, writes of it in this manner: "*It comes upon me to wonder how John [Chrysostom], since he exercised so great a zeal for temperance, taught in his homilies to contemn temperance. For since there was but a single penance given by the synod of bishops to the lapsed,*[4] *he dared to say, 'Thou too, who hast done penance a thousand times, approach': on account of which doctrine he was condemned also by [his] friends, especially by Sisinnius, bishop of the Novatians, who wrote a book against this saying, and on account of it strongly resisted him.*" These things Socrates: whom there is no doubt to have been a Novatian,[5] and on that account offended, together with his own bishop, at Chrysostom's sayings. Yet Chrysostom, saying these things, did not look to that solemn and public penance which the synodical decrees granted but once to the lapsed, but to the private, singular, and secret penance, which is necessary before God — or before a particular priest — to everyone sinning: this [penance], to [him who has sinned] a thousand times, Chrysostom offers a thousand times as a remedy — not that he might furnish them the matter

of intemperate license, but that he might free them from all occasion of despairing. Which he himself also, in the same homily, after the aforesaid words, plainly declares, thus adding: "*These things I say, not that I may make you negligent, but that I may lead you to the faith of a salutary expectation: lest you ever despair of yourselves, but always trust in the mercy of God — for one must despair only of that [man] who has despaired of himself.*"

◊ **4. Right margin:** Public penance was granted to the lapsed only once.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Socrates was a Novatian.

Annotation CLXXIV [contents]

"And according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my iniquity." — Psalm 50:3

Concerning satisfaction.

Chrysostom, in homily 2 on the fiftieth Psalm, interpreting this clause, among other things inserts these words: "*Where mercy is implored, interrogation ceases; where mercy is sought, judgment rages not; where mercy is asked, there is no place for punishment; where [there is] mercy, [there is] no inquiry; where [there is] mercy, the answer is [one] of pardon.*" →

[…continues on folio 587 (PDF p. 404): the rest of Chrysostom on mercy and satisfaction (Annotatio CLXXIV).]

---

*(printed folio 587 [PDF p. 404]. **Annot. CLXXIV–CLXXV** (Ps 50:3–50:5): Calvin abusing Chrysostom against satisfaction (closed); then the long crux on **sacramental confession** — Chrysostom and Cassian texts marshaled against private confession, answered as touching only public/theatrical confession (abolished by Nectarius) → folio 588.)*

(folio 587, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXIV (continued)

John Calvin, in the ninth chapter of his Institutes, abuses this sentence to overthrow the satisfactory penalties, which the theologians teach are most especially necessary to penitents.[1] Reread Annotation 16 of this book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Satisfactory penalties are necessary to penitents.

Annotation CLXXV [contents]

"My sin is always before me." — Psalm 50:5

Whether sacramental confession is necessary.

Chrysostom, in the second homily on this Psalm, to the exposition of the present little verse inserted some things concerning confession, which John Calvin, in the ninth chapter of his Institutes, and the rest of the Lutherans bring forward (together with very many other sentences of the same Author) against sacramental confession. They run in this manner: "*Say thy sins, that thou mayest blot them out. If thou art ashamed to say to anyone that thou hast sinned, say [them] within. [I do] not [say] that thou confess to thy fellow-servant, who may reproach thee; but say [them] to God, who heals them.*" A similar sentence, and in almost the same words, Chrysostom inculcates in very many places; of which I shall bring hither some of the more notable, that at one glance I may set before your eyes whatsoever he has said on this subject, and lest it be needful for me again to repeat passages of this kind of argument.

In the fourth **homily on Lazarus**, on Luke chapter 16: "*Why, therefore, art thou ashamed and dost thou blush to confess thy sins? Dost thou tell [them] to a man, that he may reproach thee? Not so; for [thou fearest] to confess to thy fellow-servant, lest he bring [it] forth into public. But thou showest thy wounds to*

him who is Lord, to him who is physician; for neither is he ignorant [of them], even if thou tell him not — [he] who knew [them] even before thou didst perpetrate [them]. Why, therefore, is there care, that thou tell [them] the less? Not, he says, *do I compel thee to come forth into the midst as into a theatre, and to employ many witnesses: to me alone tell thy sin privately, that I may heal the ulcer, and free thee from grief.*"

In the **homily on the Publican**, on Luke 18, he left this written: "*I admonish thee that thou confess assiduously. For neither do I lead thee to the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor do I compel thee to enunciate thy sins to men: unfold thy conscience to God; to him show thy deeds and wounds, and from him seek medicine; show thyself to him who reproaches not, but heals. For though thou be silent, yet he knows all. Tell [them], therefore, to him, that thou mayest depart thence free and loosed from sins, and be freed from that intolerable publication of sins.*"

In **homily 31 on the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews**: "*Not only,* he says, *let us say that we are sinners, but let us also compute the sins themselves specially, one by one. I do not say to thee, that thou betray thyself in public, nor that thou accuse thyself before others; but I would have thee obey the prophet, saying, 'Reveal to the Lord thy way.*[2] *Before God, therefore, confess thy sins; at the true judge pronounce thy offenses with prayer — not with the tongue, but with the memory of thy conscience: and then at last hope that thou canst obtain mercy.*"

◊ **2. Left margin:** Psalm 36:5.

In the **homily On penance and confession** he says: "*Thou art confounded, and blushest to utter thy sins? And yet it behoved [thee] most of all to say them, and to divulge [them] among men: for to sin is confusion; it is not confusion to confess sins. But now it is not even necessary to confess in the presence of witnesses: let the inquisition of offenses be made by thought; without a witness let this judgment be; let God alone see thee confessing — God, who reproaches not thy sins, but looses the sins on account of [thy] confusion,*" etc.

In the **eighth homily among those which are titled On penance**: "*Reveal not,* he says, *thy sores; do not produce accusation in the common theatre; do not set up witnesses of [thy] offenses: within, in [thy] conscience, no one standing by except him who sees all — God, who both searches and judges concerning [thy] sins, and weighs the judgment of the sins of all, as it were, by a certain balance. Reform that in which thou hast offended; and so, with a pure conscience, approach the sacred table, and be a partaker of the holy sacrifice.*"

In the **fifth homily On the incomprehensible nature of God** he says: "*How greatly I exhort and beseech and pray you, dearest brethren, that ye more frequently confess to the immortal God, and — your offenses being enumerated — seek pardon, and [seek] the deity propitious! I lead thee not into the theatre of thy fellow-servants; I do not compel [thee] to detect thy sins to men: unfold thy conscience before God, and explain [it]; show to God, the most excellent physician, thy wounds, and ask from him the medicine; show [them] to him who reproaches not, but heals most humanely. Say to him, that — thy stains being wiped off — thou mayest depart thence clean, and without any disgrace, [and] be freed from that intolerable promulgation of thy offenses.*"

John Cassian, consenting to the same opinion of his own preceptor Chrysostom, in book 20 of the Collations, chapter 8, wrote these things: "*There is none who cannot say suppliantly to God, 'My sin I have made known to thee,*[3] *that, through this confession, he may deserve to subjoin also that, 'And thou hast remitted the impiety of my sin.' Because, if — shame drawing [thee] back — thou blushest to reveal thy sins before men, cease not to confess them, by continual supplication, to him from whom they cannot lie hidden, and to say: 'My iniquity I acknowledge, and my sin is always before me. To thee only have I sinned, and done evil before thee*[4] *— who is wont both to heal without any publication of shame, and to pardon without reproach.*"

◊ **3. Right margin:** Psalm 31:5.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Psalm 50:5.

The **Master of the Sentences**, book 4, distinction 17, says that these sayings of Chrysostom are not so to be understood, as though it be lawful to anyone — if he has had the opportunity — not to confess to a priest; but that it suffices, where the crime is secret, to tell [it] to God alone [rather than] in secret through a confessor. But I judge that Chrysostom said these things not concerning secret confession — which is a part of sacramental penance — but concerning that theatrical and public confession, which is a part of public penance, which of old the penitents were wont to make, for enormous crimes, as in a theatre, before the bishop, the presbyters, and the multitude of the people. For to this [public confession] Chrysostom would not compel those who had secretly offended: both because those things which are secret he judged ought not to be published before all; and also because, even in his own times, public confession had been abrogated (through fear of the raging people) by **Nectarius**, bishop of Constantinople, his predecessor[5] — on account of a matron [who had been] violated by a deacon in the temple, under the pretext of confession: as Sozomen indicates in book 9 of the *Tripartite History*, chapter 35. From which [chapter] it pleases [me] to relate the ancient rite of public confession and penance, that the aforenoted passages of Chrysostom may be better understood. These, therefore, are the words of Sozomen from that chapter: "*Since it is known that altogether not to sin is divine, and beyond human nature — but that God commanded pardon to be given to sinners, and to those doing penance; while those who refuse to confess acquire a greater burden of sins — therefore it seemed [good] to the ancient*" →

◊ **5. Right margin:** For what cause public confession was abrogated at Constantinople.

[…continues on folio 588 (PDF p. 405): Sozomen on the ancient office of the penitentiary priest and its abolition (Annotatio CLXXV).]

---

*(printed folio 588 [PDF p. 405]. **Annot. CLXXV–CLXXIX** (Ps 50:5–50:7): the public-penance rite and its abolition by Nectarius (Sozomen); royal versus priestly power; and three annotations on "conceived in iniquities— " Arnobius, Chrysostom (accused by Faber), and Theodoret → folio 589.)*

(folio 588, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXV (continued)

certain wise men to appoint over the people certain Pontiffs, that — as it were in a theatre, under the testimony of the ecclesiastical people — offenses might be laid open; and for this matter they appointed a presbyter of good conversation, discreet and wise: to whom, coming, those who had offended confessed their own offenses. But he, according to each one's fault, appointed also the penalty [the satisfaction to be paid]: which even hitherto is diligently observed in the Western Churches, and especially at Rome — where also there is a fixed place for the penitents. For the guilty stand, and are set as it were amid lamentations. For when the sacred celebration [of the Mass] has been completed, they — not partaking of the communion — with groaning and lamentation prostrate themselves upon the ground; to whom the Bishop, hastening together, himself also prostrates himself with tears and spiritual groaning, and the whole people of the Church is flooded with weeping. But after these things the Bishop first rises, and lifts up those lying on the ground; then, a fitting prayer being made over the penitents, he dismisses them all. But they, of their own accord giving themselves to mortifications — whether by fastings, or by abstinence from the bath, or by the withholding of foods, or by other things which are enjoined — await the common time which the Bishop decrees; and when the appointed time has come, as though discharging a certain debt, [and being] cured of the sin by the affliction, they partake of the communion with the people. These things, therefore, the Roman Pontiffs have observed from antiquity even unto our time. But further, at Constantinople there was a presbyter set over the penitents, until that time in which a certain most noble woman, when she had

confessed her sins, and it had been enjoined her by the presbyter that she should fast and supplicate God with [good] works — while she was observing this, confessed that she had more than once lain with a deacon in the church. When the people had come to know this, they raged against the priests, as though through them an injury had been done to the Church. Then Nectarius the Bishop removed the wicked deacon; and, certain persons persuading [him] that he should leave each one to the judgment of his own conscience as to communicating, he ordained that there should by no means [any longer] be a presbyter set over the penitents. And from that [time] the custom of antiquity was taken away — since, as I judge, the lesser sins were being ventured [more boldly], on account of the shame of confession and the [over-]nicety of those who examined [them]." These things Sozomen.

Annotation CLXXVI [contents]

"To thee only have I sinned." — Psalm 50:6

Whether the royal power is to be preferred to the sacerdotal.

Cassiodorus, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this verse has these things: "*If anyone of the people has erred, he sins both against God and against the king; but when the king offends, he is guilty to God alone, because he has no man who may judge his deeds. Rightly, therefore, does the king say that he has sinned to God only: because [God] was the only one who could sift what [the king] had committed.*" **John of Torquemada**, cardinal-presbyter, in book 1 *On Ecclesiastical Power*, chapter 91, places this passage among the arguments of those who prefer the Caesarean power to the Pontifical. The heretics of our times — who strive to vindicate the first grade of ecclesiastical dignity to the secular magistrate — cite this very passage, and annex to it another sentence out of the third commentary of **Jerome** on Jeremiah, where, in the explanation of chapter 13, it is thus read: "*Not only the ignoble common crowd and the vile populace, but [also] the Kings of the Churches, who sit upon the throne — the priests themselves too, the second grade in ecclesiastical honor — are filled up with the variety of sins.*"

The words of these authors must be referred to the kingdom and the priesthood of the Jews and of the Gentiles: among whom, since all the sacerdotal worship was instituted for the obtaining of the earthly and temporal goods of the present life — the care of which looks to the king — justly were the priests and pontiffs both of the Jews and of the Gentiles made subject to Kings and Emperors. But in the Evangelical law — in which Christ, the assisting Pontiff of the good things to come, instituted a priesthood far more excellent, in that it confers on us spiritual and heavenly goods, over which the royal power has no right[1] — it is fair that kings be made subject to the rule of the pontiffs, and obey the word of the priests. Yet it is to be observed here that **Philo** the Jew, in the book *On Fugitives* [*De profugis*], and in the third book *On the Life of Moses*, admonishes that, although the high priest of the Jews was inferior to the king, nevertheless, for so long as he was discharging his ministry — entering the temple, clothed with the sacerdotal vestment, bearing on his head the tiara [*cidaris*] in place of the royal diadem, and the golden plate marked with the name of God — he was superior to the king himself. Nay more, in the book *On the Legation to Gaius* [Caligula] he testifies that the Maccabean princes, his own ancestors, by the best right preferred the Priesthood in every respect to the kingdom, saying thus: "*I, who had both ancestors [that were] kings, and, of these, several who were also high Pontiffs — they valued that [priestly] dignity more than the royal: judging that, by how much God stands before man, by so much the pontificate is more excellent than the kingdom; for to the care of the one [the priesthood] pertain divine things, to that of the other [the kingship], human.*" You have [something] on this matter in St. **Thomas**, book 1 *On the Governance of Princes* [*De regimine principum*], chapter 14; likewise you shall read more of these things below, in the book which next follows this [one], in the seventy-second Annotation.

◊ **1. Right margin:** The royal power has no right over spiritual goods.

Annotation CLXXVII [contents]

"For behold, in iniquities [was I conceived]." — Psalm 50:7

Whether Adam's sin transmitted to posterity only the death of the body.

Arnobius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, opening the sense of this little verse, seems to signify that Adam, by sinning, transmitted to his heirs only the punishment of bodily death, but not the sin and the vice of origin. For he speaks in these words: "*David did not say, 'With iniquities,' or 'With sins did my mother beget me': but, 'In iniquities was I conceived, and in sins did my mother beget me.' For by saying [this] he signified that his mother bore him amid the sins of the world, because every sin is conceived in the heart and consummated by the mouth. But this [child] who is born has the sentence [condemnation] of Adam — yet Adam's sin itself he has not.*" Read Annotation 236 of the sixth book.

Annotation CLXXVIII [contents]

"For behold, in iniquities [was I conceived]." — Psalm 50:7

Concerning original sin.

Chrysostom is brought under suspicion by **John Faber** [Johann Fabri], bishop of Vienna, because in his exposition of Psalm 50 — which he expounded splendidly — he purposely left the present little verse untouched, lest he fall into discourse of original sin, which he himself thought to be nothing [non-existent], and in many places also demonstrated to be nothing. These things Faber [says] in the Apology of his commentaries on Paul: whose error we have confuted in [our] censures upon the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. Read Annotation 236 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXIX [contents]

"For behold, in iniquities was I conceived." — Psalm 50:7

Whether the sin contracted from Adam is only the occasion of sin, and not sin [itself].

Theodoret, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon the little verse of this Psalm, is believed to have been in the opinion of those who assert that the sin of origin, contracted from Adam, is simply →

[...continues on folio 589 (PDF p. 406): the rest of Theodoret on whether the sin contracted from Adam is sin properly or only the occasion of sin (Annotatio CLXXIX).]

---

*(printed folio 589 [PDF p. 406]. **Annot. CLXXIX–CLXXXIV** (Ps 50:7–65:12): Theodoret on original sin; Euthymius on marriage without the Fall; Hilary on Peter's denial, Christ's assumed passions, and merit vs. election; and Origen on whether men rise in the numerically same body → folio 590.)*

(folio 589, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXIX (continued)

and in itself is not sin, but only the occasion and incitement of sin: which [occasion], if anyone repels it by the judgment of reason, he will be free from all sin; but if he consents to it, he will fall into sin, and be condemned to the punishment of sin. For his words written below hint at this in a certain manner — translated by us from the Greek exemplar: "*David, therefore, does not accuse marriage, nor does he call the nuptial communion a transgression, as certain persons have imprudently presumed, thus understanding that [text], 'In iniquities was I conceived, and in sins did my mother conceive me': but he brings forth into the midst the transgression once dared of old by the first men, and says that this begot the fountain of these defluxions. For unless they had sinned, they would not have received death, which is the penalty of sin; but,*

being free from mortality, they would have been more powerful to conquer sin — for with incorruption there would have been also all impassibility; and, impassibility governing, there would have been no place for sin. But since they sinned, they were delivered to corruption; and, being made corruptible, they begot sons very like themselves — whom desires, fears, pleasures, griefs, anger, and envy pursued; and with these [passions], and with the things born from them, reason contends: which reason, if it shall have conquered, is honored, and is crowned with victorious crowns; but if conquered, it is punished with confusion and torn with penalties." These things Theodoret repeats more openly in the exposition of the fifth chapter to the Romans; in the censures of which — [as to] what is said there — thou shalt see Annotation 236 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXX [contents]

"For behold, in iniquities was I conceived." — Psalm 50:7

If the first parents had not sinned, whether [there would have been] conception and generation.

Euthymius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this sentence, affirms that Adam's sin was the cause of human conception and generation; for unless he had sinned, there would have been no carnal union, nor the joining of male and female. For he thus writes: "*If Adam had not sinned, it would never have behooved Eve to be joined to him; sin, therefore, begot the union, and the union in turn produced those who were born of Adam and Eve; and so thereafter others, down to David. And although marriage be now held in honor, yet [things] of nature come forth from sin: 'from sin, therefore,' says David, 'was I conceived and begotten.'*" In the same manner the Author of the *Imperfect Work on Matthew* expounds the present passage, in the first homily. We have confuted this opinion above, in Annotations 20 and 21.

There are [some] who think that Euthymius applied this exposition to this little verse of set purpose, lest he be compelled to confess that sin which the royal Prophet in this place chiefly deplores — that is, original sin, which we constantly believe to have been transfused from the first parent into all [his] posterity. That this opinion did not altogether please Euthymius, those things testify which were written by him in the second volume of the *Panoplia*, title twenty-two, where — the words of Gregory Nazianzen being also borrowed — he thus speaks of Adam's sin: "*Therefore, for the transgression of the precept, and for the sin of the first parent, are appointed diseases, and death, which the transgression and sin brought about; which death indeed indicates the benignity of God — for it is the cause that, sin being cut short, the evil be not perpetual, as Gregory the Theologian says. But the eternal punishments are not appointed for the first transgression, but for the individual men who bind themselves with sins — or who, from the first parent even unto the consummation [of the world], applied no cure to [their] sins.*" Some attribute this opinion of Euthymius to Chrysostom, but wrongly and unjustly, as one may see in Annotation 236 of the sixth book.

Annotation CLXXXI [contents]

"There is none that doeth good, [there is] not even one." — Psalm 52:4

Whether Peter, in the denial of Christ, lost [his] faith.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this little verse, so excuses Peter's denial that he says he did not lose the firmness of [his] faith: because, although from the trepidation of the flesh — which he could not restrain — his tongue burst forth into the denial of Christ,[1] yet the firm faith of confessing Christ even unto martyrdom did not depart from his mind. **Prudentius**, in the hymn to the cock-crow, subscribes to Hilary in these verses: "*The denier wept, at last, for the wickedness slipped from his mouth, while his mind remained innocent, and his soul preserved the faith.*" By another way also [Hilary] strives to wrest this same denial of Peter to a pious sense, in the commentaries on Matthew. St. Jerome reprehends him in this matter, as thou shalt be able to see in Annotation 160 of the following book.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Matthew 26:70, 72, 73.

Annotation CLXXXII [contents]

"Because strangers have risen up against me." — Psalm 53:5

Whether hunger, thirst, grief, and death were natural to Christ.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, seems to hint that thirst, hunger, sleep, sadness, grief, weariness, and other passions of this kind were not natural to the humanity of Christ, but assumed [voluntarily taken on]; for thus he speaks to the exposition of the proposed verse: "*Hence that [fact], that he hungered, thirsted, slept, was wearied, and wept, and suffered, and died. And that he might be understood to be subject to all these things not by nature, but by [voluntary] assumption, having gone through them all, he rose again.*" Read Annotation 186 of this book.

Annotation CLXXXIII [contents]

"Blessed [is he] whom thou hast chosen and taken up." — Psalm 64:5

Whether our merits are the cause of the eternal election.

Hilary, in the explanation of the Psalter, illustrating this passage, seems to incline to the opinion of those who lay down that our merits are the cause of the divine and eternal election, saying: "*Blessed is whosoever shall have been elected: for many, according to the Gospel, are called, but few [are] chosen; and the elect are conspicuous in the nuptial garment, splendid with the pure and whole body of the new nativity. And so election is not a matter of undiscerning judgment, but a discrimination made out of the choice of merit: blessed, therefore, [is he] whom God has chosen — blessed for this, that he is worthy by [his] election.*" Augustine condemns this opinion in [his books] against the Pelagians, as thou hast below in Annotation 251 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXXIV [contents]

"We have passed through fire and water, and thou hast brought us out into a refreshment." — Psalm 65:12

Whether men shall rise again in the same individual [body].

Origen's commentaries on the Psalms have here some things which **Methodius**, bishop of Olympus, thinks were written against the resurrection of the flesh in the same individual [body]; and these the same bishop recounts in [his dialogue] the *Aglaophon* in these words: "*Thou hast indeed surely seen the skin of an animal, or some other such thing, filled with water: in what manner, if it be gradually emptied, and gradually filled, it always shows the same appearance. For of whatever sort that which contains [the skin] shall be, it is necessary that to it also that which is within [the water] be conformed*" →

[…continues on folio 590 (PDF p. 407): the rest of Origen's simile (as reported by Methodius) on the flux of the body and the resurrection (Annotatio CLXXXIV).]

---

*(printed folio 590 [PDF p. 407]. **Annot. CLXXXIV–CLXXXV** (Ps 65:12, 65:11): Origen's water-skin simile on the risen body closes; then his error that souls are thrust into bodies for sins committed in heaven, with Cyril of Alexandria's reasons against it (1–5, the sixth begins) → folio 591.)*

(folio 590, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXIV (continued)

conformed: for if the water flows away beneath, [and] if one adds as much as is poured out, not suffering the skin[-bottle] to be emptied of its water all at once, it is necessary that what is added appear such as the whole [was], because that which contains [it] is the same. And truly, if anyone should wish to liken the body to these things, he will be confounded by no shame: for in the same manner also those things which are introduced from nourishment, in place of the flesh expelled, are transmuted into the figure of the appearance [*species*] of the very thing containing them; and inasmuch as [the flesh] is spread out to the eyes, it is like the eyes; inasmuch as [it pertains] to the face, [like] the face; inasmuch as to the other parts, [like] those same — so that each one appears the same, not because there are [the same] fleshes as the first substrate in the same [man], but [the same] appearance, according to which the things that accrue are specified. Accordingly, if we are not the same even for a few days in [respect of] body, but [the same] of the appearance in the body — for this alone stands firm in [our] nativity — much more, therefore, neither then [at the resurrection] shall we be the same according to the same flesh, but according to the appearance, which even now is always conserved in us and remains. For what there [in the simile] is the skin, this here is the appearance; and what there is the water in the likeness, this here is that which accrues and departs. As, therefore, now — although the body be not the same — yet the character is preserved the same according to the same form: so, the body not remaining the same, the appearance, increased into greater glory, shall be shown no more in a corruptible, but in an impassible and spiritual body. See above, Annotation 148.

Annotation CLXXXV [contents]

"Thou hast led us into a snare." — Psalm 65:11

Whether Souls, on account of sins committed in heaven, are thrust down into bodies.

Methodius, bishop of Olympus, imputes it as a fault to **Origen** that, interpreting this verse in the commentaries on the Psalter, he said that Souls were brought into bodies in order that in these — as in a snare, and a chain, and a prison — they might pay the penalties of the crimes which, while dwelling in heaven, they had committed. This same error in Origen was condemned by **Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis, in book 2 of the *Panarion*; by **Theophilus**, bishop of Alexandria, in his first Paschal [letter]; by **Jerome**, in the epistle to Pammachius; and especially by **Cyril**, bishop of Alexandria — who, in the first book of the commentaries on John, confuted this very dogma with many reasons of no small moment brought forward: which, because thou wilt find them in no one of the school of theologians, it has pleased [me] to append here, for the favor of the studious reader.

First: if the Souls existed before the bodies of men, and — by a certain inclination to evil, as [Origen] himself says — are joined to bodies in place of punishment, how are they said to be *illumined* when coming into this world?[1] For illumination seems to bring greater grace, and is certainly [a thing] of honor, not of punishment; but he who is honored is not punished, nor is he vexed with torments who partakes of the divine light. Wherefore it is certain that the Soul, which in the body itself is honored, is not punished by [its] conjunction with the body.

◊ **1. Left margin:** The reason against Origen asserting that they [souls] are thrust into bodies on account of sins committed. John 1:9. [The margin flags each successive argument (the second through sixth) simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."]

Secondly, it is added, that it would be altogether false that the Soul is illumined [when] coming into this world — if indeed it was already a mind and an entire intellect beforehand: for if, while it comes into the body, it is illumined, it is necessary that, before it comes, it lack light. How, therefore, will the intellect be entire and pure, if it then at last began to be illumined, when it descended into this world and into the mass of the flesh?

Thirdly, if the Soul existed before the body, and — as a pure mind and an entire intellect — was more closely joined to the good itself, but by the depravity and desire of worse things was pressed down to earthly things: how is not a great injury done to it, which — now pressed down in this body — is bidden to live

rightly and not to sin? Whereas it would rather have behooved [it to do so] then, when — not yet bound to a body — it was farther from all perturbation. One certainly could not say either that the fitting occasion for admonishing the soul was unknown to God, or that [the soul] was injuriously handled by him who cannot sin. Fittingly, therefore, and justly, are we bidden not to sin in this flesh, since we began to be at that time in which, together with the body, we came into this world, and, as it were, arrived from a certain [nothingness] out of nothing unto being.

Fourthly, I would gladly ask of him what likelihood the reasoning has, when he says that, on account of the offenses which the Soul had previously committed, it is thrust into a body, that by the experience of things it may learn the baseness of its own concupiscence: how does he not blush to say these things? For it seems rather that [the soul] ought to be freed from depraved thoughts, than to be thrust down into the depth of the basest pleasures — for not thus, but that [other] manner, could have healed it. But if it was thrust into a body in order that it might enjoy the pleasures of the body, and in that manner be the more sickened, then the physician can rightly be accused of the crime as much of ignorance as of injury — [the physician] who thought that the sick [soul] could be healed by that method, if she were driven by injury into greater and more numerous offenses. But if [it was done] that he might make an end of her sinning: how did he think she would rather emerge from the utmost depth of misery and of desire, than [that], at the very beginning of evils — when she lacked the tinder of sin, that is, the body — she would retain her state with a small chastisement?

Fifthly, besides these things: if the Soul offended before the body, and was joined to a body in order to pay the penalties, it would certainly behoove that believers, who by faith are freed from sins, should straightway be freed from the punishment — that is, from the body. For how, tell me, I pray, would the Soul be understood to have thoroughly obtained the remission of sins, when it is still held enclosed in the body on account of sin? But we see it happen far otherwise: for not only do the faithful not straightway fly forth from [their] bodies, but even, by the profession of the resurrection and by faith, they believe that they shall live immortally with [their] bodies. Not, therefore, is the body joined to the Soul for torment — especially since it has been so divinely honored that it both attests the omnipotence of the Savior who is to raise it again, and is destined to have an immortal life.

Sixthly, add that, according to the law, the greater offenses are punished with death, while those who have sinned more lightly are permitted to live; but those who seem altogether innocent are even affected with rewards, as it were with certain enticements to living. But it would have behooved, if the Soul was joined to the body in order to pay the penalties of things committed, that wicked men should rather be invited to live, so that they might be the more vexed by the mass of the body; and that the innocent, on the contrary, should the sooner [be freed] from this body — that is, from the punishment —[2] →

◊ **2. Right margin:** The sixth reason.

[…continues on folio 591 (PDF p. 408): the rest of Cyril's sixth reason and his remaining arguments against Origen (Annotatio CLXXXV).]

---

*(printed folio 591 [PDF p. 408]. **Annot. CLXXXV** (Ps 65:11): Cyril of Alexandria's reasons 6–17 against Origen's pre-existence of souls — the body is a divine gift, not a punishment (Abraham, Moses, Hannah, Hezekiah, Daniel, and Paul as witnesses) → folio 592.)*

(folio 591, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXV (continued)

that is, from the punishment.[1] But the law would justly have ordered the homicide, and others of this kind, to die, and the just to be adorned with honors. Falsely, therefore, is it said that Souls are attached to bodies for the sake of punishment.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Each of Cyril's successive arguments is flagged in the margin simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."

Seventhly, let him say, I pray: if the body is attached to the Soul for punishment, what good has the Savior conferred on us — death being destroyed, and immortality bestowed on the body through the resurrection? We ought rather to give thanks to the perpetual corruption of the body, [as the thing] setting an end to the punishment, than to our Lord Jesus Christ (whom we believe to have bestowed resurrection on [our] bodies): but the Church does not do so; rather it gives thanks to Christ, esteeming him Savior in very deed, because he freed us from death. Not, therefore, were bodies given to Souls for punishment; for, if it were so, the resurrection would bring greater evils upon us, enclosing the wretched Souls in bodies perpetually, and driving [them] back thither whence they had escaped through death. But [the body] was given by Christ as nothing evil, but for the renovation of nature, as a singular gift: not for a penalty were bodies given to souls.

Eighthly, a certain prophet, announcing to us a singular joy, cried out: "*The dead shall rise, and they shall be raised up who are in the tombs; and all who are in the earth shall exult.*"[2] [But if the body were a punishment,] it ought rather to have been said that they would be affected with great sadness, returning again into bodies; or, if he truly wished to affect the human race with joy, he would have affirmed that the dead were not to rise, but that the nature of the flesh was given over to perpetual corruption. But since, breathed upon by the divine Spirit, he announces the resurrection of the flesh unto joy — we are not annexed to the body for punishment, in whose immortality we are bidden to rejoice and exult.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Daniel 12:2.

Ninthly, it is added, that God, when he blessed the blessed Abraham, promised that his [offspring] would be innumerable, like the stars of heaven.[3] Wherefore, if the Soul is introduced into the body as into a punishment, then [God] promises a throng of souls divinely damned, and, as it were, of fugitives from the good, and slaves of malignity, and rather a seed of malediction than of benediction: but in very deed Abraham was blessed by God; therefore the conjunction of body and Soul is free from all fault.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Genesis 15:5.

Tenthly, similarly, that divine man Moses, when not without cause he had marveled at the multitude of the Jews, said: "*For behold, ye are this day as a multitude, like the stars of heaven*"; and, praying, he added: "*May the Lord God of your fathers add to this number many thousands.*"[4] Which thing, if souls fallen into bodies are [thereby] punished, ought not to have been desired by Moses, but rather repelled by [his] prayer and intercession to God; yet it was a thing to be desired (for we do not say that Moses was some empty [foolish] man). Falsely, therefore, and out of themselves — not out of the Scriptures — do wicked men devise falsities of this kind.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Deuteronomy 1:10–11.

Eleventhly, we are not ignorant that nothing is granted by God to those who ask amiss: "*For ye ask,*" he says, "*and receive not, because ye ask amiss.*"[5] If, therefore, incarnation is given to the Soul for the paying of penalties, as [Origen] says, then Hannah, the daughter of Phanuel, sinned not a little, demanding a son from God by long prayer;[6] for she was asking first the fall of a soul, then [its] punishment. And if the woman, as a human [being], erred, how did she prevail upon God? For the woman could not conceive in the womb unless a Soul had offended in the heavens — so that, on account of [its] offense, entering the womb of the woman, it might assume a body. But God had been [successfully] entreated, because she asked well. Not, therefore, are [souls] joined to flesh because we sinned beforehand — inasmuch as we did not exist before the body.

◊ **5. Left margin:** James 4:3.

◊ **6. Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 1:11.

Twelfthly, if we are attached to the body for the sake of punishment: why did Hezekiah, a holy and upright man, ask for the prolongation of this life?[7] Or how did God, moved by his piety and tears, add to him fifteen years in the place of a benefit? For [God] would seem to have conferred on him rather a calamity and a torment than a gift and a grace — if these trifles [of Origen] have anything of truth. But certainly the prolongation of life was a gift and a grace: not, therefore, are bodies given to Souls for punishment.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Isaiah 38.

Thirteenthly, if the body was given to the Soul for punishment: God repaid an empty grace, who led Jeremiah out of the pit — [Jeremiah] whom he promises would escape the assault of the Chaldeans and would live longer[8] — whereas he ought rather, if he wished to honor him, to have freed him as soon as possible from the vexation of the body. Nor, besides, did he impart any good to those three young men, whom he saved from the Babylonian flame,[9] nor to Daniel, whom he snatched from the ferocity of the lions.[10] But this is altogether false: for [God] is praised, and thanks are given to him, because he conferred on them a chief benefit; false, therefore, is also that [premise] from which this follows.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Jeremiah 37:20.

◊ **9. Right margin:** Daniel 3:94.

◊ **10. Right margin:** Daniel [in the lions' den].

Fourteenthly, add that, before the tribunal of the Lord, all our works shall lie open, that each one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he has done, whether good or evil.[11] If, therefore, retribution shall be made for the works which we have done, wrongly or otherwise, with the body — and there shall be no mention of those things which we did, well or ill, before the body — how do they dare to say that the Soul existed before the body, if only those things are inquired into which it did with the body?

◊ **11. Right margin:** 2 Corinthians 5:10.

Fifteenthly, how does the same Paul say: "*Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God*"?[12] For if bodies are given to Souls for punishment, how do we offer to God, for an odor of sweetness, that through which we are punished? Or how shall that possess virtue which, born for punishing, has driven great roots in sin?

◊ **12. Right margin:** Romans 12:1.

Sixteenthly, on account of the transgression of the first man, corruption invaded our race, as Paul says: "*But death reigned from Adam unto Moses*"; and he affirms that death reigned even over those who had not sinned.[13] If a mortal body is attached to us because of ancient offenses, how did they "not sin," if on account of sins they fell into a body?

◊ **13. Right margin:** Romans 5:14.

Seventeenthly, concerning a certain man blind from his mother's womb, the disciples asked the Savior, saying: "*Rabbi, who sinned — this man, or his parents — that he should be born blind?*"[14] For, since it is written in the prophetic books that God repays the sins of the parents upon the children,[15] the Apostles thought for this cause that that man had been born blind. What, then, [says] Christ? "*Neither did this man sin,*" he says, "*nor his parents; but that the works of God might be made manifest in him.*"[16] But how does he assert that they did not sin — who, since they were men, undoubtedly could not but have erred? It is manifest →

◊ **14. Right margin:** John 9:2.

◊ **15. Right margin:** Exodus 20:5.

◊ **16. Right margin:** John 9:3.

[…continues on folio 592 (PDF p. 409): the close of Cyril's seventeenth reason and the remainder of his confutation of Origen (Annotatio CLXXXV).]

*(printed folio 592 [PDF p. 409]. **Annot. CLXXXV–CLXXXVI** (Ps 65:11–68:2): Cyril's confutation of Origen closes (reasons 18–23); then Hilary of Poitiers on whether Christ's humanity could grieve and fear, or took hunger, sorrow, and fear only voluntarily → folio 593.)*

(folio 592, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXV (continued)

that is, of Christ.[1] For in this manner the integrity of truth will be discerned in the words of the Truth.

◊ **1. Left/right margin:** Cyril's successive arguments are each flagged in the margin simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."

Eighteenthly, it is added, that Isaiah, showing for what cause the earth was made, says: "*It was not created in vain, but that it might be inhabited*";[2] and it can fittingly be inhabited not by bare spirits, nor by incorporeal souls, but by ensouled bodies. From which it follows: if we grant that Souls pre-existed and, offending, glide down into bodies, [then we grant] that they offend by the very will of God — namely, that there might be men by whom the world might be inhabited: but this is altogether false; the other [alternative], therefore, is true.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Isaiah 45:18 [printed "Isa. 62, 4"].

Nineteenthly, add, that Wisdom, the artificer of all things, is introduced in the book of Proverbs saying words of this kind concerning herself: "*I was [that] in whom [he] rejoiced*" — namely, the creator of all things — "*daily I was delighted before him at all times, when, the world being finished, he rejoiced, and was delighted over the sons of men.*"[3] If, therefore, God the creator rejoiced over man, how are they not mad who think that Souls are thrust into bodies for [their] sins? For if he rejoices because they pay penalties through bodies, he will not be good, who triumphs in the punishment of others; but he himself is good by nature, and the producer of good creatures: not, therefore, are bodies an instrument of punishing, as many falsely proclaim.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Proverbs 8:30–31.

Twentiethly, if the Souls which had offended before the bodies are punished by being annexed to bodies, why was the flood sent against the impious, and Noah the just saved in the retribution of [his] faith?[4] For the contrary ought to have happened — that the just should the sooner be loosed from the body, but the wicked be tormented a longer time by the mass of the body. But the just Lord punished the impious with death, [and] honored the just [man] with longer spaces of this life: false, therefore, is the opinion, and to be cast utterly out of our minds.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Genesis 6; Genesis 6:9.

Twenty-first, why did the Savior raise up Lazarus, whom he loved, and lead back into punishments the friend [who had been] freed from punishments?[5] But he raised him up, honoring [the one] whom he loved. Against the truth, therefore, is it said that Souls offended before the bodies.

◊ **5. Left margin:** [Lazarus:] John 11.

Twenty-second, add, that if it were so, this rational animal, man, and the nature of man, would seem to have been produced through sin; but through sin, again, death entered into the world — wherefore sin would seem repugnant to itself, since it dissolves the former by the latter. Satan also would be divided against himself: how, then, would his kingdom stand?[6] But these things are false: true, therefore, are those which are opposed to them.

◊ **6. Left margin:** Luke 11:18.

Lastly, the Church denies that death was produced by God;[7] for the Scripture confirms that it came into the world by the envy of the Devil.[8] But if the body is joined to the soul in order to punish the soul, why is the Devil blamed, who by death dissolves the punishment of the soul? And why do we give thanks to the Savior,

who by the resurrection restores [our] bodies to us again? But rightly do we both give, and owe, thanks to the Savior, who freed us by his own blood from the corruption which the envy of the Devil brought upon us. Not, therefore, are bodies an instrument of punishment, nor could Souls sin before bodies, when they did not [yet] exist.

◊ **7. Left margin:** Wisdom 1:13.

◊ **8. Left margin:** Wisdom 2:24.

Annotation CLXXXVI [contents]

"Save me, O God, for the waters have come in even unto my soul." — Psalm 68:2

Whether Christ's humanity was, by its own nature, capable of grief and misery.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, inserted into the explanation of this Psalm several sentences by which he seems to hint that the humanity of Christ was, by its own nature, free from grief and misery — and that hunger, thirst, sorrow, fear, and the other infirmities of soul and body were not natural to him, but voluntarily assumed for our sake. For in the preface of the Psalm he thus speaks: "*Having thus gone through the lot of all human passions, he speaks and grieves according to our infirmities [which he] took upon [him] — himself indeed placed outside the necessity of fear and of grief, yet accommodating himself to these things which he assumed: that he who was born a man of our flesh might speak out of the complaints of our griefs and the prayer of [our] infirmity.*" And after these things, expounding that [verse], "*In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,*"[9] he added: "*But he said, prophetically, that he thirsted — because all our [passions] which were in him are infirmities not natural, but assumed.*" This matter he pursues far more copiously and clearly in book 10 *On the Trinity*, where he strives to show that there was in Christ no fear of death — taking his argument from this: that if Christ had dreaded death, he would have feared either on account of the spirit or of the body, neither of which could happen. For, according to the spirit, he desired death with so great an ardor of mind that he could not fear it; and, according to the flesh, he likewise could not fear — inasmuch as he knew that he had flesh by nature impassible, which, although enemies could cut and pierce with blows, strokes, and wounds, yet they were not able to affect with pain. His words are these: "*Perhaps there will be [some] who think that Christ feared death: let them determine for what thing they judge death was terrible [to him] — for the spirit, or for the body? If death is terrible to the spirit, [then] Christ would fear the infernal chaos, while Lazarus was rejoicing in the bosom of Abraham — [but] these things are foolish and ridiculous: [to think] that he — having power to lay down the Soul and to resume [it] — should fear to die, [he who was] to die, for the sacrament of human life, under the liberty of his own will. There is no fear of death in the will of one dying and having power; nor, in the hand of death, does [it] long remain: because both the will of dying and the power of reviving are outside the nature of fear, since death cannot be feared, [being] both in the will of dying and in the power of living. But perhaps the pain of the body hanging on the cross, and the violent bonds of the binding cords, and the wounds of the driven-in nails, are [matter] for fear: let us see, therefore, of what body Christ is — into which, although a blow might fall, or a wound descend, or the knots press together, or the suspension lift [him] up, these things would indeed bring the assault of suffering, yet would not inflict the pain of suffering — as some dart, or [something] piercing water, or pricking fire, or wounding the air. All these [agents] their nature inflicts, that it may pierce, prick, and wound; but the suffering inflicted does not retain its nature in this [case], since it is not in the nature [of things] for water to be bored, or fire to be pricked, or the air to be wounded — although it be the nature of the dart to wound, and*" →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Psalm 68:22.

[…continues on folio 593 (PDF p. 410): the rest of Hilary's argument that Christ's flesh, of its own nature, could receive the assault but not the pain of the passion (Annotatio CLXXXVI).]

*(printed folio 593 [PDF p. 410]. **Annot. CLXXXVI–CLXXXVII** (Ps 68:2–70:15): Hilary on Christ's impassible flesh (defended and faulted; Justinian's incorruptibility edict; the Escharodocite heresy); then whether commerce is sinful — Cassiodorus: the trader's vice, not trade, is condemned → folio 594.)*

(folio 593, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXVI (continued)

to prick, and to bore. The Lord Jesus indeed suffered — while he is struck, while he is hung up, while he is crucified, while he dies; but the suffering, rushing upon the body of the Lord, did not exercise the nature of suffering: for although it raged with a penal ministry, yet the power of the body, without the sensation of pain, received into itself the force of the pain raging [against it]. That body of the Lord would indeed have had the nature of our grief, if our body has this of nature: to tread the waves, and walk upon the floods, and not be weighed down by [its] entrance [into water], nor yield with the footsteps of one standing on the water — [and] to penetrate even solid things, nor be barred by the walls of a closed house. But truly, if this alone be the nature of the Lord's body — that it is borne by its own power upon moist things, and stands upon liquids, and runs through structures — how is the flesh, conceived of the Holy Spirit, judged [to act] according to the nature of a human body? That flesh is from the heavens, and that man is from God, having indeed a body for suffering (and he suffered), but not having a nature for grieving; for that body is of its own proper nature — [the body] which is transformed into heavenly glory on the mountain, which by its touch puts fevers to flight, which from its own spittle forms eyes," etc.

In the commentaries on Matthew also there are certain sayings of this author, not abhorrent from the sense of the proposed narration, which — studying brevity — I omit. I pass over, too, several sentences of Jerome and Augustine that lend color to this dogma, which thou wilt more conveniently inspect above, in Annotation 162, and below, in Annotation 115 of the following book.

Peter [Lombard], bishop of Paris, in book 3 of the Sentences, distinction 15, interpreting Hilary's discourse amicably and benevolently,[1] says that he took away from Christ neither the true sense of fear, grief, and suffering, nor the natural necessity of fearing, grieving, and suffering, but [only] the *cause* and *merit* [desert] of suffering, grieving, and fearing, which is in us. For in us there is a natural necessity of suffering, brought in on account of Adam's sin; but in Christ there is truly a natural necessity of suffering — not inflicted by a defect of human conception, but voluntarily assumed of his own free will.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Hilary excused.

Claudianus [Mamertus], bishop of Vienne in Gaul, who preceded Peter by nearly seven hundred years, in the second book *On the State of the Soul*, so excuses Hilary that he pronounces him plainly to have erred, in these words: "*Hilary of Poitiers, among the many [excellent things] of his lofty disputations, thinking in a certain [matter] otherwise [than truly], disputed these two things contrary to the truth: one, that he said nothing incorporeal is created; the other, that Christ felt nothing of grief in the passion. But since he abolished the defect of this opinion by the virtue of [his] confession, he so sustains the pen of reprehension that he suffers no loss of merit. Wherefore it is fitting to give faith to the expounders of the divine Scriptures [only] so far as they accord with the tenor of the same truth.*"

Justinian Augustus, a man in other respects Catholic, so adhered to the Hilarian dogma that he commanded by an imperial edict that it be publicly taught in the church by the priests, and received by all the people, and firmly believed.[2] A witness of this thing is Evagrius, in book 4 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 39, writing thus: "*Justinian the Emperor put forth an edict in which he decreed the body of the Lord [to be] incorruptible, and said that it was by no means capable of the natural and blameless passions, but that the Lord ate before the passion in the same manner as he ate after the resurrection; and that his most sacred body [received] no mutation or alteration from the very [moment] in which it was formed in the womb,*

neither in the voluntary nor in the natural passions, nor even after the resurrection: to which opinion he compelled the priests everywhere to assent. Against him wrote **Anastasius**, *bishop of Antioch,*[3] *and demonstrated to him, with great wisdom and eloquence, that the divine Apostles and the holy Fathers both knew and handed down that the body of Christ was corruptible [and subject] to the natural and blameless passions.*" These things Evagrius.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The Emperor Justinian denied that the body of Christ was capable of grief, or of any mutation.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Anastasius, bishop of Antioch, refuted the error of the Emperor Justinian.

John Damascene, in the book *On the Hundred Heresies*, chapter 84, reports that this error was peculiar to the Escharodocite heretics,[4] in these words: "*The Escharodocitae, who are also called Gaianitae, venerate the body of the Lord [as] incorruptible from its very formation; and they confess indeed that the Lord sustained suffering — I mean hunger, and famine, and thirst, and toil — but they say that he sustained [them] not according to the manner which is in us, nor as [one] serving the laws of nature.*" I suspect that Damascene imposed on those heretics the surname *Escharodocitae* for this reason: that they ascribed to Christ a certain insensible and impassible hardness of flesh, which — however much bruised by blows and wounds — would suffer nothing of pain. For among the Greeks ἐσχάρα signifies the callous hardness of flesh drawn over by inveterate wounds, which has no sense of pain; and δοκητής [means] "an approver [one who holds an opinion]": so that *Escharodocita* sounds nothing else than "an approver [maintainer] of a hard and impassible flesh."

◊ **4. Right margin:** The Escharodocite heretics.

Annotation CLXXXVII [contents]

"Because I have not known letters [learning]." — Psalm 70:15

Whether trading [commerce] is condemned.

The explanation of **Cassiodorus** on this little verse St. **Thomas**, in the Second Part of the Second Part, question 77, article 4, brings forward in [his] argumentation, as [something] at first sight favoring the error of those who assert that traders — selling dearer than they buy — are to be altogether cast out of the Church. He cites the author's [Cassiodorus's] words, alluding to this, in this manner: "*'For I have not known letters' — or 'trading,' according to another reading:* what," he says, "*is trading, other than to procure more cheaply, and to sell more dearly?*"; and he adds: "*Such traders the Lord cast out of the temple; but no one is cast out of the temple except on account of some sin: therefore such trading is a sin.*" But if the words themselves, as they are in Cassiodorus, be diligently inspected, they bring their own interpretation with them — since the author himself interprets his own opinion clearly enough, speaking thus: "*'For I have known tradings': this part of the verse, unless it be well examined, is recognized to admit a question. For if every trader is to be altogether condemned, then neither do those escape this penalty who are known to exercise the remaining crafts. For what else is trading, than to wish to sell more dearly the things that can be procured more cheaply? Then, in the Lives of the Fathers, we read that Paphnutius, that most holy man, was by a revelation compared to a trader; and we find even today, in the Church of God, [some] who indeed handle merchandise, yet are strong in the highest faith: for the worst act, not the honest thing, is condemned — just as we read that the rich man does not enter into the kingdom of heaven, although the patriarchs Job, Abraham, Isaac, [and] Jacob were abounding also in riches. Those traders, therefore, are esteemed abominable, who — least of all considering the justice of the Lord — through immoderate*" →

[...continues on folio 594 (PDF p. 411): the rest of Cassiodorus distinguishing lawful commerce from the covetous trader's sin (Annotatio CLXXXVII).]

*(printed folio 594 [PDF p. 411]. **Annot. CLXXXVII–CXC** (Ps 70:15–89:4): commerce closes; whether Hell's penalty exceeds the sin (only in duration); Jerome's punctuation against Origen; and whether the world lasts only six thousand years (Jerome, Justin, Irenaeus, Lactantius) → folio 595.)*

(folio 594, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXVII (continued)

gain are polluted, loading their merchandise more with perjuries than with prices — such the Lord cast out of the temple, saying: "*Make not the house of my Father a house of trading, and a den of thieves,*" etc.[1] On this subject, read Annotation 95 of book 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** John 2:16.

Annotation CLXXXVIII [contents]

"From usuries and iniquity he shall redeem their souls." — Psalm 71:14

Whether the punishment of Hell exceeds the gravity of the sin.

Strabo [Walafrid Strabo], in his Ordinary Gloss, weighing what the usuries are which David here mentions, says that the usuries are the sins, which bring forth for us punishments with much and great interest: "For God exacts more in punishments than has been committed in faults." But these words are taken from the commentaries of Augustine, expounding this little verse. St. **Thomas**, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 46, question 2, article 2, noted this sentence as [being] misappropriated by those who think that God punishes the sins of men beyond [their] desert; and he says it must be understood not according to an excess of the punishment beyond the fault in the intensity and gravity of the penalty, but according to the duration of time: because for a momentary delectation an eternal punishment is inflicted. For it is established that the duration of the punishment be not proportioned to the duration of the fault, but that the intensity of the punishment correspond to the enormity of the fault[2] — as has been shown elsewhere.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The intensity of the punishment corresponds to the gravity of the fault.

Annotation CLXXXIX [contents]

"Lord, thou hast been made our refuge from generation to generation; before the mountains were made, or the earth and the world were formed, from everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God." — Psalm 89:1–2

Whether the Soul was created before bodies.

The Interpretation of **Origen** — the author's name being suppressed — **Jerome** reprehends, writing thus in his explanation of this psalm to Cyprian: "*This passage certain [men] subvert by a depraved punctuation — especially those who wish that souls existed before man was created in the number of the sixth day. For thus they read and punctuate: 'Lord, thou art made a refuge for us, from generation unto generation. Before the mountains were established, and the earth and the world were formed.' 'From everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God' — for thus they expound it: If the Lord was a refuge of men before the mountains were established and the earth and the world were formed, then Souls existed in the heavens before the bodies of men were formed. But we, as we have set forth the reading, ought so to punctuate: 'Before the mountains were established, and the earth and the world were formed, from everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God' — so that our refuge was not before the foundation of the world (we who did not yet exist), but [the sense is] that God, from eternity unto eternity, is always God.*"

Annotation CXC [contents]

"For a thousand years in thy sight are as yesterday, which is past." — Psalm 89:4

Whether the age of the world consists of only six thousand years.

Jerome, in the epistolary exposition of the eighty-ninth Psalm to Cyprian, deduces from the present little verse that all the duration of the present age — from the founding of the world unto the day of judgment — is concluded within the space of six thousand years, writing thus: "*I judge, from this passage and from the epistle which is inscribed with the name of Peter, that a thousand years are wont to be called [as] one day: so that, namely, since the world was fabricated in six days, it is believed to subsist only six thousand years; and afterward comes the sevenfold and eighthfold number, in which the true sabbatism is kept, and the purity of circumcision is restored — whence also by the eight beatitudes the rewards of good works are promised. But Peter writes in this manner: 'Let this one thing not escape you, dearly beloved: that one day with God is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.'*[3] *To the same sentence he alludes in the commentary on Micah, chapter 4, where he shows that the sixth and last hour of the sixth millennium is the time of the faith of the gentiles, in these words: 'In the consummation of the ages our Savior appeared, and came at the eleventh hour to hire laborers; and, his passion being completed, John says: "Little children, it is the last hour."*[4] *For if, in the six thousand years, five hundred years be divided among the single hours of the day, the last hour, consequently, is the time of the faith of the gentiles.'*"

◊ **3. Right margin:** 2 Peter 3:8.

◊ **4. Right margin:** 1 John 2:18.

This was of old the opinion of many Fathers of great name — chiefly of **Justin**, philosopher and martyr, in the book of Questions to the Gentiles, question 17, writing thus: "*From very many words it may be understood that those speak truly who hand down that there are now six thousand years [of] time from the founding of the world. For sometimes Paul says: 'In these last times he has spoken to us through the Son';*[5] *but elsewhere, 'Upon whom the ends of the ages have come';*[6] *and sometimes also, 'When the fulfilment of the times came.'*[7] *But all these things were said in the six-thousandth year.*"

◊ **5. Right margin:** (a) Hebrews 1:2.

◊ **6. Right margin:** (b) 1 Corinthians 10:11.

◊ **7. Right margin:** (c) Galatians 4:4.

Irenaeus, after him, in the fifth book *Against Heresies*, the last chapter, speaks to the same sentence thus: "*In however many days this world was made, in so many thousand years is it consummated; and for this cause the scripture of Genesis says: 'And the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the ornament of them. And God finished on the sixth day all his works which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his works which he had made.'*[8] *But this is both a narration of things done — in what manner they were made — and a prophecy of things to come: for the day of the Lord is as a thousand years; and in six days were consummated the things that were made. It is manifest, therefore, that the consummation of these is the six-thousandth year.*"

◊ **8. Right margin:** Genesis 2:1–2.

Lactantius, in book 7 of the Institutions, chapter 7, subscribes to Irenaeus in these words: "*Let the philosophers know, therefore, who enumerate thousands of ages from the beginning of the world, that the six-thousandth year is not yet concluded; which number being completed, the consummation must needs come, and the state of human things be reformed for the better: the argument of which is, that God consummated the world — this admirable work of nature — as is contained in the secret [pages] of holy Scripture, in the space of six days; and he sanctioned the seventh day, in which he rested from [his] works. But this is the day of the Sabbath, which in the tongue of the Hebrews took its name from the number [seven] — whence the sevenfold number is legitimate and full: for there are also seven days, by whose alternating revolution the cycles of years are completed; and [there are] seven stars, which are called Wandering [planets], whose unequal courses and unequal motion are believed to effect the varieties of things and of*

times. Therefore, since all the works of God were perfected in six days, it is necessary that [the world] remain in this state through six ages — that is, six thousand years; for a great day of God is bounded by a circle of a thousand years, as the prophet indicates, saying, 'Before thy eyes, O Lord, a thousand years are as one day.[9] *And as God labored in the making of so great things, so also his religion and truth must needs labor in these six thousand years, malice prevailing and dominating; and again, since*" →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Psalm 89:4.

[…continues on folio 595 (PDF p. 412): the rest of Lactantius on the seventh millennial rest and the world's renewal (Annotatio CXC).]

---

*(printed folio 595 [PDF p. 412]. **Annot. CXC–CXCIII** (Ps 89:4–98:5): the six-thousand-year age of the world closes (the millennial Sabbath; the Hebrew "tradition of Elias"; Sixtus's 5528-year reckoning, refusing to affirm rashly); Jerome on Ps 90 vs. Giustiniani; and Calvin on Bernard and Augustine on merit (both → Annot. 195).)*

(folio 595, left column → right column)

Annotation CXC (continued)

since, his works being perfected, God rested on the seventh day, and blessed it: it is necessary that, at the end of the six-thousandth year, all malice be abolished from the earth, and that justice reign for a thousand years, and there be tranquillity and rest from the labors which the world so long endures." These things Lactantius.

Hilary, in the seventeenth canon on Matthew, expounding that [verse], "And after six days he was transfigured," says:[1] "*When, after six days, the Lord's glory is shown in [his] appearance, there is prefigured — the times, namely, of six thousand years being rolled out — the honor of the heavenly kingdom.*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Matthew 17:1–2.

Augustine, in book 20 *On the City of God*, chapter 7, explaining the thousand years during which John foresaw that Satan would be bound, wrote thus: "*The 'thousand years' can, as far as occurs to me, be understood in two ways: either because this thing is done in the last thousand years — that is, in the sixth millennium of years, as [on] the sixth day, whose later spaces are now unrolling, the Sabbath being thereafter to follow, which has no evening (namely, the rest of the saints, which has no end) — so that he called this millennium, as it were the last part of the day (which will remain unto the end of the age), 'a thousand years,' by that manner of speaking whereby the part is signified by the whole; or else he certainly put 'a thousand years' for all the years of this age, that by a perfect number the very fulness of time might be denoted.*"

Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, added to this number five hundred years, on the authority of illustrious Fathers of Greece. For he, when in the book which he entitled *On the Theory of Ecclesiastical Things* he inquired the cause why the pontiff, blessing the people, raises [his] fingers fitted to the computation of the number six thousand five hundred, speaks thus: "*That the pontiff signs the people, hints at this: that the future coming of Christ will be in the six-thousand-five-hundredth year — from the computation of the fingers, signifying six thousand five hundred.*" This also **Hippolytus** of Rome and Saint **Cyril** say in their books on Antichrist — that in the six-thousand-five-hundredth year the [second] coming will be; and likewise **Chrysostom**.

These things the Christian authors have handed down concerning the duration of the world. But among the Gentiles, that Hydaspes, Mercurius Trismegistus, and the Sibyls handed down the same, Lactantius is witness. And among the Hebrews there is had a most ancient tradition of the prophet Elias, in the Talmudic volumes, in the fourth order, in the fourth tractate whose title is *Sanhedrin* — that is, *Judgment* — in these

words:

ב אלפים ימות המשיח :שתא אלפי שני לתהו עלמא וחד חרב :ב אלפים תהו :ב אלפים תורה

that is (*scitta alphe sene lehene alma, vechad chareb, be alaphim tohu, be alaphim tora, be alaphim iemot Hamasciach*): "Six thousand years shall the world be, and then it shall be destroyed: two thousand [of] emptiness, two thousand [of the] Law, two thousand [of the] days of the Messiah."

Ambrose, in the seventh book of the commentaries on Luke, expounding that [saying] of Matthew, "After six days he was transfigured,"[2] indicates that he does not accept such a period of the world's age: because in his own times more than six thousand years were already reckoned — by a reasoning, as I judge, entered upon from a certain computation of the years of the world peculiar to himself. For, according to the calculation of the Hebrew verity, in Ambrose's time there had not yet passed four thousand four hundred years.[3] For the Hebrews reckon, from the founding of the world unto Christ, 3962 years; and from Christ unto the present year 1566, in which we write these things, 5528 years. Whence, if these things be true, at this time we are distant from the consummation of the world by 476 years — whether it be so, posterity itself shall see. We affirm nothing rashly, lest we fall into the error of Judas and of Lactantius:[4] of whom the former wrote that the fall of the world would be present in his own time — that is, in the two-hundredth year from the nativity of Christ; and the latter judged that from his own age unto the destruction of the world there would be not more than two hundred years — deceived by the false computations of the Greeks, which then almost all the ecclesiastical writers followed.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Matthew 17:1–2.

◊ **3. Left/right margin:** The Hebrews reckon, from the founding of the world unto Christ, 3962 years.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The errors of Judas and Lactantius concerning the end of the world.

Augustine, in the exposition of the present Psalm, refutes those who wrested the proposed little verse to an opinion of this kind, in these words: "*Men have dared to presume the knowledge of the times — which, to the disciples desiring to know it, the Lord [refused], saying, 'It is not yours to know the times which the Father hath put in his own power';*[5] *and they have determined that this age can be finished in six thousand years, as [in] six days: nor have they attended to what is said, 'As one day, which is past.' For it was not, when this was said, [that] only a thousand years had passed; and that which ought most of all to have admonished them — lest they be deluded by the uncertainty of the times — is that [phrase], 'As a watch in the night.' For, just as they seem to have opined something plausible concerning the six days (on account of the first six days in which God perfected his works), [not] so also can the six watches — that is, eighteen hours — be adapted to that opinion.*"

◊ **5. Right margin:** Acts 1:7.

Annotation CXCI [contents]

"He that dwelleth in the help of the Most High." — Psalm 90:1

On the theme of Psalm 90.

The commentaries on the Psalms inscribed to **Jerome** have, under this little verse, these words: "*'Help' [adiutorium] is interpreted 'Ezra'; hence Ezra is called βοηθός [helper] — this is he who led back the people from the Babylonian captivity, and brought them into the land of promise.*" **Augustine** [Giustiniani], bishop of Nebbio, in his *Octaplum*, refutes Jerome, [alleging] that by these words he denied this Psalm to have been said of Christ, [affirming it said] rather of Ezra. But I do not see whence Augustine could rightly elicit a sense of this kind[6] — especially since, in the very beginning of the explanation, Jerome most evidently pronounces that the present psalm regards Christ, thus beginning: "*This psalm has no title, because it is sung of [Christ] the head and of his members. The head is in heaven, the members on earth. And it is properly understood of the fast, and of that temptation of the desert: for the prophet foresaw that Christ was to come*

in the flesh, to be tempted by the Devil in the desert."

◊ **6. Right margin:** St. Jerome is defended.

Annotation CXCII [contents]

"Because he hoped in me, I will deliver him." — Psalm 90:14

On the merit of good works.

A testimony of **Bernard**, from the fifteenth sermon on the ninetieth Psalm, John Calvin the heretic wrests against the merits of good works: the right interpretation of which thou hast below, in Annotation 195.

Annotation CXCIII [contents]

"Exalt ye the Lord our God." — Psalm 98:5

On the merit of good works.

Augustine, expounding this, seems to bring forward certain words against the merits of good works: concerning which, see below, Annotation 195 of this book.

---

*(printed folio 596 [PDF p. 413]. **Annot. CXCIV–CXCV** (Ps 98:5–102:4): Augustine's "the flesh profits nothing, understand it spiritually" abused by the Sacramentarians (vindicated by Peter Lombard); then the great crux, **whether good works are meritorious** (the "Annot. 195" cross-referenced above) — Bodius turns Augustine's "God crowns his own gifts" against merit, but Sixtus shows Augustine defends the merits of the faithful and crushes only Pelagian pride.)*

(folio 596, left column → right column)

Annotation CXCIV [contents]

"Adore ye the footstool of his feet." — Psalm 98:5

On the Eucharist.

The words of **Augustine** expounding this passage, the Sacramentarians of our times usurp; and of old the heretics usurped [them] who excluded the body of Christ from the sacrament of the Eucharist. The text of the words is this: "*When thou adorest the footstool of his feet, remain not in the flesh by [thy] thought, and be not left un-quickened by the Spirit; for the Spirit quickens, but the flesh profits nothing. But at that time, when the Lord commended this, he had spoken of his flesh, and had said, 'Unless one shall have eaten my flesh, he shall not have life eternal in himself';*[1] *certain disciples were scandalized, and said, 'This is a hard saying.' They took it foolishly, they thought it carnally, and supposed that the Lord was about to cut off certain little pieces from his body and give them to them; and they said, 'This is a hard saying.' They themselves were hard, not the saying. But he instructed them, and said to them: 'It is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.' Understand spiritually that which I have spoken: it is not this body which ye see that ye are to eat, nor are ye to drink that blood which they will shed who will crucify me. I have commended to you some sacrament; understood spiritually, it will quicken you. And although it is necessary that it be visibly celebrated, yet it must be understood invisibly.*" **Peter** [Lombard], bishop of Paris, vindicated this passage from the wrenching of the heretics, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 10. See below, Annotation 196 of book 6.

◊ **1. Left margin:** John 6:53.

Annotation CXCV [contents]

"Who crowneth thee in mercy and compassions." — Psalm 102:4

Whether good works are meritorious.

The sentence of **Augustine** from the exposition of this little verse, **Hermann Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, reckons among those by which the Lutherans impugn the merits of good works. It is of this kind: "*[We] who in ourselves are conquered, in him have conquered; therefore he crowns thee, because he crowns his own gifts, not thy merits. 'I have labored more than all,' says the Apostle; but see what he added: 'Yet not I, but the grace of God with me.'*"[2] And in the exposition of Psalm 98, upon that [verse], "Exalt the Lord our God," he says: "*God, who is about to crown in us not our merits, but his own gifts — how much ought he to be exalted by us? Exalt, therefore, the Lord our God.*" And in the exposition of Psalm 88 he says: "*When a man shall have seen that whatsoever good he has, he has not of himself, but of his God, he sees that all which is praised in him is not of his own merits, but of the mercy of God.*" And on Psalm 139 he says: "*The saints attribute nothing to their own merits: they attribute the whole to nothing but thy mercy, O God.*" And on Psalm 144, expounding those words, "The Lord is merciful and compassionate," etc., he says:[3] "*'By grace ye are made safe' — where thou hearest 'grace,' understand 'freely' [gratis]; if therefore freely, thou hast brought nothing, thou hast merited nothing: for if anything is rendered to merits, it is a wage, not grace*";[4] and a little after: "*The whole is of mercy; nowhere boast thy merits, because thy very merits are his gifts.*" And in epistle 105, to Sixtus the presbyter: "*When God crowns our merits, he crowns nothing else than his own gifts.*" And on John, tractate 3: "*When, therefore, God bestows the reward of immortality, he crowns his own gifts, not thy merits.*" And in the fifth book of the Fifty Homilies, homily 14: "*We know nothing of thine, prepared by thyself for thyself, except evils; when, therefore, God crowns thy merits, he crowns nothing but his own gifts.*"

◊ **2. Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 15:10.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Psalm 144:8.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Ephesians 2[:8].

Augustine repeats this same sentence in almost innumerable places, which — lest I be troublesome to the reader — I pass over. Yet not by these words, as the Lutheran heretics falsely pretend, does he condemn the merits of the faithful and of good men (for these he everywhere teaches, establishes, and defends,[5] always carrying about that [saying] which he uttered in the sermon "On the Season" 162, saying: "*God, for the merits of faith and of good works, will give to his faithful the kingdom of heaven*"); but by these sayings he casts down the pride of the Pelagians, who boasted that by their own powers and labors — even without the aid of divine grace — they could merit and obtain the crown of eternal felicity. Against so insolent an arrogance, Augustine pronounces that God crowns in us not our merits, but his own gifts — so that by this manner of speaking he hints that human merits are to be considered in two ways:[6] either inasmuch as they arise from the destitute powers of our nature, with none preceding and none accompanying [them] of the aid of divine grace — and these indeed are worthy of no crown, nor are they crowned in us by God, but enjoy only the empty name of merit; or inasmuch as they arise from the favor of the divine benignity and prevenient grace (we consenting), and are increased (we cooperating) — and these indeed are they which he esteems worthy of eternal rewards, and crowns in us. And that this is his own definition, he himself explains in epistle 105 to Sixtus the presbyter, in these words: "*There is no merit of man before grace, whereby he might receive grace; since all our merit is wrought in us by nothing but grace, and since, when God crowns our merits, he crowns nothing else than his own gifts. For as, from the beginning of faith, we obtained mercy — not because we were faithful, but that we might be [so] — so in the end, which will be in life eternal, he will crown us, as it is written: 'In mercy and compassions.' Not in vain, therefore, is it sung to God: 'And his mercy shall follow me.'*[78] *Whence also that very eternal life — which surely will be had at the end, without end, and is therefore rendered to preceding merits — nevertheless, because those same merits, to which it is rendered, are not prepared by us through our own sufficiency, but wrought in us through grace, is itself also called grace: for no other reason than that it is given freely — not because it is not given to merits, but*

because the very merits, to which it is given, are themselves also [given]." He expresses this same thing more lucidly in the book *On Grace and Free Will*, chapters 6 and 7, saying: "*When the Pelagians say that this alone is the grace [given] not according to our merits — that by which sins are remitted to man — but that the [grace] which is given at the end, that is, eternal life, is rendered to our preceding merits: it must be answered to them: If, indeed, they so understood our merits as to acknowledge that these too are gifts of God, that opinion would not be to be reproved; but since they so preach human merits as to say that man has them of his own self, the Apostle most rightly answers: 'For who distinguisheth thee? And what hast thou which thou hast not received?*[9] *To one thinking such things, it is most truly said: 'God crowns his own gifts, not thy merits — if thy merits are of thyself; but if [they be] of God, [thy] good merits are [his] gifts: [and so] God crowns thy merits not as thy merits, but as his own gifts.'*"

◊ **5. Right margin:** St. Augustine defends the merits of the faithful.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Human merits are to be considered in two ways.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Psalm 58:11.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Psalm 22:6.

◊ **9. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 4:7.

---

*(printed folio 597 [PDF p. 414]. **Annot. CXCVI–CCIII** (Ps 103:30–118:57): eight short annotations — Cajetan on "send forth thy Spirit"; Arnobius on cursing/blessing; Chrysostom on God's "oath" as metaphor; Basil and Chrysostom on grace and the merit of vocation; the count of alphabetic Psalms; Hilary that all the saints pass through the fire; and whether clergy may hold secular possessions → folio 598.)*

(folio 597, left column → right column)

Annotation CXCVI [contents]

"Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created." — Psalm 103:30

On the Holy Spirit.

Thomas Cajetan is censured by **Ambrose** [Catharinus], bishop of Conza, because in his commentaries on the Psalms he did not interpret this little verse of the Holy Spirit, as most of the saints [Fathers] do, but of the spirit [breath] of animals, or of the soul itself, which is a likeness of the divine Spirit.

Annotation CXCVII [contents]

"He loved cursing, and it shall come to him; and he would not [have] blessing, and it shall be put far from him." — Psalm 108:18

On predestination and reprobation.

Arnobius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, brought forward these things to the exposition of this little verse: "*He loved the cursing of Adam, which is taken away through Christ — 'and it shall come to him'; he would not [have] the blessing which is brought through Christ — 'and it shall surely be put far from him.' Note that it happened from [free] choice that he would not [have it]*" — on account of the heresy which says that God predestined some to blessing, others to cursing; for here [the man] is proved to have the cursing from his own choice [love], and by [his own] unwillingness not to have the reward of his blessing. There are [some] who think that these [words] in a certain manner censure the opinion of Augustine, and of all the schoolmen theologians, concerning eternal predestination and reprobation. See below, Annotation 251 of book 6.

Annotation CXCVIII [contents]

"The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent." — Psalm 109:4

On God swearing.

Chrysostom, expounding these words, says that an oath in God is to be understood no otherwise than by a metaphor — just as we also say that there is anger in God. These [words] allude to Chrysostom's teaching concerning the Oath, [as] altogether forbidden to all Christians. See Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CXCIX [contents]

"Turn, O my soul, into thy rest." — Psalm 114:7

On the merit of works.

Basil, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this passage says: "*Eternal rest is set forth for those who have lawfully striven in this life; which [rest] indeed is rendered not according to the debt and merit of works, but is bestowed, according to the grace of the most magnificent God, on those who have hoped in him.*" The *Collectanea* of Hermann bring forward these words against the merits of holy actions, but violently and perversely, as [they do] the rest. For Basil everywhere proclaims merits,[1] but most of all on Psalm 61, where, expounding that sentence of David, "Because thou renderest to every one according to his works,"[2] he says: "*'With what measure ye shall have measured, the same shall be measured back to you':*[3] *thou hast afflicted a brother — expect the [counter]balance; thou hast plundered the goods of inferiors, thou hast calumniated, thou hast lied — expect the retribution of these; for 'what things each one sows, such also shall he reap.'*[4] *But if anything of good has been done by thee, expect manifold retributions of that also, because he will render to every one according to his works.*" Basil, therefore, did not wish to take away the efficacy of merit, but to extol the immense munificence of God — who compensates the individual merits of our works, not keeping an equality of quantity, but, exceeding the measure of the merits, remunerates our labors, above all condignity, with most ample rewards. Thou hast sentences looking hither above, in Annotation 92.

◊ **1. Left margin:** St. Basil proclaims the merits of good works.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Psalm 61:13.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Matthew 7:2.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Galatians 6:8.

Annotation CC [contents]

"I believed, for which cause I have spoken." — Psalm 115:1

Whether the divine vocation is from the merits of those called.

Chrysostom, expounding these things, seems to establish that the divine vocation is from the dignity and merits of those who have made themselves worthy to be called. For he says: "*If the Father draws, the Son leads, the Spirit illumines: how do they sin who are neither drawn, nor led, nor illumined? Because they do not offer themselves worthy to receive that illumination. See, therefore, that this happened to Cornelius:*[5] *for he did not find this at home within himself, but God called him, because he himself, anticipating [prevening], rendered himself worthy. For although it is [God's part] to draw and to lead in, yet he requires a soul that will comply, and then applies his aid.*" Wherefore Paul elsewhere says, "*called according to purpose.*"[6] The sense of these words [thou hast] in Annotation 251 of the sixth book.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Acts 10.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Romans 8:28.

Annotation CCI [contents]

"Blessed are the undefiled in the way." — Psalm 118:1

On the number of the alphabetic Psalms.

Hilary, prefacing on this Psalm, handed down that only three Psalms are found among the Hebrews [that are] alphabetic — that is, whose verses begin with the letters arranged according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet — namely Psalm 111, and 112, and 118. But the very truth of the Hebrew Psalter plainly indicates, and Jerome in the epistle to Paula Urbica confirms, that the alphabetic Psalms are five[7] — namely the three aforesaid, and, besides them, [Psalms] 25 and 34. **Thomas Cajetan**, in the commentaries on the Psalter, to these five adds also two other Psalms arranged according to the series of the alphabet: that is, the thirty-seventh, woven with an interpolated and interrupted alphabet, and [the one] which — [Psalm] 145 — runs on with a continuous alphabet.

◊ **7. Right margin:** The alphabetic Psalms are five.

Annotation CCII [contents]

"My soul hath coveted to desire thy judgments." — Psalm 118:20

Whether all the saints must be purged by the fire of the conflagration.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, appending an interpretation to this little verse, seems to intimate that all men — however holy, and Mary herself too, the Mother of God — must be expiated from [their] sins by the pain and punishment of fire in the conflagration of the last judgment. For these things are written by him: "*The Prophet remembers that it is arduous to desire the judgment; for since no living [man] is clean in [God's] sight, how can the judgment be desirable, in which that unwearied fire must be undergone by us — in which those grave punishments, to be expiated from the sins of the soul, must be undergone? A sword passed through the soul of blessed Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed:*[8] *if, therefore, that Virgin of God, [full of] capacity, is to come into the severity of the judgment, who will dare to desire to be judged by God?*" See above, Annotations 170 and 171.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Luke 2:35.

Annotation CCIII [contents]

"My portion, O Lord — I have said [it is] to keep thy law." — Psalm 118:57

Whether the possession of secular things befits the clergy.

Hilary, expounding these things in the commentaries, brings forward some [statements] from which **Erasmus**, in the annotations he published on Hilary, gathers that it is not lawful for priests to retain the possession of secular things. The words of Hilary are these: "*One must renounce the world, and all its things, that God may be our portion; but if ambition detains us, if the care of money occupies [us], if the businesses of family affairs delay [us], the Lord will not be our portion — we [being] held by the possession of secular cares and vices. To Moses, when it had been commanded that he distribute the portions of the [land of] sojourn to the twelve tribes of Israel, [God] thus commanded concerning the Levitical tribe:*" →

[…continues on folio 598 (PDF p. 415): the rest of Hilary (via Erasmus) on the Levites' portion and whether clergy may hold secular possessions (Annotatio CCIII).]

---

*(printed folio 598 [PDF p. 415]. **Annot. CCIII–CCVIII** (Ps 118:57–129:2): the Levites' portion is God, not earthly goods; Ambrose seeming to forbid all oaths; whether sins are remitted to the still-unbelieving ("faith" = conscience); and three textual notes from Jerome to Marcella — the "sons of the shaken-off," the "labors of thy hands" (καρπός/כפיך), and whether the soul was formed before the body → folio 599.)*

(folio 598, left column → right column)

Annotation CCIII (continued)

concerning the Levitical tribe it is commanded: "*To the sons of Levi there shall be no portion, nor lot in the midst of their brethren, because the Lord God is their part.*" To those, therefore, serving God, the law willed [there to be] no earthly portion, because God is their part. The preacher of the Gospel, Peter, also remembers that there was to him no portion of human possession, when to [the beggar] praying for sustenance he answered, "*Gold and silver I have not; but what I have, this I give thee.*"[1] What is that? What is that, Peter, which thou possessest? Thou hadst renounced all things to thy God, saying, "*Behold, we have left all things,*" etc.[2] See below, Annotation 121 of the following book.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Acts 3:6.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Matthew 19:27.

Annotation CCIV [contents]

"I have sworn, and I have determined to keep the judgments of thy justice." — Psalm 118:106

On the Oath.

The commentaries of **Ambrose** seem here to contain a certain opinion which would forbid to Christians every kind of oath — even a just one, and in just causes. Consult Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CCV [contents]

"Thou art just, O Lord, and thy judgment is right." — Psalm 118:137

Whether sins are remitted to those remaining in unbelief.

Ambrose, in the commentaries, inquiring into the allegory of the letter ץ [Tzadi], from which this little verse begins, seems to be in the opinion that, the sin of unbelief remaining, certain offenses are remitted to unbelievers by God. For he thus writes: "*There is also another kind of consolation for those who have paid grave penalties, as it is written in Isaiah: 'Comfort ye my people, for his sin is loosed*[3] *— even if faith was lacking, the penalty had satisfied.*" St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 86, article 3, illustrating this passage, says: "*In that word of Ambrose, 'faith' cannot be taken for that by which one believes in Christ; because, as Augustine says upon that [saying] of John, 'If I had not come, and had not spoken to them, they would not have sin*[4] *— namely, [the sin] of unbelief (for this is the sin by which all sins are held [retained]) — but it is taken for conscience, because sometimes, through the penalties which one patiently sustains, he obtains the remission of a sin of which he has no awareness.*"

◊ **3. Left margin:** Isaiah 40:1–2.

◊ **4. Left margin:** John 15[:22].

Annotation CCVI [contents]

"As an arrow in the hand of the mighty, so [are] the sons of those cast out." — Psalm 126:4

On the sons of those cast out.

Hilary's exposition upon this little verse, **Jerome**, writing to Marcella, disapproves in these words: "*That also of the same Psalm thou hast deigned to ask — Who are the 'sons of those cast out' [filij excussorum]? I wonder that thou hast not read [it] in Hilary's Commentaries — that he interprets 'the sons of those cast out' [as] the peoples of believers, namely, that he supposed the Apostles to be called by that name, to whom in the Gospel it is enjoined, into whatever city they enter, and are not received, to shake off the dust of their feet in testimony against the unbelievers: although thou subtly object beforehand that the Apostles cannot be understood under the name of 'the shaken-off,' since it is one thing [to be] of the shakers, another of the shaken (because the shakers are those who shake off, but the shaken those who are shaken off by others), and that it is incongruous [for] the Apostles to be taken [as] 'shaken off,' who ought rather to have been called*

'shakers.' What, then, shall I do? So great a man, and in his own times most eloquent, I dare not reprehend — [one] who, by the merit of his confession, the industry of [his] life, and the brightness of [his] eloquence, is praised wherever the Roman name is: except that it must not be ascribed to his fault that he was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.[5] *Of Greek letters also he had caught a certain little breeze [smattering], but from Heliodorus the presbyter, with whom he was familiarly acquainted, [he sought] those things which he could not understand — how they had been said according to Origen; who, because he could not find Origen's commentary on this psalm, chose to insinuate his own opinion rather than confess his ignorance — [an opinion] which he set forth in clear speech, and pursued another's error the more eloquently. It remains, therefore, that we run back again to the fountain of the Hebrew speech, and see how it is written where we have 'As the sons of the shaken-off': there is read ken bene ha-neurim* (כן בני הנעורים) *— which Aquila translated 'As the sons of [their] youth'; Symmachus and Theodotion, 'As the sons of youth'; the Seventy [rendered it otherwise], which we may render 'Sharpened perceptions' [Exacuti sensus] — from which it is manifest that by [the sons] of youth the Christian peoples are to be understood.*"

◊ **5. Left margin:** Hilary was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.

Annotation CCVII [contents]

"Because thou shalt eat the labors of thy hands." — Psalm 127:2

On the correct rendering of this passage.

Hilary, in the interpretation of this little verse — though erring slightly — **Jerome** noted, in the epistle to Marcella, writing thus: "*In this Psalm Heliodorus rather than our Hilary erred: who, concerning that passage in which it is written, 'Thou shalt eat the labors of thy fruits,' opining various things, asserted that the sense stands better if it be written, 'to eat some fruit of [one's] labors,' and not 'the labors of [one's] fruits' — whence a spiritual understanding must be sought; and, entering upon this occasion into a long disputation, he used as much elaborateness [to make] what he wished to be understood [seem persuasive] as falsehood always needs, that it may seem true. Whereas in this place not the Seventy interpreters, but the Latins — deceived by the ambiguity of the Greek word — translated* καρπούς *rather 'fruits' than 'hands,' although* καρποί *are also called 'hands' [wrists]; which in the Hebrew is set as* **calphecho** (כפיך) *— and Symmachus, and the Fifth Edition, translated 'of thy hands,' that they might escape the ambiguity of the former [Greek] speech.*"

Annotation CCVIII [contents]

"Let thy ears be attentive." — Psalm 129:2

Whether the Soul was formed before the body.

Hilary, illustrating this passage by [his] exposition, indicates that the Soul of the first man was formed before the body; for thus we read in him: "*When God, the world being now finished, began the most beautiful work — namely, making man to his own image — he composed him of a lowly and a heavenly nature, that is, of Soul and body; and first indeed he constituted that Soul by that divine and (to us) incomprehensible work of his power. For that God did not, when he made man to the image of God, then also make the body, Genesis teaches: [namely, that] long after man had been made to the image of God, the dust [was] taken, and the body formed, and thereupon again made into a living Soul by inspiration — this nature, namely the earthly and the heavenly, being coupled by a certain covenant of the in-breathing.*"

From this opinion **Augustine** does not altogether shrink, in the book *On Genesis, to the Letter*, book 7, chapter 24, where he committed these things to writing: "*Let us therefore see whether perchance that can be true which certainly seems to me more tolerable to human opinion: that God, in those first works in which he created all things at once, created also the human Soul — which in its own time he might breathe into the*

members of the body formed from clay; of which body, among those things established all at once, he had created causally the rational principle, according to which it should come to be when the human body was to be made. For neither that which is said, 'to his image,' do we rightly understand except in the soul; nor that which is said, 'Male and female,'[6] except in the body. Let it be believed, therefore, if no" →

◊ **6. Right margin:** Genesis 1:27.

[…continues on folio 599 (PDF p. 416): the rest of Augustine on whether the soul was created causally before the body (Annotatio CCVIII).]

(printed folio 599 [PDF p. 416]. ***Annot. CCVIII–CCXI*** *(Ps 129:2–Proverbs 1:1): the "soul before body" question closes (Leo I: souls did not pre-exist their bodies); whether Christ's soul is omniscient; Origen on souls imprisoned in bodies (read with caution); and* ***the Psalms end, Proverbs begins*** *— whether Solomon was a prophet → folio 600.)*

(folio 599, left column → right column)

Annotation CCVIII (continued)

authority of the Scriptures, or reason of truth, contradicts, that man was so made on the sixth day, that the causal ratio of the human body indeed [was] in the elements of the world, but the Soul itself was now created — as the day was first made — and, [once] created, lay hidden in the works of God, until, at its own time, by breathing upon it, he might insert it into the body formed from clay."

Rufinus, in the first book of the Invectives, asserts that Jerome once held this same [opinion], in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, when he elucidated that [saying] of the Apostle, "For we are his workmanship,"[1] etc.; and he brings forward his words, having this form: "*Diligently observe that he did not say, 'We are his figuration and molding [plasmatio],' but, 'We are his making [factura]'; for the molding draws its origin from the clay of the earth, but the 'making' took its beginning according to the likeness and image of God — which, in the one-hundred-and-eighteenth psalm, being placed together, signifies diverse things: 'Thy hands have made me, and formed me'[2] — the 'making' holds the first place, then the 'formation.'*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Ephesians 2:10.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Psalm 118:73.

Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, adheres to this opinion so constantly that, in the catalogue of heresies published by him, chapter 99, he judges those who think otherwise [to be] heretics; against whom he also brings forward the testimony of Moses, who, describing the formation of man, first narrated the creation of the Soul, when in the first chapter of Genesis he said: "*God created man to his own image*"[3] — for man is not the image of God according to the body, but according to the soul only. Then, in the second chapter of the same book, relating the formation of the body, he says: "*God therefore formed man of the clay of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life*" — by which distinction of narrations Moses willed (as Philastrius says) to signify that the Soul was first created, and then the body was molded.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Genesis 1:27.

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, consenting to these, affirms that not only the Soul of the first man, but the Souls of all men also, were created at once, before the body of Adam; and this he strives to demonstrate by the authority of the sacred Letters and by reason, in the second book of [his] *Philosophy*, chapter 6, writing: "*If anyone shall think that the Soul was sent in after the fashioning of the body, or that it was begotten after the body, he strays from the truth: for neither does Moses say that it was then created, when it was being sent into the body, nor does it so stand according to reason.*" And further, bringing forward the demonstration of his opinion, he says: "*It is the most principal work of creation, to make some things out of non-existents. If,*

therefore, Souls came to be from mutual procreation, they would surely come to be by [the] reason of providence, and would be corruptible — no otherwise than the animals begotten from the succession of [their] kind. But if they come to be out of non-existents, [then] creation still goes on, and that [saying] of Moses is not true, 'God rested from all his works.[4] *But both of these are unfitting; not therefore are souls now coming to be.*" And again, meeting Eunomius — who, from that sentence of Christ saying, "My Father worketh until now,"[5] showed that new souls are created daily — he subjoins: "*But that [Christ] says, 'My Father worketh until now,' is to be taken not of creation, as it seems to him, but of provision, and that [things] may be well [maintained in being].*"

◊ **4. Left margin:** Genesis 2:2.

◊ **5. Left margin:** John 5:17.

There are [some] who think that this assertion can be both believed and defended without any danger of heresy, provided we do not think that the Souls sinned before they glided into bodies, and were thrust down into bodies on account of [their] sins, as into prisons — which [error], in Origen and in the Origenists and Priscillianists, the decrees of the Councils condemned. Nor does Peter, bishop of Paris, seem to differ from these, leaving this matter in doubt, in book 2 of the Sentences, distinction 17.

But against these [opinions] the authority of Pope **Leo** the First openly protests, who in the epistle to the bishop of Astorga thus decrees: "*The Catholic faith constantly and truly preaches that the Souls of men were not, before they were breathed into their own bodies.*" St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the Theological Summa, question 90, opines that this position can in some manner be sustained, if we say that the Souls of men preceded [their] bodies not according to act, but according to a certain likeness of kind, by which souls agree with the Angels in intellectual nature. **Albert** [the Great], bishop of Regensburg, in the *Summa on Man*, question 15, rejecting the aforesaid opinion of Gregory of Nyssa as a Platonic figment, says that the authority of Moses, adduced by him, is to be so taken that we understand God indeed to have rested from the specific creation of all the species,[6] but not from the individual creation of Souls, which are daily infused into human bodies.

◊ **6. Right margin:** God rested from the creation of new species.

Annotation CCIX [contents]

"Thy knowledge is become wonderful [beyond] me; it is exalted, and I shall not be able to [reach] it." — Psalm 138:6

Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient.

Cassiodorus, elucidating this, seems to intimate that the Soul of Christ neither has knowledge equal with God, nor knows all things which God knows. For he says: "*The wonderful knowledge of the Father was made [manifest] through Jesus Christ, when the mysteries of the holy law were narrated to the earth-born; and, that the truth of the human condition might be laid open, he added, 'And I shall not be able to [reach] it,' because the nature of man, which he deigned to assume, could not equal itself to the divine substance.*" **Peter** [Lombard], bishop of Paris, in the third book of the Sentences, distinction 14, explaining this authority adduced by [his] adversaries, says: "*The Soul [of Christ], through the wisdom freely given to it in the Word of God, to which it is united, knows all things which God knows — but not so clearly and perspicuously as God, whose wisdom is far more worthy, and embraces all things far more excellently and perfectly than the Soul of Christ, although that too is omniscient, nor does any thing escape it which God knows.*"

Annotation CCX [contents]

"Bring my soul out of prison." — Psalm 141:8

The error of Origen concerning souls thrust into bodies.

Read Origen's commentaries here prudently, lest thou strike upon the error concerning Souls thrust down into the prison of bodies — for the confirmation of which Origen uses the present little verse. See above, Annotation 185.

Annotation CCXI [contents]

"The parables of Solomon, the son of David," etc. — Proverbs 1:1

Whether Solomon was a prophet.

Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre and martyr, when in the *Synopsis* of divine scripture he touched briefly on the arguments of the books of Solomon, seems to have asserted that Solomon did not receive the gift of prophecy, in these words: "*Solomon wrote*" →

[...continues on folio 600 (PDF p. 417): the rest of Dorotheus, and whether Solomon was a prophet (Annotatio CCXI).]

---

*(printed folio 600 [PDF p. 417]. **Annot. CCXI–CCXIV** (Proverbs 1:1–Ecclesiastes 11:3): Solomon's prophecy closes; **Ecclesiastes begins** — whether the stars are animate (Jerome, Origen, Virgil, vs. Basil); whether worlds existed before this one (Origen's* Peri Archon *vs. Augustine's* Confessions *XI); and whether the soul's state after death is fixed forever (the fallen tree) → folio 601.)*

(folio 600, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXI (continued)

the Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesiastes; for when he had received the grace of wisdom from God, he admonished all men to live wisely in this life; but the gift of Prophecy he did not receive: for we have already reckoned up those who received [it] by the divine bounty, that they might prophesy concerning Christ." **Athanasius**, in the *Synopsis*, thinks otherwise, [as do] **Origen**, on the Canticle of Canticles, and St. **Augustine**, who in book 17 *On the City of God*, chapter 20, says: "**Solomon** *himself is also found to have prophesied, in his books which are received into canonical authority — three [of them]: the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles,*" etc. Perhaps [Dorotheus] understands that Solomon is not to be placed in the catalogue of the major or minor prophets, who are called prophets in the proper and more usual signification. For Augustine also, although in book 2 *On Christian Doctrine* he had numbered the books of Solomon among the prophetic [books], separated [them] from the books of the sixteen prophets, whom he said are properly called prophets.

Annotation CCXII [contents]

"The spirit goeth, surveying all things round about in [its] circuit." — Ecclesiastes 1:6

Whether the stars are animate.

Jerome, in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes, discussing the sense of this sentence, writes these things: "*But in that he says, 'Surveying all things round about in [its] circuit' — or 'wheeling, the spirit goeth wheeling, and returns into its own circuits' — [Solomon] either called the Sun itself 'spirit,' because it animates, and breathes, and is vigorous, and completes the yearly courses of the orb, as the Poet says:* 'Meanwhile the great Sun rolls round the year'; *and elsewhere,* 'And into itself, along its own tracks, the year rolls back'; *or because [it is written]:* 'The Spirit within nourishes the shining globe of the Moon and the Titanian stars, and Mind, infused through the limbs, moves the whole mass, and mingles itself with the great body' — *[either way] he speaks not of the yearly course of the Sun, but of its daily paths.*" St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the Theological Summa, question 70, article 3, gathers from these [words] that Jerome held, with Origen, that

the Sun and the other stars are animate[1] — against the opinion of Basil and of many Fathers. See above, Annotation 108.

◊ **1. Left margin:** St. Jerome held the stars to be animate.

Annotation CCXIII [contents]

"What is that which has been done? The same thing which is to be." — Ecclesiastes 1:9

Whether before this world there were other worlds, and whether there will be [others] after this.

Origen, as Methodius is witness in the book *On the Resurrection*, when in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes he was discussing the proposed clause, said that Solomon signified by this saying both that before this world there were other worlds, and that after this world there will be others — which of old, among the ethnic philosophers, Democritus and Epicurus handed down. This same thing Jerome, in the epistle to Avitus, reports that Origen wrote in the third book of the *Peri Archon*; which, when I myself perused it, I read in it these words: "*The adversaries are wont to object to us, saying: If the world began from time, what was God doing before the world was made? For to say that the nature of God is idle is at once idle and absurd, [and so is it] even to think that the goodness [of God] at some time did not act, and the omnipotence at some time did not exercise [its] power. To which propositions we, observing the rules of piety, will answer: that God did not then first begin to work when he made this visible world; but that, as after the corruption of this world there will be another world, so also, before this one was, we believe there were others. Both of which the divine Scripture confirmed by [its] authority. For that there will be another world after this one, Isaiah teaches, saying: 'There shall be a new heaven, and a new earth, which I will make to remain in my sight, saith the Lord.*[2] *But that before this world there were others also, Ecclesiastes shows, saying: 'What is that which has been done? The same thing which is to be. And what is that which has been created? The very thing which is to be created; and there is nothing at all new under the Sun. But who shall speak and say, "Behold, this is new"? It was already in the ages which were before us.*[3] *By which testimonies both are proved: that there were ages before, and that there will be [ages] afterward — yet it must not be thought that many worlds exist at once, but that after this [one] others will be, in the meantime.*"

◊ **2. Right margin:** Isaiah 65:17.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Ecclesiastes 1:9[–10].

These things [are] in the books of the *Peri Archon*: whether they were corrupted by the corruptors of Origen's volumes, or whether Origen himself either imprudently uttered [them], or knowingly and willingly committed [them] to writing, is uncertain. Yet no one would think that Origen — a man of exceptional erudition — was so dull and stupid as not to have perceived that the objection of the adversaries could be resolved no less easily than [it could be] evaded. For if he had preferred to deride [it], there was ready at hand [the retort] which Augustine, in book 11 of the Confessions, chapter 12, writes that a certain [man] said: who, to those asking, "What was God doing before he founded the world?"[4] — jestingly enough mocking the vanity of the question — answered, "He was preparing hells for those who pry into deep things." Or, if he had thought the question unworthy of laughter, he might indeed have answered that the nature of God was never idle, nor did his goodness and power ever grow torpid by ceasing.[5] For that eternal Deity, remaining ever in itself, outside all place, was working within itself by an unceasing action of intellect and will — namely, beholding in [its] mind the world which it bore in [its] thought, handling [it] with intelligence, and deliberating and determining by [its] will that the world itself should not be made from eternity, but together with time, when the divine providence knew that it would be good and opportune for it to exist. For it was not because the world's being-to-come was good that God therefore founded the world; but because God willed the world to be, therefore it was good that the world exist.[6] Rightly, therefore, was the world founded then, when God decreed it to be good, and not before.

◊ **4. Right margin:** What God was doing before he founded the world.

◊ **5. Right margin:** God was never idle.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Because God willed the world to be, therefore it was good that the world exist.

Annotation CCXIV [contents]

"If the tree fall to the south, or to the north, in the place where the tree shall fall, there shall it be." — Ecclesiastes 11:3

Whether after this life there is given a place from which Souls, once entered, can go out.

Jerome, on Ecclesiastes, expounding these words, seems to hint that after this life there is no place from which Souls, when they shall have come to it, can any more go out. For thus it is written in him: "*'In the place where the tree shall fall, there shall it be': for wherever thou shalt have prepared for thyself a place, and a future seat — whether to the north or to the south — there, when thou art dead, shalt thou remain. For thou, like the tree, however long-lived thou be, shalt not be [so] forever; but, overthrown by the sudden tempest of death (as [trees] by that of the winds), wherever thou shalt fall, there shalt thou remain continually — whether the last [hour] shall have found thee stiff and savage, or clement and merciful.*" **Olympiodorus**, in the commentaries on this book and passage, subscribes to Jerome in these words: "*In whatever place, therefore, whether luminous or dark,*" →

[…continues on folio 601 (PDF p. 418): the rest of Olympiodorus on the soul's fixed abode after death (Annotatio CCXIV).]

---

*(printed folio 601 [PDF p. 418]. **Annot. CCXIV–CCXIX** (Ecclesiastes 11:3–Wisdom 1:1): the fixed state after death closes (the Lutherans abuse it against Purgatory, answered by Bunderius); **Canticles begins** — whether angels are corporeal, whether guardian angels desert their charges, and Bernard's "my merit is the Lord's mercy" (vs. Calvin); **Wisdom begins** — its authorship (Augustine's retraction; Jerome and Philo) → folio 602.)*

(folio 601, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXIV (continued)

— that is, whether in the base station of crimes, or in the honorable [station] of virtues, a man be found when he dies, in that order and grade he remains forever: for he either rests in the light of eternal felicity with the just and Christ the Lord, or is tormented in the darkness with the wicked, and their prince, the Devil." These testimonies the Lutherans are wont to bring forward against the Catholic assertion concerning **Purgatory**, whence souls, the expiation of [their] sins being completed, are freed. Refuting their madness, **John Bunderius**, in the eleventh title of his *Concertationes*, says that the authority of Solomon, Jerome, and Olympiodorus means nothing else for him than that the dead [man], in whatever state he departed, in that shall he remain — namely, in charity, or outside charity. So that, if one has died without charity — which is to be stiff and savage — he cannot become merciful and clement in charity, or the reverse. For after death no one is able to lose charity, or to acquire [it] anew for himself;[1] yet with this [truth] it stands, by an immutable state, that those who have merited this while existing in charity can, on departing hence, be relieved from [their] due punishments by the suffrages of the living. For that relief of punishments does not change the state, but they are in that state in which they can be relieved from [their] due punishments.

◊ **1. Left margin:** After death no one loses or acquires charity.

Annotation CCXV [contents]

"Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth." — Canticle 1:1

Whether the Angels are corporeal.

Bernard, in the fifth sermon on the Canticle of Canticles, seems to teach that the Angels are corporeal, when he says: "*Now, that even the super-celestial spirits have need of bodies, let that true and truly divine sentence make us most certain: for 'all are ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who receive the inheritance of salvation.'*[2] *In what manner, then, do they fulfil their ministry without a body — especially among those living in the body? Finally, to run about, and to pass from place to place, belongs only to bodies: which that the Angels frequently do, an authority as undoubted as [it is] known proves. Hence it is that they were also seen by the Fathers,*" etc. See above, Annotation 8, on the first chapter of Genesis.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Hebrews 1:14.

Annotation CCXVI [contents]

"Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth." — Canticle 1:1

Whether the Angels desert those whom they have received into [their] custody.

The words of **Bernard**, from the seventh homily on the Canticle of Canticles, the Scholastics are wont to use when, for the sake of disputing, they contend that the guardian Angels sometimes desert the custody of those whom they have received to guard. They run thus: "*I grieve, likewise, that some of us are weighed down by a heavy sleep in the sacred vigils, and reverence not the citizens of heaven, and appear in the presence of the princes as [it were] disorderly: I fear lest [the angels], sometime abominating our sloth, depart with indignation, and each one of us begin, too late, to say with groaning, 'Thou hast put my acquaintances far from me: they have made me an abomination to themselves,'*[3] *and that [other], 'Thou hast put away from me my friend,'*[4] *etc.*" **Albert the Great**, in the first volume of the Summa, question 8, weighing this passage, says that men are deserted by the guardian Angels not according to place, or local custody, but according to [the angel's] power and efficacy[5] — and this not from the Angel's sloth, but from the man's fault, in that manner in which the saints are wont to say that a sinner departs from God "into the region of unlikeness," not by distance of place, but of merit.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Psalm 87:9.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Psalm 87:19.

◊ **5. Left margin:** In what manner men are deserted by the Angels.

Annotation CCXVII [contents]

"Come, my dove, in the clefts of the rock." — Canticle 2:10, 14

On the merits of the just.

Bernard, in homily 61 on the Canticle of Canticles, inserted into the exposition of this clause these words: "*My merit, therefore, [is] the mercy of the Lord: I am not plainly destitute of merit, so long as he [the Lord] shall not be [destitute] of mercies; and if the mercies of the Lord are many, I too am, nonetheless, abundant in merits. Shall I sing of my own justices? O Lord, I will be mindful of thy justice alone: for that is mine also — namely, thou hast been made unto me justice from God.*"[6] **John Calvin**, in chapter 10 of his Institutes, while he strives to show that there are no merits of our good [works] before God, abuses this testimony; adding also that [saying] which was uttered by the same author in the fifteenth sermon on Psalm 90: "*This is the whole merit of man, if he place his whole hope in him who has made the whole man safe,*" etc.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 70:16.

But Bernard does not suffer himself to be so interpreted, whose plain definition concerning the merits of the pious thou hast in the 68th sermon on the Canticle of Canticles, to this effect:[7] "*It suffices,*" he says, "*to know, for [obtaining] merit, that merits do not suffice; but as, for merit, it is enough not to presume upon [one's] merits, so to be destitute of merits is enough for [condemnation at the] judgment. Furthermore, none of the*

reborn infants is destitute of merits, but they have the merits of Christ — of which nevertheless they render themselves unworthy, if they, who ought to join their own merits [to Christ's], have neglected [to do so]: which danger indeed is [only] of the adult age. Take care, therefore, to have merits; [and] when thou hast [them], know [them] to be given [to thee]. And thus thou hast escaped all danger of poverty and of presumption: for pernicious is the poverty and penury of merits, but presumption [is] the deceitful riches of the spirit; and therefore, 'Give me neither riches nor poverty, O Lord,' says the Wise Man."[8] These [are] Bernard's words: from which it appears that he, in those [passages] which Calvin adduced, does not destroy nor condemn the merits of holy works, which are humbly done by the servants of God (God leading, and the Holy Spirit favoring), but [rather] admonishes the servants of God not so to swell up over their own virtues and merits as to think that they have them either from themselves, without the breathing of the divine Spirit, or that they are worthy, without the aid of heavenly grace, to merit anything, however small. Hither look the things thou hast above in the sayings of Augustine, Annotation 92.

◊ **7. Right margin:** St. Bernard acknowledged the merits of pious men.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Proverbs 30:8.

Annotation CCXVIII [contents]

"Love justice," etc. — Wisdom 1:1

On the author of the book of Wisdom.

Augustine, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 8, in which he enumerates the canon of the sacred Scriptures, said that the book which is entitled the *Wisdom of Solomon* had for [its] author Jesus, the son of Sirach, who wrote the book of Ecclesiasticus. This same thing he retracted, in book 2 of the Retractations, chapter 3, in these words: "*Concerning the author of the book which many call the Wisdom of Solomon — that it too, like Ecclesiasticus, [was written] by Jesus the son of Sirach — [I say that] it does not so stand as was said by me; for I afterward learned, and found [it] altogether more probable, that he is not the author of this book.*"[9]

◊ **9. Right margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation CCXIX [contents]

"Love wisdom [justice], you that judge the earth." — Wisdom 1:1

On the author of the book of Wisdom.

Jerome, proposing the argument [preface] to the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, [as] emended by himself, says: "*The book of Wisdom is nowhere [found] among the Hebrews; whence its very style savors of the Greek language and speech. The Jews affirm this [book] to be Philo's,*" etc. →

[…continues on folio 602 (PDF p. 419): the rest of Jerome on the authorship of the book of Wisdom (Annotatio CCXIX).]

---

*(printed folio 602 [PDF p. 419]. **Annot. CCXIX–CCXXV** (Wisdom 1:1–Isaiah 14:19): the authorship of Wisdom closes (Faber attacks Jerome, answered by Beda); **Isaiah begins** — the LXX omission at 2:22; angels enjoy God's glory not his nature; Origen's Trinitarian misreading of the two Seraphim; the "Wonderful… Prince of peace" prophecy (9:6, with the Greek restored); whether angels have a soul; and whether the damned ever find rest (Anselm's "impossible hypothesis") → folio 603.)*

(folio 602, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXIX (continued)

For the sake of this argument [preface], **Jacobus Faber**, bishop of Vienna — a man very often dissenting from the ecclesiastical dogmas[1] — bites Jerome with insolent words, and [words] little worthy of the modesty of a Bishop, writing thus against him in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans: "*In composing the argument of the book which is called Wisdom, Jerome seems to have been too credulous of a certain perfidious Jew — provided [the argument] be his, [and] more worthy (as indeed I believe) of the ashes than of the Bibles. The zeal of God and of truth compels me thus to speak: would that Jerome — otherwise a holy and admirable man — had never, when he composed the arguments of the sacred books, consulted the Jews.*" This error [of Faber], **Noël Beda**, theologian, most amply confuted, in book 1 of the Annotations against the same Bishop: to the reading of which — hastening elsewhere — we send the curious reader.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Jacobus Faber is reprehended.

Annotation CCXX [contents]

"For he is reputed high." — Isaiah 2:22

A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy.

Jerome wonders at the Seventy Interpreters, that they left this sentence untouched; for thus he writes at the end of the first commentary on Isaiah: "*Handling it silently in my mind, I cannot find the reason why the Seventy were unwilling to translate into Greek so perspicuous a prophecy concerning Christ. For the others [Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion], who did indeed translate [it], but drew the ambiguous phrase to a sense of impiety — [it is] no wonder why they translated ill, and were unwilling to say anything glorious concerning Christ, in whom they did not believe — namely, as Jews, or half-Jews, that is, Ebionites.*"

Annotation CCXXI [contents]

"I saw the Lord sitting," etc. — Isaiah 6:1

On God being seen.

Chrysostom, in the first homily on the present passage, says that the Angels enjoy the ineffable glory of God, but do not see his nature. See Annotation 182 of book 6.

Annotation CCXXII [contents]

"The Seraphim cried one to another." — Isaiah 6:3

On the Trinity.

That **Origen** wrongly expounded these things in [his] commentaries, **Jerome** testifies, in book 3 on Isaiah, saying: "*Impiously does he understand the two Seraphim [to be] the Son and the Holy Spirit — whereas, according to the Evangelist John and Paul the Apostle, we are taught that the Son of God was seen reigning in majesty, and that the Holy Spirit spoke.*" And in the epistle to Pammachius and Oceanus: "*In the reading of Isaiah, in which the two Seraphim are described crying — Origen interpreting [them as] the Son and the Holy Spirit — I changed his detestable exposition into the two Testaments.*" Although Jerome says that he changed [this], we nevertheless still read, in Origen, in the fifth homily on this passage of Isaiah, that our Lord Jesus Christ is one of the two Seraphim — which indeed one ought to understand according to the allegory, and according to the dispensation of the flesh.

Annotation CCXXIII [contents]

"His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, God, Mighty, Father of the world to come, Prince of peace." — Isaiah 9:6

A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters.

Jerome, in book 3 on Isaiah, notes that the Seventy Interpreters — terrified by the majesty of these words — did not dare manifestly to translate this prophecy of Isaiah, pronounced concerning the Messiah, Christ, lest they be compelled openly to confess that Christ was to be called Wonderful, God, Mighty, Father of the world to come, Prince of peace; but for those six names they put others, which are not had in the Hebrew, writing in this manner: "*His name shall be called the Angel of great counsel; and I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him.*" And yet now, in the vulgate Greek edition — which is believed to be [that] of the Seventy interpreters — there plainly appear [the words] which Jerome wonders [to be] changed or omitted. For thus is it found written in it:

> *Καλεῖται τὸ ὀνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος, Θαυμαστός, σύμβουλος, Θεὸς ἰσχυρός, ἐξουσιαστής, ἄρχων εἰρήνης, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αῶινος· ἄξω γὰρ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ μεγάλη ἀ ἠρχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν τέλος —*

that is: "*His name shall be called the Angel of great counsel, Wonderful, Counselor, God, Mighty, Having power, Prince of peace, Father of the world to come; for I will bring peace upon the princes, and his health; and great [is] his rule, and of his peace there is no end.*" But that the true and emended version of the Seventy of old had [it] in this manner, Eusebius testifies, in book 7 of the *Evangelical Demonstration*, saying: "*Therefore, according to the Seventy themselves, [there was foretold] not simply an Angel, but the Angel of great counsel, and Wonderful Counselor, and God Mighty, and Having power, and Prince of peace, and Father of the world to come, [who was] to arise at some time, and to be a little child.*" In the same manner also Chrysostom reads [it], in the book *On the Deity of Christ, against the Gentiles*, writing thus: "*These things no one says of a [mere] child-man; for no one of men was ever called God, Mighty — as neither Father of the world to come, nor Prince of this peace: for of his peace, he says, there is no end.*"

Annotation CCXXIV [contents]

"Every soul of man shall fear." — Isaiah 13:7

Whether angels have a soul.

Basil, in the commentaries on Isaiah, says: "*Beautifully is the word 'of man' added: for the Soul of the Angels is not subject to fear; for the Soul of the Angel is superior to this turbulent affection.*" He seems by these [words] to hint that the Angels are living beings, which consist of body and soul — unless perchance, this being a figurative form of speaking, by "the Souls of the Angels" we understand the Angels [themselves], who are souls, and most simple spirits. Of this we have spoken more fully above, in Annotation 8.

Annotation CCXXV [contents]

"But thou art cast out," etc. — Isaiah 14:19

Whether the souls of the damned shall at some time have rest.

Anselm of Laon, in the Interlinear Gloss, drawing this passage allegorically to the Devil, says: "*Even though all souls shall at some time have rest, thou shalt never have [it].*" A scholion of this kind is taken from the fifth commentary of Jerome on Isaiah, where he himself, bringing forward the mystical [interpretation] of an uncertain author — and perhaps of Origen — says: "*But others interpret this passage thus: All souls, among the dead, shall receive some rest; thou alone shalt be bound in the outermost darkness.*" St. **Thomas**, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 46, question 2, admonishes that these words are to be read prudently, lest anyone through carelessness slip into the dogma of Origen, who thought that the punishments of the damned would at some time be ended. But they will be read prudently, if we consider that Anselm spoke not simply and absolutely, but under an impossible hypothesis, to exagge-" →

> *[…continues on folio 603 (PDF p. 420): the rest of Sixtus's resolution of Anselm's "impossible hypothesis" on the rest of the damned (Annotatio CCXXV).]*

*(printed folio 603 [PDF p. 420]. **Annot. CCXXV–CCXXIX** (Isaiah 14:19–66:24): the rest of the damned closes; the shaving of the beard (cross-ref); whether open sin is lighter than feigned holiness (malicious hypocrisy mortal, well-meant concealment venial); whether the saints remember their past evils (a memory without pain); and the Isaiah 66:24 crux — Jerome reports two "damnable expositions" of hell-fire without refuting them → folio 604.)*

(folio 603, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXV (continued)

the magnitude of the sin into which the Devil cast himself of his own accord.

Annotation CCXXVI [contents]

"Every beard shall be shaven." — Isaiah 15:2

What **Jerome** wrote to this [effect] concerning the shaving of the beard and of the head, see below, Annotation 244 of this book.

Annotation CCXXVII [contents]

"In three years the glory shall be taken away, [like the glory] of a hireling." — Isaiah 16:14

Whether it is a lighter [sin] to sin openly than to feign holiness.

Jerome, at the end of book 6 on Isaiah, says: "*If I feign myself chaste, and there is another thing in my conscience, I have not the glory [reward] of a hireling, but the punishments of a sinner; because, in the comparison of the two evils, it is lighter to sin openly than to simulate and feign holiness.*" St. **Thomas**, in the Second Part of the Second, question 111, article 4, notes this passage, [saying] that at first sight it seems to favor those who assert that hypocrisy is always a mortal sin;[1] but he indicates that Jerome's words must be understood of that kind of simulation whereby someone feigns a holiness which he neither has, nor desires to have — nay, even hates — but not of that kind of simulation whereby many feign a holiness which is none of theirs, not for the cause of deceiving and harming, but rather from a zeal of helping [edifying]: for this, although it be not altogether free from fault, is nevertheless not a deadly vice, nor worthy of eternal punishment.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether all hypocrisy is a deadly sin.

According to this understanding, St. **Thomas** judges that two sentences of Strabo must be interpreted. Of these, the one is had in the glosses collected by him, on Job 1, where, expounding that [verse], "As it pleased the Lord, so it was done," etc.,[2] he says: "*Feigned equity is not equity, but a double sin*"; the other is had on the Lamentations, chapter 4, where, expounding that [verse], "The iniquity of my people is greater than the sin of Sodom,"[3] he says: "*Crimes are bewailed in the soul which slips into hypocrisy, whose iniquity is greater than the sin of Sodom.*"

◊ **2. Left margin:** Job 1:21.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Lamentations 4:6.

Annotation CCXXVIII [contents]

"The former distresses are given over to oblivion." — Isaiah 65:16

Whether the saints in heaven remember [their] past evils.

Jerome, in book 18 on Isaiah, seems to hand down that the saints in heaven will not have memory of [their] preceding evils or crimes. For he says: "*In the new heaven and in the new earth, all memory of the former*

conversation is blotted out, lest this very thing be a part of the evils — to remember the former distress." The Master of the Sentences, in book 4, distinction 43, citing this passage otherwise than it is read in the Hieronymian codex, says that it must be so understood by us that we do not exclude from the blessed the memory of [their] preceding evils, but [only] the injury and molestation of the memory: for the memory of [their] offenses will not in any part diminish the felicity of the Saints, but will render [them] the more prompt and eager to render thanks to God. Which interpretation there is no doubt that he took from Gregory, who most aptly explained this at the end of book 4 of the Explanations on Job, saying thus: "*It must be asked, how the mind of the elect can be perfect in beatitude, if the memory of its own guilt touches it amid [its] joys? But it must be known that, as often now we joyfully remember [past] sad things, so then we shall remember the wickedness [we have] passed through, without injury to our beatitude: for often, in the time of wholeness, we recall past griefs to memory without grief, and by how much we recollect ourselves [as having been] sick, by so much [the more], being whole, do we love [our health]. There will be, therefore, in that beatitude a memory of guilt — not [one] that pollutes the mind, but [one] that binds us more closely to gladness: so that, while the mind remembers its own grief without grief, it both more truly understands itself a debtor to the physician, and loves the more the salvation received, by how much it remembers the trouble which it has escaped.*"

Annotation CCXXIX [contents]

"Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be extinguished," etc. — Isaiah 66:24

Whether the fire of hell is metaphorical.

Jerome, at the end of book 18 on Isaiah, brought hither two damnable expositions of other authors, [but] without their name: of these, the one teaches that the fire of hell is metaphorical, placed in the affliction of the conscience and memory alone; the other, that the fire of hell and the burnings of the damned are at some time at last to be ended. Since he relates these explanations not only without any confutation or accusation of the error, but even confirms [them] by bringing forward very many testimonies of the divine Scripture, **Rufinus**, the detractor of Jerome, took occasion of calumniating him, as a favorer of both dogmas.

The words of the former exposition are these: "'*The worm which shall not die, and the fire which shall not be extinguished,' is taken by very many [to be] the conscience of sinners, which torments those set in punishments, because by their own vice and sin they were deprived of so great a good — according to that which is said, 'I was turned in misery, while the thorn is fixed in me,*[4] *and in Proverbs, 'The moth of the bones [is] an understanding heart,*[5] *and again, under the obelus, 'As the moth [consumes] a garment, and the worm the wood, so grief tortures the heart of a man.'*"

◊ **4. Right margin:** Psalm 31:4.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Proverbs 25:20.

The words of the latter interpretation are thus: "*But those who wish the punishments at some time to be ended — and, though after long times, yet the torments to have a term*[6] *— use these testimonies: (a) 'When the fulness of the gentiles shall have entered in, then all Israel shall be saved';*[7] *and again, (b) 'God hath concluded all under sin, that he may have mercy on all';*[8] *and in another place the holy [man] speaks, (c) 'I will bear the wrath of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he judge my cause, and take away my judgment, and bring me forth into the light';*[9] *and again, (d) 'I will bless thee, O Lord, for thou wast angry with me; thou hast turned away thy face from me, and hast had mercy on me.'*[10] *The Lord also speaks to the sinner: 'When the anger of my fury shall be [past], I will heal again.' And this is that which is said in another place, (f) 'How great is the multitude of thy goodness, O Lord, which thou hast hidden for them that fear thee.'*[11] *All which [testimonies] they repeat, desiring to affirm that after the torments there will be refreshments — which now must be hidden from those to whom fear is useful, that, while they dread the punishments, they may cease to sin: which [matter] we ought to leave to the knowledge of God alone, whose*

not only mercy, but also torments, are [weighed] in a balance; and he knows whom, how, or how long he ought to judge. And let us only say what befits human frailty: 'O Lord, rebuke me not in thy fury, neither correct me in thy wrath.'[12] *And, as of the Devil — [and] as of all deniers and impious [ones], who have said in their heart, 'There is no God'*[13] *— we believe [there are] eternal torments: so of sinners and impious [ones], and yet Christians, whose works are to be tried and purged in the fire, let us think [that there will be] a moderated sentence of the judge, and [one] mingled with clemency.*" →

◊ **6. Right margin:** Whether the punishments of hell are at some time to be ended.

◊ **7. Right margin:** (a) Romans 11:25–26.

◊ **8. Right margin:** (b) Galatians 3:22.

◊ **9. Right margin:** (c) Micah 7:9.

◊ **10. Right margin:** (d) Isaiah 12:1.

◊ **11. Right margin:** (f) Psalm 30:20.

◊ **12. Right margin:** Psalm 6:2.

◊ **13. Right margin:** Psalm 13:1.

[…continues on folio 604 (PDF p. 421): Sixtus's Catholic resolution of both expositions, defending Jerome against Rufinus (Annotatio CCXXIX).]

---

*(printed folio 604 [PDF p. 421]. **Annot. CCXXIX–CCXXXII** (Isaiah 66:24–Jeremiah 13:12): Sixtus resolves the Isaiah 66:24 crux (both expositions are Origen's, reported not asserted; Jerome holds hell-fire corporeal). **Jeremiah begins** — Origen on the expiatory fire (Jer 2:22); the oath (Jer 4:2); and whether anyone in this life is truly just (Jer 13:12), where Bodius abuses "no living man shall be justified" and others the "kings of the churches" clause → folio 605.)*

(folio 604, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXIX (continued)

Both of these explanations are so faithfully and word-for-word expressed in the second volume of Origen's works, in the ninth homily on divers passages of Matthew, that I could easily have been persuaded that Jerome translated both from thence — had I not first, by most certain conjectures noted in the preceding book, discovered that that homily is not Origen's. Nevertheless, the dogmas of both expositions are Origenic — proposed by Jerome indeed under another's person, but not confirmed by [his] own assertion. For the impiety of the second interpretation he everywhere detests, as we show below, Annotation 290 of the sixth book; and the error of the former he in many places altogether condemns — especially in the epistle to Avitus, where, enumerating Origen's heresies, he reckons this one too among the others, in these words: "**Origen**, *in book 2 of the* Περὰ ἀρχῶν, *places the fire of gehenna, and the torments which holy Scripture threatens to sinners, not in punishments, but in the conscience of sinners — when, by the virtue and power of God, all memory of [our] offenses is set before our eyes, and, as it were, from certain seeds left behind in the soul, the whole harvest of vices springs up; and whatsoever we had done in life, whether base or impious, the picture of all these things is portrayed in our sight; and the mind, beholding [its] past pleasures, is punished with the burning of conscience, and pierced through with the goads of penitence.*" And in the book on the epistle to the Ephesians, book 3, expounding that [saying] from chapter 5, "Let no man deceive you with vain words,"[1] etc., he says: "*Because there are very many who say that there are no future punishments for sins, nor torments to be applied from without, but that the very sin and the conscience of the offense is [itself] the punishment — while the worm in the heart dies not, and a fire is kindled in the mind after the likeness of a fever, which does not torment the sick [man] from without, but, seizing the very bodies, punishes [them] without the application of torments from without: these persuasions, therefore, and fraudulent snares, Paul*

called 'vain and empty words,' which seem to have a certain flower of speech, and to flatter sinners — but, while they give [false] confidence, rather carry them to eternal punishments." From these [passages] it is clear how piously and catholically Jerome held that the fire of hell is corporeal,[2] and that those who are set in it are tormented within and without.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Ephesians 5:6.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The fire of hell, in Jerome's judgment, is corporeal.

But to those very testimonies of the divine Scripture, which Jerome — because he had elsewhere most fully explained [them] — here left unexplained, it must be said that by these the corporeal and external punishments of the damned are not taken away, but [that] mention is made of the interior and spiritual punishment: the memory and conscience of the damned being tortured with a perpetual goad. For the first and greatest punishment of the reprobate is the scourge of the avenging conscience;[3] next to this is the exterior punishment — namely, fire, sulphur, the spirit of tempests, and the other corporeal torments which the divine Letters everywhere threaten to the impious and impenitent. Consult, on those things which pertain to the reality of the fire of hell, the fortieth Annotation of this book; but on those things which regard the eternity of the same fire, read Jerome's opinion [in] Annotation 290 of book 6.

◊ **3. Left margin:** What is the greatest punishment of the damned.

Annotation CCXXX [contents]

"Though thou wash thyself with nitre," etc. — Jeremiah 2:22

The expiatory fire.

Origen, in the thirteenth homily on Jeremiah, expounding this, says that all who sinned after the laver of baptism are to be purged by the fire of the conflagration on the day of judgment. See above, Annotation 167.

Annotation CCXXXI [contents]

"Thou shalt swear, 'The Lord liveth,' in truth." — Jeremiah 4:2

The Oath.

What **Jerome** held concerning the Oath, expounding this passage, **John Arboreus** noted in his *Theosophia*. See below, Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CCXXXII [contents]

"Every bottle shall be filled with wine, and all the kings and priests [shall be filled] with drunkenness." — Jeremiah 13:12

Whether anyone in this life is truly just.

Jerome, in book 3 on Jeremiah, brought forward these things to the elucidation of this passage: "*The Prophet shows that we are a fragile vessel, according to the Apostle, saying, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels'; and that it cannot but be that there is fulfilled in us that which is written, 'There dwelleth no good in my flesh'; and again, 'For the good which I will, this I do not, but the evil which I will not, this I work'; and then, 'Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' But by this drunkenness, by which we forget the precepts of God, and by vices and sins, the whole human condition is filled — the prophet saying, 'No living [man] shall be justified in thy sight' — not in comparison with God (as the old and new heretics, and the patrons of heretics, wish), but in respect of his knowledge. For man sees in the face, God in the heart; and what to us sometimes seems beautiful, is found sordid in his eyes. Not only the ignoble common crowd and the vile populace, but the kings of the churches, who sit upon the throne — the priests themselves also, the second grade in ecclesiastical honor — are filled with the variety of sins.*"

This passage of Jerome the heretics of our times abuse in two ways. **Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, drags it to the defenses of the Lutherans, who teach that no one — however perfect — is truly just in this life, but that in all [men] sin, worthy of the wrath of God, remains until death. Again, those who impugn the Ecclesiastical power[4] adduce the last clause of this passage against the Sacerdotal power, which they contend must be subjected to the secular magistrate. But both violently wrest these words: for as regards the dignity of the Priest and of the King, we have already shown above — namely, in Annotation 166 — that Jerome here spoke of the Jewish priesthood, not of the Christian. But in the other words of the proposed sentence, we say that Jerome had regard to the human condition, destitute of the grace of God: for no one is just without the aid of divine grace,[5] nor can [anyone] long remain without a deadly crime. But if thou press [the point] that he pronounced these things also of the just, in whom the divine grace is present, infused through the Holy Spirit: we will answer that Jerome must be understood of light and venial errors, and not of deadly and pernicious crimes. For there are many venial vices, from which no one — however just, the holy Virgin excepted — is altogether freed. For there is, even in the saints [who have been] repaired by grace, a certain downward inclination to sinning, from the frailty of the flesh —" →

◊ **4. Right margin:** Whether the royal power is inferior to the sacerdotal.

◊ **5. Right margin:** No one is just without the aid of divine grace, nor can [anyone] long live without a deadly sin.

[…continues on folio 605 (PDF p. 422): the rest of Sixtus on the inclination to sin remaining in the just (Annotatio CCXXXII).]

---

*(printed folio 605 [PDF p. 422]. **Annot. CCXXXII–CCXXXIII** (Jeremiah 13:12–19:11): whether anyone is truly just closes (the "indwelling sin" of Romans 7 leaves even the just, save the Virgin, with venial faults). Then the great annotation on **Chiliasm / Millenarianism** (Jer 19:11) — Jerome and Augustine treat it gently yet deride it, sparing the ancient Fathers (Papias, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Victorinus); Sixtus distinguishes the orthodox millenarians' golden age from Cerinthus's carnal fable → folio 606.)*

(folio 605, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXII (continued)

inclination, which Paul called "indwelling sin," because it arose from sin, and was left, for the punishment of sin, for the contest and exercise of the just;[1] and from this also many venial sins emerge, the just being unwilling. Looking to this, therefore, Paul exclaimed, "Unhappy man that I am," etc.;[2] and, "I know that there dwelleth no good in my flesh," and, "Not the good which I will do I do, but the evil which I will not";[3] and David, directing his mind to the venial but continual errors of the saints, said: "No living [man] shall be justified in thy sight,"[4] if he be examined according to the rigor of the divine justice — because "Seven times a day the just [man] falleth."[5]

◊ **1. Left margin:** Romans 7:17.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Romans 7:24.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Romans 7:18–19.

◊ **4. Left margin:** Psalm 142:2.

◊ **5. Left margin:** Proverbs 24:16.

Annotation CCXXXIII [contents]

"I will break this people, and this city, as the potter's vessel is broken, which cannot be made whole again." — Jeremiah 19:11

Whether the opinion of the Chiliasts is to be condemned.

Jerome, in book 4 on Jeremiah, so explains this passage that he seems to assert that the error of the χιλιασταί [Chiliasts] — that is, of the Millenarians — is not to be condemned; which [error], nevertheless, very many most holy Fathers condemned, in [the person of] Cerinthus the heresiarch, as a heretical dogma; but [Jerome holds] that it is free to each one to think in this [matter] what he will. For these things we read in him: "*Manifestly this is said not of the Babylonian, but of the Roman captivity; for after the Babylonians both the city was restored, and the people brought back into Judaea, and restored to [its] former abundance; but after the captivity under Vespasian and Titus, and [what] afterward befell under Hadrian, unto the consummation of the age, the ruins of Jerusalem shall remain — although the Jews think that a golden and jeweled Jerusalem is to be restored to them, and again victims and sacrifices, and the marriages of the saints, and the kingdom of the Lord Savior on earth: which, though we do not follow, yet we cannot condemn, because many ecclesiastical men and martyrs said these things. And let each one abound in his own sense, and let all things be reserved to the judgment of the Lord.*"

These things Jerome; who, disclosing by name the asserters of this opinion, says in the book *On Illustrious Men*: "**Papias**, *the hearer of John, bishop of Hierapolis, is said to have published a Jewish* Δευτέρωσις [Deuterosis, a 'second [teaching]'] *of a thousand years, whom Irenaeus and Apollinaris followed, and the rest, who say that after the resurrection the Lord will reign in the flesh with the saints. Tertullian also, in the book* On the Hope of the Faithful, *and Victorinus of Poetovio, are led by this opinion.*" And in book 11 on Ezekiel, indicating the writings in which the same authors taught this, he says: "*For neither, according to the Jewish fables — which they call* Deuteroses *— do we expect a golden Jerusalem from heaven: which [error] both many of ours, and especially the book of Tertullian which is entitled* On the Hope of the Faithful, *and the seventh volume of the* Institutions *of Lactantius, promise; and the frequent expositions of Victorinus of Poetovio; and lately our own Severus, in the dialogue on which he imposed the name* Gallus; *and — to name the Greeks, and to join the first and the last — Irenaeus and Apollinaris.*"

Nor does **Augustine** seem to have shrunk from this opinion of Jerome; who, not daring to call it either a heresy or an error, wrote thus concerning it in the twentieth [book] *On the City of God*, chapter 7: "*This opinion would be in some way tolerable, if some spiritual delights were believed to be about to be present to the saints in that Sabbath — namely, of a thousand years — through the presence of the Lord. For we too once held this opinion.*" Thus far Augustine.

Know, therefore, that neither Jerome nor Augustine tempered their discourse in this manner in order to show that this opinion is not damnable — which both of them in many places assail and deride[6] — but in order to indicate, by the example of their modesty and benignity, that we too must dissent from the errors of the ancient Fathers of the Church with the highest reverence; and lest they should seem to persecute the many Catholics who were then led by that opinion — which Jerome hints not obscurely in the preface of the eighteenth commentary on Isaiah, in these words: "*The Apocalypse of John, if we take [it] according to the letter, we must judaize; if we treat [it] spiritually, as it was written, we shall seem to go contrary to the opinions of many of the ancients — of the Latins, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius; of the Greeks (to pass over the rest), I will make mention only of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons: against whom that most eloquent man Dionysius, Pontiff of the Alexandrian church, writes an elegant book, deriding the fable of the thousand years, and the golden and jeweled Jerusalem on earth, the restoration of the temple, the blood of victims, the rest of the Sabbath, the injury of circumcision, the marriages, the births, the education of children, the delights of banquets, and the servitude of all the nations; and again wars, armies, and triumphs, and the slaughters of the conquered, and the death of the hundred-year-old sinner — to whom Apollinaris responded in two volumes: whom not only the men of his own sect, but also (in this part only) a very great multitude of ours follows; so that with a foreboding mind I already perceive how great a rage is to be stirred up against me by [these], to whom I bear no envy, if they so love the earth that in the kingdom of Christ they desire earthly things, and, after the abundance of foods and the gluttony of belly and gullet, seek those things which*

are beneath the belly."

◊ **6. Right margin:** The opinion of the Chiliasts is disapproved.

Thus far Jerome, hinting by these words that the opinion of those [millenarians] is not far distant from the dogma of Cerinthus. There are, however, [some] who judge that the two opinions are most widely distant from each other. For Cerinthus, as Eusebius writes in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, because he was given to the belly, and the gullet, and lust,[7] taught those things which lust dictated to him — decreeing not only that Christ, after the resurrection, would administer a kingdom on earth for a thousand years, but also that in that very kingdom there would be all base pleasures: that is, the foul gluttony of banquets, of the belly, and the most exquisite incitements of those things which are beneath the belly, and certain most base vices of every monstrous and execrable lust. But those [orthodox millenarians], although they thought that Christ — the bodies of the Saints being raised up — would return to the earth and there reign a thousand years, nevertheless believed that there would be in that kingdom no wickedness, nor impiety, nor injustice of evil men, but, on the contrary, an inestimable tranquillity of a most happy and truly golden age, in which the Saints, living in the flesh, would enjoy all the delights of soul and body with the highest innocence, purity, justice, temperance, and piety. Which, that it may become more clear, it pleases [me] to write down here what Lactantius, in the seventh book of the Divine Institutions, has recorded concerning this matter, saying thus:" →

◊ **7. Right margin:** To what vices Cerinthus was given.

[…continues on folio 606 (PDF p. 423): the long passage from Lactantius on the millennial reign (Annotatio CCXXXIII).]

---

*(printed folio 606 [PDF p. 423]. **Annot. CCXXXIII** (continued; Jeremiah 19:11): the long Lactantius passage (*Divine Institutions *VII) on the thousand-year reign — Christ ruling the raised just, the gentled beasts, the earth flowing with honey and wine (with Virgil's fourth Eclogue), the Devil bound, then loosed, the last assault, the conflagration, and the general resurrection. Sixtus closes: it still errs against the Gospel (after the resurrection no marriage or food " —as the Angels of God"); the Anabaptists revived it → folio 607.)*

(folio 606, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXIII (continued)

"*The Son of the most high and greatest God will come, that he may judge the living and the dead; and when he shall have blotted out injustice, and executed the greatest judgment, and restored to life the just who were from the beginning, he will dwell among men for a thousand years, and will rule them with a most just governance. Then, those who shall be alive in [their] bodies will not die, but through those same thousand years will beget an infinite multitude, and their offspring will be holy and dear to God. But those who shall be raised from the dead, these shall preside over the living as judges; and the nations shall not be altogether extinguished, but certain [of them] will be left for a victory of God, that they may be triumphed over by the just, and subjugated to a perpetual servitude. About that time also the prince of the Demons, who is the contriver of all evils, will be bound with chains, and will be in custody for the thousand years of the heavenly empire, in which justice shall reign in the world, lest he contrive any evil against the people of God. After his coming, the just shall be gathered together out of every land; and the judgment being finished, the holy city shall be set up in the midst of the earth, in which the founder God himself may dwell with the just [who are] ruling. Then shall be taken away from the world that darkness by which heaven was affronted and obscured; and the Moon shall receive the brightness of the Sun, and shall no more be diminished; but the Sun shall become seven times brighter than it now is. And the earth shall open its fruitfulness, and of its own accord*

shall bring forth most abundant crops; the rocks of the mountains shall sweat honey, wines shall run down through the streams, and rivers shall overflow with milk; finally the world itself shall rejoice, and all the nature of things shall be glad, snatched away and freed from the dominion of evil, and of impiety, and of crime, and of error. In this time the beasts shall not be nourished with blood, nor the birds by prey; but all things shall be quiet and placid: lions and calves shall stand together at the manger; the wolf shall not seize the sheep; the dog shall not hunt; hawks and eagles shall not harm; infants shall play with serpents. In fine, then shall come to pass those things which the Poets said were done in the golden ages, Saturn then reigning; whose error arose from this, that the Prophets bring forth and pronounce very many things as if already accomplished. For visions were presented by the divine Spirit to their eyes, and those things were seen in their sight as if being done and finished; which prophecies of theirs, when report had gradually spread [them] abroad — since the profane, ignorant of the mystery, knew not in what sense they were said — they thought that all those things had been fulfilled in the ancient ages: which surely could not be done and fulfilled while [mere] man was reigning. But when, the impious religions being blotted out, and crime suppressed, the earth shall be made subject to God,

> *The sailor too shall give up the sea, nor shall the nautical pine exchange [its] wares; every land shall bear all things. The ground shall not suffer the harrows, nor the vine the pruning-hook; the sturdy plowman also shall now loose the yokes from the bulls. Then too the field shall grow golden with the soft ear [of grain], and the reddening grape shall hang on the wild brambles, and the hard oaks shall sweat dewy honey. Nor shall wool learn to counterfeit varied colors, but the ram himself in the meadows shall now change his fleece, now to a sweetly-blushing purple, now to a saffron dye; of its own accord scarlet shall clothe the grazing lambs. The she-goats themselves shall bring home their udders swollen with milk, and the herds shall not fear the great lions.*

"*Men shall therefore live a most tranquil and most abundant life, and shall reign together with God; and the kings of the nations shall come from the ends of the earth with gifts and presents, to adore and honor the great King, whose name shall be illustrious and venerable to all the nations which shall be under heaven, and to the kings who shall rule on the earth. But when the thousand years of the kingdom shall have begun to be ended, the prince of the Demons will be loosed again, and, sent forth from custody, will go out; and he will stir up all the nations which shall then be under the dominion of the just, that they may make war on the holy city; and there shall be gathered from all the globe of the earth an innumerable people of nations, and it shall besiege and surround the city. Then shall come the last wrath of God upon the nations, and he shall vanquish them to the last man. And first he shall shake the earth most violently, and by its motion the mountains of Syria shall be rent, and the hills shall sink down into a chasm, and the walls of all cities shall fall; and God shall fix the Sun for three days, that it set not, and shall inflame it; and there shall descend an excessive heat, and a great burning upon the rebellious and impious peoples; and showers of sulphur, and hailstones of stone, and drops of fire; and their spirits shall melt in the heat, and [their] bodies shall be crushed in the hail; and they themselves shall strike one another with the sword: the mountains shall be filled with corpses, and the fields shall be covered with bones. But the people of God shall, for those three days, be hidden beneath the hollows of the earth, until the wrath of God against the nations, and the final judgment, be ended. Then shall the just go forth from their hiding-places, and shall find all things covered with corpses and bones. But every race of the impious shall utterly perish by the root, nor shall there be any longer any nation in this world, save only the nation of God. Then, for seven whole years, the forests shall be untouched, nor shall wood be cut from the mountains, but the arms of the nations shall be burned; and there shall not even be war, but peace and everlasting rest. But when the thousand years shall have been completed, the world shall be renewed by God, and the heaven shall be folded up, and the earth shall be changed; and God shall transform men into the likeness of the Angels, and they shall be white as snow, and shall dwell forever in the sight of the Almighty, and shall sacrifice to their Lord, and serve [him] forever. At the same time shall come to pass that second and public resurrection of all, in which also the impious shall be raised up to everlasting torments. These are they who worshiped things made by hand, who either knew not, or denied,*

the Lord and Parent of the world. But their lord [the Devil] also, with his ministers, shall be seized, and condemned to punishment; with whom likewise all the crowd of the impious, for their crimes, in the sight of the Angels and of the just, shall be burned with perpetual fire forever. This is the doctrine of the holy Prophets, which we Christians follow: this is Christian wisdom."

Thus far the opinion of Lactantius, and of the others whom we have commemorated: which, although it be diverse from the dogma of Cerinthus, nevertheless contains an error foreign to the Evangelical doctrine, which teaches that after the resurrection there will be no union of male and female, no use of food and drink, and, finally, no delight of the carnal life — Christ saying, to those who dreamed that there would be carnal marriages after the resurrection: "*You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God: in the resurrection they shall neither marry, nor be married, but shall all be as the Angels of God*"[1] — who indeed neither use wives, nor are delighted with banquets, but feed on an invisible food, as Tobias says, which is God:[2] with whose nectar and ambrosia the minds of the blessed are spiritually fed; so that, according to Paul's word, "*the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but joy and peace in the Holy Spirit.*"[3] **Frederick Staphylus**, in the *Epitome of Lutheran Theology*, reports that the Anabaptists — the plagues of our times — received this error among their other heresies. A very similar observation thou hast below, in Annotation 347 of the following book.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Matthew 22:29–30.

◊ **2. Right margin:** Tobit 12:19.

◊ **3. Right margin:** Romans 14:17.

---

*(printed folio 607 [PDF p. 424]. **Annot. CCXXXIV–CCXL** (Jeremiah 22:30–Ezekiel 1:12): a chain of Origen-refutations from Jerome on Jeremiah — Christ the "abominated man" torn like a ring from the Father; Jerome on free will (vs. the Lutheran Bodius and Pelagius); the descent of souls into bodies (demons into aerial, men into gross bodies); the Susanna question (Jer 29:22 vs. Daniel 13; Rufinus attacks Jerome); hypocrisy worse than Sodom; and Ezekiel begins → folio 608.)*

(folio 607, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXIV [contents]

"Write this man abominated, or sterile." — Jeremiah 22:30

On Christ.

Origen, in the fifth book of the *Stromata*, expounding this wrongly, **Jerome** censures, in book 4 of the commentaries on Jeremiah, in these words: "*Origen refers this passage to Christ — that from the hand of the Father he was torn off like a ring, and sent into the land of captivity, into the vale of tears, and delivered to the cross; his mother also — doubtless — [being] the synagogue captured and cast out; and he does not fear, in commemorating these things, to understand this which follows — 'O earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord: thus saith the Lord, Write this man abominated, or sterile,' and the rest — of the Lord of majesty. But he writes this, lest his disciples dare to deny [it], in the fifth book of the Stromata.*" These things Jerome against Origen — who, it is credible, brought these things forth (expounding, as he does, allegorically) concerning Christ, in that sense in which Paul dared to say that Christ was made for us sin, a curse, and an execration:[1] that is, an oblation for sin and for the curse, to which we all were liable.

◊ **1. Left margin:** In what sense Christ is called sin. — 2 Corinthians 5:21. [The printed margin cites "1 Cor. 5, 21," but the text — "him who knew no sin he made sin for us" — is **2 Corinthians 5:21**; the "curse" (*maledictum*) is from Galatians 3:13.]

Annotation CCXXXV [contents]

"The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream." — Jeremiah 23:28

On free will.

Jerome, in book 4 on Jeremiah, from the interpretation of this clause fell into these words: "*Heretics are wont always to promise prosperous things, and to throw open the kingdoms of heaven to sinners, so that they say, 'The kingdoms of heaven are prepared for thee: thou canst imitate the majesty of God, so that thou be without sin; for thou hast received the power of free choice, and the knowledge of the law, through which thou mayst attain what thou wilt' — and they deceive the wretched by flatteries, and especially poor little women laden with sins, who are carried about with every wind of doctrine.*" This pericope, as is conjectured from the *Collectanea* of **Bodius**, the Lutherans usurp, to show that we are heretics — [we] who teach that man received the power of free choice, so that, by divine grace favoring, he can abstain from every deadly fault. Know that Jerome by these words does not reject this our Catholic opinion concerning free will — which everywhere he proclaims, and excellently defends[2] — but condemns the proud and insolent dogma of Pelagius: who, the aid of divine grace being excluded, asserted that man, from the knowledge of the law and from the strength of his own will, could become altogether impeccable in imitation of God, and the possessor also of eternal felicity. And to this especially looks that which Jerome noted against Origen above, Annotation 159.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Jerome defends free will.

Annotation CCXXXVI [contents]

"The captivity of Judah, which I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans, [I will regard] for good." — Jeremiah 24:5

On souls fallen down from heaven.

Origen expounding this allegorically, concerning the descent of Souls into the earth on account of crimes perpetrated in the heavens, **Jerome**, in book 5 on Jeremiah, refuted [him] with these words: "*The allegorical interpreter always dotes in this place, and, wishing to do violence to the historical truth, refers [it] to captives from the heavenly Jerusalem, and [says] that they were transferred into the land of the Chaldeans, and again about to return to their former place — like Jeremiah and the other holy prophets; but that others, who shall have been sinners in this land and in the vale of tears, are about to die.*" The same [thou hast] above, Annotation 185.

(left column continues into the right column)

Annotation CCXXXVII [contents]

"Thou hast broken chains, or wooden yokes: I will make for them iron yokes." — Jeremiah 28:13

The incarceration of souls.

Origen, discoursing on these things allegorically, said that Souls sinned in the heavens, and that on that account the Souls of demons [were sent down] into aerial, subtler bodies, but the Souls of men into grosser bodies sent down. **Jerome** reports this, in book 5 on Jeremiah, thus writing: "*The allegorical interpreter dotes in this place, calling forks and wooden chains 'ethereal and aerial bodies' — namely of the Demons and of the adverse powers — but 'iron forks or chains' our grosser bodies, which are woven together with nerves and with bones of flesh and veins: so that those who wished, out of the heavenly Jerusalem, according to the quality of [their] sin, to undergo lesser torments, are condemned into the chains of our bodies, and sustain the wailing of infancy, the bonds of swaddling-cloths, and filth, and serve the Devil, the king of Babylon — that is, of this world (Scripture saying, 'The world is set in the malignant one'* [1 John 5:19]*) — together with the beasts of the earth, which [souls] are bound fast into the bodies of brute animals.*" See above, Annotation 185.

Annotation CCXXXVIII [contents]

"The Lord make thee like Sedecias and Achab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire." — Jeremiah 29:22

On the history of Susanna. — Daniel 13:52, 56.

Jerome, in commentary 5 on Jeremiah, appended to this passage such an exposition: "*The Hebrews say that these two were the presbyters [elders], of whom Daniel says to the one, 'O thou that art grown old in evil days,' and to the other, 'O thou seed of Chanaan, and not of Juda, beauty hath deceived thee: thus did ye to the daughters of Israel, and they for fear conversed with you.' But that which is at present said — 'whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire' — seems to be contrary to the history of Daniel. For he asserts that they were stoned by the people according to the sentence of Daniel; but here it is written that the king of Babylon roasted them in the fire — whence also by very many, and almost all the Hebrews, that [book] is not received, as [being] a fable, nor is it read in their synagogues. For how, they say, could it be that captives should have the power of stoning the princes set over their own prophets? And they affirm this to be more true, which Jeremiah wrote — that the presbyters [elders] were indeed convicted by Daniel, but that the sentence was carried out upon them by the king of Babylon, who over the captives, as victor and lord, held the command.*" **Rufinus**, in the second book of the *Invectives*, accuses Jerome, that under the assumed person of a Jew he confuted the history of Susanna with various arguments. Thou hast these things more fully in Annotations 245 and 250 of this book.

Annotation CCXXXIX [contents]

"The iniquity of my people is greater than the sin of Sodom." — Lamentations 4:6

On hypocrisy.

Strabus, in his Gloss which is called the *Ordinary*, annotating this clause, said that hypocrisy is a crime far greater than the sin of Sodom. See above, on Isaiah chapter 16, Annotation 227.

Annotation CCXL

"Whither the spirit was to go, thither they went, and returned not when they walked." — Ezekiel 1:12

(the body of this annotation begins on folio 608; the catchword "GRE—" points to Gregory) →

> *[…continues on folio 608 (PDF p. 425): the exposition of Ezekiel 1:12 (Annotatio CCXL), opening with Gregory.]*

---

*(printed folio 608 [PDF p. 425]. **Annot. CCXL (continued)–CCXLII** (Ezekiel 1:12–14:13): whether charity once had can be lost — Gregory and Augustine seem to make it unlosable, Aquinas resolves (unlosable in its essence, but easily lost on the side of the mutable will); whether one sin is remitted without another (Gregory on Amos 4:7, tempered by Aquinas); and Origen's fancy that the earth is a rational animal → folio 609.)*

(folio 608, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXL (continued) [contents]

"Whither the spirit was to go, thither they went, and returned not when they walked." — Ezekiel 1:12

Gregory, in homily 5 on Ezekiel, so interprets this passage that he seems to assert that charity once had cannot be lost.[1] For he says: "*They returned not when they walked: because the elect indeed so go to good things, that they return not to the perpetrating of evils.*" And, after many things, expounding that, "*A splendor of fire running about in the midst of the animals,*"[2] he says: "*The running-about and the mobility*

can be understood thus. For in the hearts of the saints, according to certain virtues, [charity] always remains; but according to certain [others], it comes as one about to withdraw, and, about to come [again], withdraws. For in faith, hope, and charity, and the other good things — without which the heavenly country cannot be attained, such as humility, chastity, justice, and mercy — it deserts not the hearts of the perfect. But in the virtue of prophecy, in the eloquence of doctrine, in the exhibition of miracles, it is sometimes present to its elect, sometimes withdraws itself. In these virtues, therefore, without which life is by no means attained, the Holy Spirit remains in the hearts of his elect — whence rightly it is called stable; but in these, through which sanctity is demonstrated, it is sometimes mercifully present, sometimes mercifully withdraws."

◊ **1. Left margin:** Whether charity once had can be lost.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Ezekiel 1:13.

Likewise, in homily 11 on Matthew chapter 13: "*Strong,*" he says, "*is love as death:*[3] *because, namely, as death destroys the body, so charity — for [the sake of] eternal life — slays the love of corporeal things; for whom it has perfectly absorbed, it renders as it were insensible to earthly, outward desires.*" Again, in homily 30 on chapter 14 of John, he says: "*Never is the love of God idle: for it works great things, if it be great; but if it has refused to work, it is not love.*"

◊ **3. Left margin:** Song of Songs 8:6.

In this opinion it is believed that **Augustine** also was, in treatise 3 on the first epistle of John — where, explaining that [saying] from chapter 2 of the same epistle, "*The unction which we have received from him, let it abide in us,*"[4] etc., he says: "*The invisible Unction is the Holy Spirit; the invisible unction is charity — which, in whomsoever it shall be, will be like that root which cannot dry up under a burning Sun. For everything which is rooted is nourished by the heat of the Sun, and dries not.*" And, in the eighth treatise on the same epistle: "*It is rooted,*" he says, "*[this] charity: be secure, nothing evil can proceed.*" That opinion also — "*The charity which could be deserted was never true*" — **Gratian** cites, [in the treatise] *On Penance*, distinction 2, from a certain epistle of Augustine to Julianus the count, which is now not found among his epistles. To this sense looks what, from the commentaries of **Ambrose** on the sixth chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians, the same Gratian alleges: "*Feigned is the charity which deserts in adversity*"; or, as it is read in Ambrose himself: "*Simulated is the charity in those who, in [time of] necessity, desert [their] brethren.*" To the same [point] pertains what **Bede**, in the exposition of the first epistle of John, chapter 1, gathered from the Rhapsodies of Gregory in these words: "*It must be noted that the Holy Spirit always remained in the Lord; but in holy men, as long as they bear the mortal body, partly it remains forever, partly, about to return, it withdraws. For it remains with them, that they may insist upon good acts, love voluntary poverty, embrace cleanness of heart and the tranquillity of peace, fear not to suffer persecution, insist upon almsgivings, prayers, fastings, and the other fruits of the Spirit. But it withdraws for a time, lest they should always have the faculty of healing the sick, of raising the dead, or even of prophesying. It abides always, that they may be able to have the virtues, and that they themselves may live marvelously; it comes at [set] times, that they may also shine forth to others, through the signs of miracles, [showing] of what sort they are within.*"

◊ **4. Left margin:** 1 John 2:27.

(left column continues into the right column)

Peter Lombard, in the third book of the *Sentences*, distinction 31, writes that there were certain persons who, having taken from these opinions an occasion of erring, affirmed that Charity can neither be had by those who are to be damned, nor, when once had, be lost by those who are to be saved. St. **Thomas**, in the second [part of the] question 24, article 11, paving a way to the understanding of these passages, says that charity, which here on earth can be had, comes into consideration in three ways:[5] either in its own essence, or as it proceeds from its author, or as it is received by the recipient. If we inspect it according to the two former modes of contemplating, then, according to the proposed opinions of the Fathers, it must be pronounced that

Charity is altogether unlosable [inamissible] — both because God himself, the author of Charity, offers to no one an occasion of losing Charity, and because Charity itself, indefectible by its own nature, cannot destroy itself. But if we regard Charity on the part of the recipients, whose disposition is various and always mutable, there is no doubt that Charity, on account of the free and unstable will of men, can easily be lost.[6]

◊ **5. Right margin:** Charity is considered in three ways.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Why charity is lost.

Annotation CCXLI [contents]

"Thus saith the Lord: If perhaps they will hear, and be quiet," etc. — Ezekiel 3:11

Whether one sin is remitted without another. — Amos 4:7.

Gregory, in homily 10 on Ezekiel, cursorily running over that saying of Amos chapter 4, "*I rained upon one city, and upon another I rained not,*" etc., seems to hint that to penitents one sin is sometimes remitted, another not remitted. For thus he speaks: "*When the very [man] who hears the preachers corrects himself of some vices, and disdains to amend of others, one and the same city is partly rained upon and partly remains dry — [that part] in which it repels from itself the rain of preaching. For there are certain [men] who do not at all hear the words of exhortation: these utterly refuse to receive the rain. And there are certain who hear, but nevertheless do not follow this marrow [inwardly]: because they cut off some vices in themselves, but in others [vices] they grievously persist.*" St. **Thomas**, in the third part of the *Summa*, question 86, article 3, thus writes: "*The word of Gregory is not to be understood as to the remission of the fault, but as to the cessation from the act: because sometimes he who was accustomed to commit several sins deserts one, [but] not however another — which [desertion] is indeed done by divine help, which nevertheless does not reach unto the remission of the fault.*"

Annotation CCXLII [contents]

"When a land shall have sinned against me, so as to transgress by transgressing." — Ezekiel 14:13

Whether the earth is an animal capable of reason.

Origen, in homily 4 on Ezekiel, from the interpretation of this sentence attempts to establish that the earth is an animal endowed with sense and reason, capable of virtue and of vice, of reward and of punishment. His sayings, summarily excerpted, are these: "*Reviewing the most ample forest of Scripture, I am constrained to suspect that this earth which we behold is an animal — receiving proofs taken from [what is said] concerning the earth: [namely] from, 'Who looketh upon the earth, and maketh it tremble';*[7] *and, 'The earth is offended by those who dwell in it'; and, 'The earth shall take complacency in its sabbaths';*[8] *likewise from, 'Attend, O heaven, and I will speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth';*[9] *and…*" →

◊ **7. Right margin (a):** Psalm 103:32.

◊ **8. Right margin (b):** Leviticus 26:34.

◊ **9. Right margin (c):** Deuteronomy 32:1.

[…continues on folio 609 (PDF p. 426): the rest of Origen's proofs that the earth is a rational animal (Annotatio CCXLII).]

(printed folio 609 [PDF p. 426]. ***Annot. CCXLII (continued)–CCXLIV*** *(Ezekiel 14:13–44:20): Origen's proof-texts that the earth is a rational animal, answered by Chrysostom (all prosopopoeia); Origen's "imitate no one but Christ" turned against monks who imitate Basil, Benedict, Dominic, Francis (Sixtus: in the saints we imitate only Christ in them); and clerical tonsure and beard — Jerome abused by the apostate Hortensius Landus's mocking* On the Persecution of Beards *→ folio 610.)*

(folio 609, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLII (continued)

"When a land shall have sinned against me, so as to transgress by transgressing." — Ezekiel 14:13

(the excerpt from Origen continues:) "…and Jeremiah: 'Earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord.'[1] *And Paul: 'Every creature groaneth together and travaileth.'*[2] *If every creature groaneth and travaileth, and part of the creatures is earth and heaven, and every creature shall be freed from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God — who knows also concerning the earth, whether according to its own nature it be held liable to some sin? whether it be an animal, whether rational, whether it needs the hearing of the prophetic word — [Scripture] saying, 'Attend, O heaven, and let it speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth,'*[3] *and, 'Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth'*[4] *— why should we not say that, as there is to be a judgment of men and of Angels, so there shall be a judgment of the air and of the earth? But if thou thinkest that we ought not to consent to this disputation, through which we assert that every creature is to be judged, hear yet another testimony concerning the earth, [addressed] to Cain: 'Cursed [be] the earth, which hath opened its mouth to receive the blood of thy brother from thy hand;'*[5] *likewise, 'Cursed [be] the earth in thy works;'*[6] *likewise, concerning the coming of the Lord it is written, 'All the earth crieth out with joy.'*[7] *For it is capable, as an animal, according to the qualities of the portions of good acts and of evil, in which it either merits praise or punishment. When therefore it is said, 'The land which shall have sinned against me,' a certain mystery is signified; for one thing is said concerning the inhabitants, another concerning it [the land] which is inhabited. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away'*[8]*: why does heaven pass over? why does the earth pass away, except because their passing has merited certain worthy things? And in another place, 'Corrupt,' it says, 'is all the earth.'*[9] *When was it corrupted? before the flood — not because it was corrupted through the inundation of the deluge. I could also interpret it otherwise, that the earth sometimes offends: for the earth is our soul, as is signified in the parable of the Gospel; but since here it is added, 'And I will take away from it man and beast,'*[10] *[it is] one thing [that is] earth, another man: for it does not now name the inhabitants of the earth for the earth, as some think; for if it wished the inhabitants of the earth to be taken by [the word] "earth," it would have been superfluous to say, "I will take away from it man and beast.""*

◊ **1. Left margin (d):** Jeremiah 22:29.

◊ **2. Left margin (e):** Romans 8:22.

◊ **3. Left margin (a):** Deuteronomy 32:1.

◊ **4. Left margin (b):** Isaiah 1:2.

◊ **5. Left margin (c):** Genesis 4:11.

◊ **6. Left margin (d):** Genesis 3:17.

◊ **7. Left margin (e):** Psalm 95:1 and 99:1.

◊ **8. Left margin (f):** Luke 21:33.

◊ **9. Left margin (g):** Genesis 6:11.

◊ **10. Left margin (h):** Genesis 6:13.

These things Origen — or rather the corrupter of Origen. To whom, according to the opinion of **Chrysostom**, we respond that all the aforesaid testimonies are to be accommodated to the earth through prosopopoeia — that is, through the fashioning of a person.[11] For the divine writers are wont, that the discourse may become more significant, to feign animated persons for inanimate things — introducing now rivers clapping with [their] hands,[12] now hills leaping, now mountains skipping[13] — not that we should think these to be animated, nor that we should attribute to them any cogitation, but that we may understand how great is the amplitude of the goods proposed, so that it may reach even to those things which lack sense. This same thing they do also in troublesome matters, introducing both a lamenting life, and mountains, and the wailing ceilings of the temple, that from this too we may reckon the gravity of evils.

◊ **11. Left margin:** Prosopopoeia is frequent in the Scriptures.

◊ **12. Left margin:** Psalm 97:8.

◊ **13. Left margin:** Psalm 113:4.

In this same homily of Origen, about seventy lines far from the beginning, read cautiously that which he says: "*That some of the Angels are those who transgress, others who do not transgress, and both are to be judged in the day of judgment according to their works.*"

Annotation CCXLIII [contents]

"Taking of my garments, thou hast made to thyself high places." — Ezekiel 16:16

Not only Christ is to be imitated. — Matthew 23:2–3.

Origen, in homily 7 on Ezekiel, when he was expounding this particle, cursorily proceeded to the explanation of Christ's sentence from Matthew: "*Upon the chair of Moses have sat the Scribes and Pharisees: all things whatsoever they say to you, hear and do; but according to their works do not [do]: for they say, and do not. This discourse is about me, who teach good things and do the contrary, and am a seat upon the chair of Moses, as a scribe and Pharisee. The precept is to thee, O people: if thou shalt not have ground of accusation — [namely] the worst doctrine, foreign to the dogmas of the Church — but shalt behold my culpable life and sins, [thou art bidden] not to order thy life according to [me] who speak, but to do those things which I shall speak: let us imitate no one; and if we wish to imitate anyone, Christ is set before us for imitation.*"

This passage, as is gathered from the *Collectanea* of **Hermann**, the heretics twist against Catholics — especially against monks, who imitate Basil, Benedict, Dominic, Francis, and the other founders of the monastic life — as if it were not enough to imitate the one Christ, whom Paul sets before us as the sole exemplar of imitation, saying: "*Be ye imitators of Christ.*"[14] To whom it must be responded: We, when we imitate the saints, imitate in the saints no other than Christ, dwelling and living in the saints — Paul saying, "*I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me.*"[15] Nor do we imitate the saints in any other way than [in imitating] him whom Paul — in whom Christ was speaking — set before us, saying, "*Be ye imitators of me, as I also [am] of Christ*"[16] — that is, in so far as the saints themselves imitate Christ. To this sense, therefore, are the proposed words of Origen brought forth.

◊ **14. Right margin:** Ephesians 5:1.

◊ **15. Right margin:** Galatians 2:20.

◊ **16. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 4:16 and 11:1.

Annotation CCXLIV [contents]

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

Whether clerics ought to have beard or hair shorn.

Jerome's explanation, appended to this passage, the heretics of our times usurp against the ecclesiastical Traditions concerning the shaving off of the hair and beard of priests. Of their number, a certain **Hortensius Landus** [Ortensio Lando], a deserter of the Augustinian profession, put out a booklet peculiar to this argument, prefaced with a title impiously enough jocose — *On the Persecution of Beards*[17] — in which, with various and shameless jests, revilings, and blasphemies, he attacks the Clerics, and especially the monks, who observe the religious institute of shaving the crown and the chin; wresting against them several testimonies of divine Scripture, and the sayings of Catholic interpreters — among which is the explanation of the proposed clause, expressed by **Jerome** in the thirteenth commentary on Ezekiel in these words: "*But that which follows — 'They shall not shave their head,' etc.*[18] *— plainly demonstrates that we ought not, like the priests and worshippers of Isis and Serapis, [to be] with shaven heads, nor again to let down the hair — which is properly luxurious and barbarian — but that the honorable habit of priests should be shown by the countenance; and that baldness is not to be made by the razor, nor the head to be shorn so close that we*

seem to be like shaven men, but the hair to be let down only so far that the skin be covered." And after a few [words]: "*The superstition of the gentiles has shaven heads; but I do not think that any of the Gentiles abstains from wine.*" Again, in book six on Isaiah, elucidating that, "*In all heads [there shall be] baldness, and every beard shall be shaven,*"[19] etc., he says: "*If virility was seen to be had in the beard, [then], with it shaved off from an ecclesiastical man, he is proved effeminate and weak.*" And again, in book three on Isaiah, expounding that threat of God, "*In that day the Lord shall shave with a razor,*"[20] etc.: "*Therefore,*" he says, "*with that most sharp razor — that is, in the king of the Syrians [Assyrians] — all the hairs, and the comeliness of the beard (which is a sign of virility), the Lord shall shave from Judaea, that nothing in that*" →

◊ **17. Right margin:** A booklet of the heretic on the persecution of beards.

◊ **18. Right margin:** Ezekiel 44:20.

◊ **19. Right margin:** Isaiah 15:2. [The quoted words — "in all heads baldness, every beard shaved" — are Isaiah 15:2.]

◊ **20. Right margin:** Isaiah 7:20.

[…continues on folio 610 (PDF p. 427): the rest of Jerome on Isaiah 7:20 and the shaving of the beard (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

---

*(printed folio 610 [PDF p. 427]. **Annot. CCXLIV (continued)** (Ezekiel 44:20): the beard-and-tonsure defense continues — Jerome on Isaiah 7:20, Epiphanius, and Clement of Alexandria on the beard; then Sixtus's rebuttal of Hortensius (shearing is warranted by God, the Church, and nature — Paul and Chrysostom on hair as the badge of male rule; the Nazarites, Ezekiel's razor, Paul's vow-shavings; the tonsure traced from the Nazarites through the Apostles) → folio 611.)*

(folio 610, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (continued)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(Jerome on Isaiah 7:20 concludes:) "…that nothing in that [Judaea] perchance remain beautiful, but that it be compared to effeminate men, nay to ignominious women."

To this sentence of Jerome is annexed another, of **Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis, who, in the third volume of the *Panarion*, contending against the Massalians [Messalians], affirms that it was sanctioned by the Apostles, by the authority of divine Scripture, that the beard should not be shaved. His words are these: "*Brethren who live in the monasteries throughout Mesopotamia — what is worse — cut off the beard, the form [mark] of a man, but often nourish the hair of the head. And yet concerning the beard indeed the divine Scripture says, in the Constitutions and the doctrine of the Apostles: 'Thou shalt not corrupt' — that is, 'Thou shalt not cut off the hairs of the beard,*[1] *nor after the manner of a harlot make thyself wild on account of [thy] hair.'*"

◊ **1. Left margin:** Leviticus 19:27.

There is joined to Epiphanius **Clement of Alexandria**, presbyter, the preceptor of Origen,[2] in the third book of the *Paedagogus*, chapter 11, thus writing: "*The hairs of men — lest they be too much let down from the head — glide into a womanish mane; for to men the beard suffices; because, if anyone also trim the beard somewhat, yet it is not to be altogether denuded: for it is a base spectacle, and a beard shorn down to the skin does not seem to be far from plucking and laceration. For the psalmographer [was] delighted with a beard as with a mane, [saying,] 'As the ointment,' he says, 'which descends into the beard, the beard of Aaron*[3] *— who, with the beard by [its] doubling adorning [him], praised the comeliness, [and] gladdened the countenance with the ointment of the Lord. The hairs, therefore, are to be shorn — not with the razor, for*

this is illiberal, but with the scissors of barbers. But the hairs of the beard, which bring no annoyance, are not to be vexed, as [those] which bring a gravity to the countenance, and strike in a certain paternal awe."

◊ **2. Left margin:** Clement of Alexandria was the teacher of Origen.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Psalm 132:2.

These sayings of the Fathers, **Hortensius** confirms with the authorities of divine Scripture — by which he not only reproves this custom of shaving, but also blames that form of shearing which the clerics now use, the head being shorn in the manner of a crown [the tonsure]. And [he says] that concerning shaving indeed it is written, by prohibition, in Ezekiel: [a] "*The priests shall not shave their head*";[4] and concerning Samuel the priest: [b] "*A razor shall not pass over his head all the days of his life*";[5] and in Numbers, to him who has consecrated himself to God, it is said: [c] "*A razor shall not pass over his head all the time of his consecration*";[6] and in Leviticus it is commanded to all: [d] "*You shall not shave your beard, nor shall you make marks upon you*";[7] whence also, in the epistle of Jeremiah [in Baruch], the Prophet, detesting the rite of the priests of Babylon shaving [their] head and beard, says: [e] "*In the houses of the idols the priests sit, having torn tunics, and their head and beard shaven, whose heads are bare.*"[8] But concerning the circular shearing of the head, he says that God commanded in Leviticus: [f] "*You shall not shear your hair round, nor shave your beard*";[9] and in Jeremiah God, threatening dispersion to the contemners of this law, says: [g] "*I will disperse into every wind those who are shorn round in [their] hair.*"[10]

◊ **4. Left margin (a):** Ezekiel 44:20.

◊ **5. Left margin (b):** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 1:11.

◊ **6. Left margin (c):** Numbers 6:5.

◊ **7. Left margin (d):** Leviticus 19:27–28.

◊ **8. Left margin (e):** Baruch 6:30. [The "epistle of Jeremiah," Baruch chapter 6.]

◊ **9. Left margin (f):** Leviticus 19:27.

◊ **10. Left margin (g):** Jeremiah 9:26. [The wording quoted — "I will disperse into every wind those shorn round in hair" — corresponds most closely to Jeremiah 49:32.]

And these are [the things] which that uncowled deserter [transfuga] brought into his booklet against the sacred custom of shearing and shaving — before approved by himself for a long time — intermixed with jests, gibes, and impure fables; to whom we briefly respond that neither by divine laws, nor by any decrees of the Fathers, is the shearing or shaving of the head and the chin simply prohibited; but, on the contrary, we assert that the custom of shearing was received both from God, and from the Church, and in a manner from the very laws of nature herself.

(left column continues into the right column)

For, writing concerning the natural law of shearing, **Paul**, in the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, says: "*Nature itself teaches you, that if a man nourish [long] hair, it is an ignominy to him; but if a woman nourish [long] hair, it is a glory to her: because the hairs are given to her for a veil; and it is base for a woman to be shorn, or made bald.*"[11] Expounding which words, **Chrysostom** says: "*Nature has given to the human race, even in the dressing of the hairs, a presidency [rule], and the symbols of subjection. For it bade the man, with the hair cut, to display with a free and uncovered head the sign of principality; but the woman it willed to wear the hair [long], as a certain veil of submission, and a mark of servitude. As, therefore, a woman — if, with hair cut off and head bared, she shall have usurped the man's symbol against the order of nature — disfigures herself; so a man, if — the dignity of his power being neglected — he shall have assumed the womanish [long] hair, shall affect himself with ignominy, bearing the mark of servitude and the token of an effeminate soul. Since, therefore, men are all persuaded by the instinct of nature to the shearing of the hair, how much more consentaneous is it that Priests — who, in the dignity of [their] office and by the example of [their] life, ought to preside over the rest — should bear about the insignia of virile presidency, with the womanish hair shorn?*"

◊ **11. Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 11:14–15.

But that God very often commanded the shearing of the hair and beard, and the shaving [abrasion], the sacred letters teach us — in which it is written that the Nazarites, the hair being first kept [grown], at length, after a great continence of life, shaved the head, and were bidden to put the hairs into the fire of the sacrifice;[12] that by this visible sign they might be admonished to cut away from themselves all the superfluous goods of the present life (which are signified by the superfluities of the hairs of the human body), and to sacrifice [them] in the service of God. This also we read to have been commanded to Ezekiel the prophet and priest, God saying to him: "*Thou, son of man, take to thyself a sharp razor, shaving the hairs, and thou shalt lead it over [thy] head, and over thy beard.*"[13] And in the Acts of the Apostles, Luke committed to memory that Priscilla and Aquila, the vow of the Nazarites being undertaken, shaved the hair in Cenchreae, the port of the Corinthians;[14] and that the same [was] done, not long after, at Jerusalem, by Paul, at the exhortation of James the Apostle, together with very many other disciples of Christ.[15]

◊ **12. Right margin:** Numbers 6:18.

◊ **13. Right margin:** Ezekiel 5:1.

◊ **14. Right margin:** Acts 18:18.

◊ **15. Right margin:** Acts 21:24, 26.

Moreover, that this very thing was established by Ecclesiastical sanctions from the very beginning of the nascent Church, **Isidore**, bishop of Hispalis [Seville], is witness, in the second book *On Ecclesiastical Offices*, chapter four, thus writing: "*The use of the ecclesiastical tonsure — arisen, if I err not, from the Nazarites — was introduced into the Church by the Apostles, that those who, dedicated to divine worship, should be consecrated to the Lord as Nazarites (that is, saints of God), might be renewed with the hair cut off.*" Which sentence of Isidore, that it is true, the epistle of **Anicetus** the pontiff [pope] confirms — written not long from the times of the Apostles to the bishops of Gaul — in which also these things, among the rest, are had: "*Prohibit, brethren, throughout all the Churches of your regions, that Clerics — who ought to be an example of virtue, honesty, chastity, and gravity to the laity and the simple, and prudently to exhibit themselves, as a sign of a purer life, to the ruder [sort] for imitation — should, according to the Apostle, not nourish the hair [long], but should shave the head above in the manner of a sphere: because, as they ought to be set apart in [their] manner of life, so also in the tonsure, and in every habit, ought they to appear set apart.*" There is extant also, in the fourth Council of Carthage — which, in the year of our salvation 416," →

[…continues on folio 611 (PDF p. 428): the Fourth Council of Carthage and the rest of the tonsure argument (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

---

*(printed folio 611 [PDF p. 428]. **Annot. CCXLIV (continued)** (Ezekiel 44:20): the tonsure defense concludes — the Councils (Carthage IV, Toledo IV) and Isidore's four causes of the tonsure (the "royal priesthood," 1 Pet 2:9); Bede on the shaven beard as a memorial of humility; then Sixtus's two classes of proof-texts — those binding only the Nazarites and Levites, and those condemning only pagan-imitating or effeminate shaving (Caesar, Otho) → folio 612.)*

(folio 611, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (continued)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(the Fourth Council of Carthage, held in the year of our salvation 416, continues:) was collected [held], the canon numbered forty-fourth, in these words:[1] "*Clerics shall neither nourish the hair, nor the beard.*" It is had likewise, in the fourth synod of Toledo (celebrated a thousand years ago from now), another canon, forty-second in order, prescribing the form and figure of the ecclesiastical tonsure in this manner: "*Let all*

clerics, or readers, like the levites and priests, the head being shorn entirely above, leave below only the crown of a circle [the ring]; not as hitherto the readers in the parts of Galicia are seen to do, who, with prolix [hair], like laics, shear a slight little circle only on the top of the head. For this rite hitherto in the Spains was of the heretics; whence it behooves that, for cutting off scandal from the Churches, this sign of dishonor be taken away, and that there be one tonsure, or habit, as is the use of all Spain. But he who shall not have kept this shall be guilty [of an offense] against the Catholic faith."

◊ **1. Left margin:** What was the form and figure of the ecclesiastical tonsure.

Isidore of Hispalis [Seville], in the book which we just now cited, referring the causes of the ecclesiastical tonsure, says that the Church instituted this in the first place,[2] that, as clerics ought to be distinct from the laics in the manner of living, and conspicuous among them by probity of life, so by a certain distinct cultivation of the head it behooved them to be discerned from the rest of the seculars — which also the decree of **Anicetus** openly indicates, saying, "*that, as they ought to be distinct from others in [their] conversation, so let them be distinct in the tonsure and habit.*"

◊ **2. Left margin:** The cause of the ecclesiastical tonsure.

Secondly, that clerics by this external symbol of the shorn head might be taught that they should bear within, in the mind (whose seat the head is said to be), that which it would be right [to bear] — that is, to cut away the superfluous cares of the flesh (which the superfluity of the hairs adumbrates) together with the hairs; and to cast away crimes [sins] with the tresses; and to lay aside the carnal and womanish mind together with the carnal and womanish hair; and to impose a new and virile mind, virilely, upon the shorn head.

Thirdly, that in the Clerics the insignia of each dignity — namely, the royal and the sacerdotal — might be beheld. For as in the old Law the Priests placed upon the head the tiara (that is, a little cap having the figure of a half-sphere), but the kings girded [their] temples with a golden crown: so now the upper portion of the head, shorn to the likeness of a hemispherical tiara, displays the sacerdotal dignity; but the garland of hairs, led round the temples in the manner of a crown, represents the likeness of royal majesty — so that plainly that sentence of Peter may suit the clerics: "*You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood.*"[3]

◊ **3. Left margin:** 1 Peter 2:9.

Fourthly, **Germanus**, bishop of Constantinople, in the explanation of the divine Liturgy, and **Bede** the presbyter in [his] history, add a fourth cause of a rite of this kind: that, when the Jews, in contumely of the Christian name, had shaved Peter — preaching at Antioch — in the upper part of the head, the later pontiffs and bishops, imposing upon their own heads, for the sake of humility, the ignominy inflicted upon Peter, changed it into an ornament and glory of the Christian priesthood. And these, they report, were the causes of the shearing of the head.

The reason for shaving the beard, **Bede**, in the commentaries on Ezra, says was instituted for the recollection of humility[4] — namely, lest men dedicated to God should be extolled into pride by the magnitude or multitude of their virtues. For since the beard, which is [a mark] of the virile sex and of age, signifies

◊ **4. Left margin:** Why priests shave the beard.

(left column continues into the right column)

the right hand, fortitude, prudence, and the other virtues worthy of a perfect man — therefore holy men are bidden to cut it off, or shave it away, that from this they may understand that they ought to cast away all confidence in their own virtue, and to remember that their virtues, howsoever great and many, are mingled with vices, and that accordingly they are few and small, or almost none, if they be examined by the scrutiny of the divine equity — David saying: "*Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, because no living [man] shall be justified in thy sight*";[5] and Job: "*If I wish to justify myself, and to show myself innocent, God will prove me depraved.*"[6] From these, therefore, it is manifest that the tonsure is not only approved by the Divine and Ecclesiastical Laws, but is even enjoined for many and just causes.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Psalm 142:2.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Job 9:20.

But, that we may respond to those [testimonies] which seem to shake this determination, it must be known that those [things] which Hortensius brought against us are distinguished in a twofold order. In the first are placed the testimonies of Scripture, which do not interdict shaving or shearing to all persons, and everywhere, and always, but to certain persons, places, and times — that is, only to the Nazarites, until they should fulfill [their] vow, or only to the Levites, until they should tarry in the holy land, and while the temple at Jerusalem stood, in which alone they could sacrifice, and exercise the other things pertaining to the sacrifice. For there, and for that time, and to the priests alone, God commanded that they should not shave the head and beard, that they might be as far as possible from the superstition of the neighboring nations — whose priests, as is read in the epistle of Jeremiah,[7] with head and chin shaven, sacrificed to the idols. But now neither do the priests of the Jews, cast out of Palestine, abstain from shaving, nor are the Christian priests prohibited from it — whom Christ, by his death, freed from the laws of the ancient priesthood. To this order, therefore, pertain [those things] which God imposed upon the Nazarites in the book of Numbers,[8] and commanded concerning shaving to the priests, whether through Moses, or through Ezekiel, or through the other prophets.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Baruch 6:30.

◊ **8. Right margin:** Numbers 6:5.

In the second order are the oracles of the Scriptures and the sayings of the covenant, which seem to prohibit shearing and shaving — when nevertheless they forbid neither, but only restrain the perverse intention, and the depraved custom of those shearing and shaving: of whom some, persuaded by a vain superstition, shaved themselves in imitation of the gentile priests; others, led by a certain womanish softness, shaved the beard, that they might make themselves effeminate — as Suetonius relates concerning certain Roman Emperors: that Julius Caesar shaved the beard with such diligence and fastidiousness that he even plucked out the hairs, not without reproach; but that Otho daily shaved the face, and smeared [it] with moist bread, and instituted this from the first down [of youth], that he might never be bearded. Such an impious use, therefore, and the wicked custom of shaving and shearing, **Jerome**, **Clement**, **Epiphanius**, and the apostolic — nay, the divine — law condemn: [the law] cited by Epiphanius from chapter 19 of Leviticus: "*You shall not shear the hair round, nor shave the beard.*"[9] For thus does **Theodoret**, bishop of Cyrus [Cyrrhus], explain it, in question 28 on Leviticus, saying: "*Certain [interpreters] — that which the Seventy rendered, 'You shall not make a* σισόην [sisoe, a curl] *out of the hair of your head, nor…'*" →

◊ **9. Right margin:** Leviticus 19:27.

[…continues on folio 612 (PDF p. 429): Theodoret's explanation of Leviticus 19:27 and the rest of the tonsure argument (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

---

*(printed folio 612 [PDF p. 429]. **Annot. CCXLIV (concl.)–CCXLV** (Ezekiel 44:20–Daniel 1:1): the tonsure annotation closes — Theodoret and Cardinal Cajetan on the Hebrew of Leviticus 19:27 (only the pe'ot, not shaving as such). **Daniel begins** — Jerome's preface on the apocryphal appendices (Susanna, the Hymn, Bel and the Dragon) and the Jewish teacher's cavils; Daniel ranked among the Hagiographa; then Rufinus's three charges and Jerome's reply from the Invectives → folio 613.)*

(folio 612, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (concluded)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(Theodoret continues:) "'...corrupting your face [with] your beard' they have interpreted [as] 'the hairs made curly of set purpose.' But I think that something else is interdicted by the law: for it is the custom among the Greeks, in boys, not to shear the extremities of the hairs, but to let the hairs grow long, and some time after to dedicate them to the Demons. They were wont also to shave the beard when they mourned someone, and to cut the cheeks in honor of the dead; and moreover they pierced some parts of the body with a needle, and clothed [themselves] in black in reverence of the Demons. These things, therefore, are interdicted by the divine law."

But **Thomas**, the presbyter Cardinal [Cajetan], thinks that no mention of the tonsure is made here; for thus he writes in the commentaries: "*In the Hebrew is had* לא תקפו פאת ראשכם *[Lo thakkiphu peath roschem], that is, 'You shall not round the corner of your head.' Nothing is said of shearing, but of rounding; and I would believe that the superstition of the garlands is restrained, which garlanded the heads of those celebrating the sacred [rites] of the Gods: for, crowned with a circle of the ivy sacred to Bacchus, they celebrated [them], as the book of Maccabees relates. Nor 'shalt thou shave the beard' — in Hebrew* ולא תשחית את פאת זקנך *[Ve lo thaschid eth peath zechanecha], that is, 'And thou shalt not destroy the corner of thy beard.' There is interdicted, to the letter, the total shaving of the corners of the beard; and there are called 'corners of the beard,' as the Hebrews testify, the uppermost parts of the beard, which are joined to the temples; and to this day the Hebrews keep these corners hairy, although they shave the rest of the beard.*"

Annotation CCXLV [contents]

"In the third year of the reign of Joachim," etc. — Daniel 1:1

On the Appendix of Daniel.

Jerome, in the preface of the translation on Daniel, giving [his] opinion concerning the parts of the book of Daniel, thus writes: "*These things I therefore relate, that I might show you the difficulty of Daniel — which, among the Hebrews, has neither the history of Susanna, nor the hymn of the three children, nor the fables of Bel and the dragon; which we, because they are dispersed throughout the whole world, having prefixed a spit [obelus], and stabbing them through, subjoined [appended], lest we should seem, among the unskilled, to have cut off a great part of the volume. I heard, therefore, a certain one of the teachers of the Jews, when he derided the history of Susanna, and said that it had been fabricated by some Greek or other, to object that which the African [Julius Africanus] also opposed to Origen: [namely] that these etymologies —* ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου, σχίσαι [from the mastic-tree, to split], *and* ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου, πρῖσαι [from the holm-oak, to saw][1] *— descend from the Greek speech; of which matter we can give this understanding to our [readers]: that, for example, we might say concerning the holm-tree [ilex] that [the judge] said to him, 'Straightway mayest thou perish' [ilico pereas], and 'from the mastic [lentisco] into a lentil [lentem] may the Angel crush thee'; or, 'Mayest thou not perish gently, or slowly [lentus]' — that is, 'flexible mayest thou be led to death'; or something else suiting the name of the tree. Then he cavilled that there was only so much leisure to the three children,*[2] *that in the furnace of the raging fire they should sport in meter, and in order provoke all the elements to the praise of God; or [cavilled] what a miracle, and token of divine inspiration, it was, either that the dragon was slain by a lump of pitch,*[3] *or that the contrivances of the priests of Bel were detected — [things] which were perpetrated rather by the prudence of a shrewd man than by a prophetic spirit. But when he came to Habakkuk — [reading] that he was snatched from Judaea into Chaldaea to carry the dish [of pottage] — he sought an example, where we might have read, in the whole Old Testament, that any of the saints had flown with [his] heavy body, and in a point of an hour had crossed such spaces of lands.*[4] *To whom, when a certain one of ours, prompt enough for speaking, had brought Ezekiel into the midst, and said that he had been translated from Chaldaea into Judaea, he laughed at the man, and, from the very volume, demonstrated that Ezekiel had seen himself transposed in the spirit.*[5] *Finally, [he objected] that even our Apostle — namely, as a learned man, and one who had learned the law from the Hebrews — had not dared*

to affirm that he was snatched away in the body, but had said, 'Whether in the body, or out of the body, I know not; God knoweth.'[6] By these and such arguments he argued the [tales] in the book of the Church [to be] apocryphal fables. Concerning which matter, leaving the judgment to the arbitration of the reader, I admonish this: that Daniel is not had among the Hebrews among the Prophets, but among those who wrote the Hagiographa. For all Scripture is divided by them into three parts — into the Law, into the Prophets, and into the Hagiographa — that is, into five, and eight, and eleven books; concerning which it is not of this time to discourse. But what things Porphyry objects out of this Prophet — nay, against this book — Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius are witnesses, who, answering his madness with many thousands of verses, [I know not] whether they have satisfied the curious reader."

◊ **1. Left margin:** Daniel 13:54. [The Greek word-plays of the Susanna story — σχῖνος/σχίσαι and πρῖνος/πρῖσαι — cited by Julius Africanus as proof it was composed in Greek.]

◊ **2. Left margin:** Daniel 3:51–52, etc. [The Hymn of the Three Children.]

◊ **3. Left margin:** Daniel 14:26. [Bel and the Dragon — the dragon killed with cakes of pitch.]

◊ **4. Left margin:** Daniel 14:35. [Habakkuk carried by the angel to Babylon.]

◊ **5. Left margin:** Ezekiel 8:3. [Ezekiel lifted up "in the spirit."]

◊ **6. Right margin:** 2 Corinthians 12:2–3.

(left column continues into the right column)

These things Jerome; whom **Rufinus**, presbyter of Aquileia, in the book of the *Invectives*, criminates especially on account of three [things]. First, that, at the exhortation of Baraba the Jew, his teacher, he cast out from the volume of Daniel the history of Susanna — which for almost four hundred years the Church had read for the instruction of chastity — and that by a certain rhetorical craft, under another's person, he brought in arguments against it. Second, that he removed from its place, and cut off, the hymn of the three children, which the Church especially chanted on solemn days. Third, that he said Daniel was not to be held among the Prophets.

Meeting these charges, **Jerome**, in the first book of the *Invectives* against Rufinus, responds to him in this manner: "*Concerning Daniel, however, I will briefly respond: that I did not deny him [to be] a Prophet — whom I straightway, at the front of the prologue, confessed to be a Prophet — but [wished] to show what the Hebrews said, and by what arguments they strove to prove their opinion; and I taught the reader that the Churches of Christ read this Prophet according to Theodotion, and not according to the Seventy translators. Of which [editions], if in that book I said the [Septuagint] edition to differ much from the truth, and to be reprobated by the right judgment of the Churches of Christ, it is not my fault, [I] who said [it], but theirs who read [it]. There are at hand four editions — of Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy, and Theodotion. The Church reads Daniel according to Theodotion. What have I sinned, if I followed the judgment of the Churches? But when I report what the Hebrews are wont to say against the history of Susanna, and the hymn of the three children, and the fables of Bel and the dragon — which are not had in the Hebrew volume — he who criminates me [as] a fool proves himself a slanderer [sycophant]: for I explained not what I myself thought, but what they are wont to say against us; whose opinion if I did not answer in the prologue, studying brevity, [it was] lest I should seem to write not a preface, but a book. I said, therefore, that I straightway subjoined [it]: for I said, 'concerning which it is not of this time to discourse.' Otherwise also, from that which I asserted — that Porphyry said many things against this prophet, and I called as witnesses of this matter Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius, who answered his madness with many thousands of verses — he will be able to accuse me [and ask] why I did not, in the little preface, write against the books of Porphyry. He who pursues trifles of this sort, and will not receive the truth from the Hebrew Scripture, let him hear [me] freely proclaiming: No one is compelled to read what he does not wish; I wrote for those seeking [it], not for the fastidious; gratis, not for the envious; for the studious, not for the yawning. And yet I wonder how [he could call] Theodotion a heretic —*" →

[…continues on folio 613 (PDF p. 430): the rest of Jerome's reply to Rufinus on Daniel and Theodotion (Annotatio CCXLV).]

---

*(printed folio 613 [PDF p. 430]. **Annot. CCXLV (concl.)–CCXLVII** (Daniel 1:1–3:18): Jerome on Theodotion closes; the fourth kingdom of iron is Rome (Jerome answers the charge of dishonoring the empire); and CCXLVII opens **the great image controversy** — the Anabaptist Balthasar Hubmaier's iconoclast dossier (Jerome; Epiphanius's Anablatha-veil letter and a second letter; Eusebius to Constantia; Ambrose; the Council of Elvira; the iconoclast council) → folio 614.)*

(folio 613, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLV (concluded)

"In the third year of the reign of Joachim," etc. — Daniel 1:1
(Jerome's reply to Rufinus concludes:) "…[a heretic] whom he both reads as judaizing, and [yet] disdains the translation of whatsoever Christian sinner."

Read these things more fully in book 8, in the confutation of the sixth heresy.

Annotation CCXLVI [contents]

"And the fourth kingdom shall be as iron," etc. — Daniel 2:40
On the kingdom of the Romans.

Jerome so expounds this clause in the commentaries on Daniel: "*The fourth kingdom, which plainly pertains to the Romans, is the iron which crushes and subdues all things; but its feet, and the toes, [are] partly of iron and partly of clay — which at this time is most manifestly proved: for as in the beginning nothing was stronger and harder than the Roman empire, so in the end of things nothing [is] more feeble, when both in civil wars, and against the diverse nations of other barbarous peoples, we need [outside] aid.*" There were not lacking, of old, [those] who accused Jerome on account of these things — that he had treated the majesty of the Roman empire, then defended by a most Christian Emperor, with too little honorific words. To whom he, answering, in the preface of the eleventh [book] of the commentary on Isaiah, thus says: "*If, in the exposition of the statue, and of its feet, and the discrepancy of the toes of iron and clay over the Roman kingdom, I interpreted that which perhaps [was] first [strong], then feeble, [as] the Scripture portends — let them not impute [it] to me, but to the Prophet. For neither is it so to be flattered to Princes, that the truth of the holy Scriptures be neglected; nor is a general disputation an injury to one person.*" These things the divine Jerome.

Annotation CCXLVII [contents]

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — Daniel 3:18
Whether the sacred Images are to be venerated.

Jerome, for the elucidation of this clause, uses these words: "*The worshippers of God ought not to adore images: therefore let the judges and princes of the world, who adore the statues and images of the Emperors, understand themselves to do that which the three children, unwilling to do, pleased God. And the property [distinction] is to be noted: they say that God is worshipped, [but] the image adored — which neither [of the two] suits the servants of God.*"

Balthasar Hiemairus [Hubmaier] — who, on account of the pertinacity of heresy, was burned at Vienna in the year of the Lord 1528 — in the book which he inscribed against the worshippers of images, abuses these

words of Jerome for the protection of his error, a testimony being added after that very [passage] from the epistle of Epiphanius to John, bishop of Jerusalem, translated and approved by Jerome himself, in these words: "*When I had come to the villa which is called Anablatha, and, passing by, had seen there a lamp burning, and had asked what place it was, and had learned that it was a Church, and had entered in to pray — I found there a veil hanging in the doors of that same Church, dyed and painted, and having an image as it were of Christ, or of some saint; for I do not sufficiently remember whose the image was. When, therefore, I had seen this — that, in the Church of Christ, against the authority of the Scriptures, the image of a man was hanging — I tore it, and rather gave counsel to the keepers of that place that they should wrap [in it] and carry out some poor dead [person]. But they, murmuring against [me], said: If he wished to tear [it], it was just that he should give another veil, and change [it]. When I had heard this, I promised that I would give [one], and that I would send [it] straightway; but now I have sent what I was able to find, and I pray that thou command the presbyters of that same place to receive*

(left column continues into the right column)

the veil from the bearer, which has been sent by us; and henceforth [give order] to command, in the Church of Christ, that veils of this sort — which come against our religion — be not hung up: for it becometh thy reverence rather to have this solicitude, that it take away the scrupulosity which is unworthy of the Church of Christ, and of the peoples who are entrusted to thee."

Again, in another epistle, which is cited in the acts of the seventh synod, the same author thus writes: "*Be ye mindful, beloved sons, not to bring images into the Church, nor to place them in the cemeteries of the saints, but always carry God about in your hearts; nay, let them not even be tolerated in a common house: for it is not lawful for a Christian to be held [in suspense] through the eyes, but through the engagement of the mind.*" These things Epiphanius; to which the author of the book [Balthasar] annexes the opinion of **Eusebius**, bishop of Caesarea.

He, in the epistle to Constantia Augusta — who was asking from him an image of Christ — so wrote: "*Since thou hast written to me concerning an image of Christ, that I should send [it] to thee, I would that thou signify to me which image of Christ thou thinkest [of] — whether that true and incommutable [one], bearing the characters [features] of his nature, or this [one] which, for our sake, he assumed, putting on for us the servile form. But indeed concerning the divine form I do not think that thou thyself art solicitous, since thou hast been taught by him that no one has known the Father except the Son, nor that anyone has worthily known the Son himself, except him who begot him, the Father.*" And after other [things]: "*But if thou altogether requirest an image of the form, and of the flesh, which for our sake he put on — this too we have learned to be commingled with the glory of his deity, and [to be] passible, and mortal.*" And after a few [words]: "*Who, therefore, could portray with dead and lifeless colors, and with shadowy painting, the shining and coruscating splendors of glory and of dignity of this sort? — since not even his divine disciples were able to contemplate him on the mountain, [but], falling on their face, confessed that they could not behold a spectacle of this kind. If, therefore, in the figure of his flesh he received such power from the divinity dwelling in it, what must one say [of it] then, when — having put off mortality, and washed away corruption — he transferred the form of a servant into the glory of the Lord and of God? [namely] after the victory of death; after the ascension into the heavens; after being seated with the Father on a royal throne, at the right hand; after rest in the ineffable and unnamable bosoms of the Father — into which, as he ascended and took his seat, the heavenly powers acclaimed him with blessed voices, saying: 'Princes, lift up your gates; be ye lifted up, O heavenly gates; and the King of glory shall enter in.'*"[1] Thus far Eusebius.

◊ **1. Right margin:** Psalm 23:7–9. [Vulgate Psalm 23 = Psalm 24 in the Hebrew numbering.]

To whom Balthasar subjoins the authority of **Ambrose**, from the funeral oration on Theodosius, where thus is read: "*Helena, therefore, found the cross of the Lord — [and] adored the King, not indeed the wood; because this is a gentile error, and a vanity of the impious: but she adored him who hung on the wood —*

inscribed in the title of the cross."

At length, after many explanations of these opinions, he [Balthasar] concludes his narration with two decrees. Of these, that which is the more ancient is contained in canon 36 of the Council of Elvira [Eliberitanum], celebrated in the year of the Lord 320. Its words are these: "*It has pleased [us] that pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted on the walls.*" But the other [decree] was published much later, about the year of the Lord 730, under Leo and Constantine his son, Augusti, in the third Ephesine council, published in these words: "*If anyone [presume] to figure the figure of the incarnate Word of God, and the ideas of all the saints,*" →

[…continues on folio 614 (PDF p. 431): the rest of the iconoclast decree, and Sixtus's refutation of Balthasar (Annotatio CCXLVII).]

(printed folio 614 [PDF p. 431]. ***Annot. CCXLVII (continued)*** *(Daniel 3:18): Sixtus refutes the iconoclasts — Jerome meant pagan idols, not Christian images; Ambrose affirms the cross is to be adored (the honor referred to Christ); the Nicaea II rhymed couplet; John Damascene's threefold answer to Epiphanius; the Council of Elvira as a temporary remedy; and emperors receive the Church's laws, they do not impose them → folio 615.)*

(folio 614, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLVII (continued)

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — Daniel 3:18

(the iconoclast decree concludes:) "*…[if anyone presume to figure the incarnate Word of God, and the ideas of all the saints] in lifeless and mute images, with material colors, since they bring no use at all — let him be anathema. For it is a vain excogitation, and a diabolical invention of insidious plotting.*" After the promulgation of which decree, the same Emperors commanded all images and statues to be taken away from the temples, and burned.

By these, and by other testimonies of the Fathers and of the divine Scripture — forcibly wrested, and wrongly expounded — the impious Balthasar strives to demolish the cult of the holy Images. To whom we respond briefly, and as much as the brevity of the present undertaking permits: that he, in the first place, most ineptly accommodates to the venerable images of the saints [those things] which Jerome had written concerning the statue of the king of the Assyrians, and concerning the other images of the gentiles[1] — which they placed not only to their gods (that is, to their demons), but also to their kings and princes, living and dead, and impiously adored. These [Jerome] said were not to be adored — not, however, those which we Christians consecrate to the true God, and to his blessed friends and servants. Nor less insipidly does he bring Ambrose into the midst: who, although he says that Helena did not adore the cross, because to adore the wood is a gentile error and vanity, nevertheless does not deny that the cross is to be adored;[2] whose adoration, a little after the proposed words, he confirms, saying: "*Wisely did Helena, who raised the cross upon the head of kings, and placed [it there], that the cross of Christ might be adored in kings. This is not that insolence, but piety, which is paid to the sacred redemption.*" And then, some words being interposed, concerning the adoration of the nail by which the feet of our Savior were transfixed, he says: "*By the iron of the feet of Christ are kings inclined [bowed] — do kings adore, and do the Photinians deny his divinity? The emperors prefer the nail of his cross to their diadem — and do the Arians diminish his power?*" By which sayings Ambrose prudently admonishes that we should not worship the cross with a gentile superstition — that is, thinking that wood to be God, or some numen of deity — but that we should adore it with a pious and Christian cult, as a symbol of human redemption, and a monument of those things which for us our redeemer

Christ endured upon it, referring to him whatsoever of honor and reverence we exhibit to his cross. In this order, therefore, and with this scope, we venerate also the other sacred images, according to the formula handed down in the second Nicene synod — which [formula], as **Sabellicus**, in book 8 of the eighth Ennead, is witness, the Latin Fathers, in the times of Charlemagne, concluded [expressed] in these two verses, translated from the Greek, under a little rill of rhythm's consonance [i.e., with rhyme], with which that age had then first begun to be delighted:

◊ **1. Left margin:** The heretics wrest, against the images of Christ and of the saints, [those things] which are written concerning idols and the statues of impious men.

◊ **2. Left margin:** The cross, in the judgment of St. Ambrose, is not to be adored with a gentile superstition, so that the wood be thought to be God.

This is God, which the image teaches — but the image itself is not God; this thou mayest look upon, yet worship with the mind that which thou discernest in it. (Hoc Deus est, quod imago docet: sed non Deus ipsa. / Hanc videas, sed mente colas quod cernis in ipsa.)

But to that which is opposed from the epistles of Epiphanius, **John Damascene**, almost eight hundred years ago from now, responded, in the first book against the Iconomastigi [the Image-scourgers], in this manner:[3] "*But if thou objectest that that eminent and admirable Epiphanius openly interdicted the cult of them [images]: first indeed I would respond that that doctrine — related perhaps from a marginal annotation into the text, and so being spurious — did not likewise proceed from his lucubration, [but] is rather of another, who was called by the same name,*

◊ **3. Left margin:** Response to the authority of Epiphanius against Images.

(left column continues into the right column)

lest [we do] that which many are wont to do. Then, in the second place, if thou opposest [it] — we know that the blessed Athanasius forbade the relics of the saints to be placed in little caskets or coffers, or rather commanded that they be buried in the earth, for this [reason]: because he desired by all means to abrogate the absurd custom of the Egyptians, who did not cover the cadavers of their [dead] with earth, but deposited [them] on beds and biers. Perhaps also Epiphanius, that eminent [man], wishing to recall some such thing to rectitude, provided by law that images should not be painted — that we may also grant it to have been his opinion. For, [seeing] that this was not his purpose, to remove them, the Church, by the testimony of this blessed Epiphanius, is even unto our times adorned in every part with images.[4] *Thirdly I would respond: it is not infrequent, nor rare, [that] some [newly] found thing is a law handed down to the Church; for neither does one swallow make the spring — as it seems to Gregory the Theologian, and to truth itself — nor can one opinion demolish from the foundations the tradition of the whole Church, and pull [it] up from the boundary of the earth even to the extreme limit.*" Thus far Damascene.

◊ **4. Right margin:** The Church, in the time of blessed Epiphanius, was — [on Damascene's testimony] — adorned with images. See what I have written on the matter in book 2 of the *Disputations*, chapter 27.

From whose second response the reason can easily be rendered why the provincial Council of Elvira [Eliberitanum] — held in Spain by only nineteen bishops — forbade images to be painted in the temples of that province:[5] namely, that it might extinguish idolatry by this remedy. For although the fathers of that synod knew that the cult of the sacred Images confers the greatest utility upon the now-adult [mature] Church, nevertheless, since they had observed that those nations — lately coming to Christ from the superstition of the idols — were still inclined to their former idolatry, and were paying divine honors to the images painted in the churches of the Christians, as if there were in them something of divinity, they judged that the present disease could not otherwise be healed than by the interdiction of images. Accordingly, since now the Christian people is not, as those Spaniards of old were, prone to idolatry, no cause appears why Images should be taken away from the Church; for although one or another, deceived by a certain simplicity, may err in the worshipping of Images, the Images are not, for the sake of those [few], to be altogether abolished, but their simplicity is to be instructed: for laws provide not for the number of the few, but for the

greater multitude of the peoples.

◊ **5. Right margin:** On the decree of the Council of Elvira, the author's judgment.

Moreover, to the Council of Ephesus, and the edicts of the two Emperors pronounced against the venerable Images, it pleases [me] to respond nothing else than that which the same **Damascene**, in the second volume of the same work, said: "*In the dogmas and dispositions ecclesiastical, it is not for Emperors*[6] *to impose laws, but to receive [them]; but to the pastors and doctors of the Church is it committed, that they prescribe the order of the ecclesiastical matter not according to the arbitration of the Emperors, but according to the norm of the right faith — the Apostle saying, 'In the Church God has placed certain ones: first the Apostles, secondly the Prophets, thirdly the Pastors and Doctors'* [1 Cor 12:28]*, making no mention of emperors among these. Wherefore those Emperors, who invaded the apostolic and pastoral function, and, a synod being violently forced together in Blachernae near Ephesus, commanded impious canons to be made, according to their [own] lust, by the bishops — deservedly, as robbers and brigands, were they condemned by the Catholics.*" And some of the bishops who had been present at that detestable council, afterward repenting, abjured that canon — published against the blessed images — in the presence of three hundred →

◊ **6. Right margin:** An excellent opinion.

[…continues on folio 615 (PDF p. 432): the abjuration of the iconoclast canon and the rest of Sixtus's defense of images (Annotatio CCXLVII).]

(printed folio 615 [PDF p. 432]. ***Annot. CCXLVII (concl.)–CCL*** *(Daniel 3:18–13:1): the image controversy closes (the 350 Fathers of Nicaea II; Eusebius's letter rejected); the world's-end error (Judas the Syrian, Lactantius); the calumny that Jerome cited too many opinions on the seventy weeks; then CCL opens* ***the question of Susanna's authenticity*** *— Julius Africanus's letter to Origen with eight arguments that the story is a Greek fabrication → folio 616.)*

(folio 615, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLVII (concluded)

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — Daniel 3:18

Eusebius's epistle against Images is condemned.

(the abjuration concludes:) [they abjured that canon] in the presence of three hundred and fifty Fathers, in the second Nicene synod, in whose first action [session] the palinode [recantation] of the penitent bishops is still read. There remains the epistle of Eusebius of Caesarea, to which it is superfluous to respond: for it is established, from the sixth action of the same synod, that it was reprobated by the common consent of all the Fathers, and — [being] among the impious writings not retracted by its own author — was rejected.

Annotation CCXLVIII [contents]

"Seventy weeks are abbreviated [shortened]." — Daniel 9:24

On the time of the world's destruction.

Judas the Syrian [Judas Syrus], explaining this chapter in his commentaries, **Jerome**, in the catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, notes with these words: "*Judas disputed most fully concerning the seventy weeks in Daniel, and produced their chronography, through the times of former [ages], down to the tenth year of Severus; in which he is convicted of error, because he said that the coming of Antichrist would be about his own times — that is, in the two-hundredth year after Christ: but this [he said] for this reason, because the magnitude of the persecutions portended the end of the present world.*" These things he [Jerome]. For the

same cause, long before, those faithful were led into the same error, whom Paul, admonishing in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, says:[1] "*We beseech you, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you be not quickly moved from your [right] sense, nor terrified, as if the day of the Lord were at hand.*" There were also many other not ignoble authors in nearly the same opinion — among whom Lactantius Firmianus defined the space of two hundred years, from his own age even to the end of the world.

◊ **1. Left margin:** 2 Thessalonians 2:2.

Return to Annotation 187.

Annotation CCXLIX [contents]

"Seventy weeks are abbreviated." — Daniel 9:24

On the calumny imposed upon St. Jerome.

To **Jerome**, expounding the seventy weeks, it was imputed as a fault by [his] rivals that in recounting the opinions of the Jews and of certain heretics he was excessive [too copious]; and that, [these] authors in many things receding from the purity of the faith, he called [them] masters of the Church. To whom he, responding, in the preface of the eleventh commentary on Isaiah, thus writes: "*In the little commentaries of Daniel I studied brevity, except [for] the last and the penultimate vision — in which it was necessary for me, on account of the magnitude of the obscurity, to extend [my] discourse, especially in the exposition of the seven, and sixty-two, and one weeks; in the treating of which — what Africanus the writer of times [the chronographer], what Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea, Clement also, presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and Apollinarius of Laodicea, and Hippolytus, and the Hebrews, and Tertullian thought — I briefly comprehended, leaving to the arbitration of the reader what he should choose out of the many. And so, that which I did with the modesty of judging, and for the honor of those who were about to read, displeases certain ones, who desire to know not the opinions of the ancients, but our [own] opinion: to whom [there is] an easy response — that I was unwilling so to receive [adopt] one [opinion], that I might seem to condemn others; and certainly, if [the work] of so great and so erudite a man displeases fastidious readers, what will they do to me, who lie exposed to the bites of the envious for the slenderness of [my] little talent? But if I named the aforesaid men masters of the Church — let them understand this: that I do not approve the faith of all [of them], who certainly are contrary among themselves; but [I cited them] for the distinguishing of Josephus and of Porphyry,*

(left column continues into the right column)

who disputed very many things concerning this question." These things Jerome.

Annotation CCL [contents]

"And there was a man dwelling in Babylon, and his name [was] Joachim." — Daniel 13:1

Whether the history of Susanna is to be received.

Julius Africanus, when he doubted concerning the truth of the history of Susanna, refuted Origen in a brief epistle, in which he embraced, most tersely, eight conjectures inferring to him[self] a suspicion of falsity. The copy of the epistle thus reads:

"*Hail, from Africanus, to my lord, and son, and most honored of all men, Origen. When thou wast holding a sacred disputation with that friend of thine, and wast making mention of the prophecy [uttered] by Daniel in [his] youth, I was, at that time, as was fitting, embracing [it].* [1.] *But I wonder by what means it has escaped thee that this part of the book is spurious; for this segment of the book, though it is indeed otherwise a pleasing little work, is nevertheless a little work which is shown by many [tokens], and is convicted, to be of a modern manner, and fabricated in Greek by a Greek author.*[2] [2.] *First indeed, because, when Susanna had*

been ordered to die, the Prophet, seized by the spirit, cried out that the sentence had been unjustly brought forth — whereas Daniel prophesies in another mode through the whole time, namely by visions, and dreams, and the apparition of an Angel, but not by prophetic inspiration. [3.] *Then afterward, when he had spoken so admirably, he uses toward the people and the elders that kind of confutation which would be most remote from the common expectation, and which not even that Philistine mime would have used: inasmuch as, not content with the rebuke effected through the spirit, he interrogates each of the two, separated from the other, apart, in what place he had seen her committing adultery; and when the one had said 'under a holm-oak' [prinos], he answered that it would come to pass that the Angel would saw [seco] him; likewise threatening cutting to the other, who had answered that he had seen her under a mastic-tree [schinos].* [4.] *For in the Greek words such [words] have the same sound —* παρὰ τὴν πρῖνον, πρῖσαι *[from the holm-oak, to saw], and* παρὰ τὴν σχῖνον, σχίσαι *[from the mastic, to split]; but in the Hebrew tongue they have an altogether different sound. Moreover, from the Hebrew are translated to the Greeks whatsoever words are reported of the old Testament.* [5.] *Besides, by what means — since they were captives among the Chaldaeans in Babylon, and the slain were thrown out into the streets unburied (as the histories narrate concerning the first captivity of Israel), and their sons were torn away to be made eunuchs, and their daughters concubines, as the Prophets had foretold — do these [elders] pronounce [capital] judgment?*[3] [6.] *And — what thou mightest wonder at more — against Joachim, the king of those very [people], whom the king of the Babylonians had made assessor to himself? But if this is not that Joachim, but some other one of the people, whence [came] this captive dwelling? whence to him [that] spacious garden?* [7.] *But before all these things, this particle of this book, with the other two particles which are at the end of Daniel, is not similar to [the] Daniel which is received by the Hebrews; nay, even the character of the diction differs.* [8.] *But to all these let it be added, that — although so many Prophets have preceded — [none] thenceforth used the testimony of another, inasmuch as their truthful speech begged [borrowed] from nowhere else; but here the one, threatening the other, alludes to the Lord saying, 'The innocent and just thou shalt not slay.'*[4] *From all these things I judge that this segment of the book was added. I have knocked; do thou, writing back, instruct [me]. Salute all my lords; and thee also all the learned [men] salute; and I pray thee to be well, together with thy company — and this I pray from [my] heart.*"

◊ **2. Right margin:** The first argument of Africanus against the history of Susanna. [The margin numbers each of Africanus's eight arguments in turn — "1. Argumentum," "2. Argumentum," … "8. Argumentum" — matching the bracketed [1.]–[8.] in the text.]

◊ **3. Right margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 25. He understands the history of Bel and the Dragon.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Exodus 23:7.

To this epistle **Origen** responded with a learned and magnificent epistle; which, since, on account of its prolixity, it would not be fitting, into this →

[…continues on folio 616 (PDF p. 433): Origen's reply to Africanus in defense of the history of Susanna (Annotatio CCL).]

(printed folio 616 [PDF p. 433]. ***Annot. CCL (concl.)–CCLI*** *(Daniel 13:1–Amos 5:2): Origen's eight answers to Africanus defending Susanna (its deuterocanonical parity, the tree-puns, Solomon's judgment, captive courts, prophets citing prophets), closing with his wish to write a full encomium; then CCLI (Amos 5:2) — whether the fallen, after penance, may be restored to their former dignity (Strabus and the Council of Lérida seem to deny it) → folio 617.)*

(folio 616, left column → right column)

Annotation CCL (concluded)

"And there was a man dwelling in Babylon, and his name [was] Joachim." — Daniel 13:1

Solution of the first argument of Africanus. [The margin flags each of Origen's eight solutions in turn — "Solutio 1/2/3 … argumenti."].

(Origen's reply, since it would not be fitting to stuff his whole long letter into this place, is given only in the summary of its solutions to Africanus's arguments:)

First, as to that which he says — that the little work of Susanna is neither genuine, nor written in Hebrew, but in Greek, and by a modern author — it is [held as] uncertain; and it will be more credible that it was of old written by its author either in Hebrew or in Syriac, and preserved among the books stored apart by the studious lovers of truth, [and] then translated by a Greek interpreter. But even if we should grant [it] to be the work not of a Hebrew but of a Greek writer, it is nevertheless not on that account to be repudiated as spurious and fabricated — especially since credit is not withheld from those [pieces] among the Hebrews — lest, by the same reasoning, we be compelled to cast away many scriptures of the same kind received by the Church, and mingled among the sacred volumes: such as are the Prayer of Sidrach, Misac, and Abdenago [Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego]; the Hymn of the three children in the book of Daniel; the Prayer of Esther, and the Prayer of Mardochaeus [Mordecai]; the Epistle of Aman [Haman], and the Epistle of Mardochaeus in the book of Ezra; and other things similar to these, which our fathers received for the edification of the Church, whose bounds, constituted for us, we ought by no means to transgress.

Second, when he says that Daniel nowhere prophesied [being] seized by prophetic inspiration, but only by dreams, and visions, and angelic apparition, he seems to have too little observed that [saying] of Paul,[1] "*In many ways and in many manners God spoke of old to the Prophets*" — for nothing hinders but that one and the same Prophet may, together with dreams, visions, and Angelic apparitions, obtain also the prophetic inspiration: as in the old Scripture innumerable examples of this matter may everywhere be seen in the Prophets.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Hebrews 1:1.

Third, he does too little gravely, when he compares the writer of this book to the Philistine mime, because Daniel — according to the counsel of human prudence — interrogated the elders, separated apart, each of the two severally, as if it were not enough that the spirit had, by its breath, so admirably rebuked them: for by this reasoning it will be permitted to deride that admirable example of judging, similar to this, which the divine Scripture relates that Solomon employed in judging the cause of the two harlots concerning the surviving little infant of the litigants.[2] Wherefore it is to be believed that, as it was not enough, for persuading the people, that Solomon — although breathed upon by the divine spirit — should say, "*Give to this [woman] the living [infant], for she is its mother*," but it behoved that he [proceed] to command the infant to be divided into two parts, that all the people, by the experiment of maternal charity, might recognize the true mother of the infant: so it was not enough for Daniel to rebuke the elders, unless he had moreover received [a means] whence he might convict them out of their own mouth before the universal multitude.

◊ **2. Left margin:** 1 Kings [3 Kings] 3:27.

Fourth, as to what he says — that the Greek allusion of πρῖνος to πρῖσις, and of σχῖνος to σχίσις, is not had among the Hebrews, but [that they are] altogether diverse words — it is dissolved in three ways. First, because it is uncertain whether the words which among the Hebrews signify the same which among the Greeks πρῖνος and πρῖσαι, and σχῖνος and σχίσαι [signify], so differ among themselves that they have no similitude of sound; since indeed, in the sacred volumes of the Hebrews, no mention is ever made of the plants which are signified by the names πρῖνος[3] and σχῖνος,[4]

◊ **3. Left margin:** Σχῖνος is a small shrub — the lentisk [mastic] — whence mastic-gum is gathered.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Πρῖνος is a small tree, from which the scarlet [kermes] is born.

(left column continues into the right column)

[so that] no one of the Hebrews can affirm with certainty how these [words] allude in Hebrew, whose Hebrew names are unknown. Then, it is also credible that Daniel used, for the Hebrew tongue, Syriac words, which had such a consonance of denomination [a like wordplay]. Finally, perhaps it happened that, when the Greek interpreter wished to express — as the matter demanded — the force of the Hebrew allusion, and could not [do so directly], he, according to a certain dispensation [licence] conceded to interpreters, found the names of other plants which among the Greeks should have a similar derivation, and [thus] more lucidly explain the proposed sentence of Daniel.

Fifth, when he doubts by what means the captives had the right of bringing judgment concerning death, he ought not to wonder if the Jews obtained from the king of Babylon the power of living under their own laws and judgments — since he sees that, in his own time, the same [Jews] received from the Roman Emperors, under whose captivity they live, the right of life and death over their own [people].

Sixth, [it] is eluded with the same facility, that which he asks — whence, to the captive Joachim, a man of private condition, [there was] a magnificent house and garden:[5] for neither is this to be wondered at, since in the sacred letters we read that Mardochaeus, Nehemiah, and very many others were rich captives, and prosperous in their captivity.

◊ **5. Right margin:** Esther 2; Nehemiah [2 Esdras] 2.

Seventh, as to what he says — that this segment does not have similitude with the volume of Daniel, and that the character [style] of each is diverse — he seems to have pronounced [this] from his own judgment and taste:[6] for if anyone attentively examine both, he will find no very great dissimilitude in the two.

◊ **6. Right margin:** Solution of the seventh argument.

Eighth, when he asserts that no one of the Prophets was wont to use the sayings of another Prophet, he is deceived: for very frequently the one uses the testimonies of the other in the same sense, and in nearly the same words — as may be seen in Micah, saying,[7] "*And it shall be in the last days, the mountain of the Lord [shall be] prepared,*" etc. — which words are written in Isaiah.

◊ **7. Right margin:** Micah 4:1; Isaiah 2:2.

These things we have briefly touched upon from the Origenic epistle, in the close of which Origen himself thus inferred: "*These things I would say for the defending of the history of Susanna; and would that I could celebrate the Scripture of Susanna with an encomium — especially after the accusations [made against it] — both by dwelling upon each of its words, and by showing [its] exquisite senses; which [is] a thing that anyone who has studiously and abundantly meditated in the divine [Scriptures] could privately compose.*"

Annotation CCLI [contents]

"She is fallen, and shall no more rise, the virgin of Israel." — Amos 5:2

Whether the fallen, after penance, are to be restored to their former dignity.

Strabus, in the glosses of this passage, seems to be in the opinion of those who think that sinners, after penance, cannot be restored into their former dignity. For thus he says: "*The Prophet does not deny that Israel can rise again; but 'it shall not rise,' he says, 'the virgin of Israel'; because [Israel], once going astray, even if it be carried back on the shoulders of the shepherd, has not so great a glory as [that] which never erred.*" This opinion the canon of the Council of Ilerda [Lérida] seems to confirm, which is cited by Gratian in the fifteenth distinction of the decree, in these words: "*They who serve the holy altar, if suddenly, by the frailty of the flesh to be bewailed, they are corru-*" →

[...continues on folio 617 (PDF p. 434): the canon of Lérida and Sixtus's resolution on the restoration of penitents (Annotatio CCLI).]

*(printed folio 617 [PDF p. 434]. **Annot. CCLI (concl.)–CCLIII** (Amos 5:2–Jonah 1:12): Aquinas resolves the "fallen virgin" (sonship restored, innocence not); whether the soul's post-mortem liberty means "only two places" (Peter of Crete: it is contemplative, not physical); and whether one may take one's own life to preserve chastity — Jerome allows it only where chastity is imperilled, Ambrose counts Pelagia's death a martyrdom → folio 618.)*

(folio 617, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLI (concluded)

"She is fallen, and shall no more rise, the virgin of Israel." — Amos 5:2

St. Thomas, [Summa Theologica] third part, question 89, article 3.

(the canon of Lérida concludes:) "*...are overtaken, and, the Lord looking upon [them], have worthily done penance — let them so receive the places of their offices that they cannot be promoted further to higher offices.*" St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the Theological Summa, explaining the sayings of these [authorities], says that a twofold dignity is lost by sinners: the one before the Church, the other before God; and that this [former] is double — one chief and primary, by which the just, by the gift of divine grace, are numbered among the sons of God; and this is restored to penitents, of which the proof is that prodigal son, to whom, [when] returning to his senses, the father commanded the stole of the lost dignity to be given back.[1] But he says that the other, before God, is a secondary dignity — that is, innocence, which no one, however penitent, can recover; although sometimes he may be able to attain far greater honors, just as Gregory, in the homily on the hundred sheep, shows by the example of a soldier who, after flight, bravely returning to the battle, deserved greater praise and more excellent rewards from his leader than he who neither ever gave [his] back [in flight], nor ever did anything boldly. Concerning the glory, therefore, of this latter dignity, the words of Strabus are to be interpreted.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Luke 15:22.

There is also, after these two, an ecclesiastical dignity, concerning which Thomas thinks that the canon of the aforesaid Council is to be understood — by which the higher grades of honors are denied, not to all penitents simply, but only to those who have done public penance. For also to Peter, as **Arnobius** on psalm 38 says, after the threefold denial a greater grade is restored to the penitent than had been taken away from the denier; and it was given to him by Christ, that he should be the bishop of all bishops.

Annotation CCLII [contents]

"If they descend even unto hell, thence my hand shall bring them out." — Amos 9:2

Whether [there are] only two places after this life.

Jerome, in book 3 of the commentaries on Amos, among the other things which he heaped up for the exposition of this passage, has these: "*When the Soul, loosed from the corporeal bonds, shall have the liberty of going whither it wills, or whither it is compelled to go — either it is led to the infernal [places], concerning which it is written,* [a] *'Let the sinners be turned into hell, all the nations that forget God,*[2] *and,* [b] *'In hell who shall confess to thee?*[3] *and, 'Thy glory descends into hell'; or certainly it will be lifted up to the heavenly [places].*" **Peter**, archbishop of Crete, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 21, question 1, where he discourses concerning Purgatory, proposes this saying, for the sake of disputing, under the person of those who assert that after this life [there are] only two Places, to which the Souls, loosed from bodies, are borne — namely heaven, and hell. But then, opening the ambiguity of this saying, he says that Jerome does not speak concerning the loosing of the Soul which is made through nature, corporeal death coming on, but concerning the voluntary and spiritual loosing of the soul from the body through speculation and contemplation — in which the Soul is so separated from the body that the body is not separated from the

Soul. And this sense the following words of Jerome openly show, when he says: "*...or certainly it will be lifted up to the heavenly [places], where are the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly [places],*" etc.

◊ **2. Left margin (a):** Psalm 9:18.

◊ **3. Left margin (b):** Psalm 6:6.

Annotation CCLIII [contents]

"Take me up, and cast me into the sea." — Jonah 1:12

Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it be licit to die by one's own hand.

Jerome, in the commentaries upon Jonah, so expounds this saying of the Prophet offering himself voluntarily to death, that he seems to hold it licit, in persecutions, for the sake of preserving chastity, to inflict death upon oneself with one's own hand. His words are these: "*It is not ours to snatch at death, but willingly to receive [death] inflicted by others; whence also in persecutions it is not licit to perish by one's own hand, except where chastity is imperilled — but [it is licit] to submit the neck to the striker.*" Of the same mind **Ambrose** is thought to have been: for he, in the third book *On Virgins*, responding to Marcellina his sister, inquiring of him concerning this matter, judges that the deaths of those women who — that they might safeguard their chastity — laid violent hands upon themselves, were martyrdoms; and he demonstrates this by the example of **Pelagia**, the virgin of Antioch, and of her two sisters, and their mother: of whom she [Pelagia], throwing down first the altars of the idols, slew herself with the sword; but the [mother and sisters] plunged themselves together into a river. But it is worthwhile to set down here the mind of Ambrose — although expressed in a somewhat more prolix narration — both for the elegant gravity of the sentences, and for the sharp little arguments by which he seems to persuade his assertion under the person of another:

(left column continues into the right column)

"*Now, to [thee] spreading the sails toward the end of the oration, thou askest, holy sister, what is to be thought concerning the merits of those who cast themselves down from a height, or plunged themselves into a river, lest they should fall into the hands of the persecutors — since the divine Scripture forbids a Christian to inflict violence upon himself. And indeed, concerning virgins placed in the necessity of guarding [chastity], we have a clear assertion, since there is extant an example of martyrdom.*[4] *Saint Pelagia was once, at Antioch, about fifteen years [old], a sister of virgins, and herself a virgin: she, at the first trumpet of the persecution shut up at home, when she saw herself beset by the robbers of [her] faith or of [her] modesty — [her] mother and sisters being absent, [she] void of protection, but the more full of God — 'What do we,' she says, 'unless captive virginity look to itself? Both [my] vow is [to die], and [my] fear is to die; because death is not [merely] received, but is taken up [freely]: let us die, if it be licit; or if they will not allow it to be licit, let us die. God is not offended by [this] remedy, and faith washes away the deed. Certainly, if we consider the very force of the name — what violence [is this]? a voluntary one? That is the more [truly] violence: to wish to die, and not to be able. Nor do we fear the difficulty; for who is there who wishes to die, and cannot, since there are ways so ready to death? For now I will overthrow the sacrilegious altars, cast down headlong, and extinguish the kindled hearths with [my] blood: I fear not lest [my] right hand, failing, strike not the blow, nor lest [my] breast withdraw itself from the pain; I will leave no sin to the flesh: I fear not*

◊ **4. Right margin:** Pelagia, and the death of the [mother's] daughters.

lest a sword be lacking: we can die by our own arms, we can die without the executioner's service.' On [her] mother's bosom she is said to have adorned [her] head, to have put on the nuptial garment, so that thou wouldst say [she was going] not to death, but to a bridegroom. But when the detestable persecutors saw the prey of [her] modesty snatched from them, they began to seek the mother and sisters; but they, by that spiritual flight, already held the field of chastity, when suddenly — the persecutors here pressing, and there [the way] being excluded from flight by a rushing torrent — shut up unto the crown [of martyrdom], 'What

do we fear?' they say: 'Behold water! Who forbids us to be baptized?[5] *And this is the baptism by which sins are forgiven, and the kingdoms [of heaven] are sought; and this is the baptism after which no one falls away. Let the water receive us, which is wont to regenerate; let the water receive us, which makes virgins; let the water receive us, which opens heaven, covers the weak, hides death, renders [us] martyrs. We pray thee, O Creator of things, that the water hold not the lifeless spirit*" →

◊ **5. Right margin:** Acts 8[:36]. [The virgins' cry "Behold water! who forbids us to be baptized?" echoes Acts 8:36; the printed "Act. 8, 8" is imprecise.]

[…continues on folio 618 (PDF p. 435): the rest of Ambrose's narration, and Sixtus's resolution on suicide for chastity (Annotatio CCLIII).]

(printed folio 618 [PDF p. 435]. ***Annot. CCLIII (concluded)*** *(Jonah 1:12): the suicide-for-chastity question — Eusebius on the Antiochene mother, her daughters, and the Roman matron Sophronia, all honored as martyrs; Augustine (*City of God *I) counters that suicide is never licit (bodily chastity is not lost while the soul stays pure); Sixtus resolves that their deaths were peculiar dispensations of the Holy Spirit, not to be imitated (cf. Razis) → folio 619.)*

(folio 618, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLIII (concluded)

"Take me up, and cast me into the sea." — Jonah 1:12

The Antiochene virgins laying hands upon themselves.

(Ambrose's narration of Pelagia's family concludes:) "…or the body; let not the wave disperse [them], lest death separate the corpses of those whose life affection did not separate: but let there be one constancy, one death, and also one burial.' Having said these things, and having tucked up [their garments] a little, the bosom being girt, that they might cover [their] modesty and not impede the step — [their] hands joined together as though they led choruses — they advance into the midst of the channel; and there where the wave [was] more torrential, where the depth [was] broken off, directing [their] steps thither, no one drew back [her] foot, no one checked [her] gait, no one hesitated where she should fix [her] step, anxious when the ground met [her], the ford dashed against, glad in the deep. Thou wouldst see the pious mother, tightening the knot of [her] hands, rejoice over [her] pledge, fear the chance, lest the flood should carry away from her the one or the other of the daughters. 'These victims,' she says, 'O Christ, I immolate to thee — guardians of virginity, leaders of chastity, companions of [thy] passion.' But who could by right wonder that there was so great a constancy in the living, since even in death they vindicated an immovable posture of the body? The wave stripped not the cadavers, nor did the swirls of the rapid current disturb [them]; nay, even the holy mother, although void of sense, still preserved the embrace of piety, and loosed not by death the religious knot which she had tightened: so that she might merit — by piety [as] heir — what she had owed to religion; for those [daughters] whom she had joined to martyrdom, she claimed even unto the tomb."

These things Ambrose: before whom **Eusebius**, bishop of Caesarea, shows himself to have been of the same opinion, who, among many martyrdoms of holy virgins described in the eighth book of the ecclesiastical history,[1] persuaded the same by the example — either the same, or a not-dissimilar one — of an Antiochene mother and daughters, in these words: "*There was a certain admirable woman, noble by birth, comely alike in beauty and in modesty, who had two virgin daughters, nourished to the rule of maternal modesty — rivals in beauty and likewise in morals, contending among themselves in probity. These, absent for the sake of avoiding the persecution, the soldiers sent for this very purpose compel to come to Antioch; but when, the soldiers urging [them] on, being set in a vehicle they journeyed, the religious and modest mother uses such*

words to [her] daughters: 'You know, most sweet daughters to me, in what discipline of God I have educated you: you know that, from [your] infancy, God has been to you father, God nourisher, God instructor; and that you have loved, equally with me, the good of modesty and chastity, so that not even your eye ever — as I am witness to you — was stained with a too-wanton look. What, therefore, do we now do? You see that all this violence studies either to [tear] us from God, or to separate [us] from [our] chastity. Shall the members, then, be prostituted to the public brothels — [members] which the almost public air itself has held unknown [kept hidden]? Nay, I pray, daughters: for neither is [our] faith in God so small to us that we should dread death, nor [is our] chastity so dejected that we should desire to live even with baseness; nay rather, if it please [you], [that] which you hold in all things, follow in this also the mother's example: let us forestall the impure hands of the executioners, and snatch away [ourselves from] the assaults of the unchaste, and let us condemn, by a pure and modest death, this world, which would compel us to an impure and unchaste [life], and would drag [us] on.' And when, by such exhortations, she saw [her] daughters kindled to a like purpose, they came to a certain river set in [their] way; where, when they had pretended to have gone down for the cause of human necessity, and the guards had withdrawn a little (natural reverence compelling [them]), their garments being diligently drawn together here and there, they cast themselves into the threatening rapid streams of the river. But also two other virgins, sisters, noble by birth, admirable in life, in the first flower of age, beautiful enough, but more beautiful in soul, adorned more with morals than with necklaces, exceedingly approvable in [their] pursuits, not bearing the violence

◊ **1. Left margin:** Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 8, chapter 24.

(left column continues into the right column)

to their chastity by public edicts and laws, plunged themselves into the sea-waves."

And again, in chapter 27 of the same volume, persisting in the same narration and opinion, he adds these: "*I think it not to be passed over in silence concerning that most noble woman in the city of Rome, Sophronia — admirable [in her deed] — whose husband, prefect of the city of Rome, lived under Maxentius the tyrant: who, when he had learned of the aforesaid woman's beauty (as was his custom), sending the ministers of debauchery, ordered the woman to be brought to him; she referred the matter to [her] husband, who, when he had discovered [it], revolving much with himself, at last groaning more deeply, 'And what,' he says, 'shall we do, by which these things must either be tolerated, or [our] life laid down?' Then she, when she saw [her] husband terrified by fear of death [seeming] to have betrayed her chastity, 'A little while,' she says, 'wait, [ye] who were sent, until, composed as is fitting, and adorned, I may come forth.' Thereupon, having entered [her] chamber, when first, on bended knees, she had prayed, as one about to immolate her chastity to God, she transfixed [her] breast and vitals with a seized dagger — sending, by the maidservants standing by, messengers of this sort to the tyrant: 'Such,' she says, 'is the woman that would please the tyrant.'*" Thus far Eusebius; whose opinion the whole Church of the Christians willingly seems to embrace — [the Church] which decreed for the aforesaid virgins, in testimony of [their] precious death, the perpetual honors of martyrdom.

But **Augustine**, in the first book *On the City of God*, treating this argument with a long discourse, established that there is absolutely no case in which it is licit to lay hands on oneself,[2] but [that] he becomes so much the more guilty who kills himself, as he was the more innocent in that cause for which he thought he must kill himself. But if thou say that this is licit, lest the integrity of virginity and chastity be lost, he responds that the chastity of the body, the chastity of the Soul remaining, is not lost:[3] because, since the chastity of the Soul is a virtue which is not numbered among the goods of the body (as are health and beauty), it follows that, the body of the woman being oppressed and violated, [the woman] whose mind remains incorrupt, her chastity does not perish. Accordingly, she who kills herself, that she may avoid the violence of another's lust, chooses a greater crime, that she may avoid a lesser sin. Finally, meeting those who opposed to him the aforesaid examples of holy women, he thus speaks in chapter 26 of the same book: "*But certain holy women, they say,*

in time of persecution — that they might escape the persecutors of their chastity — threw themselves into a river to be swept away and killed, and in this manner departed; and their martyrdoms in the Catholic Church are celebrated with most thronged veneration. Concerning these I dare judge nothing rashly. For whether the Church, by certain trustworthy testimonies, so honors their memory [as] the divine authority may have persuaded [it], I know not; and it could be that it is so. For what if they did this not humanly deceived, but divinely commanded — not erring, but obeying? — as concerning Samson[4] *it is not licit for us to believe otherwise. When, moreover, God commands, and signifies himself to command without any ambiguities, who shall call obedience into crime? who shall accuse the dutifulness of piety?*" Thus far Augustine; from which, inferring that the voluntary deaths of these virgins were peculiar economies [dispensations] of the divine will — not to be imitated by all, but by those only to whom it was singularly commanded by the certain and undoubted command of the Holy Spirit. See what we have written concerning **Razias** [Razis], killing himself, in book 8, in the confutation of the 12th heresy, argument 6.

◊ **2. Right margin:** For no cause is it licit to bring death upon oneself.

◊ **3. Right margin:** The chastity of the body, the chastity of the soul remaining, is not lost.

◊ **4. Right margin:** Judges 16:30.

[…folio 619 (PDF p. 436) opens a new annotation (catchword "AN—"): Annotatio CCLIV.]

(printed folio 619 [PDF p. 436]. ***Annot. CCLIV–CCLVI*** *(Jonah 3:4–Micah 6:1): the LXX's "three days" for the Hebrew "forty days" (Jerome; Theophylact excuses it);* ***the gourd-versus-ivy controversy*** *— Rufinus derides Jerome for turning κολοκύνθη into "ivy," and Jerome answers with the kikaion plant and his letter to Augustine on the Oea riot; and whether the guardian angels of nations are judged at the last day → folio 620.)*

(folio 619, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLIV [contents]

"Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." — Jonah 3:4

A passage badly translated by the Seventy.

The Seventy Interpreters, for that which in Hebrew is read ארבעים יום (*Arbaim yamim*), that is, "*forty days*," translated τρεῖς ἡμέραι, that is, "*Three days*": which **Jerome** so much wonders at — that they so rendered [it], when in Hebrew there is no community either of syllables, or of accents, or of the words [themselves], and the ternary number does not suit penitence, to which the number forty is more accommodated according to the sacred letters. Hence it happened that Chrysostom, and very many of the Greek expositors who followed the Septuagint edition, said various things upon this ternary number of days, [things] pertaining nothing to the truth of the Hebrew Scripture. **Theophylact**, in the commentaries upon Jonah, civilly excuses the error of the Septuagint interpreters in these words: "*It is to be observed here, that the other interpreters said forty days for three, and received it as a fitting number* — [reading it thus,] since in three days he first went round the whole city, then they offered that laborious Penitence of Nineveh to God, [and] afterward the Prophet, sitting before the gates of the city, awaited the end of his prophecy: whence also they say the space of forty days to be the truer [reading]. And yet it is likely that the Seventy first put forty days, and that those who at the beginning transcribed erred, and that afterward the error was diffused into all the copies. Nevertheless see, that neither to those taking [it as] three days does anything absurd befall: for neither was it necessary for the Prophet to go round the whole city, but, having at the same time set out on the journey of one day, preaching, that this preaching might be carried to all, and might reach even to the king himself, and that this grave and anxious penitence of the Ninevites might be shown, and received by God — there

sufficed, after the preaching, [some] days, whether we posit those three, or two: since indeed one day would have been enough to show that men had genuinely repented, and had put on a better mind.*" Thus far Theophylact.

Annotation CCLV [contents]

"And the Lord God prepared an ivy [a gourd]." — Jonah 4:6

On the ivy of Jonah.

Jerome, in the translation of this passage, was noted [criticized] by very many of the ancients, because, for that which the LXX interpreters translated κολοκύνθη, that is, "*a gourd*," he turned "*ivy*." **Rufinus**, in the second book of the Invectives, deriding him, says: "*After the world has grown old, and all things are urged toward the end, let us write even upon the sepulchres of the ancients — that they too may know, who here read otherwise — that Jonah did not have the shade of a gourd, but of ivy; and again, when the lawgiver shall have willed [it], not even ivy, but [the shade] of a shrub.*" **Augustine**, in the third [letter] to Jerome, jokes with an inserted fable. To each Jerome, rendering like for like, responds to Rufinus (his name being changed) thus, in the commentaries on Jonah: "*Canthelius — that is, a huge ass, slow and dull, of the most ancient race of the Cornelii, or, as he himself boasts, of the stock of Asinius Pollio — is long since said, at Rome, to have accused me of sacrilege, because for 'gourd' I translated 'ivy.' He feared, forsooth, lest, if for gourds ivy should be born, he might not have whence he might occultly and darkly drink; and in very truth, in those little gourd-vessels — which the common [people] call* saucomariae *[drinking-cups] — the [companions] of the Apostles are wont*

(left column continues into the right column)

to shadow forth images: whence also he took to himself a name not his own. But if vocables are so easily changed, that for 'Cornelii, seditious tribunes,' [one may write] 'Aemilii, consuls' — I wonder why it be not licit for me to translate 'ivy' for 'gourd.' But let us come to serious matters. For 'gourd,' or 'ivy,' we read in Hebrew קיקיון *(kikaion), which also in the Syriac and Punic tongue is called* elkeroa. *It is, moreover, a genus of shrub, or a little tree, having broad leaves in the manner of a vine-tendril, and a most dense shade, sustaining itself by its own trunk; which in Palestine grows most frequently, and especially in sandy places; and, in a wonderful manner, if thou cast the seed into the ground, it quickly, being nourished, springs up into a tree, and within a few days [that] which thou hadst seen a herb, thou findest a little tree. Whence also we, at the same time in which we were interpreting the Prophets, wished to express the name itself in the Hebrew tongue, because the Latin speech did not have this species of tree; but we feared the grammarians, lest they should find licence for caviling, and feign either beasts of India, or mountains of Boeotia, or certain portents of this sort: and so we followed the old translators, who also themselves interpreted 'ivy,' which in Greek is called κισσός; for they did not have whence they might say [it] otherwise.*"

These things Jerome, to Canthelius; but to Augustine, in the epistles, he writes back this passage in this manner: "*In an epistle of thine of this kind thou weavest a fable. A certain [bishop], our brother and fellow-bishop, when he had appointed thy interpretation to be read in the Church over which he presides, [something] put down far otherwise than it was — inveterate in the sense and memory of all, and chanted through so many successions of ages — [and thereupon] there was made so great a tumult in the people, especially the Greeks arguing and crying out the calumny of falsity, that the Bishop (for that city was Oea) was compelled to demand the testimony of the Jews. Whether these, by unskillfulness or by malice, responded that this was [so] in the Hebrew codices which the Greeks and Latins had, and were saying, is uncertain. Why [say] more? The man was compelled to correct [it] as though a lie, wishing, after the great peril, not to remain without a congregation. Whence also it seems to us that sometimes, in some things, thou too couldst be deceived. Thou sayest that I translated something badly in the prophet Jonah, and that, by a sedition of the people crying out on account of the dissonance of one word, the Bishop almost lost his priesthood. And*

what that is which I badly interpreted, thou withdrawest, taking away from me the occasion of my defense — lest, whatever thou shouldst say, it be dissolved by my responding: unless perhaps, as [it was] very many years ago, the gourd comes into the midst, [thou] asserting that in those times Cornelius and Asinius Pollio [charged] that I had translated 'ivy' for 'gourd,' upon which matter, in the commentary on the prophet Jonah, we have more fully responded. I ask, at the end of the epistle, that thou compel not a resting old man, and once a veteran, to militate again, and again to be imperilled concerning [his] life. Thou, who art young, and constituted in the pontifical summit, teach the peoples, and enrich the Roman households with the new fruits of Africa: it suffices me, with a hearer and a poor little reader, to whisper in a corner of the monastery."

Annotation CCLVI [contents]

"Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc. — Micah 6:1

Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment.

Jerome, opening the understanding of this clause, seems to imitate Origen, asserting that the Angels set over the care of men can err in their administration, and accordingly that they are to be set before the judge on the day of judgment, that, according to the merit of the care performed, they may [receive] punishments or →

[...continues on folio 620 (PDF p. 437): the rest of Jerome on the judgment of the guardian angels (Annotatio CCLVI).]

---

*(printed folio 620 [PDF p. 437]. **Annot. CCLVI (concl.)–CCLVIII** (Micah 6:1–Zephaniah 3:4): the "mountains" of Micah 6:1 are the angels over the nations, arraigned at the judgment; whether God has providence over the least creatures (Jerome, reconciled by Peter of Poitiers); and unworthy priests and the sacraments — the errors an objector draws (a wicked priest cannot consecrate) plus Calvin's fourth, answered by Gratian → folio 621.)*

(folio 620, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLVI (concluded)

"Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc. — Micah 6:1

(Jerome continues:) [that, according to the merit of the care performed, they may receive] punishments or rewards. His words, in the second commentary on Micah, thus read: "*Arise, and contend in judgment against the mountains — which [mountains] I think to signify no others than the Angels, to whom the administration of human affairs has been committed*[1] *— the Canticle of Deuteronomy agreeing in this very thing: 'When the Most High divided the nations, when he disseminated the sons of Adam, he constituted the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God.' These are administering spirits, sent for ministry for the sake of those who shall possess the inheritance of salvation.*[2] *And contend in judgment, that whether the mountains or the hills [higher or lower angels] shall have been found not worthily to have administered the peoples — either it may seem to be mine [my fault], who set such ones over [them], or the fault may be taken away from the people and referred to the princes. Let us read the Apocalypse of John the Apostle,*[3] *in which are praised and accused the Angels of the Churches for the virtues and vices of those over whom they are said to preside: for as it is sometimes the Bishop's fault, sometimes the people's, and often the master sins, often the disciple, and sometimes it is the father's fault, sometimes the son's — whether they be well or badly instructed: so in the judgment of God, [it will be] that the crime shall be referred to the Angels, if they have not done all the things which pertained to their office, or to the people, if — those [angels] doing all things — they have contemned to hear them.*" Thus far Jerome, who, although in many places he often assails this error, at present wrote these things from the mind of Origen — [Origen's name] being suppressed for

modesty, as is his custom, under the Origenic name: which also can be discerned from those things which not much below he added.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Hebrews 1[:14]; Deuteronomy 32:8. [The quoted "he constituted the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God" is Deuteronomy 32:8 (Septuagint); the printed "Deut. 3, 8" is a misprint for 32:8.]

◊ **2. Left margin:** Hebrews 1:14.

◊ **3. Left margin:** Revelation 2:2.

Thou wilt find Origen's opinion on this matter above, Annotation 126.

Annotation CCLVII [contents]

"Thy eyes are clean, that thou mayest not behold evil." — Habakkuk 1:13

Whether God has knowledge and providence of the least things.

Jerome, on the first chapter of the prophet Habakkuk, seems to affirm that God does not have a singular providence of irrational [creatures], and a peculiar and certain knowledge of each particular little animal, but bears the care of them only in general, and in the species. For thus he speaks: "*In the other animals we can indeed understand the general disposition and order of God, and the courses of things: for example, in what manner the multitude of fishes is born, and lives in the waters; in what manner reptiles [and] quadrupeds arise on the earth, and by what foods they are nourished. But it is absurd to draw down the majesty of God to this — that he should know, through single moments, how many gnats are born, [and] how many die; what is the multitude of bugs, and fleas, and flies on the earth; how many fishes swim in the water; and which of the smaller ought to fall as prey to the greater. Let us not be such foolish flatterers of God that, while we draw down his providence even to the lowest things, we be injurious to ourselves — saying that the providence of rational and of irrational [creatures] is the same.*"

But that this was not Jerome's [true] mind, the same [author's] explanation on Matthew chapter 10 shows,[4] where, expounding that, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and one of them shall not fall upon the ground without your Father?" he says: "*The sense is: If small and vile animals do not fall without God [as] author, and in all things there is always providence, and [those things] which are to perish among these do not perish without the will of God — you, who are eternal, ought not to fear that you live without the providence of God.*" And a little after: "*When it is said, 'Fear not therefore; you are of more value than many sparrows' — more manifestly the sense of our exposition is expressed, that we ought not to fear: because, if without God's knowledge small animals do not die, how much more [shall not] man? But as to what he says, 'The very hairs of your head are all numbered' — it shows the immense providence of God toward men, and signifies [his] ineffable affection: that nothing of ours lies hidden from God; even small and trifling things do not flee his knowledge.*"

◊ **4. Left margin:** Matthew 10:29.

(left column continues into the right column)

Peter of Poitiers, bishop, in the first book of the Sentences, distinction 39, demonstrates that Jerome's sayings are to be interpreted in a twofold manner. First, that he understand [Jerome to mean] that God does not so — alternately, particularly, and through the diverse moments of times — foresee all the least things, as [if], through various moments, some of them fail, [and] some begin; but by a single, indivisible, and sempiternal gaze knows all things at once and singly, however small — knows the number of gnats, and fleas, and flies, both being born and perishing, at each single moment. Secondly, that he wish it to be understood that God does not have the knowledge and providence of men and of brutes in the same and equal manner:[5] for to men he has given both precepts, and Angels for [their] custody; but to brutes [he administers] only those things which are of the body.

◊ **5. Right margin:** He does not have altogether the same manner of providence of mute animals and of men.

Annotation CCLVIII [contents]

"Her priests have polluted the sanctuary." — Zephaniah 3:4

On the power of the priesthood.

Jerome applies such an exposition to this sentence: "*The priests who serve the Eucharist, and divide the blood of the Lord to his people, act impiously in the law of Christ, thinking that the Eucharist [is made] by the imprecation of words, not by [the] life [of the priest], and that only a solemn prayer is necessary, and not the merits of the priests — of whom it is said: 'And the priest in whom there shall be a blemish shall not approach to offer the oblation to the Lord.'*" And a little after, expounding the same, he says: "*The priests who give Baptism, and at the Eucharist invoke the coming of the Lord, make the oil of chrism, impose hands, instruct catechumens, constitute Levites and other priests — let them not be indignant at us thus expounding, but let them act carefully, lest they be counted of the [number of] priests who violate the holy things of the Lord.*"

From these words of Jerome, the Scholastics and canonists have deduced three [errors], from the person of the opponent [that an objector might draw]: of which the first is, that the Sacrament of the Lord's body cannot be consecrated by a wicked Priest; the second, that it is lawful for any Priest [whatever] to confect the holy chrism of confirmation, and to impose hands on those who are confirmed; the third, that it is in the power of any Priest [whatever] to confer the sacred orders. A fourth error also, besides these, **Calvin** the heretic gathers, in chapter eighteen of his *Institution* — namely, that the Eucharist is to be exhibited to the laity under both species, from that [passage] where Jerome said: "*The priests divide the blood of the Lord to the peoples.*"

Gratian, in the Collectanea of the decrees, Cause 1, question 1, says that Jerome, in the first proposition, wished to signify that the life and merits of the Priest are necessary — not indeed to the consecration, but to the effect of the consecration. For although an impure and unworthy priest, by the virtue of the divine word, may complete the consecration of the sacrament most perfectly, yet he does not obtain the grace and virtue of the consecration, but rather prepares for himself judgment and condemnation; and in this manner also he admonishes that it is to be understood, that the Roman Pontiff **Gelasius** →

[…continues on folio 621 (PDF p. 438): Gelasius and the resolution on the power of unworthy priests (Annotatio CCLVIII).]

---

*(printed folio 621 [PDF p. 438]. **Annot. CCLVIII (concl.)–CCLXII** (Zephaniah 3:4–Malachi 1:1): unworthy priests (Gelasius, Aquinas); Origen's Trinity reading of the two olive-trees; whether Christians may swear (Jerome); whether Abraham's bosom and the hell of the damned are one (Jerome, Augustine, and Aquinas — one enclosure divided by the χάσμα); and whether an Angel wrote Malachi (Origen, rejected by Jerome) → folio 622.)*

(folio 621, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLVIII (concluded)

"Her priests have polluted the sanctuary." — Zephaniah 3:4

Gelasius wrote concerning this matter to Elpidius, saying: "*For the invoked celestial Spirit will not come to the consecration of the mystery, if the priest who prays him to be present be proved full of criminous actions.*" The divine **Thomas**, in the third part of the Summa of theology, question 82, article 5,[1] says, in these words, that the error of certain priests is reproved, who from this cause alone — that they are Priests — think that they rightly and worthily perform the consecration of the Eucharist, even though they be unclean

with the filth of sins; and according to this sense he interprets a not-dissimilar sentence of Dionysius the Areopagite, writing to Demophilus the monk, in these words: "*Perfectly has he fallen from the sacerdotal order who is not illuminated; and rash indeed does such a one seem to me, laying [his] hand upon the sacred rites, and [who] dares to pronounce impure infamies (for I will not say prayers) over the divine symbols in a Christ-like manner.*" **Peter**, bishop of Crete, in the fourth book on the Sentences, distinction 13, thinks that Jerome, in the second [and] third proposition — by "Priests who consecrate the oil of chrism, impose hands, and constitute priests and Levites" — understood Bishops; because from the sacrament of order they differ not from [simple] Priests, although in jurisdiction and dignity they are far distant.

◊ **1. Left margin:** Article 5. [St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica* III, question 82, article 5.]

Concerning the fourth proposition, see Annotation 268 of the sixth book.

Annotation CCLIX [contents]

"What are these two olive-trees, on the right of the candlestick, and on its left?" — Zechariah 4:3, 4

On the Trinity.

Origen, in the commentaries on Zechariah, interprets the two olive-trees [as] the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the lamp, or candlestick, which is in the midst of them, [as] God the Father. **Jerome**, in book 1 on Zechariah, confesses that he knows not how, without blasphemy, the Son and the Holy Spirit — the one on the right, the other on the left — may be so said.

Annotation CCLX [contents]

"Love not a false oath." — Zechariah 8:17

Whether it is licit for Christians to swear.

Jerome, in book 2 on Zechariah, on the occasion of this precept, seems to affirm that absolutely every oath is interdicted to Christians; for he speaks in this manner: "*'Love not a lying oath,' he says: the Lord in the Gospel commanding, 'But I say to you, that you swear not at all; but let your speech be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay':*[2] *for whosoever shall not have sworn will never be able to perjure. In precepts which pertain to life, and are manifest, we ought not to seek an allegory: lest, according to the comic [poet], we seek a knot in a bulrush.*" **John Arboreus** annotated this passage in [his] *Theosophia*.

◊ **2. Left margin:** Matthew 5:34, 37.

See below, Annotation 26 of the following book.

Annotation CCLXI [contents]

"Thou also, in the blood of thy testament, hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, in which there was no water." — Zechariah 9:11

Whether the bosom of Abraham and the hell of the damned are the same.

Jerome, in the second commentary on Zechariah, is thought to have placed the bosom of Abraham in the hell of the damned, and to have thought both [to be] the same; for there he put these words: "*'Thou also, in the blood,' etc. — which is thus understood: 'In the blood of thy passion [thou hast freed] those who were bound in the prison,*

(left column continues into the right column)

in which there is no mercy — by thy clemency thou hast freed [them].' And a little after: 'In the prefiguration of this pit, which did not have water, both Joseph was sent by [his] brothers into the pit, and Jeremiah [was cast] by the Chaldeans — not into the water of the pit, but into the mud; and into the mire the pit was sunk down, which could suffocate rather than refresh. Whence in the psalm it is written, 'I am fixed in the mud of

the deep, and there is no footing.[3] *In this pit of hell tarried that rich man once clothed in purple,*[4] *whose boastful tongue was burned with the burnings of punishments; and to such a degree he had no refreshment of the punishments, that he demanded the refreshment of the extreme finger of the poor man, dipped in water.*"

◊ **3. Right margin:** Psalm 68:3. [Vulgate Psalm 68 = Psalm 69 in the Hebrew numbering.]

◊ **4. Right margin:** Luke 16:24.

The divine **Augustine** — [in] epistle 57 to Dardanus, epistle 99 to Evodius, and in book 12 *On Genesis to the Letter* — seems to refute this opinion for a twofold cause: first, because in the Gospel there is said to be a vast chaos, and a deep and impassable gulf set between the bosom of Abraham (where Lazarus enjoyed solace) and Hell (where the rich man burned in torments); then, because, since in the sacred Letters nowhere is the name of the infernal [places] found to be taken in a good sense, it is not credible that that rest, in which Lazarus with the other souls of the holy Fathers rejoiced, was among the Infernal [places]. The Scholastic theologians teach that the bosom of Abraham and Hell are the same in situation, [but] differ in quality; [being] moreover enclosed by the same enclosure of a subterranean place — as Jerome rightly holds — each is comprised together, yet so that they are distinguished into a supreme and a lowest region by some interval. But the quality of each region is so diverse, that there [in the one] were of old the refreshments of pious souls, but here [in the other] are the perpetual punishments of the impious; and that [gulf], moreover, [is] χάσμα, that is, an immense gap, lying between each region — whether Augustine understood it corporeally, or spiritually, as a most firm law of God, as [it were] by a certain impermeable abyss prohibiting the commingling of these and those. Nothing prohibits but that the bosom of Abraham and Hell are comprehended in the same circuit of the earthly cavity.[5] But to that which Augustine says — that nowhere is Hell called in a good sense — **Thomas**, in the fourth volume of the Sentences, distinction 45, question 1, responds plainly in these words: "*The place and state of the holy Fathers, as to that which it had of good, was called the bosom of Abraham; but as to that which it had of defect, was called hell: and so neither is the bosom of Abraham taken in an evil sense, nor hell in a good sense — although in a certain manner they are one.*"

◊ **5. Right margin:** In what manner the bosom of Abraham and Hell differ.

Annotation CCLXII [contents]

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel, by the hand of Malachi," etc. — Malachi 1:1

Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi.

Origen, following the edition of the LXX — who, for that which in Hebrew is put בְּיַד־מַלְאָכִי (*Be-yad Malachi*), translated ἐν χειρὰ ἰγγέλου, that is, "*By the hand of the angel*" — asserted that the author of this book was an incarnate Angel; which **Jerome**, who thinks that the author of the volume was Ezra, indicated in the preface of Malachi in these words: "*Origen wrote three volumes upon this book, but he touched not the history [literal sense] at all; and, after his manner, being wholly occupied in the allegorical interpretation, he made no mention of Ezra, but, thinking [it] to have been an Angel who wrote [it] — according to that [saying] which we read concerning John,*[6] *'Behold, I send my angel before thy face' — which we altogether do not*" →

◊ **6. Right margin:** Matthew 11:10.

[…continues on folio 622 (PDF p. 439): the rest of Jerome against Origen on the authorship of Malachi, and the end of Liber Quintus (Annotatio CCLXII →).]

(printed folio 622 [PDF p. 439]. ***Annot. CCLXII (concl.)–CCLXIV — the end of Liber Quintus*** *(Malachi 1:1–2 Maccabees 7:41): Origen's fancy that John the Baptist, Malachi, and Haggai were incarnate Angels (rejected by Jerome); whether election and reprobation spring from foreknowledge of merits (Jerome vs. the*

Pelagians); and CCLXIV, the 264th and final annotation — whether the Maccabees' mother died of joy (Marius Victorinus's verse) or was martyred by Antiochus (Josephus, the Fathers' view). ***The Fifth Book here ends: "QVINTI LIBRI FINIS. F. Sixtus.")***

(folio 622 — the last folio of Liber Quintus; left column → right column)

Annotation CCLXII (concluded)

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel, by the hand of Malachi," etc. — Malachi 1:1

(Jerome against Origen concludes:) "*...[which we] altogether do not receive, lest we be compelled to admit the falls of Souls from heaven.*" And in the commentaries on Haggai, chapter 1, repeating the same more fully, he says: "*Certain [persons] think that John the Baptist, and Malachi (which is interpreted 'Angel of the Lord'), and Haggai were Angels, and, by the dispensation and command of God, assumed human bodies, and were conversant among men — nor [is it] a wonder that this was believed concerning Angels, since for our salvation even the Son of God assumed a human body. And for this cause also they furnish testimony from the apocrypha, where it is said that Jacob (who afterward was called Israel) was an angel, and that on that account he supplanted [his] brother in the womb of his mother; and that John, too, exulted at the voice of the mother of the Lord in the womb of Elizabeth; and that there is one nature of all rational [beings]; and that for this cause men who have pleased God are made equal to the Angels. Let those [persons] hold this opinion: but we [hold] otherwise.*" This passage is had in Origen, volume 2 on the Gospel of John, and in book 3 of the *Peri Archon*.

Annotation CCLXIII [contents]

"I have loved Jacob, but Esau I have hated." — Malachi 1:2, 3

Whether election and reprobation are from the foreknowledge of merits.

Jerome, in the commentary on Malachi, explaining this, seems not to be far from the opinion of the Pelagians, saying that election and reprobation arise from the foreknowledge of merits, since indeed he writes in this manner: "*Moreover, the love and hatred of God arises either from the foreknowledge of things to come, or from works: otherwise we know that God loves all things, and hates nothing of those [things] which he created; but properly he vindicates to his love those who are enemies of the vices, and rebels [against them]; and, on the contrary, he hates those who desire to build up again the [things] destroyed by God.*"

See below, Annotation 251 of book 6.

Annotation CCLXIV [contents]

"But last of all, after the sons, the mother also was consumed," etc. — 2 Maccabees 7:41

Whether the mother of the Maccabees died of joy.

Marius Victorinus, the preceptor of St. Jerome, in the book on the Maccabees which

(left column ends; the right column concludes:)

he composed in heroic verse, expressing the sense of that word "*Consumpta est*" [she was consumed] — for which in the Greek is had ἐτελεύτησεν [she died] — seems to indicate that the mother of the Maccabees did not perish, slain by the hands of the executioners, but that, after the slaughter of the last and younger son, [she died] the amplitude of joy and gladness being exhausted [i.e., overcome by an excess of joy]: since, on account of the triumphs obtained over death by [her] seven sons, she had conceived [so great a joy]; which sentiment he not inelegantly expressed in these verses:

While the boy bears these things, the joys undid the mother. And now, as she was, unstrung by [her] woes, now with voice failing, Sighing, and collapsed amid the hands of her own, She fell down lifeless, and [her] loosened limbs grew still. So she too, with [her] sons, was received into the portion of the saints. (Dum puer ista gerit soluerunt gaudia matrem. / Iamque, ut erat laxata malis, iam voce negata / Suspirans, interque manus collapsa suorum, / Concidit exanimis, resolutaque membra quierunt. / Sic ipsa, & nati sanctorum in parte recepta est.)

This sense, although the historical record does not reject it (for Livy also has handed down to memory that, after the noble battle at Trasimene, two mothers, their sons being received back unexpectedly, were extinguished by excessive joy)[1] — nevertheless all ecclesiastical writers hand down that she was killed by the lictors with various tortures and torments, according to Polybius of Megalopolis, who writes these things concerning her: "*Last of all, her single sons being consumed, the admirable parent of such great champions, in the cruel butchery of punishments, suddenly, [her] knees being bent, besought from God the dissolution of the body: for [she had drawn out the time] not by desire of living, but had prolonged so much time only for the sake of [her] sons. Antiochus, therefore, gnashing [in his throat], orders the noble mother to be afflicted; she is snatched away tyrannically, is stripped in [her] tender limbs, [her] hands are bound aloft, the old woman is struck with scourges, she mourns with wounded breasts; and, condemned to the frying-pan of flame, she of her own accord accompanies her burnt sons into the punishments, and, extended in prayer, and [her] hands raised up as though for child-bearing mothers, being poured out [prostrate], she poured forth [her] chaste spirit.*" This opinion of Josephus all the Christian Fathers receive, as it is said, with open arms.

◊ **1. Right margin:** The mother of the Maccabees was killed by the lictors.

QVINTI LIBRI FINIS.

[THE END OF THE FIFTH BOOK.]

— F. Sixtus [Senensis]

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VI

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

---

(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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 114 of the fifth book [the print gives "113", an error of the press: the Thamar annotation is the 114th].

(right column:)

Annotation III [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"…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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

(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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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

(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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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] [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 episēmon [ϛ] 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 episēmon [ϛ], 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 episēmon [ϛ], 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 [ϛ], made the sixth hour out of the third.

Annotation CXXXII [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [kecharitōmenē], 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 156 [the print gives "153", an error of the press: the annotation on Arnobius and the sanctification of the Virgin is the 156th].

[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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 καᾶ ὶλλους ἑβδομήκοντα δύο κηρύττειν, ἐξ ὧν ἦσαν οἑ ἱπτά, οἑ ἱπὶ τῶν χηρῶν τεταγμένοι, Στέφανος, Φίλιππος, Πρόχορος, Νικάνωρ, Τίμων, Παρμενᾶς, καὶ Νικόλαος, πρὸ τούτων ἢ Ματθίας, ἀ όντἸ ìούδα συμψηφισθεὶς μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων· μετὰ τούτους ἢ τοὺς ἑπτὰ καὶ Ματθίαν τὸν πρὸ αὐτῶν, Μάρκον, Λουκᾶν, Ἰοῦστον, Βαρνάβαν, καἈ ìπελλῆν, 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 108 [the print gives "107", an error of the press: the annotation on the stars as living beings is the 108th].

Annotation CLXIX [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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.]* ὢ ὀν 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 Θεού 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

[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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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, "ἀἘν 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 ἀὲν 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 ἀὲν 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 ἀ῾Εν [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 ἀ῾Εν 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [merikḗn] — 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 prothýrōn] — 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 [contents]

"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 δὰ ἐλλαγησόμεθα — 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [epignṓsei autoû], some understand thus: that between γνῶσις [gnôsis] and ἐπίγνωσις [epígnōsis] — 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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]

[margin: Whether the angels, before the passion of Christ, knew the mystery of redemption.]

(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.

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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [hypomonḗn] — 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 [hypomonḗ] — 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* [tiqwāh], that is, "expectation"; but among the Greeks Μακροθυμία [makrothymía], that is, "longanimity," or ἀνοχή [anochḗ] — 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 καᾶ ὶνθρωπον [Theòn kaì ánthrōpon], 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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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 [contents]

"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.

SUBJECT INDEX

Both books, in one taxonomy. Each annotation appears under every theme it touches; 5· numbers are Book V (Old Testament), 6· numbers Book VI (New Testament). All are clickable.

GOD, TRINITY, CHRIST

Christ — person & work 5·XCIX, 5·CII, 5·CXVII, 5·CXIX, 5·CXLIII, 5·CLX, 5·CLXI, 5·CLXII, 5·CLXV, 5·CLXXXII, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CCIX, 5·CCXX, 5·CCXXIII, 5·CCXXXIV

Christology (Christ's person, natures, soul, body) 6·X, 6·XIII, 6·XVIII, 6·XXX, 6·LI, 6·LXI, 6·LXXIV, 6·XCII, 6·XCVIII, 6·CV, 6·CX, 6·CXI, 6·CXIV, 6·CXVIII, 6·CXIX, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXV, 6·CXXVI, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXIV, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXXXIX, 6·CXLI, 6·CXLIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CLI, 6·CLX, 6·CLXII, 6·CLXIV, 6·CLXX, 6·CLXXXV, 6·CLXXXVI, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCI, 6·CCIV, 6·CCXIII, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXLIV, 6·CCXCIII, 6·CCXCIX, 6·CCCXX, 6·CCCXXIX, 6·CCCXXXI

God & the Holy Trinity 5·I, 5·II, 5·VII, 5·XVIII, 5·C, 5·CXXX, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXXXV, 5·CXLIII, 5·CXLIV, 5·CXLVI, 5·CLVIII, 5·CLXVIII, 5·CXCVI, 5·CCXXII, 5·CCLVII, 5·CCLIX

Knowledge of God; divine attributes & the mysteries 6·CLXVII, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CCXVII, 6·CCXXXI, 6·CCCXII

Procession of the Holy Spirit / Filioque 6·CLXXII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXVI, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CLXXXVIII, 6·CCVIII, 6·CCXI, 6·CCCXXVIII

The Trinity; equality of the divine persons 6·VI, 6·XIV, 6·XV, 6·XVI, 6·XXXIX, 6·XLIV, 6·LXXXVIII, 6·XCIV, 6·C, 6·CIII, 6·CLXIX, 6·CLXXI, 6·CCXXXV, 6·CCCXLII

CREATION & THE COSMOS

Creation & the cosmos 5·II, 5·III, 5·IV, 5·IX, 5·X, 5·XI, 5·XII, 5·XIII, 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XIX, 5·XXII, 5·XXIII, 5·XXIV, 5·LXIX, 5·LXXX, 5·LXXXI, 5·CV, 5·CVIII, 5·CXV, 5·CXLVII, 5·CCXII, 5·CCXIII, 5·CCXLII

GRACE, JUSTIFICATION, PREDESTINATION

Adam, Eve, the Fall & original sin 5·XX, 5·XXI, 5·XXVII, 5·XXIX, 5·XXXI, 5·XLIII, 5·XLIV, 5·XLV, 5·XLVI, 5·XLVII, 5·XLIX, 5·L, 5·LI, 5·LII, 5·LIII, 5·LIV, 5·LXIII, 5·LXXV, 5·LXXVI, 5·LXXVII, 5·CLXXVII, 5·CLXXVIII, 5·CLXXIX, 5·CLXXX

Free will; the beginning of salvation 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXIII

Grace, free will, merit & predestination 5·VI, 5·CI, 5·CXXXII, 5·CXXXVIII, 5·CXLV, 5·CLIX, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXXI, 5·CLXXXIII, 5·CXCII, 5·CXCIII, 5·CXCV, 5·CXCVII, 5·CXCVIII, 5·CXCIX, 5·CC, 5·CCXVII, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXV, 5·CCXL, 5·CCLXIII

Justification; faith & works; 'faith alone' 6·XLIII, 6·LI, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CXC, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCII, 6·CXCIV, 6·CC, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXV, 6·CCXVI, 6·CCXXXII, 6·CCXXXIII, 6·CCXXXIV

Merit; grace, nature & impeccability 6·XX, 6·XL, 6·XLVI, 6·LXIII, 6·LXXXVII, 6·LXXXIX, 6·XCVII, 6·XCIX, 6·CI, 6·CVII, 6·CLXXXI, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLV, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLXX, 6·CCLXXXI, 6·CCLXXXV

Original sin 6·CCIX, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXVII, 6·CCXXXVIII, 6·CCXL, 6·CCXLII, 6·CCXLV, 6·CCCIX

Predestination, reprobation & foreknowledge 6·XLVI, 6·LII, 6·XCIX, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXXX, 6·CCXLVIII, 6·CCXLIX, 6·CCL, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLII, 6·CCLXX, 6·CCLXXXV

CHURCH, MINISTRY, AUTHORITY

Bishop, presbyter & holy orders 6·CCXXV, 6·CCC, 6·CCCI, 6·CCCXVIII, 6·CCCXIX, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXV

Clergy: temporal power, immunity & possessions 6·XXXVI, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXV, 6·LXXVI, 6·XCV, 6·CXXI, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CCCXXI

Heresy: coercion, excommunication & anathema 6·LX, 6·LXXVIII, 6·CCLXVII

Papal primacy (Peter & Paul) 6·LXXII, 6·CXVIII, 6·CLX, 6·CCVI, 6·CCXXI, 6·CCLIII, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCLXXI, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXV

The Church, clergy & discipline 5·CXVIII, 5·CXXII, 5·CLXXVI, 5·CCIII, 5·CCXLIII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCLVIII

The Church: its nature, marks & members 6·XXXVIII, 6·XLII, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXIX, 6·CIV, 6·CCCV

The power of the keys; priestly absolution 6·XLV, 6·LV, 6·LXX, 6·LXXI, 6·CVIII, 6·CCII

SACRAMENTS

Baptism; rebaptism; unbaptized catechumens 6·XI, 6·XII, 6·XVII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCCXI

Extreme unction 6·CCCXXXIX

Matrimony as a sacrament 6·IV, 6·XXIII, 6·CCCVII

Penance, confession & the remission of sins 6·XXVIII, 6·LVI, 6·LVII, 6·CXIX, 6·CXLII, 6·CLIII, 6·CLIV, 6·CLV, 6·CLXI, 6·CXCIX, 6·CCII, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCLXI, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXVI, 6·CCCXLIII

Sin, penance, confession & the keys 5·XVI, 5·LXII, 5·CLXXIII, 5·CLXXIV, 5·CLXXV, 5·CCV, 5·CCXLI, 5·CCLI

The Eucharist; communion under both kinds 6·XXI, 6·LXVI, 6·CXI, 6·CXII, 6·CXIII, 6·CXCIII, 6·CXCV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXXIX

The sacraments 5·LXXXV, 5·XCVI, 5·XCVII, 5·CXX, 5·CXXI, 5·CLII, 5·CLXIII, 5·CLXIV, 5·CXCIV, 5·CCLVIII

THE LAST THINGS

End of the world; the state & conflagration of the heavens 6·LXXIII, 6·CCXLV, 6·CCCXXX, 6·CCCXXXIV, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLI

Hell, purgatory, limbo & the purging fire 5·XXXIX, 5·XLII, 5·XCIII, 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXVII, 5·CXLI, 5·CLXV, 5·CLXX, 5·CLXXI, 5·CLXXXVIII, 5·CCII, 5·CCXIV, 5·CCXXV, 5·CCXXIX, 5·CCXXX, 5·CCLII, 5·CCLXI

Hell; eternity of punishment; apocatastasis 6·XLI, 6·CCXLVII, 6·CCXLVIII, 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCV

Purgatory & the expiatory fire 6·CCLIV, 6·CCLVIII, 6·CCLIX

Resurrection of the body; whether all die; the millennium 6·XCI, 6·CLI, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCCXLVI, 6·CCCXLVII

The end of the world & millenarianism 5·CXC, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLVI, 5·CCXLVIII

The intermediate state; whether souls see God before judgment 6·XC, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXLV

The vision of God & the state of souls after death 5·XL, 5·XLI, 5·LXIV, 5·LXXVIII, 5·CXXVII, 5·CXXVIII, 5·CXXXIX, 5·CXL, 5·CLXIX, 5·CCXXI, 5·CCXXVIII

ANGELS, DEMONS & THE SOUL

Angels & demons 5·V, 5·VIII, 5·XVII, 5·LVII, 5·LVIII, 5·LX, 5·LXX, 5·LXXI, 5·LXXII, 5·LXXIII, 5·LXXVII, 5·XC, 5·XCV, 5·CII, 5·CXXVI, 5·CXLII, 5·CXLVII, 5·CCXV, 5·CCXVI, 5·CCXXIV, 5·CCLVI, 5·CCLXII

Angels (nature, orders, guardian angels) 6·VII, 6·LIII, 6·LXV, 6·LXXVII, 6·CXXXV, 6·CXLII, 6·CXLIX, 6·CL, 6·CLIX, 6·CLXV, 6·CLXX, 6·CLXXXIX, 6·CCXCII, 6·CCXCVI, 6·CCXCIX, 6·CCCII, 6·CCCVIII, 6·CCCXIII, 6·CCCXX, 6·CCCXXIII

Demons (their bodies; whether restored or saved) 6·XIX, 6·CXVII, 6·CCXCIV, 6·CCXCV, 6·CCXCVIII, 6·CCCII

The human being: body, soul & bodily goods 6·XXXV, 6·XXXVII, 6·XLVIII, 6·LXXXIV

The human soul 5·XXVI, 5·XXVIII, 5·XXX, 5·XXXII, 5·XCV, 5·CVIII, 5·CXLII, 5·CXLVIII, 5·CLXXXIV, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CLXXXIX, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCIX, 5·CCX, 5·CCXXXVI, 5·CCXXXVII

ORIGENIST ERRORS

Pre-existence & imprisonment of souls 6·CLXVI, 6·CLXXVII, 6·CLXXXVI, 6·CCIII, 6·CCIV, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCXCI, 6·CCXCVII

Restoration of all (apocatastasis) 6·LXVII, 6·CCCIII, 6·CCCVI

Stars ensouled; God the 'form' of things; sin as 'nothing' 6·CLXVII, 6·CLXVIII, 6·CLXXIV, 6·CCXCIII

SAINTS, MARY, VENERATION

Invocation, intercession & merits of the saints 6·XLVII, 6·LXXXV, 6·CLXIII, 6·CCXXVII, 6·CCLXXX, 6·CCLXXXIII, 6·CCCX, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXLV

Mariology; the Holy Family; the 'brethren of the Lord' 6·II, 6·III, 6·V, 6·LVIII, 6·LIX, 6·LXII, 6·LXIV, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXXIII, 6·CXXXVI, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXXXIX, 6·CXL, 6·CLXXXV, 6·CCXXVIII, 6·CCLXXII

Relics, images & amulets 6·CII, 6·CCXLVI

The Virgin Mary, the saints & sacred images 5·CIV, 5·CLIII, 5·CLIV, 5·CLVI, 5·CCXLVII

SCRIPTURE

Canon & canonicity 6·CCLXII, 6·CCCXXVII, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXLIV

Clarity vs. obscurity of Scripture 6·CCCXVI

Reading heretical books; the Index 6·CCLXVI

Scripture — canon, authorship & the sense of Scripture 5·LV, 5·CXXIX, 5·CXLIV, 5·CXLIX, 5·CLVII, 5·CXCI, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXVIII, 5·CCXIX, 5·CCXXXVIII, 5·CCXLV, 5·CCXLIX, 5·CCL, 5·CCLXII, 5·CCLXIV

Scripture — text & translation 5·LXV, 5·LXVI, 5·LXVII, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXIV, 5·LXXIX, 5·LXXXII, 5·LXXXIII, 5·LXXXIV, 5·LXXXVIII, 5·CIII, 5·CVI, 5·CIX, 5·CX, 5·CXII, 5·CXVI, 5·CXXV, 5·CXXXIII, 5·CXXXVI, 5·CL, 5·CLI, 5·CLV, 5·CCI, 5·CCVI, 5·CCVII, 5·CCXX, 5·CCXXIII, 5·CCXXVI, 5·CCLIV, 5·CCLV

Text-criticism, authenticity & punctuation 6·LXI, 6·CXXIX, 6·CXXXII, 6·CXLIII, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CXCVIII, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXVI, 6·CCXLI, 6·CCXLV, 6·CCLXXVII

Vernacular Bible reading; who may read Scripture 6·I, 6·CLII, 6·CLXXX, 6·CLXXXIII, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCCXV

MORALS, DISCIPLINE, SOCIETY

Blasphemy & its punishment 6·CCCXXII

Christian ethics: love, injury & forgiveness 6·XXVII, 6·XXXII, 6·XXXIV, 6·CCLXXXIV

Magic, astrology & superstition 6·IX

Magic, witchcraft, astrology & the evil eye 6·VIII, 6·IX, 6·X, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCCXIV

Marriage, divorce & impediments 6·XXII, 6·XXIV, 6·LXIV, 6·LXXIX, 6·LXXX, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·CCLX

Monastic life, manual labor & mendicancy 6·XVIII, 6·XXXIII, 6·LXXXVI, 6·CXXVIII, 6·CXLVII, 6·CCLXXIX, 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXXII

Moral, practical & historical questions 5·XXV, 5·XLVIII, 5·LIX, 5·LXI, 5·LXXXVI, 5·LXXXVII, 5·LXXXIX, 5·XC, 5·XCI, 5·XCII, 5·XCIV, 5·XCVIII, 5·CVII, 5·CXI, 5·CXIII, 5·CXIV, 5·CXVI, 5·CXXIII, 5·CXXIV, 5·CLXVI, 5·CLXXII, 5·CLXXXVII, 5·CCIV, 5·CCXXVII, 5·CCXXXI, 5·CCXXXIX, 5·CCLIII, 5·CCLX

Oaths & swearing 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·CXXIII, 6·CCXXIII, 6·CCXXIV, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCCXXXVIII

Prayer, liturgy & worship 6·XXIX, 6·XXXI, 6·XCVI, 6·CCCIV, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXXVI

The Law: Mosaic & natural 6·LIV, 6·LXXIX, 6·CI, 6·CCXLIII, 6·CCLXXIII

War, the sword, trade & almsgiving 6·LXXXIII, 6·XCV, 6·CVI, 6·CXV, 6·CXVI, 6·CLVI, 6·CLVII, 6·CLVIII, 6·CCLVI

BIBLICAL HISTORY, PERSONS & REALIA

Gospel history, persons & antiquities 6·XLIX, 6·L, 6·LXII, 6·XCII, 6·XCIII, 6·CIX, 6·CXX, 6·CXXII, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXVII, 6·CXXX, 6·CXLIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CCV, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXXII, 6·CCXXIX

The earthly Paradise 5·XXXIII, 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXV, 5·XXXVI, 5·XXXVII, 5·XXXVIII, 5·LVI

INDEX OF PERSONS

Fathers, Doctors, interpreters, and adversaries discussed in either book. 5· = Book V (Old Testament), 6· = Book VI (New Testament).

Agrippa, Cornelius 5·LXXIII · 6·CXXV, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCCXLV

Alcuin 6·LXV

Ambrose of Compsa (Catharinus) 5·I, 5·IV, 5·VII, 5·XXXVI, 5·LIX, 5·LXI, 5·C, 5·CLVII, 5·CLXVIII, 5·CXCVI · 6·IX, 6·XVIII, 6·XXXII, 6·LII, 6·LVII, 6·LXI, 6·LXXVII, 6·LXXVIII, 6·LXXIX, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·LXXXVI, 6·XCVII, 6·CI, 6·CXI, 6·CXXVIII, 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXII, 6·CXLIII, 6·CLIX, 6·CLXIX, 6·CXCVII, 6·CXCVIII, 6·CCI, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXXV, 6·CCXLVIII, 6·CCLII, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXI, 6·CCLXII, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXVII, 6·CCXCIV, 6·CCCVII, 6·CCCXXVII, 6·CCCXXX, 6·CCCXXXI, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLII

Ambrose of Milan 5·I, 5·II, 5·IV, 5·V, 5·VII, 5·XXIV, 5·XXXV, 5·XLIX, 5·LVIII, 5·LIX, 5·LXI, 5·LXII, 5·LXIV, 5·LXX, 5·LXXVII, 5·XCII, 5·XCIV, 5·XCVIII, 5·C, 5·CV, 5·CXIV, 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXLVII, 5·CLVII, 5·CLXVIII, 5·CLXXI, 5·CXC, 5·CXCVI, 5·CCIV, 5·CCV, 5·CCXL, 5·CCXLVII, 5·CCLIII · 6·XIII, 6·XXVI, 6·LXXIII, 6·CV, 6·CIX, 6·CXXXIV, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLVIII, 6·CLX, 6·CLXI, 6·CLXII, 6·CLXIV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCIX, 6·CCXLV, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXLV

Ambrosiaster (pseudo-Ambrose) 6·LXXXI, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXII, 6·CCLXXIII, 6·CCXCVIII, 6·CCC, 6·CCCXXIV

The Anabaptists (Balthasar Hubmaier) 5·CLXIX, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XXVI, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCCXLV

Anatolius 6·CCCXLVII

Anselm 6·CCXXXV, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXV

Anselm of Laon 6·CCLV

Apollinaris 5·CXXIII, 5·CCXXXIII · 6·CIV, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCCXLVII

Aquinas, Thomas 5·V, 5·VIII, 5·IX, 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XX, 5·XXIV, 5·XXX, 5·XXXII, 5·XXXVIII, 5·XL, 5·XLVII, 5·XCII, 5·XCIV, 5·XCVI, 5·CVIII, 5·CXXXVII, 5·CXXXIX, 5·CXLI, 5·CLXI, 5·CLXIII, 5·CLXVI, 5·CLXXVI, 5·CLXXXVII, 5·CLXXXVIII, 5·CCV, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXII, 5·CCXXV, 5·CCXXVII, 5·CCXL, 5·CCXLI, 5·CCLVIII · 6·III, 6·VI, 6·VII, 6·X, 6·XIII, 6·XXVI, 6·XXVIII, 6·XXX, 6·XXXIII, 6·XLI, 6·XLVII, 6·LXII, 6·LXXI, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXIV, 6·LXXIX, 6·LXXXIX, 6·XCV, 6·XCVIII, 6·CII, 6·CXI, 6·CXVII, 6·CXXI, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXLV, 6·CXLVII, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXVII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CXCV, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXIII, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXVII, 6·CCXLIX, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLV, 6·CCLVIII, 6·CCCIV, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXLI

Arator 6·CCXXII, 6·CCXXV

Arethas 6·CCCXLV

Arnobius 5·CLVI, 5·CLXXVII, 5·CXCVII, 5·CCLI · 6·CXXXVI, 6·CCXXXVII

Athanasius 5·I, 5·VIII, 5·CLVIII, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XXVI, 6·LIII, 6·LVI, 6·CXXII, 6·CXXIII, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CLXXXVII

Augustine 5·I, 5·II, 5·III, 5·V, 5·VI, 5·VII, 5·VIII, 5·X, 5·XIII, 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XX, 5·XXI, 5·XXII, 5·XXIV, 5·XXV, 5·XXVII, 5·XXVIII, 5·XXX, 5·XXXI, 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXVI, 5·XL, 5·XLI, 5·XLII, 5·XLIII, 5·XLIV, 5·XLV, 5·XLIX, 5·L, 5·LI, 5·LII, 5·LVIII, 5·LXVI, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXIII, 5·LXXVII, 5·LXXXV, 5·LXXXVII, 5·LXXXIX, 5·XCI, 5·XCII, 5·XCIV, 5·XCVI, 5·XCVIII, 5·CIV, 5·CV, 5·CVII, 5·CVIII, 5·CXIV, 5·CXX, 5·CXXX, 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXII, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXXXVII, 5·CXXXIX, 5·CXLI, 5·CLII, 5·CLX, 5·CLXII, 5·CLXIII, 5·CLXV, 5·CLXVI, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXIX, 5·CLXX, 5·CLXXI, 5·CLXXXIII, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CLXXXVIII, 5·CXC, 5·CXCI, 5·CXCIII, 5·CXCIV, 5·CXCV, 5·CXCVII, 5·CCV, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXIII, 5·CCXVII, 5·CCXVIII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXL, 5·CCLIII, 5·CCLV, 5·CCLXI · 6·VI, 6·X, 6·XIII, 6·XX, 6·XXII, 6·XXIV, 6·XXV, 6·XXVIII, 6·XXX, 6·XXXI, 6·XXXIII, 6·XXXIV, 6·XXXV, 6·XXXVI, 6·XXXVII, 6·XXXVIII, 6·XLI, 6·XLVII, 6·LI, 6·LX, 6·LXIII, 6·LXIV, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXIII, 6·LXXVI, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXVI, 6·LXXXVII, 6·LXXXIX, 6·CI, 6·CIV, 6·CV, 6·CIX, 6·CXX, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXLV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXVII, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CLXXIV, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CLXXXVI, 6·CXCIII, 6·CXCIV, 6·CXCV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCI, 6·CCVI, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXIII, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXI, 6·CCXXXV, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCXLI, 6·CCXLVI, 6·CCXLIX, 6·CCL, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLII, 6·CCLV, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCLXXX, 6·CCLXXXI, 6·CCLXXXIV, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCCIV, 6·CCCXI,

6·CCCXII, 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLIII, 6·CCCXLV

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos 5·IV, 5·XXXVI, 5·LII, 5·LXV, 5·LXVI, 5·LXXXIII, 5·CXVI, 5·CXXIII, 5·CXXIV, 5·CXXV, 5·CXXX, 5·CXXXIII

Basil 5·II, 5·V, 5·VII, 5·VIII, 5·XI, 5·XVII, 5·XXIV, 5·XXXIV, 5·CVIII, 5·CXLVII, 5·CLXXI, 5·CXCIX, 5·CCXII, 5·CCXXIV, 5·CCXLIII · 6·X, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXXV, 6·LXXXIX, 6·CXI, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCCVII

Beatus Rhenanus 6·CLIV

Bede 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXVIII, 5·LXVIII, 5·XCVI, 5·CCXL, 5·CCXLIV · 6·LXII, 6·CIX, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXLIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CLIV, 6·CLXII, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXXV, 6·CCXXIX, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXLI, 6·CCCXLIII

Bernard 5·VIII, 5·XCVI, 5·CXIX, 5·CXCII, 5·CCXV, 5·CCXVI, 5·CCXVII · 6·LXXII, 6·LXXXIX, 6·CIX, 6·CXVIII, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CLVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCCXLV

Bertram 6·CXCVI, 6·CCLXXXIX

Bodius 5·CXVIII, 5·CXX, 5·CLII, 5·CXCV, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXV · 6·XXVII, 6·LX, 6·CVII, 6·CCII

Boniface 6·CLVI, 6·CXCVI

Brie, Germain de 6·CCLIII, 6·CCLXXI

Bucer, Martin (Bodius) 5·CXVIII, 5·CXX, 5·CLII, 5·CXCV, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXV

Bunderius, John (Bonderius) 5·CXL, 5·CCXIV · 6·LXIX, 6·CCXXI

Cajetan, Thomas de Vio 5·I, 5·V, 5·VII, 5·XLVI, 5·XLVII, 5·C, 5·CVIII, 5·CXX, 5·CLVII, 5·CLXI, 5·CLXVIII, 5·CXCVI, 5·CCI, 5·CCXLIV · 6·IX, 6·XIII, 6·XIV, 6·XVIII, 6·XXXII, 6·LII, 6·LVII, 6·LXI, 6·LXII, 6·LXIV, 6·LXXVII, 6·LXXVIII, 6·LXXIX, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·LXXXVI, 6·XCVII, 6·CI, 6·CXI, 6·CXXVIII, 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXII, 6·CXLIII, 6·CLIX, 6·CLXIX, 6·CXCVII, 6·CXCVIII, 6·CCI, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXXV, 6·CCXXVI, 6·CCXXIX, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXI, 6·CCLXII, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCXCIV, 6·CCCVII, 6·CCCXXVII, 6·CCCXXXI, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXLII, 6·CCCXLIV

Calvin, John 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXIV, 5·CLXXV, 5·CXCII, 5·CCXVII, 5·CCLVIII · 6·XI, 6·LXXII, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCCXVII

Cassian, John 5·VIII, 5·LXXIII, 5·CVII, 5·CLXXV · 6·XXXI, 6·XXXV, 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLXXIV

Castro, Alfonso de 5·XXIX, 5·LXXXVII, 5·XCI · 6·LXXI, 6·CXLVII, 6·CLXIII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXLV

Cerinthus 5·XVII, 5·CCXXXIII · 6·CCCXLVII

Christian Druthmar 5·XIII, 5·XV, 5·XVIII, 5·XXXVI, 5·XLVIII, 5·LII, 5·CVII, 5·CXVIII, 5·CXX, 5·CXXX, 5·CLXVI, 5·CXC, 5·CXCVIII, 5·CCIV, 5·CCVI, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXVIII, 5·CCXXIX, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCXLVI, 5·CCXLVII, 5·CCLIII, 5·CCLX, 5·CCLXIV · 6·X, 6·XIII, 6·XVII, 6·XVIII, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·XXVII, 6·XXIX, 6·XL, 6·XLII, 6·XLVII, 6·L, 6·LI, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXVI, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·LXXXIII, 6·XCV, 6·CIV, 6·CIX, 6·CXI, 6·CXII, 6·CXV, 6·CXVI, 6·CXVII, 6·CXXIII, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLVIII, 6·CLXII, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXIII, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXI, 6·CCXXIV, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLVI, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXIX, 6·CCLXXXIV, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXL

Chromatius 6·XXIII, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·LXXXI

Chrysippus 6·CCCXL

Chrysostom, John 5·II, 5·III, 5·VII, 5·VIII, 5·IX, 5·XIV, 5·XVI, 5·XVII, 5·XX, 5·XXIV, 5·XXVII, 5·XXXIV, 5·XLVI, 5·XLVIII, 5·LVIII, 5·LXIII, 5·LXXII, 5·LXXIII, 5·LXXV, 5·LXXVII, 5·LXXVIII, 5·LXXXIV, 5·LXXXV, 5·LXXXVII, 5·LXXXIX, 5·XCIV, 5·XCVI, 5·XCVIII, 5·CI, 5·CIV, 5·CVII, 5·CXII, 5·CXIII, 5·CXIV, 5·CLIII, 5·CLIV, 5·CLXIV, 5·CLXXIII, 5·CLXXIV, 5·CLXXV, 5·CLXXVIII, 5·CLXXX, 5·CXC, 5·CXCVIII, 5·CC, 5·CCXXI, 5·CCXXIII, 5·CCXLII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCLIV · 6·I, 6·II, 6·VI, 6·X, 6·XI, 6·XIII, 6·XXIII, 6·XXVI, 6·XXVII, 6·XXIX, 6·XXXI, 6·XLI, 6·XLII, 6·XLVI, 6·XLVII, 6·XLVIII, 6·LI, 6·LVIII, 6·LX, 6·LXIII, 6·LXV, 6·LXVII, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXIV, 6·LXXXVII, 6·XCIII, 6·XCV, 6·XCVIII, 6·CIV, 6·CV, 6·CVI, 6·CIX, 6·CX, 6·CXI, 6·CXIII, 6·CXVI, 6·CXX, 6·CXXI, 6·CXXV, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXVII, 6·CXXIX, 6·CXXX, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CLI, 6·CLII, 6·CLIII, 6·CLV, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXV, 6·CLXXI, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXX, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CLXXXIII, 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CLXXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CXCIV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CC, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXIII, 6·CCXXIV, 6·CCXXV, 6·CCXXVII, 6·CCXXXI, 6·CCXXXII, 6·CCXXXIV, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCXLII, 6·CCXLIII, 6·CCXLV, 6·CCXLVII, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLIII, 6·CCLVI, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXI, 6·CCLXXIV,

6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCLXXXV, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCCVII, 6·CCCIX, 6·CCCX, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXII, 6·CCCXIII, 6·CCCXIV, 6·CCCXV, 6·CCCXVI, 6·CCCXIX, 6·CCCXXI, 6·CCCXXII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXIX, 6·CCCXXXII, 6·CCCXXXIII, 6·CCCXXXIV, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXXXVI, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLV

Cleanthes 6·CCCXL

Clement (of Alexandria) 6·CXI, 6·CXLVI, 6·CCCXL

Clement of Rome 6·LXVIII, 6·CCCXLV

Cyril 5·VIII, 5·XXVII, 5·LXXIII, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CXC · 6·XXVI, 6·LXXIII, 6·CXI, 6·CXLVI, 6·CLII, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCCVII

Didymus of Alexandria 5·XXVII, 5·LXXIII, 5·CXXXI, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCXLIX · 6·VIII, 6·LI, 6·LIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·CXIX, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXV, 6·CCLXXXIX

Edward Lee 6·CXI, 6·CCI

Epiphanius 5·XI, 5·XVIII, 5·XXXIII, 5·XLIX, 5·LIII, 5·LVIII, 5·LXVIII, 5·XC, 5·CXLVI, 5·CXLVII, 5·CXLVIII, 5·CLVIII, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XVII, 6·XXVI, 6·LXIV, 6·CXXII, 6·CXLVI, 6·CXLVIII, 6·CLXXXVII

Erasmus of Rotterdam 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CL, 5·CLVI, 5·CCIII · 6·XXVII, 6·LXVI, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXV, 6·LXXVI, 6·LXXXIII, 6·CVII, 6·CXI, 6·CXVI, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CXLVI, 6·CLVI, 6·CLVII, 6·CLVIII, 6·CLXII, 6·CCI, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXVI, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCLVI, 6·CCLXXI

Eusebius 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XVIII, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXVII, 5·LXXXIX, 5·CIII, 5·CXII, 5·CLVIII, 5·CCXXIII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLV, 5·CCXLVII, 5·CCXLIX, 5·CCLIII · 6·LXIV, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXXIX, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXV, 6·CCCXL

Eusebius of Emesa 5·XIV, 5·CIII · 6·CXLIV, 6·CCLXXIV

Euthymius Zigabenus 5·XX, 5·CLXVIII, 5·CLXXX · 6·XXIII, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·LVIII, 6·LIX, 6·LX, 6·LXIV, 6·LXXXI, 6·XCIII, 6·XCVI, 6·CV, 6·CIX, 6·CX, 6·CXV, 6·CXX, 6·CXXII, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXXIX, 6·CXLIV, 6·CLXIII, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CLXXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CCVIII, 6·CCXI, 6·CCCXLV

Ferus, John 6·XL, 6·XLIII, 6·XLV, 6·LV, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXXIX, 6·CXV, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CLXXXI, 6·CXC, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXV, 6·CCXVI, 6·CCLV

Gennadius 5·LIV, 5·LVIII, 5·LXXVI, 5·CXXXVII · 6·XXXV, 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCCXI, 6·CCCXL

George of Trebizond 6·XCIII, 6·CCXX

Gilbert 6·XLVII

Giorgio, Francesco (Veneto) 5·XXVI, 5·XXIX, 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXVII, 5·XLV, 5·LI, 5·LIV, 5·LXIX, 5·LXXXVI, 5·XCVII, 5·CIX · 6·XLVIII

Godefridus Tilmannus 6·CXXVII, 6·CXXIX, 6·CXXX

Gratian 5·LXII, 5·CLXIII, 5·CCXL, 5·CCLI, 5·CCLVIII · 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·CLXI

Gregory 5·V, 5·XX, 5·XXIV, 5·XL, 5·CXXX, 5·CXXXVII, 5·CXXXVIII, 5·CXXXIX, 5·CXL, 5·CXLI, 5·CXLIII, 5·CXLV, 5·CLXXX, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXXVIII, 5·CCXL, 5·CCXLI, 5·CCXLVII · 6·VII, 6·L, 6·CIX, 6·CLVI, 6·CCXXXVI

Gregory of Nyssa 5·XX, 5·XXIV, 5·CXXX, 5·CCVIII · 6·CCCXXVIII

Gregory of Rimini 5·CXXXVII · 6·CCLXXVIII

Gregory the Theologian 5·V, 5·CXXX, 5·CLXXX, 5·CCXLVII · 6·CXLIV, 6·CCXXXVI

Henry Hayton 6·CXXXIV

Henry of Andernach 6·XLII

Henry of Hesse 5·LXXXI · 6·XLII, 6·LXXII, 6·CXXXIV, 6·CCXLIV

Hilary of Poitiers 5·V, 5·VIII, 5·LXI, 5·CXII, 5·CXLIX, 5·CL, 5·CLXXI, 5·CLXXXI, 5·CLXXXII, 5·CLXXXIII, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CXC, 5·CCI, 5·CCII, 5·CCIII, 5·CCVI, 5·CCVII, 5·CCVIII · 6·V, 6·XXIII, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·XXXV, 6·LXII, 6·LXIV, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·XCI, 6·XCVI, 6·CV, 6·CVII, 6·CXIV, 6·CXVIII, 6·CXXI, 6·CXXVI, 6·CLX, 6·CLXIV, 6·CLXXV, 6·CCLII, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLVI

Hugh of Saint-Cher 6·CXLV, 6·CLVI

Irenaeus 5·XC, 5·CXC, 5·CCXXXIII · 6·LXXIII, 6·CCLXXIII, 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVII

Jacobus Faber 5·CXXXI, 5·CCXIX · 6·XXVII, 6·LXII, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCL, 6·CCLI

Jacobus Sadoletus 6·CCL, 6·CCLI

James the Apostle 6·CXI

Jerome (of Stridon) 5·V, 5·XI, 5·XII, 5·XVIII, 5·XXIII, 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXVII, 5·LVIII, 5·LXV, 5·LXVI, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXII, 5·LXXIV, 5·LXXV, 5·LXXXI, 5·LXXXVIII, 5·XC, 5·XCVIII, 5·CIII, 5·CVI, 5·CVII, 5·CVIII, 5·CIX, 5·CX, 5·CXI, 5·CXII, 5·CXIV, 5·CXVI, 5·CXVII, 5·CXXIV, 5·CXXV, 5·CXXVI, 5·CXXIX, 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXIII, 5·CXXXVI, 5·CXLI, 5·CXLII, 5·CXLIX, 5·CLI, 5·CLV, 5·CLIX, 5·CLXI, 5·CLXXI, 5·CLXXVI, 5·CLXXXI, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CLXXXIX, 5·CXC, 5·CXCI, 5·CCI, 5·CCVI, 5·CCVII, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXII, 5·CCXIII, 5·CCXIV, 5·CCXIX, 5·CCXX, 5·CCXXII, 5·CCXXIII, 5·CCXXV, 5·CCXXVI, 5·CCXXVII, 5·CCXXVIII, 5·CCXXIX, 5·CCXXXI, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXXXIV, 5·CCXXXV, 5·CCXXXVI, 5·CCXXXVII, 5·CCXXXVIII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCXLV, 5·CCXLVI, 5·CCXLVII, 5·CCXLVIII, 5·CCXLIX, 5·CCLII, 5·CCLIII, 5·CCLIV, 5·CCLV, 5·CCLVI, 5·CCLVII, 5·CCLVIII, 5·CCLIX, 5·CCLX, 5·CCLXI, 5·CCLXII, 5·CCLXIII, 5·CCLXIV · 6·III, 6·VI, 6·VIII, 6·IX, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·XXXI, 6·XXXIII, 6·XXXV, 6·LXIV, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXI, 6·LXXIII, 6·LXXIV, 6·LXXV, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXIX, 6·XCVI, 6·XCVIII, 6·CII, 6·CV, 6·CVIII, 6·CXIV, 6·CXXI, 6·CXXII, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXVIII, 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CL, 6·CLII, 6·CLIX, 6·CLX, 6·CLXXIV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CCX, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXXIX, 6·CCXXXVIII, 6·CCXL, 6·CCXLIV, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCLXX, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXV, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCLXXVII, 6·CCLXXIX, 6·CCLXXX, 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCLXXXIII, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCLXXXIX, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCI, 6·CCXCII, 6·CCXCIII, 6·CCXCV, 6·CCXCVI, 6·CCXCVII, 6·CCXCIX, 6·CCCI, 6·CCCII, 6·CCCIII, 6·CCCIV, 6·CCCV, 6·CCCVI, 6·CCCVIII, 6·CCCXIII, 6·CCCXVIII, 6·CCCXIX, 6·CCCXXIII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXV, 6·CCCXXVI, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLIV, 6·CCCXLVII

John Damascene 5·VIII, 5·XX, 5·CVIII, 5·CXLI, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XLVII, 6·LXXXV, 6·CLXXXVII

John Driedo 6·LXIII

John Henten 6·CXV, 6·CCVIII

John of Torquemada 5·CLXXVI · 6·LXXII

John Wycliffe 6·XXVI, 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXIV

Justin 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CXC · 6·VIII, 6·X, 6·LI, 6·LXXIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·CXIII, 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVII

Juvencus 6·CCXXII

Lactantius 5·III, 5·VIII, 5·XIII, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXV, 5·LXXVII, 5·CLXXI, 5·CXC, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLVIII · 6·LXXIII, 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVII

Lanfranc 6·CXCVI

Lombard, Peter (Master of the Sentences) 5·I, 5·VIII, 5·LXII, 5·CXLIII, 5·CLXII, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXV, 5·CLXXXVI, 5·CXCIV, 5·CCIX, 5·CCXXVIII, 5·CCXL · 6·XXXVI, 6·LXXI, 6·LXXII, 6·LXXXI, 6·CXIV, 6·CXXXIV, 6·CXLI, 6·CL, 6·CLXI, 6·CLXIV, 6·CLXXXVI, 6·CXCIV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCXXXV, 6·CCLXXXIV, 6·CCLXXXIX, 6·CCXCIX

Lorenzo Valla 6·CCXX

Lucian the Monk 6·CCXXXI, 6·CCXXXII, 6·CCXXXIV, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCXLII, 6·CCCXL

Luther, Martin 5·LXXIII, 5·CI, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXXXVIII, 5·CXL, 5·CXLV, 5·CLIII, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXV, 5·CXCV, 5·CCXIV, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXXXV · 6·XVI, 6·XXVI, 6·XXVII, 6·XXXVIII, 6·XL, 6·XLIII, 6·XLV, 6·LX, 6·LXIX, 6·LXXI, 6·LXXXVI, 6·CLIV, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXXI, 6·CCXXXIII, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXVII, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCCV, 6·CCCX, 6·CCCXV, 6·CCCXVII

Mark of Ephesus 5·CCXLVII · 6·XI, 6·XXVI, 6·CXI, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXL

Maximus 6·CLXI, 6·CLXXXVII

Medina, Michael 6·XL, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXV, 6·CCXVI

Nepos 6·CCCXLVII

Nicholas Cabasilas 6·CXI

Nicholas of Lyra 5·XII, 5·XL, 5·CLXV · 6·LXII, 6·LXXII, 6·CXI, 6·CLVII

Oecolampadius 5·CI, 5·CLXIV

Oecolampadius, John 6·CXLVII, 6·CCLXVI

Oecumenius 5·CXI · 6·XXVI, 6·LXIV, 6·CCVII, 6·CCXXII, 6·CCXXV, 6·CCXXVIII, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXV, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXXXVIII, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLV

Origen 5·II, 5·V, 5·VII, 5·VIII, 5·XI, 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XXVI, 5·XXXII, 5·XXXIII, 5·XXXIV, 5·XXXV, 5·XLIX, 5·LIII, 5·LIV, 5·LXVI, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXXVI, 5·XC, 5·XCIII, 5·CII, 5·CIV, 5·CVII, 5·CVIII, 5·CXI, 5·CXVII, 5·CXVIII, 5·CXIX, 5·CXX, 5·CXXI, 5·CXXII, 5·CXXVI, 5·CXXVII, 5·CXXVIII, 5·CXXXI, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXXXV, 5·CXLI, 5·CXLIII, 5·CXLIV, 5·CXLVI, 5·CXLVIII, 5·CL, 5·CLIX, 5·CLX, 5·CLXX, 5·CLXXI, 5·CLXXXIV, 5·CLXXXV, 5·CLXXXIX, 5·CCVI, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCX, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXII, 5·CCXIII, 5·CCXXII, 5·CCXXV, 5·CCXXIX, 5·CCXXX, 5·CCXXXIV, 5·CCXXXV, 5·CCXXXVI, 5·CCXXXVII, 5·CCXLII, 5·CCXLIII, 5·CCXLIV, 5·CCXLV, 5·CCXLIX, 5·CCL, 5·CCLVI, 5·CCLIX, 5·CCLXII · 6·VIII, 6·XXVI, 6·XLVII, 6·LVI, 6·LXIV, 6·LXVI, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXIX, 6·LXX, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXIII, 6·CV, 6·CIX, 6·CXVII, 6·CXIX, 6·CXX, 6·CXXI, 6·CXXII, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXXV, 6·CXXXVI, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXL, 6·CXLII, 6·CXLIX, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXV, 6·CLXVI, 6·CLXVIII, 6·CLXX, 6·CLXXI, 6·CLXXII, 6·CLXXV, 6·CLXXVI, 6·CLXXVII, 6·CLXXXVIII, 6·CLXXXIX, 6·CXCVI, 6·CXCIX, 6·CCIII, 6·CCIV, 6·CCV, 6·CCXXX, 6·CCXXXIII, 6·CCXLIX, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLIV, 6·CCLV, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCLXXXIV, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCI, 6·CCXCII, 6·CCXCIII, 6·CCXCIV, 6·CCXCV, 6·CCXCVI, 6·CCXCVII, 6·CCXCVIII, 6·CCCII, 6·CCCVI, 6·CCCXLV

Papias 5·CCXXXIII · 6·CCXXII, 6·CCCXLVII

Peter d'Ailly 5·LXXXI · 6·X

Philip Melanchthon 6·LXXXI

Philo 5·II, 5·VIII, 5·XVI, 5·XVII, 5·XIX, 5·XXIII, 5·XXIV, 5·XXXII, 5·XXXV, 5·XLIII, 5·LXVIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXI, 5·LXXVII, 5·XCIII, 5·XCV, 5·CV, 5·CVIII, 5·CXII, 5·CXV, 5·CLXXVI, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXIX · 6·XXVI, 6·LXXXII, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCCXLV

Pope Adrian the Sixth 6·CCCXLV

Pope Alexander the Third 6·LXXII

Pope Benedict XI 6·CCCXLV

Pope Gelasius the First 6·LXXII

Pope Gregory 6·CXLIV, 6·CCXVII

Pope Gregory the Fifth 6·LXXII

Pope Gregory the Fourth 6·LXXII

Pope Gregory the Seventh 6·LXXII

Pope Gregory the Third 6·LXXII

Pope Hadrian the First 6·LXXII

Pope John the Eighth 6·LXXII

Pope John XXII 6·CCCXLV

Pope Leo the Eighth 6·LXXII

Pope Leo the Fourth 6·LXXII

Pope Leo the Third 6·LXXII

Pope Liberius 6·CCX

Pope Nicholas the First 6·LXXII

Pope Urban the Second 6·LXXII

Pope Zacharias 6·LXXXI

Pope Zacharias the First 6·LXXII

Prepositinus 6·XLVII

Primasius 6·CCLXIX

Procopius of Gaza 5·III, 5·XIII, 5·XIV, 5·XV, 5·XX, 5·XXIV, 5·XLIV, 5·LVIII, 5·LX, 5·LXIII, 5·LXX, 5·LXXX, 5·XCIX, 5·CXI, 5·CXIII · 6·XIII

Prosper 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CCLII

Prudentius 5·CLXXXI · 6·XLI, 6·XLVII, 6·CCCXLV

Rabanus 5·XII · 6·CIX

Rufinus 5·CXVII, 5·CXXXI, 5·CLI, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXXIX, 5·CCXXXVIII, 5·CCXLV, 5·CCLV · 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCI, 6·CCXCII, 6·CCXCIII, 6·CCXCV, 6·CCXCVI, 6·CCXCVII, 6·CCCII, 6·CCCIII, 6·CCCVI

Rupert 6·XLVII

Sanctes Pagninus 6·CCXLIII

Sedulius Scotus 6·CCLI, 6·CCXCIX, 6·CCCXVIII, 6·CCCXXIV

Servetus 6·CCXXXVI

Severus 6·CCCXLVII

Socrates 5·CLXXIII · 6·LI, 6·LXXXII, 6·CLXIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCLXVI

Soto, Domingo de 6·XLIII, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CLXXXI, 6·CXC, 6·CXCII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXVI, 6·CCXLVIII

Stanislaus Pannonius 6·CCXC

Strabo 5·XLV, 5·CXXXVI, 5·CLXIII, 5·CLXXXVIII, 5·CCXXVII · 6·XXXIII, 6·XCVIII

Sulpicius 6·CLVI, 6·CCCXLVII

Sulpicius Severus 6·CLVI, 6·CCCXLVII

Tertullian 5·XVIII, 5·XXXIX, 5·CXLIX, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLIX · 6·XXXV, 6·LXXXI, 6·CXXXVII, 6·CLIV, 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVII

Theodoret 5·V, 5·VII, 5·XVII, 5·XVIII, 5·XXIII, 5·LV, 5·LVIII, 5·LXXVI, 5·CXIII, 5·CXIV, 5·CXXX, 5·CLXXIX, 5·CCXLIV · 6·CLII, 6·CLXV, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CCXXXVII, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLVIII, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCCXX, 6·CCCXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXIV, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXLV

Theodulus 6·CCLI

Theognostus 6·LVI

Theophylact 5·XCVIII, 5·CIV, 5·CCLIV · 6·XXIII, 6·XXV, 6·XXVI, 6·LVIII, 6·LXIV, 6·LXVIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·XCIX, 6·CIX, 6·CXXII, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CXXXVIII, 6·CXLIV, 6·CXLVI, 6·CXLVII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLX, 6·CLXII, 6·CLXIII, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CLXXXV, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CXCIV, 6·CCII, 6·CCV, 6·CCX, 6·CCXXII, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXXIV, 6·CCCI, 6·CCCXXIX, 6·CCCXXXIV, 6·CCCXXXV, 6·CCCXLV

Ulphilas 6·CLII

Victorinus 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCLXIV · 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVI, 6·CCCXLVII

Vida, Marco Girolamo (of Alba) 6·CCLXXVI

Vincent of Lérins 6·LX, 6·CIV

Waldensis, Thomas 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXIV

William 6·XLVII

William of Ockham 6·CCCXLV

William of Saint-Amour 6·CCCXVII

William Opembacchius 6·CXXXIV

Zeno 6·CCCXL

INDEX OF COUNCILS & CANONS

Church councils and synods cited in either book.

Council of Trent 6·X, 6·XL, 6·XLI, 6·XLIII, 6·XLV, 6·LVIII, 6·LXX, 6·LXXXI, 6·CLII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CCXIV, 6·CCXV, 6·CCXVI, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXXXI, 6·CCXXXII, 6·CCXXXIII, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXVIII, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXI, 6·CCLXVI, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXL, 6·CCCXLV

African Council 5·XXXVI, 5·LII · 6·CCXXXVIII

Council of Ancyra 5·LXXIII

Council of Basel 6·CCLV, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII

Council of Carthage 5·CCXLIV · 6·CCLXVI

Council of Chalcedon 5·LVIII

Council of Constance 6·XXVI, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCCXVII

Council of Constantinople 5·LVIII · 6·CCLXVII

Council of Elvira 5·CCXLVII · 6·LXXXI, 6·CLII

Council of Ephesus 5·CCXLVII · 6·XXVI

Council of Florence 6·CXI, 6·CLXXXVII, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCCXLV

Council of Ilerda 5·CCLI

Council of Laodicea 5·CXVIII

Council of Nicaea 5·CLVIII · 6·XVII, 6·CI

Council of Vienne 5·XXVI · 6·CXXV

First Council of Braga 6·CCCX, 6·CCCXI

Fourth Council of Carthage 6·CCLXV, 6·CCLXVI

Lateran Council 5·V, 5·VIII · 6·CLXXXVII

INDEX OF HERESIES & CENSURED OPINIONS

Heretical sects, heresiarchs, and censured opinions refuted or corrected in either book. 5· = Book V (Old Testament), 6· = Book VI (New Testament).

Albanenses 6·XXVI

Anabaptists 5·CLXIX, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XXVI, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCCXLI, 6·CCCXLV

Anthropomorphites / Audians 5·XVIII, 5·XLVI, 5·XLVII

Arians 5·XLVI, 5·XLVII, 5·CXXX, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CLVIII, 5·CCXLVII · 6·XIII, 6·XV, 6·XVI, 6·XVII, 6·XXXIX, 6·XLIV, 6·XCI, 6·XCII, 6·CIV, 6·CV, 6·CLXVI, 6·CLXXI, 6·CLXXV, 6·CCX, 6·CCXIII, 6·CCCXXIX

Armenians (on the beatific vision) 5·XXI, 5·LXXVIII, 5·CLXIX · 6·CXI, 6·CXIII, 6·CLII, 6·CLXIII, 6·CCLVIII, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCCXLI, 6·CCCXLV

Bertram / Ratramnus (on the Eucharist) 6·CXCIV, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCLXXXIX

Calvin 5·XVI, 5·XVIII, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXIV, 5·CLXXV, 5·CXCII, 5·CCXVII, 5·CCLVIII · 6·XI, 6·LXXII, 6·CXCVI, 6·CCI, 6·CCVI, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXIX, 6·CCCXVII

Cerinthus 5·XVII, 5·XVIII, 5·CCXXXIII · 6·CCCXLVII

Chiliasts / Millenarians 5·CCXXXIII · 6·LXXIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCCXXIII, 6·CCCXLV, 6·CCCXLVII

Cornelius Agrippa (censured) 5·LXXIII · 6·CXXV, 6·CCLXIV, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCCXLV

Donatists 6·LX, 6·CLVI

Ebionites 5·CCXX

Erasmus (censured) 6·XXVII, 6·LXVI, 6·LXXV, 6·LXXVI, 6·CXI, 6·CXVI, 6·CXXIV, 6·CXXXIII, 6·CLVI, 6·CLXII, 6·CCI, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCLV

Errors of Cajetan (censured) 6·IX, 6·XIII, 6·XVIII, 6·XXXII, 6·LII, 6·LVII, 6·LXXVIII, 6·LXXXI, 6·LXXXII, 6·LXXXVI, 6·XCVII, 6·CI, 6·CXI, 6·[unnum.], 6·CXXVIII, 6·CXXXI, 6·CXXXII, 6·CXLIII, 6·CLIX, 6·CLXIX, 6·CXCVI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CXCVIII, 6·CCI, 6·CCXVI, 6·CCXVIII, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXXII, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXI, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCIV, 6·CCCVII, 6·CCCXXIV, 6·CCCXXVII, 6·CCCXXVIII, 6·CCCXXXI, 6·CCCXXXVII, 6·CCCXXXIX, 6·CCCXLI, 6·CCCXLII, 6·CCCXLIV

Hussites 6·LXX, 6·CVIII

Lutherans / Luther 5·LXXIII, 5·CI, 5·CXXXIV, 5·CXXXV, 5·CXXXVIII, 5·CXL, 5·CXLV, 5·CLIII, 5·CLXVII, 5·CLXXV, 5·CXCV, 5·CCXIV, 5·CCXXXII, 5·CCXXXIII, 5·CCXXXV · 6·XVI, 6·XXVI, 6·XXVII, 6·XXXVIII, 6·XL, 6·XLIII, 6·XLV, 6·LX, 6·LXIX, 6·LXXI, 6·LXXXVI, 6·CLIV, 6·CLXXVIII, 6·CLXXIX, 6·CXCI, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCII, 6·CCIX, 6·CCX, 6·CCXII, 6·CCXIX, 6·CCXXI, 6·CCXXXIII, 6·CCXXXIX, 6·CCLX, 6·CCLXIII, 6·CCLXVII, 6·CCLXVIII, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCLXXVII, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCCI, 6·CCCV, 6·CCCVII, 6·CCCX, 6·CCCXII, 6·CCCXV, 6·CCCXVII

Macedonians (pneumatomachi) 6·XV, 6·CIV, 6·CLXXIII, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCCXXIV

Manichaeans 5·L, 5·CI, 5·CLX, 5·CLXII · 6·CLVI, 6·CLXXIV

Marcion / Marcionites 6·IV, 6·LXXXI, 6·CCCXLV

Novatians 5·CLXXIII, 5·CLXXIV · 6·LVI, 6·CIV, 6·CXV, 6·CXIX, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCLXXXVIII

Origenism (see also Origenist errors under Subjects) 5·XXXIV, 5·LIV, 5·CL, 5·CCVIII, 5·CCXI, 5·CCXXIX · 6·XLVII, 6·CCLIX, 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCLXXXVI, 6·CCLXXXVII, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCXC, 6·CCXCI, 6·CCCI, 6·CCCII

Paul of Samosata 6·XVII, 6·CCCXXIX

Pelagians 5·VI, 5·XXXVI, 5·L, 5·XCVIII, 5·CI, 5·CXXXVII, 5·CXLI, 5·CLIX, 5·CLXXXIII, 5·CXCV, 5·CCXXXV, 5·CCLIII, 5·CCLXIII · 6·XCVI, 6·CI, 6·CIV, 6·CLXXXII, 6·CLXXXIV, 6·CCXX, 6·CCXXX, 6·CCXXXVI, 6·CCXXXVIII, 6·CCLI, 6·CCLV, 6·CCLVII, 6·CCLXXVIII, 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCLXXXV, 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCXC

Priscillianists 5·LXXXIX, 5·CVII, 5·CCVIII · 6·CIV

Sabellius / Sabellians 5·CCXLVII · 6·CIV, 6·CCCXXIX

Sacramentarians 5·CXXI, 5·CXCIV · 6·CXII, 6·CXCIII, 6·CXCVI

Stanislaus Pannonius (Anabaptist) 6·CCLXXXVIII, 6·CCXC

Vigilantius 6·CCLXXXII, 6·CCLXXXIII

Waldenses & Wycliffites (John Wycliffe) 6·XXVI, 6·CCCXVII, 6·CCCXXIV

Witchcraft, malefic women & the magical arts (censured) 5·LXXIII, 5·CLXVI · 6·VIII, 6·IX, 6·X, 6·CCLXXVI, 6·CCCXIV

Zwingli / Oecolampadius 5·XVI, 5·CI, 5·CLXIV · 6·XCIX, 6·CXLVII, 6·CLVIII, 6·CXCVII, 6·CCLXVI

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

The lemma of every annotation, in canonical order — where Sixtus treats each passage of Scripture.

Genesis

Genesis 1:1 — 5·I
Genesis 1:1 — 5·II
Genesis 1:1 — 5·III
Genesis 1:1 — 5·IV
Genesis 1:1 — 5·V
Genesis 1:2 — 5·VI
Genesis 1:2 — 5·VII
Genesis 1:6 — 5·VIII
Genesis 1:6 — 5·IX
Genesis 1:6 — 5·X
Genesis 1:7 — 5·XI
Genesis 1:8 — 5·XII
Genesis 1:9 — 5·XIII
Genesis 1:17 — 5·XIV
Genesis 1:17 — 5·XV
Genesis 1:19 — 5·XVI
Genesis 1:26 — 5·XVII
Genesis 1:26 — 5·XVIII
Genesis 1:26 — 5·XIX
Genesis 1:27 — 5·XX
Genesis 1:28 — 5·XXI
Genesis 1:29 — 5·XXII
Genesis 2:2 — 5·XXIII
Genesis 2:2 — 5·XXIV
Genesis 2:2 — 5·XXV
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXVI
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXVII
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXVIII
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXIX
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXX
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXXI
Genesis 2:7 — 5·XXXII
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXIII
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXIV
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXV
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXVI
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXVII
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXVIII
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XXXIX
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XL
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XLI
Genesis 2:8 — 5·XLII
Genesis 2:17 — 5·XLIII
Genesis 2:18 — 5·XLIV
Genesis 2:20 — 5·XLV
Genesis 2:21 — 5·XLVI
Genesis 2:21 — 5·XLVII
Genesis 2:24 — 5·XLVIII

Genesis 3:7 — 5·XLIX
Genesis 3:15 — 5·L
Genesis 3:15 — 5·LI
Genesis 3:19 — 5·LII
Genesis 3:21 — 5·LIII
Genesis 3:21 — 5·LIV
Genesis 3:21 — 5·LV
Genesis 3:24 — 5·LVI
Genesis 3:24 — 5·LVII
Genesis 3:24 — 5·LVIII
Genesis 3:24 — 5·LIX
Genesis 3:24 — 5·LX
Genesis 4:1 — 5·LXI
Genesis 4:1 — 5·LXII
Genesis 4:1 — 5·LXIII
Genesis 4:1 — 5·LXIV
Genesis 4:7 — 5·LXV
Genesis 4:8 — 5·LXVI
Genesis 4:12 — 5·LXVII
Genesis 5:7 — 5·LXVIII
Genesis 5:29 — 5·LXIX
Genesis 6:2 — 5·LXX
Genesis 6:2 — 5·LXXI
Genesis 6:2 — 5·LXXII
Genesis 6:2 — 5·LXXIII
Genesis 6:3 — 5·LXXIV
Genesis 6:3 — 5·LXXV
Genesis 6:4 — 5·LXXVI
Genesis 6:4 — 5·LXXVII
Genesis 6:9 — 5·LXXVIII
Genesis 7:11 — 5·LXXIX
Genesis 7:11 — 5·LXXX
Genesis 7:11 — 5·LXXXI
Genesis 8:4 — 5·LXXXII
Genesis 8:7 — 5·LXXXIII
Genesis 8:11 — 5·LXXXIV
Genesis 8:21 — 5·LXXXV
Genesis 9:20–21 — 5·LXXXVI
Genesis 11:1 — 5·LXXXVII
Genesis 11:11 — 5·LXXXVIII
Genesis 12:13 — 5·LXXXIX
Genesis 14:18 — 5·XC
Genesis 14:18 — 5·XCI
Genesis 14:23 — 5·XCII
Genesis 16:2 — 5·XCIII
Genesis 16:3 — 5·XCIV
Genesis 16:11 — 5·XCV
Genesis 17:10 — 5·XCVI
Genesis 17:12 — 5·XCVII
Genesis 17:17 — 5·XCVIII
Genesis 18:2 — 5·XCIX
Genesis 18:3 — 5·C
Genesis 18:16 — 5·CI
Genesis 22:12 — 5·CII

Genesis 22:13 — 5·CIII
Genesis 25:21 — 5·CIV
Genesis 26:18 — 5·CV
Genesis 26:32 — 5·CVI
Genesis 27:19 — 5·CVII
Genesis 28:12 — 5·CVIII
Genesis 30:14 — 5·CIX
Genesis 30:42 — 5·CX
Genesis 32:24 — 5·CXI
Genesis 32:28 — 5·CXII
Genesis 37:2 — 5·CXIII
Genesis 38:16 — 5·CXIV

Exodus

Exodus 28:4 — 5·CXV
Exodus 34:29 — 5·CXVI

Leviticus

Leviticus 1:5 — 5·CXVII
Leviticus 8:4 — 5·CXVIII
Leviticus 10:9 — 5·CXIX
Leviticus 10:14 — 5·CXX
Leviticus 16:13 — 5·CXXI
Leviticus 25:32 — 5·CXXII

Numbers

Numbers 12:1 — 5·CXXIII
Numbers 17:6 — 5·CXXIV
Numbers 24:3 — 5·CXXV
Numbers 25:4 — 5·CXXVI
Numbers 26:53 — 5·CXXVII
Numbers 33:1 — 5·CXXVIII
Numbers 34:2 — 5·CXXIX

Deuteronomy

Deuteronomy 6:4 — 5·CXXX

Joshua

Joshua 8:28 — 5·CXXXI

1 Kings

1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:6 — 5·CXXXII

3 Kings

3 Kings [1 Kings] 10:1 — 5·CXXXIII

Job

Job 1:1 — 5·CXXXIV
Job 1:17 — 5·CXXXV
Job 1:21 — 5·CXXXVI
Job 9:17 — 5·CXXXVII
Job 9:28 — 5·CXXXVIII
Job 14:21 — 5·CXXXIX

Job 17:12 — 5·CXL
Job 20:26 — 5·CXLI
Job 25:5 — 5·CXLII
Job 38:12 — 5·CXLIII
Job 38:29 — 5·CXLIV
Job 42:16 — 5·CXLV

Psalm

Psalm 1:1 — 5·CXLVI
Psalm 1:1 — 5·CXLVII
Psalm 1:5 — 5·CXLVIII
Psalm 2:1 — 5·CXLIX
Psalm 2:8 — 5·CL
Psalm 2:12 — 5·CLI
Psalm 3:2 — 5·CLII
Psalm 4:2 — 5·CLIII
Psalm 13:3 — 5·CLIV
Psalm 13:3 — 5·CLV
Psalm 14:2 — 5·CLVI
Psalm 15:1 — 5·CLVII
Psalm 15:2 — 5·CLVIII
Psalm 15:7 — 5·CLIX
Psalm 18:5 — 5·CLX
Psalm 21:3 — 5·CLXI
Psalm 21:3 — 5·CLXII
Psalm 21:30 — 5·CLXIII
Psalm 22:5 — 5·CLXIV
Psalm 30:11 — 5·CLXV
Psalm 30:16 — 5·CLXVI
Psalm 31:1 — 5·CLXVII
Psalm 32:6 — 5·CLXVIII
Psalm 36:10 — 5·CLXIX
Psalm 36:14 — 5·CLXX
Psalm 36:15 — 5·CLXXI
Psalm 46:3, 8 — 5·CLXXII
Psalm 50:3 — 5·CLXXIII
Psalm 50:3 — 5·CLXXIV
Psalm 50:5 — 5·CLXXV
Psalm 50:6 — 5·CLXXVI
Psalm 50:7 — 5·CLXXVII
Psalm 50:7 — 5·CLXXVIII
Psalm 50:7 — 5·CLXXIX
Psalm 50:7 — 5·CLXXX
Psalm 52:4 — 5·CLXXXI
Psalm 53:5 — 5·CLXXXII
Psalm 64:5 — 5·CLXXXIII
Psalm 65:11 — 5·CLXXXV
Psalm 65:12 — 5·CLXXXIV
Psalm 68:2 — 5·CLXXXVI
Psalm 70:15 — 5·CLXXXVII
Psalm 71:14 — 5·CLXXXVIII
Psalm 89:1–2 — 5·CLXXXIX
Psalm 89:4 — 5·CXC

Psalm 90:1 — 5·CXCI
Psalm 90:14 — 5·CXCII
Psalm 98:5 — 5·CXCIII
Psalm 98:5 — 5·CXCIV
Psalm 102:4 — 5·CXCV
Psalm 103:30 — 5·CXCVI
Psalm 108:18 — 5·CXCVII
Psalm 109:4 — 5·CXCVIII
Psalm 114:7 — 5·CXCIX
Psalm 115:1 — 5·CC
Psalm 118:1 — 5·CCI
Psalm 118:20 — 5·CCII
Psalm 118:57 — 5·CCIII
Psalm 118:106 — 5·CCIV
Psalm 118:137 — 5·CCV
Psalm 126:4 — 5·CCVI
Psalm 127:2 — 5·CCVII
Psalm 129:2 — 5·CCVIII
Psalm 138:6 — 5·CCIX
Psalm 141:8 — 5·CCX

Proverbs

Proverbs 1:1 — 5·CCXI

Ecclesiastes

Ecclesiastes 1:6 — 5·CCXII
Ecclesiastes 1:9 — 5·CCXIII
Ecclesiastes 11:3 — 5·CCXIV

Canticle

Canticle 1:1 — 5·CCXV
Canticle 1:1 — 5·CCXVI
Canticle 2:10, 14 — 5·CCXVII

Wisdom

Wisdom 1:1 — 5·CCXVIII
Wisdom 1:1 — 5·CCXIX

Isaiah

Isaiah 2:22 — 5·CCXX
Isaiah 6:1 — 5·CCXXI
Isaiah 6:3 — 5·CCXXII
Isaiah 9:6 — 5·CCXXIII
Isaiah 13:7 — 5·CCXXIV
Isaiah 14:19 — 5·CCXXV
Isaiah 15:2 — 5·CCXXVI
Isaiah 16:14 — 5·CCXXVII
Isaiah 65:16 — 5·CCXXVIII
Isaiah 66:24 — 5·CCXXIX

Jeremiah

Jeremiah 2:22 — 5·CCXXX
Jeremiah 4:2 — 5·CCXXXI

Jeremiah 13:12 — 5·CCXXXII
Jeremiah 19:11 — 5·CCXXXIII
Jeremiah 22:30 — 5·CCXXXIV
Jeremiah 23:28 — 5·CCXXXV
Jeremiah 24:5 — 5·CCXXXVI
Jeremiah 28:13 — 5·CCXXXVII
Jeremiah 29:22 — 5·CCXXXVIII

Lamentations

Lamentations 4:6 — 5·CCXXXIX

Ezekiel

Ezekiel 1:12 — 5·CCXL
Ezekiel 3:11 — 5·CCXLI
Ezekiel 14:13 — 5·CCXLII
Ezekiel 16:16 — 5·CCXLIII
Ezekiel 44:20 — 5·CCXLIV

Daniel

Daniel 1:1 — 5·CCXLV
Daniel 2:40 — 5·CCXLVI
Daniel 3:18 — 5·CCXLVII
Daniel 9:24 — 5·CCXLVIII
Daniel 9:24 — 5·CCXLIX
Daniel 13:1 — 5·CCL

Amos

Amos 5:2 — 5·CCLI
Amos 9:2 — 5·CCLII

Jonah

Jonah 1:12 — 5·CCLIII
Jonah 3:4 — 5·CCLIV
Jonah 4:6 — 5·CCLV

Micah

Micah 6:1 — 5·CCLVI

Habakkuk

Habakkuk 1:13 — 5·CCLVII

Zephaniah

Zephaniah 3:4 — 5·CCLVIII

Zechariah

Zechariah 4:3, 4 — 5·CCLIX
Zechariah 8:17 — 5·CCLX
Zechariah 9:11 — 5·CCLXI

Malachi

Malachi 1:1 — 5·CCLXII
Malachi 1:2, 3 — 5·CCLXIII

2 Maccabees

2 Maccabees 7:41 — 5·CCLXIV

Matthew

Matthew 1:1 — 6·I
Matthew 1:3 — 6·II
Matthew 1:16 — 6·III
Matthew 1:18 — 6·IV
Matthew 1:20 — 6·V
Matthew 1:20 — 6·VI
Matthew 2 — 6·X
Matthew 2:1 — 6·VII
Matthew 2:2 — 6·VIII
Matthew 2:2 — 6·IX
Matthew 3:1–2 — 6·XI
Matthew 3:11 — 6·XII
Matthew 3:16 — 6·XIII
Matthew 3:16 — 6·XIV
Matthew 3:16 — 6·XV
Matthew 4:1 — 6·XVI
Matthew 4:17 — 6·XVII
Matthew 5:3 — 6·XVIII
Matthew 5:5 — 6·XIX
Matthew 5:9 — 6·XX
Matthew 5:22 — 6·XXI
Matthew 5:31 — 6·XXII
Matthew 5:32 — 6·XXIII
Matthew 5:32 — 6·XXIV
Matthew 5:34 — 6·XXV
Matthew 5:34 — 6·XXVI
Matthew 5:39 — 6·XXVII
Matthew 5:44 — 6·XXVIII
Matthew 6:6 — 6·XXIX
Matthew 6:10 — 6·XXX
Matthew 6:11 — 6·XXXI
Matthew 6:14 — 6·XXXII
Matthew 6:16 — 6·XXXIII
Matthew 6:24 — 6·XXXIV
Matthew 6:25 — 6·XXXV
Matthew 6:33 — 6·XXXVI
Matthew 6:34 — 6·XXXVII
Matthew 7:5 — 6·XXXVIII
Matthew 7:16 — 6·XXXIX
Matthew 7:17 — 6·XL
Matthew 7:19 — 6·XLI
Matthew 7:24 — 6·XLII
Matthew 8:8 — 6·XLIII
Matthew 8:9 — 6·XLIV
Matthew 9:8 — 6·XLV
Matthew 9:9 — 6·XLVI
Matthew 9:24 — 6·XLVII
Matthew 10:28 — 6·XLVIII
Matthew 10:29 — 6·XLIX

Matthew 11:3 — 6·L
Matthew 11:5 — 6·LI
Matthew 11:26 — 6·LII
Matthew 11:27 — 6·LIII
Matthew 11:28 — 6·LIV
Matthew 11:28 — 6·LV
Matthew 12:32 — 6·LVI
Matthew 12:32 — 6·LVII
Matthew 12:47 — 6·LVIII
Matthew 12:48 — 6·LIX
Matthew 13:11 — 6·LXIII
Matthew 13:30 — 6·LX
Matthew 13:35 — 6·LXI
Matthew 13:55 — 6·LXII
Matthew 13:55–56 — 6·LXIV
Matthew 14:3,10 — 6·LXV
Matthew 15:11 — 6·LXVI
Matthew 15:29 — 6·LXVII
Matthew 16:18 — 6·LXVIII
Matthew 16:18 — 6·LXIX
Matthew 16:18 — 6·LXX
Matthew 16:19 — 6·LXXI
Matthew 16:19 — 6·LXXII
Matthew 17:1 — 6·LXXIII
Matthew 17:3 — 6·LXXIV
Matthew 17:24 — 6·LXXV
Matthew 17:26 — 6·LXXVI
Matthew 18:10 — 6·LXXVII
Matthew 18:17 — 6·LXXVIII
Matthew 19:5 — 6·LXXIX
Matthew 19:8 — 6·LXXX
Matthew 19:9 — 6·LXXXI
Matthew 19:9 — 6·LXXXII
Matthew 19:12 — 6·LXXXIII
Matthew 19:14 — 6·LXXXIV
Matthew 19:20 — 6·LXXXV
Matthew 19:21 — 6·LXXXVI
Matthew 20:1 — 6·LXXXVII
Matthew 20:8 — 6·LXXXVIII
Matthew 20:8 — 6·LXXXIX
Matthew 20:16 — 6·XC
Matthew 20:19 — 6·XCII
Matthew 20:20 — 6·XCI
Matthew 20:23 — 6·XCIII
Matthew 20:23 — 6·XCIV
Matthew 21:9 — 6·XCVI
Matthew 21:12 — 6·XCV
Matthew 21:33 — 6·XCVII
Matthew 21:38 — 6·XCVIII
Matthew 22:14 — 6·XCIX
Matthew 22:37 — 6·C
Matthew 22:39 — 6·CI
Matthew 23:5 — 6·CII
Matthew 24:7 — 6·CIII

Matthew 24:15 — 6·CIV
Matthew 24:36 — 6·CV
Matthew 24:50 — 6·CVI
Matthew 25:9 — 6·CVII
Matthew 25:18 — 6·CVIII
Matthew 26:7 — 6·CIX
Matthew 26:20 — 6·CX
Matthew 26:26 — 6·CXI
Matthew 26:26 — 6·CXII
Matthew 26:29 — 6·CXIII
Matthew 26:37 — 6·CXIV
Matthew 26:52 — 6·CXV
Matthew 26:52 — 6·CXVI
Matthew 26:63 — 6·CXVII
Matthew 26:74 — 6·CXVIII
Matthew 26:74–75 — 6·CXIX
Matthew 27:5 — 6·CXX
Matthew 27:6–7 — 6·CXXI
Matthew 27:33 — 6·CXXII
Matthew 27:34 — 6·CXXIII
Matthew 27:45 — 6·CXXIV
Matthew 27:46 — 6·CXXV
Matthew 27:46 — 6·CXXVI
Matthew 27:56 — 6·[unnum.]

Mark

Mark 1:16 — 6·CXXVII
Mark 6:8 — 6·CXXVIII
Mark 9:2 — 6·CXXIX
Mark 11:15 — 6·CXXX
Mark 15:25 — 6·CXXXI
Mark 16:9 — 6·CXXXII

Luke

Luke 1:28 — 6·CXXXIII
Luke 1:32 — 6·CXXXIV
Luke 2:14 — 6·CXXXV
Luke 2:22 — 6·CXXXVI
Luke 2:23 — 6·CXXXVII
Luke 2:35 — 6·CXXXVIII
Luke 2:43 — 6·CXXXIX
Luke 2:50 — 6·CXL
Luke 2:52 — 6·CXLI
Luke 3:12 — 6·CXLII
Luke 3:36 — 6·CXLIII
Luke 7:19–20 — 6·CXLIV
Luke 9:30–31 — 6·CXLV
Luke 10:1 — 6·CXLVI
Luke 10:7 — 6·CXLVII
Luke 12:18 — 6·CXLVIII
Luke 12:58 — 6·CXLIX
Luke 15:31 — 6·CL
Luke 16:20 — 6·CLI

Luke 16:24 — 6·CLII
Luke 16:31 — 6·CLIII
Luke 17:14 — 6·CLIV
Luke 18:13 — 6·CLV
Luke 22:36 — 6·CLVI
Luke 22:38 — 6·CLVII
Luke 22:38 — 6·CLVIII
Luke 22:43 — 6·CLIX
Luke 22:57 — 6·CLX
Luke 22:62 — 6·CLXI
Luke 23:28 — 6·CLXII
Luke 23:43 — 6·CLXIII
Luke 23:46 — 6·CLXIV

John

John 1:1 — 6·CLXV
John 1:1 — 6·CLXVI
John 1:1 — 6·CLXVII
John 1:1 — 6·CLXVIII
John 1:1 — 6·CLXIX
John 1:1 — 6·CLXX
John 1:1 — 6·CLXXI
John 1:3 — 6·CLXXII
John 1:3 — 6·CLXXIII
John 1:3 — 6·CLXXIV
John 1:4–5 — 6·CLXXV
John 1:5 — 6·CLXXVI
John 1:7 — 6·CLXXVII
John 1:7 — 6·CLXXVIII
John 1:9 — 6·CLXXIX
John 1:14 — 6·CLXXX
John 1:16 — 6·CLXXXI
John 1:18 — 6·CLXXXII
John 1:34 — 6·CLXXXIII
John 1:38 — 6·CLXXXIV
John 2:3 — 6·CLXXXV
John 2:20 — 6·CLXXXVI
John 3:34 — 6·CLXXXVII
John 4:24 — 6·CLXXXVIII
John 4:38 — 6·CLXXXIX
John 4:50 — 6·CXC
John 4:53 — 6·CXCI
John 6:27 — 6·CXCII
John 6:29 — 6·CXCIII
John 6:44 — 6·CXCIV
John 6:48 — 6·CXCVI
John 6:49 — 6·CXCV
John 6:53 — 6·CXCVII
John 8:1 — 6·CXCVIII
John 8:21 — 6·CXCIX
John 8:25 — 6·CCI
John 8:31 — 6·CC
John 8:34 — 6·CCII

John 8:37 — 6·CCIII
John 8:42 — 6·CCIV
John 11:16 — 6·CCV
John 12:8 — 6·CCVI
John 12:21 — 6·CCVII
John 13:10 — 6·CCIX
John 14:16 — 6·CCVIII
John 14:16 — 6·CCX
John 15:26 — 6·CCXI
John 16:9 — 6·CCXII
John 17:5 — 6·CCXIII
John 17:6 — 6·CCXIV
John 17:6 — 6·CCXV
John 19:30 — 6·CCXVI
John 20:19 — 6·CCXVII
John 20:22–23 — 6·CCXVIII
John 21:17 — 6·CCXIX
John 21:19 — 6·CCXXI
John 21:22 — 6·CCXX

Acts

Acts 1:18 — 6·CCXXII
Acts 3:26 — 6·CCXXIII
Acts 4:20 — 6·CCXXIV
Acts 6:5 — 6·CCXXV
Acts 9:5 — 6·CCXXVI
Acts 9:43 — 6·CCXXVII
Acts 15:13 — 6·CCXXVIII
Acts 17:34 — 6·CCXXIX

Romans

Romans 1:1 — 6·CCXXX
Romans 1:17 — 6·CCXXXI
Romans 2:25 — 6·CCXXXII
Romans 3:27 — 6·CCXXXIII
Romans 4:19 — 6·CCXXXIV
Romans 5:5 — 6·CCXXXV
Romans 5:12 — 6·CCXXXVI
Romans 5:12 — 6·CCXXXVII
Romans 5:12 — 6·CCXXXVIII
Romans 7:6 — 6·CCXXXIX
Romans 7:8 — 6·CCXL
Romans 7:14 — 6·CCXLI
Romans 7:14 — 6·CCXLII
Romans 7:25 — 6·CCXLIII
Romans 8:3 — 6·CCXLIV
Romans 8:20 — 6·CCXLV
Romans 8:21 — 6·CCXLVI
Romans 8:27 — 6·CCXLVII
Romans 8:28 — 6·CCXLVIII
Romans 8:29 — 6·CCXLIX
Romans 8:30 — 6·CCL
Romans 9:13 — 6·CCLI

Romans 9:18 — 6·CCLII
Romans 11:1 — 6·CCLIII
Romans 11:5 — 6·CCLIV
Romans 14:23 — 6·CCLV
Romans 16:3 — 6·CCLVI

1 Corinthians

1 Corinthians 1:10 — 6·CCLVII
1 Corinthians 3:12 — 6·CCLVIII
1 Corinthians 3:15 — 6·CCLIX
1 Corinthians 7:10-11 — 6·CCLX
1 Corinthians 11:28 — 6·CCLXI
1 Corinthians 12:28 — 6·CCLXII
1 Corinthians 14:14-16 — 6·CCLXIII
1 Corinthians 15:19 — 6·CCLXIV
1 Corinthians 15:51 — 6·CCLXV
1 Corinthians 15:51 — 6·CCLXVI
1 Corinthians 16:22 — 6·CCLXVII

2 Corinthians

2 Corinthians 8:24 — 6·CCLXVIII

Galatians

Galatians 1:1 — 6·CCLXIX
Galatians 1:15 — 6·CCLXX
Galatians 1:18 — 6·CCLXXI
Galatians 1:19 — 6·CCLXXII
Galatians 2:2 — 6·CCLXXIII
Galatians 2:11 — 6·CCLXXIV
Galatians 2:14 — 6·CCLXXV
Galatians 3:1 — 6·CCLXXVI
Galatians 3:10 — 6·CCLXXVII
Galatians 3:21 — 6·CCLXXVIII
Galatians 4:6 — 6·CCLXXIX
Galatians 4:24 — 6·CCLXXX
Galatians 5:17 — 6·CCLXXXI
Galatians 5:22 — 6·CCLXXXII
Galatians 6:5 — 6·CCLXXXIII
Galatians 6:10 — 6·CCLXXXIV

Ephesians

Ephesians 1:4 — 6·CCLXXXV
Ephesians 1:4 — 6·CCLXXXVI
Ephesians 1:4 — 6·CCLXXXVII
Ephesians 1:6 — 6·CCLXXXVIII
Ephesians 1:7 — 6·CCLXXXIX
Ephesians 1:12 — 6·CCXC
Ephesians 1:17 — 6·CCXCI
Ephesians 1:21 — 6·CCXCII
Ephesians 1:22 — 6·CCXCIII
Ephesians 2:2 — 6·CCXCIV
Ephesians 2:7 — 6·CCXCV
Ephesians 2:17 — 6·CCXCVI

Ephesians 3:1 — 6·CCXCVII
Ephesians 3:10 — 6·CCXCVIII
Ephesians 3:10 — 6·CCXCIX
Ephesians 4:10.b — 6·CCCII
Ephesians 4:11 — 6·CCC
Ephesians 4:11 — 6·CCCI
Ephesians 4:16.b — 6·CCCIII
Ephesians 5:19 — 6·CCCIV
Ephesians 5:24 — 6·CCCV
Ephesians 5:28 — 6·CCCVI
Ephesians 5:32 — 6·CCCVII
Ephesians 6:12 — 6·CCCVIII
Ephesians 6:24 — 6·CCCIX

Philippians

Philippians 1:18 — 6·CCCX
Philippians 1:23 — 6·CCCXI

Colossians

Colossians 1:11 — 6·CCCXII
Colossians 1:20 — 6·CCCXIII
Colossians 3:15 — 6·CCCXIV
Colossians 3:16 — 6·CCCXV

2 Thessalonians

2 Thessalonians 2:5 — 6·CCCXVI
2 Thessalonians 3:10 — 6·CCCXVII

1 Timothy

1 Timothy 3:2 — 6·CCCXVIII
1 Timothy 3:8 — 6·CCCXIX
1 Timothy 3:16 — 6·CCCXX
1 Timothy 5:18 — 6·CCCXXI
1 Timothy 5:23 — 6·CCCXXII

Titus

Titus 1:2 — 6·CCCXXIII
Titus 1:5 — 6·CCCXXIV
Titus 1:6 — 6·CCCXXV
Titus 2:11 — 6·CCCXXVI

Hebrews

Hebrews 1:1 — 6·CCCXXVII
Hebrews 1:3.a — 6·CCCXXVIII
Hebrews 1:9 — 6·CCCXXIX
Hebrews 1:11 — 6·CCCXXX
Hebrews 2:7 — 6·CCCXXXI
Hebrews 4:16 — 6·CCCXXXII
Hebrews 7:10 — 6·CCCXXXIII
Hebrews 8:2 — 6·CCCXXXIV
Hebrews 11:37 — 6·CCCXXXV
Hebrews 12:17 — 6·CCCXXXVI

James

James 1:1 — 6·CCCXXXVII
James 5:12 — 6·CCCXXXVIII
James 5:14 — 6·CCCXXXIX

2 Peter

2 Peter 3:10 — 6·CCCXL
2 Peter 3:10 — 6·CCCXLI

1 John

1 John 5:7 — 6·CCCXLII
1 John 5:16 — 6·CCCXLIII

Jude

Jude 1 — 6·CCCXLIV

Apocalypse

Apocalypse 6:9 — 6·CCCXLV
Apocalypse 11:3 — 6·CCCXLVI
Apocalypse 20:6 — 6·CCCXLVII

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VII

On those who have assailed the volumes of the New Testament (against the destroyers of the new Scripture)

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, BOOK VII

TABLE OF HERESIES

The 10 heresies confuted in this book, in order, with the parts of each. The page number is the page of this English translation.

Page 4: OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GENERAL — Heresy the First *(De Novo Testamento in universali haeresis prima)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 4
- The Refutation — p. 5
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 7
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 9

Page 12: OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW — Heresy II *(De Evangelio Matthaei haeresis II)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 12
- The Refutation — p. 13
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 13
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 18

Page 28: OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK — Heresy III *(De Marci Evangelio haeresis III)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 28
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 28
- The Dissolution — p. 30

Page 32: OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE — Heresy IV *(De Lucae Evangelio haeresis IIII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 32
- The Confutation — p. 36

Page 39: OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN — Heresy V *(De Evangelio Ioannis haeresis V)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 39
- The Refutation — p. 39
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 40
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 42

Page 45: OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES — Heresy VI *(De Actis Apostolorum haeresis VI)*

Page 46: OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE IN GENERAL — Heresy VII *(De epistolis Pauli Apostoli in universali. Haeresis VII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 46
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 47
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 49

Page 51: OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE HEBREWS — Heresy VIII *(De epistola Pauli ad Hebræos hæresis VIII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 51
- The Refutation — p. 51
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 54
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 56

Page 61: OF THE CANONICAL OR CATHOLIC EPISTLES — Heresy IX *(De Canonicis siue Catholicis Epistolis. Hæresis IX)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 62
- The Refutation — p. 62
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 64
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 66

Page 69: OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST — Heresy X *(De Apocalypsi Ioannis Euangelistæ hæresis X)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 69
- The Refutation — p. 70
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 71
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 73

(printed p. 575 [PDF p. 580] — Book VII title-block, Praefatio, and Catalogue of heresies.)

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VII

Of Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On those who have assailed the volumes of the New Testament, or, Against the destroyers of the new Scripture *(De his, qui novi Testamenti volumina oppugnarunt, sive adversus novae scripturae destructores)* — the Seventh Book of the *Bibliotheca Sancta*

PRAEFATIO [Preface]

Since in the foregoing books I have set in order the labors and all the monuments whereby the illustrious writers of the Church have illustrated the holy letters of the blessed Scripture, it has seemed good, in the two books that follow, to confute the errors and heresies brought forth by those who, from the ascension of Christ even unto this day, have attempted to obscure the glory of the sacred volumes, and — God's grace favoring — to overthrow their impious endeavors against the holy writings. But since I perceived that my own exceedingly slender powers were far unequal to the labor marked out, I judged it best to approach the matter not with my own defenses, but with greater and far stronger ones. Accordingly, out of the various writings of the ancient fathers of the Church I first gathered the accusations, argumentations, and fallacious objections with which sundry heretics, in divers ages, have hostilely assailed the divine books of both Testaments; and then, to each several objection of the heretics, I subjoined the responses, solutions, and confutations of the fathers. And in collecting these I have, wherever I could and so far as I could, amassed the authors' very words, sayings, and entire sentences and periods with the utmost fidelity and integrity — setting down, either within the body of the text or without, in the margins over against each sentence, not only the authors' names but also the titles of their books, citing the chapters by number: so that whatever was taken from any author's work, and from what place, might be denoted the more clearly, and as it were with a pointing finger. In those matters, however, whose confutations I could not find in the monuments of the ecclesiastical fathers, I have attempted, out of my slender poverty, to supply some things as best I might. And that each matter might be the more lucid and perspicuous, I have undertaken in the first place the defense of the New Testament in this seventh volume, purposely reserving the apology for the Old Instrument to the eighth volume. For although the writings of the New Instrument are, in the succession of time and in the order of things done, later than the Old Instrument, I have nevertheless judged that the beginning should be made from them, as from those which, in order of doctrine, in the constancy of their demonstrations, and in the excellence of their subject narration, far precede all the books of the Old Testament.

Now in refuting each several heresy I shall follow chiefly this order: **first**, I shall set forth, as briefly as may be, the depraved and pernicious assertions of the heretics, with the names of their assertors indicated; **then**, bringing to bear, on behalf of the Catholic truth, the reasonings of the ancient fathers, together with those testimonies of divine Scripture which the heretics themselves accept as certain and undoubted, I shall overturn the assertions they propose from their very foundations, as the saying is; **in the third place**, I shall bring forward the crafty arguments of the heretics according to a numbered series; **lastly**, repeating the same sequence of numbers, I shall dissolve their argumentations and, God favoring, lay prostrate all their assaults. These things therefore being thus disposed, and duly, as I judge, made ready, it remains that, divine grace assisting, I descend into the field and begin to join battle with the impious destroyers of the New Testament.

CATALOGUE OF THE HERESIES which are confuted in this seventh book
(Haereseon, quae hoc septimo libro confutantur, Catalogus)

Of the New Testament in general	Heresy 1
Of the Gospel of Matthew	Heresy 2
Of the Gospel of Mark	Heresy 3
Of the Gospel of Luke	Heresy 4
Of the Gospel of John	Heresy 5
Of the Acts of the Apostles	Heresy 6
Of the Epistles of Paul in general	Heresy 7
Of the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews	Heresy 8
Of the Canonical Epistles	Heresy 9
Of the Apocalypse of John the Apostle	Heresy 10

(printed p. 576 [PDF p. 581] — Heresy I begins.)

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GENERAL — Heresy the First *(De Novo Testamento in universali haeresis prima)*

Since the New Testament was not written by the Apostles of Christ, there is no need to believe all the things that are contained in it, but [one may] accept certain of them, and reject certain others as fallaciously brought in by falsifiers.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

[1] **The chief** heresy of the Manichaeans is this, which Faustus, bishop of the Manichaeans, defended fiercely beyond the other Manichaeans; concerning which he himself speaks thus in Augustine: "It is agreed that the **New** Testament was written neither by Christ nor by his Apostles, but a long time afterward by certain men of uncertain name, who — lest no credit should be given to them writing things they did not know — set upon the fronts [title-pages] of their writings partly the names of the apostles, partly the names of those who seemed to have followed the apostles, asseverating that they had written according to them." And in another book, in the same Augustine, yet more plainly: [2] "Many words," he says, "have been inserted by your forefathers into the utterances of our Lord, which, though marked with his name, do not agree with his faith — written neither by Christ nor by his Apostles, but discovered, long after their assumption [death], by I know not whom, half-Jews even discordant among themselves, out of rumors and opinions; who nevertheless, referring all these same things to the names of the apostles, or of those who seemed to have followed the apostles, lied that they had written their own errors and falsehoods according to them." And what those things were that had been falsely thrust into the New Testament and were repudiated by the Manichaeans, the same Faustus taught in many places, asserting that two kinds of lies had been inserted into the New Testament: [3] first, all the testimonies of the Old Testament which are found in the New Testament; secondly, all those scriptures in which it should be read that Christ was truly a man and truly suffered human things. These two being excluded, the rest, which pertained to the divinity of Christ, the Manichaeans willingly accepted and confessed to be most true. Helvidius also, in those same times, affirmed that the Greek exemplars of the New Testament had been falsified in many places, as St. Jerome left attested in the book which he wrote against him. But in our own times, in which all things are called back into doubt, the execrable Anabaptists and Servetians have — to the great harm of the Church — restored this error so often routed, confessing indeed that some books of the New Testament were written by the apostles, but that they were afterwards falsified by heretics and contaminated with many errors, and that these same errors have endured in the New Testament even to this day.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Among the nefarious and pernicious heresies which in this our age have revived by the work of the Anabaptists, none surely is more pestilent than this one. For whereas all other heresies can be confuted out of the sacred letters, this one alone cannot be overcome by the arms of holy Scripture: for whatever from the sacred scriptures shall have been brought forward by Catholics to prove the sincerity [integrity] of the sacred volumes, the heretics will at once answer that it was said neither by Christ nor by the Apostles, but written under their name by falsifiers and corrupters. Yet although this detestable heresy cannot be conquered by the arms of holy Scripture, it can easily be stormed by other forces — namely, by the authority of the holy fathers, of the sacred councils, and of the apostolic Church. For this, as Augustine says, is the one and only engine *(machina)* of religion, which has once for all abolished all heresies, by the help of Christ, who promised her: "**I** am with you even unto the consummation of the age." [4] From the authority, therefore, of this Catholic Church the [following] arguments are drawn.

1. First, against Faustus it is most evidently demonstrated that the Apostles were the authors of the New Testament, the continued succession of all the apostolic churches consenting in this. [5] And this rule of succession, as it pleases Augustine, is wont to be observed not only in judging the sacred books, but also in discerning the authors of secular writings. "For whence," says Augustine, "is it agreed that the books now current are those of Hippocrates, the most noble physician, except that the series of succession has so commended them, from the very time of Hippocrates down to this time, that to doubt of them would be [the mark] of a madman? Likewise the books of Plato, of Aristotle, of Cicero, of Varro, and of other authors of that sort — whence have men known that they are theirs, except by the same continuous attestation of times succeeding one another? Wherefore, if it be asked of us whence we know these letters to be the apostles', we answer briefly: From the most well-founded attestation of the Church, carried down by sure successions from the times of the apostles even to these times; which [Church] has always believed the New Testament to have been written by the apostles and evangelists, and has set it forth to be believed."

2. Next, that the books of the New Testament have in no wise been falsified or corrupted is shown by the reading of it in the Church, always the same and continued after the same manner. Augustine uses this argument in the book *On the Profit of Believing*, saying: [6] "By no exemplars extant in so recent a memory can it be proved that the divine scriptures have been falsified. For if we speak of the New Testament, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and the other fathers who followed one another in the Church through the series of times succeeding each other, cite and read it in the same manner. But that all these together were deceived, and that along with them the whole succession of the Catholic Church was through so many years so deluded that she read corrupted and falsified [texts] for uncontaminated ones — who would ever say this, unless one utterly impious?"

3. To this is added moreover both the dignity and the merit of the Church: since Christ, the highest truth, promised her that he would be with her perpetually, it is not to be believed that he was unwilling to preserve for his spouse her scriptures intact and inviolate — seeing he has granted this to so many writings of the gentiles, that they should be kept inviolate. [7] For who is blinded with such fury — unless he be subverted by consenting to the malice and fallacy of the demons' lying — as to say that the church of the apostles could not have de-

[1] Augustine, in the book against Faustus, ch. 3 (Aug. lib. contra Fau. c. 3).
[2] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 3 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Faust. cap. 3).
[3] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 7 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Faust. cap. 7).
[4] Matthew 28 (Matth. 28).
[5] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Fau. cap. 6).
[6] Augustine, On the profit of believing, ch. 3 (Aug. de utilitate cred. c. 3).
[7] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Fau. cap. 6).

(printed p. 577 [PDF p. 582] — Heresy I continues: arguments 4–7; the heretics' objections begin.)

served [could not have merited] that the church of the apostles — so faithful, so numerous a concord of brethren — should faithfully convey their writings to posterity, seeing that it has preserved their chairs *(cathedras)* by a most certain succession even to the present bishops; and seeing that this comes to pass with such felicity for the writings of men of whatever sort, whether outside the Church or within the Church itself?

4. Moreover, if anything in the New Testament, however least, be said to be falsified, all the credit and authority of the New Instrument is taken away. For just as it will be permitted to suspect the corruption of one part, so it will be permitted to opine the same of its other parts, since there is no weightier reason why this part rather than that ought to have been preserved uncontaminated. Whence Augustine, writing to Jerome, says: [1] "To me it seems that it is most ruinously believed that any lie is contained in the holy letters — that is, that those men by whom they were written lied in anything; for if once some officious [well-meant] lie be admitted into so lofty a summit of authority, no particle of those books will remain which — as it shall seem to each man — being either difficult as to morals or incredible as to faith, may not by the same most pernicious rule be referred to the design and office of a lying author."

5. But not only is all the authority of holy Scripture abrogated if either the name of the writer or the context [text] of the Scripture be believed falsified; rather, all the writings of all nations will also be rendered doubtful, uncertain, and suspect of falsity and lying, as regards their authors and the things set down in them. [2] "For what letters will ever have any weight of authority, if the evangelical and apostolic letters have none? Of what book will it be certain whose it is, if it be uncertain whether those letters be the apostles' which the Church — propagated from the apostles themselves and declared with such eminence throughout all nations — declares and holds to be the apostles'?"

6. Besides these things, if it be permitted to each man according to his own caprice to approve or to reject whatever he will out of the New Testament, not only will all scriptures, divine as much as human, be subverted, but even our whole faith. For our faith will no longer be faith — that faith, namely, which, the intellect being made captive, and the judgment of human reason and of carnal prudence being renounced, commits itself wholly to the divine words and to the authority of the Church — but a certain empty conjecture of one's own fancy, and a certain foolish opinion emerging out of the murky darkness of our blind reason; and we shall believe the holy scriptures not on account of their venerable authority, but on account of the foolish persuasion of our insane reason — which ought to be so absurd in the eyes of a faithful man that nothing could be more absurd. Whence Augustine, casting the deformity of this absurdity in the teeth of the Manichaeans, says: [3] "You see, therefore, that you are aiming at this: that all authority be removed from the midst of the scriptures, and that each man's own mind be the author [judge] of what to approve and what to disapprove in each scripture — that is, that he be not subjected to the authority of the scriptures unto faith, but subject the scriptures to himself: not that a thing therefore pleases him because it is read written in that sublime authority, but it seems rightly written because it pleased him."

7. Finally, while the heretics press too hard upon the overthrow of our doctrines, they hurl themselves headlong by their own impulse, and utterly destroy all their own scriptures and all their own heresies. [4] For if our Gospel codices are falsified and lack credit — codices which, from the very times of Christ's presence, through the dispensations of the apostles and the other successions of bishops from their sees, have come down to these times, kept, commended, and made illustrious throughout the whole world — how shall the furtive codices of the heretics, lately hammered out by them in their lurking-holes, be able to find any credit among men? Next, if our evangelical scriptures are falsified, whence, O wretched and unhappy men, will you prove your perverse doctrines, and whence will you assert the things you say? [5] You will answer that you prove them from the Gospel. From what Gospel — you who do not accept the whole of it, since you say it has been falsified? For who would himself first say that his own witness has been corrupted by falsity, and

then produce him for testimony? For if we believe him in what you wish, and do not believe him in what you do not wish, then we shall be believing not him, but you. But if we were willing to believe you, we should not demand a witness from you. Therefore either you are compelled to confess those codices truthful, if you wish to establish your heresies from their authority; or to affirm them deceitful — and then you have overturned all your own heresies.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. First: the scriptures of the New Testament are so dissonant among themselves and so various, so stuffed with contrarieties of narrations as well as of sentences, that neither does the one agree with the other, nor the same with themselves; and if these be attributed to the apostles, what else is that but to calumniate good men, and to summon the concordant company of Christ's disciples to the charge of discord? [6] And that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John conflict with the other apostles and among themselves, whoever shall have compared the histories of the four Evangelists with one another will easily know of himself; and we too shall show this very thing when we speak particularly of each of their histories.

2. And that it is lawful for us to accept and believe certain things in the New Testament, and neither to accept nor believe certain others, we demonstrate by your own example: you who, since you do not accept so many things of the Old Testament, and think they are to be cast away as unworthy of faith, [7] admonish us to do the same likewise in the New Testament according to the same rule. For how would you compel us to accept all the things that are inserted in the monuments of the New Testament, when you neither believe nor accept so many things of the Old Testament — which nevertheless you affirm to be equal in sanctity to the New? For you do not believe what is said in the Old Testament, namely: that he is accursed who has not raised up seed in Israel (since that would comprehend all virgins too); or that he shall utterly perish from his race who has not been circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin [8] (since this too would pertain to every Christian); or that he who has broken the sabbath is to be put out [stoned to death] with stones; or that he is not to be spared who has violated any single commandment of the Old Testament; or that God is to be appeased with sacrifices, offerings, and immolations (as seems good to Moses); or that the Pasch is to be cele-

[1] Augustine to Jerome, epistle 8 (Aug. ad Hieronymum epist. 8).
[2] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Faust. cap. 6).
[3] Augustine against Faustus, book 32, ch. 19 (Aug. contra Faust. lib. 32 cap. 19).
[4] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 9 (Aug. lib. 33 contra Fau. cap. 9).
[5] Augustine, book 32 against Faustus, ch. 16 (Aug. lib. 32 contra Faust. cap. 16).
[6] From Augustine, book 32 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Ex Aug. lib. 32 contra Fau. c. 2).
[7] From Augustine, book 32 against Faustus, chs. 3 & 5 (Ex Aug. lib. 32 cont. Fau. cap. 3 & 5).
[8] Genesis 17 (Gen. 17).

(printed p. 578 [PDF p. 583] — Heresy I continues: objections 2–4; the Dilutio begins.)

brated with a lamb and the eating of unleavened bread, and that for seven days one must beware of leaven; or that one must not abstain from the foods prohibited in the Law. And since these things are in no wise believed by you — seeing that you do not observe them — but are repudiated as alien, far removed from the Christian rite, and in no part to be believed or observed, why should it not be lawful for us to do the same in the New Testament? — especially in those things which agree neither with the gravity of the writers nor with the Christian faith, but discolor the beauty and grace of the Gospel itself, and diminish the honor and praise of the majesty of Christ: as that Christ was born of a woman shamefully, circumcised Jewishly, sacrificed after the manner of the gentiles, baptized humbly, led about by the devil through the deserts, and by him most wretchedly tempted. All which things we think are deservedly to be rejected, as written imprudently by unskilled men, or wickedly inserted by enemies.

3. For this same cause we also reject all the testimonies of the prophets and of the old Law which are found in the New Testament — not only because they have been falsely and wrongly inserted into the New Testament, but because they are brought in superfluously and beside the point, and lead the reader to suspicion rather than to faith: as though the majesty of the Son of God, his authority, the testimonies of his works, and his miracles were not sufficient to confirm and establish the authority of the Gospel; but these arguments were so invalid and infirm that, casting them aside, it should be necessary to summon foreign witnesses from this side and that, and — for the strengthening of the Gospel's stability — to beg from the Jews, even our enemies, the doubtful, uncertain, and suspect testimonies of our foes. Thus far Faustus. [1]

4. But the **Anabaptists** strive to show, out of the testimonies of many fathers, that the codices of the New Testament, Latin as well as Greek — even those which the Catholic Church used — were falsified of old. And first, concerning the falsified exemplars of the Latins: Ambrose, say they, bringing in against the heretics that testimony of Paul, "We serve by the Spirit of God," speaks thus: [2] "But if anyone contends about the variety of the Latin codices, some of which the perfidious have falsified, let them inspect the Greek codices, and observe that it is written: οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες [they who worship God in the Spirit]." [3] And Jerome, in the preface to the four gospels addressed to Damasus, asserts that the greatest variety is found in the Latin exemplars, and that there are as many Latin exemplars as codices; adding that the New Testament in our tongue is discordant, and that therefore he wished to correct the New Testament to the Greek truth, and to emend in it whatever things had either been badly put forth by faulty translators, or more perversely emended by unskilled presumers, or added or changed by drowsing copyists. But in what way Jerome could have restored the Latin New Testament to its integrity by a collation made with the Greek codices does not appear, since the Greek codices in his age were much more depraved than the Latin, and much more divergent — as he himself confesses upon the fifth chapter of [the epistle to] the Galatians; and in the preface to the Pentateuch he writes that the Latin exemplars are more correct than the Greek. And the divine Ambrose, in the exposition of the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, speaking of the diversity and discrepancy of the Greek exemplars, says: "The **Greeks** have divers codices, which through zeal for contention disagree with one another." And this discrepancy of the Greek codices is shown by Jerome's very translation, which the Church now has; which, since in many things (as is manifest) it disagrees with the truth [text] of the Greek codices which the Church now holds, it remains either that Jerome did not translate the New Testament faithfully, or, if he translated faithfully, that he had other Greek exemplars greatly divergent from these, which at that time were read in the church as sincere and uncontaminated, and that from those, as from the true fountain, he translated the New Testament — those Greek codices which are now found being rejected as vitiated and by no means entire. Nor are there wanting those who judge that the Greek codices which we now have were vitiated by the Greeks after they separated themselves, on account of their contentions, from the Roman Church. Yet we know that even long before those discords of the Greek and Latin Church, down to the times of Origen, the Greek codices of the New Testament disagreed much among themselves; and that Origen himself, though laboring diligently, could not reduce that dissension into concord. For Origen himself affirms this in the eighth homily upon Matthew, in which he sets down these words: "We have found **much** difference among the exemplars. In the exemplars of the Old Testament indeed, whatever things were consonant we were able, God assisting, to fit together, using the judgment of the other editions. For those things which seemed doubtful in the Seventy because of the consonance of exemplars, making a judgment from the remaining editions, we kept what agreed; and certain things we marked as not set down in the Hebrew, not daring to remove them altogether; and certain things we added with asterisks, that it might be manifest that we added, in agreement with the Hebrew, from the other editions the things not set down in the Seventy. But in the exemplars of the New Testament I did not think I could do this very thing without peril; I judged it not unreasonable that I ought only to set forth suspicions and reasonings, and the causes of the suspicions." By which words Origen most clearly shows that the Greek codices of the New Testament in his age were various among themselves, and that this variety could not be

removed by applying asterisks and obeli, as had been done by him in the Old Testament. Now an irreconcilable variety and dissension is an argument of falsity.

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Since the heretics, with a certain general and indefinite calumny, accuse the evangelical scriptures as discordant and fighting among themselves, and yet do not prove it, promising that they will do so hereafter, therefore for the present we shall answer them with nothing but a certain general response: namely, that this variety of the evangelists, which the heretics object in place of falsity, is with us the greatest argument of truth — as the most eloquent Chrysostom excellently demonstrated when, against the heretics, he wrote on behalf of the evangelical diaphony [discord] in the preface on Matthew after this manner: [4] "But, you will say, there is no truth in the Evangelists, because they are found divergent from one another in many things;

[1] Augustine against Faustus, book 12, ch. 1, and book 32, ch. 7 (Aug. contra Faust. lib. 12 cap. 1 & lib. 32 cap. 7).
[2] Ambrose, in the book On the Holy Spirit (Amb. lib. de Spiritu sancto).
[3] Philippians 3 (Phil. 3).
[4] Chrysostom, in the preface upon Matthew (Chrysost. in praef. super Matth.).

(printed p. 579 [PDF p. 584] — the Dilutio of Heresy I continues: responses 1–4.)

and dissonant. Nay rather, this very thing is the greatest testimony of truth. For if they agreed entirely and in all things, and if with excessive diligence and care their words ran together equally, down to the times, all the places, and the very single words, no enemy would ever have believed but that they, gathered by a common counsel to deceive, had composed the Gospel as it were by a certain human contrivance; for they would judge that so anxious a consonance was not [the mark] of simplicity. But as it is, that seeming dissonance in small matters defends them from all suspicion, and clearly enough protects the reputation of the writers. If, however, they have spoken variously of times and places, that in no way prejudices the truth of the things said. Yet nevertheless, as God shall grant, proceeding onward we shall attempt to declare what this [variety] is; after this asking what we have said [before] — that you note diligently that in those principal matters, in which both our life and the sum of the preaching consist, no one of them is found to differ even in the least. And what are these? That God was made man; that he worked marvels; that he was crucified; that he was buried; that he rose again; that he ascended into heaven; that he is to be judge; that he established saving precepts; that he brought in no law contrary to the former; that he is the Son of God; that he is only-begotten; that he is of the same substance with the Father — and whatsoever things are of this kind. For in all these we find their concord to be greatest. But if, in the choosing of the marvels [to relate], not all have said all the same things, but this one narrated those and another others, let it not disturb you at all. For if any one of them had said everything, the number of the rest would have been superfluous; and if they had all written things divergent among themselves and all new, no proof of their agreement could have appeared. For this reason they have both said many things in common, and nonetheless each has written down something proper and special to himself; and lest anything should seem added superfluously and unseasonably, [each so wrote] that neither would nothing new be added, nor — had he said everything different — would the whole credit of the matters be called into doubt." Let these words of the divine John [Chrysostom] suffice for now. But when the heretics begin to produce by name passages of the gospels [allegedly] fighting with one another, we too shall answer each one appositely, according to the series of their objections, so far as can be done.

2. Now let us pass to Faustus's comparison, whereby he claims it is lawful for him not to believe certain things of the New Testament because we do not believe many things of the Old Testament — those, namely, which we do not observe out of it. This comparison is indeed null, because it is one thing to *believe* the things Faustus mentions from the Old Testament, and another to *observe* them. For if we speak of faith and belief, we believe all the things contained in those books, and we praise, accept, and approve them as written most truly and most profitably for eternal life, and we defend them with the firmest reason of truth. [1] But if the

discourse is about the observance of the same, we say that we do not observe with bodily operation the things commanded in them; because we know that they were most rightly commanded, suitably to that time and to that people; and we have learned that they were a shadow of things to come, and we now know that they are being fulfilled. And hence, whoever at that time failed to observe, even in deed, the things commanded to be done for signification, paid by God's most righteous judgment the divinely appointed penalties — just as now, if anyone should dare with sacrilegious temerity to violate the sacraments of the New Testament, distinct [from the old] according to the reckoning of the time. [2] We believe, therefore, and accept all things — whether those we observe, that we may live rightly, or those we do not observe, that we may now see fulfilled the things which then were commanded and observed in figure and prophecy. Faustus lies, therefore, in saying that we do not believe many things of the Old Testament because we pass over their bodily observance, since nevertheless we accept all those things within the number of things to be believed.

3. Concerning the testimonies of the Old Testament, which he rejects as false or superfluous, our response is this: they can be neither false nor superfluous. [3] False — by no means: since Paul, whom the Manichaeans venerate most of all, and profess to have entire [uncorrupted], testifies in many places that all the evangelical mysteries were promised by God in the holy scriptures through the mouths of the Prophets. And superfluous — not at all; nay, they are necessary in the highest degree: not indeed that we believe the testimony of Christ to need the authority of external testimony for its stability, or that we prefer the testimonies of the prophets to him; but lest, unmindful of the benefit received, we be ungrateful to the prophets, extinguishing the oracles of the prophets, by whose attestation the apostles demonstrated to us that their preaching was true, and by their authority invited [men] to the faith of Christ. Likewise, that we may have the means whereby to invite all unbelievers, Hebrews as well as gentiles, to the faith of Christ, if they do not resist; or whereby to defend that same faith of Christ against them, if they contradict — showing to both that the things which are now fulfilled in Christ and in the Church were foretold by the prophets so long a time before, that no one, unless wholly devoid of reason, can deny them.

4. But to that which the Anabaptists object concerning the corruption of the Greek as well as the Latin codices, we say: it is not lawful to infer, from the particular depravation of some codices, a universal and general corruption of all codices. For from the fact that Ambrose, Jerome, and Origen said either that some Latin codices had been falsified by certain perfidious men, or that there is much variety in the Greek exemplars, one may not conclude that all the codices of the Catholic Church together were vitiated. Just as neither from the particular negligence of certain unskilled men, or the malice of falsifiers, is it lawful to deduce what Faustus and the Anabaptists have perniciously deduced — namely, that our forefathers, to mock the simple and rude Christians, corrupted all the evangelical codices on purpose. Since (as Augustine says) [4] even if all the fathers had conspired in this — to deprive themselves and others of the truth of the scriptures (which cannot be imagined) — yet they could not have falsified all the codices everywhere, which were by now worn by the hands of Christians throughout the whole world; because as soon as they had begun to do it, with all Christians everywhere crying out against them, they would have been convicted and confuted as falsifiers out of the truth of the ancient codices — especially since [the scriptures were] now not in one language

[1] Augustine, book 32 against Faustus, ch. 13 (Aug. lib. 32 contra Faust. cap. 13).
[2] Augustine, book 16, ch. 15 (Aug. 16. cap. 15).
[3] Augustine against Faustus, book 13, chs. 10 & 14 (Aug. co. Fau. lib. 13 ca. 10 & 14).
[4] Augustine, book 32 against Faustus, ch. 16 (Aug. lib. 32 co. Fau. c. 16).

(printed p. 580 [PDF p. 585] — end of Heresy I; Heresy II, on the Gospel of Matthew, begins.)

but the Gospel was contained in many languages. But even if we should grant to the heretics that all the codices were corrupted in some part, and that the several exemplars of the Catholic Church were vitiated in

certain particular places, it will nevertheless not follow that all the codices together were corrupted in the same places, parts, sentences, and words; but some were corrupted in some, others in other parts, sentences, and words — in such wise that the things which in certain exemplars had been depraved, whether by chance or by malicious industry, remained in certain others entire and inviolate. And in this manner indeed the truth of the evangelical text, which in the single and particular codices of the church had been varied according to the diversity of times and of copyists, remained always entire and incorrupt in all the exemplars collected together — God so willing: that the integrity of the true reading, which the malice or negligence of men had corrupted in parts, should be preserved at least in the whole universality of the churchly codices; lest the church of Christ should for any time lack the integrity of the divine scriptures; and that pious and erudite men might always have the means to correct and emend whatever the ignorance of the unskilled or the perfidy of the wicked had vitiated, a collation of many exemplars with one another being made. From which it is now plain whence the Latin New Testament could be emended (a thing that seems impossible to the heretics): namely, from the collation of the Latin codices with the Greek exemplars, and of the Greek likewise among themselves.

Nor does it stand in the way that Ambrose and Jerome say the Greek codices were more depraved than the Latin. For Ambrose does not speak universally — that all the Latin codices are more correct than those of the Greeks — but particularly of certain ones which the simplicity of the times preserved incorrupt. And Jerome, in the preface to the Pentateuch, said not by way of assertion that the Latin are more correct than the Greek, but brought forth those words as something impossible *(adynaton)* or absurd, saying: "**If** the Latin [copies] are more correct than the Greek, and the Greek more than the Hebrew…" Whence the same [Jerome], in the epistle to Sunnia and Fretela, affirms that one must have recourse to the Greek codices as the more correct, in these words: "In the New Testament, if ever a question arises among the Latins, and there is variety among the exemplars, we run back to the fountain of the Greek speech, in which the New Testament was written." And this Jerome certainly observed when he restored the New Testament to the Greek truth. It remains, therefore, that there were always among the Greeks certain codices entire and faithful, from which the Latin codices could be emended. And even if it be conceded that some faultiness could befall these too through the fault of copyists, they could nevertheless easily be restored to their pristine integrity: because from several exemplars corrupted by chance, when collated into one, the true reading is very often detected; for it frequently happens that what has been depraved in one codex by the carelessness of scribes is found entire in another codex.

But when the heretics subjoin that either the Greek codex which the church now commonly has is not the one Jerome used in translating, or that Jerome did not translate rightly and faithfully, we say: that the Greek codex which is now read in the church is that very same one which the Greek church used in the times of Jerome, and long before, even to the times of the apostles — true, sincere, faithful, and contaminated by no fault of falsity; [1] as the continued reading of all the Greek fathers most lucidly shows, they all reading always one and the same tenor of the scripture: Dionysius, Justin, Irenaeus, Melito, Origen, Africanus, Apollinarius, Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and other fathers before and after the times of Jerome. Nor is it likely that the Greek fathers vitiated their own codices to the detriment of the Latins; for if they had done this out of hatred of the Western church, they would have depraved them chiefly in those places about which there was fighting and dissension between them and the Latin church; and since those places endure still entire and inviolate, and the Greeks have not vitiated them, much less is it to be believed that they vitiated others. Nor is Jerome for this reason to be believed to have translated the New Testament badly — because our vulgate edition, which is said to be Jerome's, differs in many things from the Greek truth. For (as we have said abundantly elsewhere, when we treated of the translations of holy Scripture) the vulgate edition of the New Testament which we now use is not purely Jerome's from Greek into Latin, but a certain mixed edition, gathered partly from the old vulgate edition, partly from a certain new castigation [revision] of Jerome upon the New Testament. For it is not altogether certain whether he translated the whole

New Testament from the Greek, or corrected it as already translated before by others — which latter he may be conjectured rather to have done, from many of his writings, especially from the preface to the four gospels, where he says: "**Thus** in this emendation we have tempered our pen, that, correcting only those things which seemed to change the sense, we permitted the rest to remain as they had been." But although this edition be not Jerome's, and many things in it do not answer to the Greek truth, yet one ought not to assail it with calumnies as false and by no means sincere and entire, as the heretics do: because even if there be many things in it which do not agree thus exactly *(adamussim)* with the Greek, nevertheless no evangelical precepts nor mysteries of our faith have been omitted in this our vulgate edition, or translated so obscurely that they cannot be understood, or turned into a sense divergent from and contrary to our doctrines; nor do they — whether in the things that regard faith or in the things that pertain to morals — contain anything less than is read in the Greek. But concerning the integrity of this edition we have spoken elsewhere, in the treatise on Translations, as much as was fitting. Now let us proceed to the other heresies.

OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW — Heresy II *(De Evangelio Matthaei haeresis II)*

To cut out of the Gospel according to Matthew — which was falsely composed by an uncertain author under the name of Matthew — certain things badly inserted by the fault of corrupters.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The first authors of this heresy (as Epiphanius relates) were the Ebionites, [so named] from Ebion, [2]

[1] Matt. 4 (Matth. 4).
[2] Book 1, Heresy 30 (Lib. 1, Haer. 30).

(printed p. 581 [PDF p. 586] — Heresy II: assertors continued; the Impugnatio and the heretics' objections begin.)

[from Ebion] so named, not long after the preaching of the Apostles; who, just as they held divers opinions concerning the nativity of Christ, so brought forth divers judgments concerning the gospel of Matthew. Accordingly it must be known that, as Eusebius in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History [1] and Epiphanius affirm, the Ebionites were divided in two around [the question of] Christ's nativity: those of them who followed the error of their teacher Ebion said that Christ was pure man, procreated by common nativity of man and woman; but those who departed from their teacher in this asserted that Christ was neither true man nor born according to the flesh. But because they saw that Matthew, in the very beginning of his gospel, ran counter to this error of theirs, and most openly attested that Christ was man and had a father and mother on earth, therefore — the genealogies being cut off, that is, the first and second chapter of this gospel, in which the generations of Christ are enumerated — they took the beginning of this gospel from its third chapter; yet with many words adulterated and changed, partly added, partly mutilated, after this manner: "It came to pass in the days of Herod, King of Juda, that John came baptizing with the baptism of penance in the river Jordan; who was said to be of the stock of Aaron the priest, son of Zachary and Elizabeth; and all went out to him." And after they had said many things, they added: "The people being baptized, Jesus also was baptized by John; and when he had come up out of the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God in the form of a dove, descending and entering into him. And a voice was made from heaven, saying: Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased; and again: I this day have begotten thee. And straightway a great light shone round about the place; and when John had seen it, he said to him: Who art thou, Lord? And again a voice from heaven to him: This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased. And then John, falling down before him, said: I beseech thee, Lord, baptize thou me. But he forbade him, saying: Suffer it, for thus it is fitting that all things be fulfilled." Thus they. But those who said Christ was born of the

seed of man kept this genealogy entire, that from it they might convince [men] that Christ had a father no less than a mother after the flesh; and on account of this sole genealogy — the other gospels being cast aside — they used the gospel of Matthew alone, though with the genealogy alone entire, the remaining parts mutilated, truncated, and corrupted. And among these the chief were Cerinthus, Merinthus, and Carpocras, as Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Philastrius attest. [2] But Marcion, after these, rejected the gospel of Matthew entirely, as Epiphanius witnesses. After him the Manichaeans took up the patronage of the same dogma; and before the rest, most of all Faustus the Manichaean, who — as appears from the books of the divine Augustine against the same Faustus, namely the second, third, and seventh — endeavored with many arguments to show that the Gospel according to Matthew was written not by Matthew, but by some other of uncertain name and uncertain authority, composed under the name of Matthew; which moreover he judged should be divided into two parts, namely into the Genealogy and the Gospel. And the Gospel indeed he would have to be that [part] which contains only the preaching of the Son of God after John was shut up in prison; but whatever was narrated before John's chains, he said, pertained not to the gospel but to the falsely fabricated Genealogy, and therefore that it was deservedly to be repudiated as a mere genealogy, which is not gospel. Then, turning to that part which he himself called the gospel, he taught that not all things out of it were to be received, but that many were to be repudiated as false and fabricated — but especially he rejected all the testimonies of the Law and the Prophets which are inserted in various places of this gospel, as brought in over and above by rash depravers. Finally the Anabaptists and Servetians in our times have called back into the light this same error, now extinct for so many ages, asserting that many vaticinations of the prophets have been falsely and violently wrested to Christ, and sewn wrongly into this gospel, as into the others, to prove the divinity of Christ.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

In the confutation of the preceding heresy above, we showed by very many arguments that there is nothing in the New Testament either mendaciously written, or maliciously depraved, altered, falsified, superadded, or subtracted. Wherefore, lest repeating the same thing twice we be compelled to take up again, in confuting the particular heresies of the New Testament, the same arguments which we have already employed in reproving the universal heresies of the whole New Testament, we will not bring a new impugnation here; but we remit the reader to the impugnation of the preceding heresy, which, as a common engine *(machina)*, we oppose to this as much as to the other similar heresies of this kind.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

Now first of all, that the gospel inscribed with the name of Matthew is not the evangelist Matthew's own, the Manichaeans as well as the Anabaptists strive to show by some arguments — plainly contemptible ones. And first of all Faustus the Manichaean speaks thus:

1. That Matthew did not write this gospel, but some other unknown man under his name, the oblique narration of the very text of Matthew teaches. [3] For what does it say? "**And** when Jesus passed by, he saw a man sitting at the receipt of custom, Matthew by name, and he called him. And he, forthwith rising up, followed him." [4] And who, then, writing of himself, would say: "He saw a *man*, and called *him*, and *he* followed him," and would not rather say: "He saw *me*, and called *me*, and *I* followed him" — unless because it is evident that Matthew did not write these things, but some other unknown one under his name?

2. But the **Anabaptists** contend from the language of the author of this gospel that it is not Matthew's. For Matthew was a Hebrew, and is recorded to have written his gospel for the Hebrews in the Hebrew language and letters, as Eusebius relates out of Papias, [5] and Jerome asserts in the book On Illustrious Men. But this gospel, which is now had under the name of Matthew, seems to have been written by its author not in the Hebrew but rather in the Greek tongue. For this the interpretations of the Hebrew names, which are read

scattered in very many places of this gospel, manifestly demonstrate;

[1] ch. 27 (cap. 27).
[2] Irenaeus, book 1, ch. 26; Ebion: [Epiphanius] book 1, heresies 28, 30 & 42; Philastrius, ch. 36 (Iren. lib. 1 cap. 26. Ebi. lib. 1 her. 28 et 30 & 42. phil. cap. 36).
[3] Augustine, book 17 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 17 contra Faust. cap. 1).
[4] Matthew 9 (Matt. 9).
[5] Eusebius, book 3, ch. 39 (Eus. lib. 3 c. 39).

(printed p. 582 [PDF p. 587] — Heresy II: objections 2–7 continue.)

as in the first chapter, where it is said: "His name shall be called **Emmanuel**, which is interpreted, God with us"; [1] and in the twenty-eighth chapter [rather, the twenty-seventh], where it is written: "**Heli**, Heli, lamazabatani, which is interpreted: God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Now if Matthew wrote the whole gospel in the Hebrew tongue, then one rightly wonders in what tongue, or in what words, and for the sake of what, he interpreted sentences of this kind; and whether in their interpretation he used words of his own or of a foreign tongue. For if he interpreted Hebrew words with Hebrew words, he incurs the vice of superfluity, expounding things known by things equally known, without any necessity; but if he expressed his own native words with foreign words, then the interpretation of the words will be more obscure than the words themselves. Next, why should he have interpreted these words of his gospel rather than others, since all were of equal facility or difficulty among the Hebrews? Wherefore, to avoid the inept superfluity of this interpretation, we are compelled to say, first, that the author of this gospel wrote not in Hebrew but in Greek; and because he inserted some Hebrew words of the Greek scripture which contained a mystery, he therefore translated them into Greek, lest the reader be defrauded of the understanding of them. But if anyone shall say that those expressions were superadded not by the author but by a Greek interpreter [translator], and that they are not had in the Hebrew codex of Matthew, then it follows that this gospel is rendered suspect in every part. For just as the interpreter brought in these words out of his own head beyond necessity, so it is likely that he either added, or could have added, many other things at his own pleasure. Nor does it stand in the way that this gospel is now found written in Hebrew letters — just as Jerome of old found this very thing written in Hebrew in the library of Caesarea; since it could have been turned from Greek into Hebrew speech by anyone skilled in the Hebrew tongue, as was done with the gospel of John, which Epiphanius writes was of old translated from the Greek tongue into Hebrew, [2] and kept in the treasuries *(gazophylacia)* of the Hebrews at Tiberias even to his own times.

3. It is rendered uncertain, moreover, whether Matthew wrote any gospel at all; because concerning the time at which Matthew wrote it there is divers opinion among the ecclesiastical writers. Eusebius of Caesarea relates in the Chronicles that Matthew first of all wrote a gospel in Judaea while Peter ruled the church of Antioch, in the third year of the empire of Caligula; but Irenaeus, in the third book Against Heresies, chapter one, hands down that Matthew wrote his gospel when Peter and Paul were evangelizing at Rome.

4. But whether this gospel was composed by Matthew or by some other, it matters little (as Faustus says). [3] It is enough that many things have been craftily inserted into it by certain depraved tamperers. Among which the first place is held by that genealogy of the Savior set before the beginning of the gospel — which many reasons show was neither written by a good man, nor is a part of the gospel, nor pertains to the gospel at all. And first, the very definition of the gospel teaches that this genealogy stands far from the gospel: for the gospel is the very preaching of Jesus Christ the Son of God; for so it is read in Matthew 4: [4] "Jesus **went about** all Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom." And since this preaching began after John was shut up in prison — as is had in the 4th chapter of Matthew, where it is said, "**From that time** Jesus began to preach and to say: Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven shall draw near" — it follows that whatever is narrated before Christ's preaching is not gospel, but is all genealogy, up to the prison of John. For also in the second chapter of Matthew a star is brought in, after the profane custom of the gentiles, seen in the East by

the Magi — as it were a certain fatal constellation under whose influence the fortune of the newborn boy was constituted.

5. This same thing appears from the inscription of his genealogy, [5] which Matthew himself did not dare to call a gospel, but inscribed it: "**The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David**." For what hindered Matthew from setting down "The Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of David," except that he thought it wicked to call a genealogy a gospel? Whence we too may rightly name those first two chapters a "Genesidium" [a little Genesis] rather than a Gospel.

6. To this is added that Mark, who was Matthew's follower and abbreviator, rejected this genealogy from the gospel of Matthew as spurious *(notham)*: [6] because, since he had undertaken to write the gospel only, he passed over the writing of that generation as in no wise pertaining to the gospel, beginning his gospel from the preaching of the Son of God, which is the true gospel; and to show that the beginning of the gospel is rightly to be taken not from the generation but from the preaching of Christ, he began thus: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God"; [7] and immediately, Christ's generation being passed over, he subjoined the preaching of John and of Christ.

7. Moreover, the very dissension of the evangelists in recounting the generation of Christ is so interminable and inexplicable that, if one of them wrote truly, it is necessary that the other of them lie. [8] For John and Mark do not write that God was born of man, nor do they bring in Mary and Joseph as Christ's parents; but John indeed says that in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God — signifying, namely, Christ; [9] while Mark says, "the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of *God*" — as though reproaching Matthew, who set down "the Son of *David*." But Luke and Matthew contend with each other about this generation even much more. For Luke in the third chapter writes that Christ was the son of Joseph, who was [the son] of Heli, who was of Mathat, who was of Levi, who was of Melchi, who was of Janne, who was of Joseph, [10] who was of Mathathias, who was of Amos, who was of Nahum, who was of Hesli, who was of Aggai, who was of Maath, who was of Mathathias, who was of Semei, who was of Joseph, who was of Juda, who was of Joanna, who was of Resa, who was of Zorobabel, who was of Salathiel, who was of Neri, who was of Melchi, who was of Addi, who was of Thesan [Cosan], who was of Telmadan [Elmadan], and the rest that follow. But Matthew, deducing the generation of Christ from parents, grandsires, great-grandsires, and forefathers far divergent [from these], says that Christ was begotten of Mary, who was the wife of Joseph, sprung

[1] Matthew 1; Matthew 28 (Matth. 1; Matth. 28 — i.e., ch. 27).
[2] Book 1, heresy 50 (Lib. 1 her. 50 — i.e., 30).
[3] Augustine, book 2 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 2 co. Fau. c. 1).
[4] Matt. 4 (Matt. 4).
[5] Augustine, in the same place; Matthew 1 (Aug. ibidem; Matt. 1).
[6] Augustine, in the same place (Aug. ibid.).
[7] Mark 1 (Marc. 1).
[8] Augustine against Faustus, book 3, ch. 10 (Aug. co. Fau. lib. 3 ca. 10).
[9] Matt. 1; Julian the apostate, in Cyril, book 8 against Julian (Matt. 1; Iulia. apost. apud Cyril. lib. 8 con. Iulianum).
[10] Luke 3 (Luc. 3).

(printed p. 583 [PDF p. 588] — Heresy II: objections 7–12 continue.)

from Jacob, sprung from Mathan, sprung from Eleazar, sprung from Eliud, begotten of Achim, begotten of Sadoch, begotten of Azor, begotten of Eliachim, begotten of Abiud, begotten of Zorobabel, begotten of Salathiel, begotten of Jeconias, begotten of Josias, begotten of Amon, begotten of Manasses, begotten of Ezechias, begotten of Achaz, begotten of Joathan, begotten of Ozias, begotten of Joram, begotten of Josaphat, begotten of Asa, begotten of Abia, begotten of Roboam, begotten of Solomon, begotten of David — and the rest. Since therefore these two evangelists disagree so greatly between themselves about this

generation of Christ that Matthew makes Joseph, [Christ's] father, the son of Jacob and grandson of Mathan, his descent deduced from the stock of David through Solomon, while Luke makes him the son of Heli, grandson of Mathat, great-grandson of Levi, deduced from the stock of David not through Solomon but through Nathan — it follows that either both of them lie, or at least one of them. [1] Nor can that solution be brought forward in this place which Augustine also condemns in the second book of Evangelical Questions, chapter five: namely, that the same man — as is wont to happen frequently not only among the Jews but among all nations — had two names. For they who think this are easily refuted by the rest of the series of the generation, as Augustine says. For what will they say of Christ's grandsires, great-grandsires, and the rest of his ancestors, of almost all of whom the several evangelists have woven diverse names, each into his own narration?

8. This Genealogy is furthermore to be cast off from the gospel because in the whole context of this generation, up to the baptism of Christ — in which he was declared by the voice of the Father to be the Son of God — no mention is ever made that Christ is the Son of God, but only the son of David, and born of men: [2] as if Matthew, together with the Ebionites, had believed that Christ was then first made the Son of God in his baptism, when the heavens were opened and the Holy Spirit descended upon him, but before the baptism was pure man — which is nowhere found in the whole gospel. For Christ never said that he had a father, or a mother, or a lineage on earth; but rather the contrary: that he was not of this world, that he proceeded from God the Father, that he descended from heaven, that none are mothers and brethren to him save those who shall have done the will of his Father who is in heaven. Therefore to ascribe this genealogy to Matthew is to thrust a calumny upon him — as though he had shut up the Son of God in the womb of a woman.

9. Again, this Genealogy cannot be true: because if Christ is the son of David according to the flesh, as it is the writer's purpose to show, then Christ drew his flesh from the seed of David either from Joseph or from Mary. [3] But from Joseph by no means: for you deny that he was seeded from Joseph as father. Therefore you must needs confess that he is not even the son of David: since the generation is deduced from Abraham to David, and from David to *Joseph* — through all the fathers, namely, of the Hebrews. From which — since Jesus was not conceived, as you say — he will not be David's son. Accordingly neither could he draw the flesh of David from Mary: because the origin of the virgin herself was not of the same tribe with David — that is, not of the tribe of Juda, from which the kings of the Jews are, but of the tribe of Levi, whence the priests [come]. And this very thing is manifest: both because Luke in the first chapter says she was the kinswoman of Elizabeth, whom he calls of the daughters of Aaron; [4] and because it is agreed that this same [Mary] had for father a certain priest by the name of Joachim — of whom, however, in this generation no mention is anywhere made. How then shall Mary be said to pertain to this lineage of Davidic kindred, in which you see she has neither father nor husband? And hence neither will he be David's son, whoever is born of her, unless you so join Joseph to this his mother that she be proved either his daughter or his wife.

10. And furthermore, those very men who ascribe these Genealogies to Christ knew Jesus neither before his nativity nor immediately after his nativity — so that it might be believed that they wrote the things they had seen done with their own eyes concerning him — but they were joined to him when he was now a young and mature man, that is, of about thirty years. [5] Wherefore, since in every testimony of truth this is always wont to be asked — whether one heard or saw [what he attests] — but these men neither confess that they heard the order of this generation from [Jesus] himself (since he had assuredly [already] been born), nor that they saw it with their eyes (since they came to know him long afterward, that is, after his baptism): to me, and to every right-judging man, it seems as foolish to believe this as if one should call a blind man and a deaf man into judgment [as witnesses]. And these are the causes for which Faustus rejects this Genealogy from the gospel.

11. After these, the wicked Anabaptists, other arguments having been devised, themselves also rise up against the same Genealogy, rashly accusing Matthew. First, because he imprudently deduced the Genealogy

of Christ from the kings of Juda and the stock of David through Jeconias by Salathiel, making Salathiel the son of Jeconias and father of Zorobabel; whereas nevertheless it is evident from the sacred letters that Jeconias died in the Babylonian captivity without sons, and that in him the whole royal stock was extinguished, according to that vaticination of the prophet Jeremias pronounced concerning him: [6] "**Thus** saith the Lord: Write this man barren and childless *(sterilem & orbum)*." Which words openly show that Jeconias departed wholly bereft of children, and that he had neither Salathiel nor any other son. Next, because Matthew disagrees in the number of these generations as much with Luke the evangelist as with himself: seeing that Luke enumerates from David to Christ forty-three generations, while Matthew enumerates from David to Christ twenty-eight, or twenty-seven. And he differs from himself: because, whereas he says there are three tessaradecades [sets of fourteen] of generations from Abraham to Christ, and affirms that he has placed fourteen generations in each of them, yet in the last tessaradecade he has fitted together not fourteen but only thirteen generations — which is most clear to those who run through the generations of the last tessaradecade, whose first generation is that of Salathiel himself, the second Zorobabel, the third Abiud, the fourth Eliachim, the fifth Azor, the sixth Sadoch, the seventh Achin, the eighth Eliud, the ninth Eleazar, the tenth Mathan, the eleventh Jacob, the twelfth Joseph, the thirteenth Christ's. Thus far the Anabaptists.

12. But **Faustus**, not content with this alone — that he has cut away that Genealogy — also [assails] other passages [7]

[1] Matth. 1 b.
[2] Augustine against Faustus, book 7, ch. 1, and book 23, chs. 1 & 2 (Aug. co. Fau. lib. 7 cap. 1 & lib. 23 c. 1 & 2).
[3] Augustine, book 23 against Faustus, chs. 3 & 4 (Aug. lib. 23 contra Faust. c. 3 & 4).
[4] Luke 1 (Luc. 1).
[5] Augustine, book 10 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 10 cotra Faust. cap. 1).
[6] Jeremias 22 (Hier. 22).
[7] Augustine, book 17 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 17 cotra Faust. cap. 1).

(printed p. 584 [PDF p. 589] — Heresy II: objections 12–14; the Dissolutio begins.)

he casts away from the same gospel as supposititious. Of which the first is that of Matthew 5, where Christ says: [1] "Do **not** think that I am come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it." This sentence of Christ — because it seemed to confirm the Law, which the Manichaeans deny — Faustus, in Augustine, book seventeen, rendered suspect with these words: "**Who** attests," says he, "that Jesus said this? Matthew. Where does he say he said it? On the mount. In the presence of whom? Of Peter, Andrew, James, and John — of these four only; for he had not yet chosen the rest, nor Matthew himself. Did one of these four, then — that is, John — write it in his gospel? So [you say]. Does he anywhere mention this himself? Nowhere. How then did Matthew write what John does not attest, who was on the mount — [Matthew] who followed Jesus at a long interval after he came down from the mount? And hence it is doubtful on this very point whether Jesus said any such thing: because the fit witness is silent, and one less fit speaks — one who was not there at all when Jesus was speaking these things on the mount."

13. Faustus likewise assails another sentence of Christ, out of the eighth chapter of Matthew, [2] because in the words of this sentence Christ approves the Patriarchs of the Old Testament, whom Faustus pursues with execrable calumnies as most flagitious men. The sentence is that which Christ brought forth against the Jews, saying: [3] "**Many** shall come from the East and the West, and shall recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." And Faustus attempts to explode it after this manner: "**That** of which it cannot certainly be established where or when it was said, nothing forbids us even not to believe that it was said — just as now happens with this sentence, which the very variety of the writers renders doubtful and uncertain. For whereas the two evangelists Matthew and Luke narrate alike concerning the Centurion whose son [servant] was sick, and on whose account Jesus, admiring his faith, is seen to have said this same thing, yet

Matthew alone has added that Jesus, after his admiration, went on to say: 'A**men** I say to you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast into the outer darkness.' But Luke makes no mention there of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And if anyone say that he therefore passed it over because it had already been said by Matthew — why then does he commemorate the deed itself concerning the Centurion and his servant, which had already been sufficiently intimated to us by Matthew's care? Nor yet did Luke keep silence about this saying in every way — reconsidering, I suppose, lest perchance it might be true; but he changes the place, and applies it to a certain other occasion far dissimilar: that is, where Jesus says to his disciples: [4] '**Strive** to enter by the narrow gate: for many shall come seeking to enter, and shall not be able.' And a little after: [5] '**When** you shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, enter into the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out; and **they shall come** from the east and the west, and the south, and the north, and shall recline in the kingdom of God.' Wherefore, since it is not established when, where, or for what cause this was said, if we should believe that it was not said, it matters nothing." These things Faustus calumniates, as brought into the gospel of Matthew by falsifiers.

14. But the **Anabaptists**, they too, together with Faustus and the other Manichaeans, amputate from this gospel certain histories along with some vaticinations of the prophets: as the history of the Magi coming to Christ with gifts, and the slaughter of the infants perpetrated by Herod. This they pronounce an addition: both because no one of the evangelists except Matthew has remembered this deed; and because Josephus — who was most diligent in recounting the cruelties of Herod, and spent three whole books in describing the life of Herod, namely the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth books of the Hebrew Antiquities — wrote nothing anywhere of this slaughter of the boys which Matthew commemorates. And concerning the vaticinations falsely inserted into this gospel, they bring forward first that which is read in Matthew's second chapter: [6] "**For** he shall be called a Nazarene" — which they say is nowhere written in the Old Testament; and that which is noted in the same chapter: [7] "Out of **Egypt** have I called my son," the words of which sentence are found nowhere in the Old Testament — as not only the edition of the Seventy interpreters attests, in which they are read neither in Osee, where these words are believed to be, nor elsewhere; but Jerome himself also, as if doubtful and uncertain where they were written in the Old Instrument, [8] says now that they are had in the eleventh of Osee, now in Numbers, the twenty-fifth chapter, Balaam saying: "Out of Egypt have I called him." And however that may be, it is enough that these words, even if they were found in the Old Testament, were violently wrested to Christ: since neither Balaam nor Osee then spoke of Christ, but of the people of Israel, whom the Lord called back from Egypt by the hands of Moses and Aaron, and asserted into liberty; which the words of Osee liquidly indicate, saying: [9] "**As** the morning passeth, so hath the king of Israel passed: for Israel was a child, and I loved him; and: Out of Egypt have I called my son." In like manner also that which in the same chapter is read from the thirty-first chapter of Jeremias [10] has been dragged by the teeth *(mordicus)* to the murder of the infants, namely: "A voice was heard in Rama, Rachel bewailing her sons, and she would not be consoled, because they are not." That this is not to be understood of the killing of the infants, but of Rachel weeping for the sons of Israel led away into captivity, the words of the prophet immediately following themselves declare. For he adds directly after the aforesaid words: "**Thus** saith the Lord: Let thy voice rest from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for there is a reward for thy work, saith the Lord, and they shall return from the land of the enemy, and shall return to their own borders." Wherefore, since these places have been thrust into this gospel partly falsely, partly violently, it is likely that many other vaticinations of the Old Testament also, with the like licence, were sent in by rash writers according to their purpose. And these are the things which the heretics declare against the holy gospel of Matthew. Now let us pass to their dissolution.

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. How elegant a thing Faustus seemed to himself to say, when he would have it that Matthew did not write these things for this reason — that, speaking of his own election [calling], he says not: [11] "He saw **me**, and said to me, Follow me,"

[1] Matth. 5.
[2] Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, chs. 1 & 2 (Aug. lib. 33 cotra Faust. cap. 1 & 2).
[3] Matth. 8.
[4] Luke 13 (Luc. 13 e).
[5] Luke 13 (Luc. 13 f).
[6] Matth. 2 d.
[7] Matth. 2 e.
[8] Jerome, in his commentary upon Matthew, ch. 2; Numbers 25 — i.e., 23/24 (Hier. in com. super Matth. cap. 2; Num. 25).
[9] Osee 11 (Ose. 11).
[10] Jeremias 18 — i.e., 31 (Hier. 18).
[11] Augustine against Faustus, book 17, ch. 4; Matth. 9 (August. con. Fau. lib. 17 cap. 4; Matth. 9).

(printed p. 585 [PDF p. 590] — Heresy II: Dissolutio, responses 1–5.)

but, "He **saw** *Matthew*, and said to *him*, Follow me." And I know not whether he said this from the error of ignorance or from the custom of fallacy [deceit]. But I could not think him so unskilled as never to have read or heard that writers of things done, when they come to their own person, are wont so to weave the narration as though they narrated of another what they narrate of themselves — as did John, whom Faustus accepts, when toward the end of his book he spoke of himself: [1] "Peter, **being turned about**, saw the disciple whom Jesus loved, who also reclined at supper upon his breast, and had said to the Lord: Who is it that shall betray thee?" and a little after: "This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things; and we know that his testimony is true." And Christ, when he spoke of himself, said of himself in oblique speech: [2] "**When** the son of man cometh, thinkest thou he shall find faith on the earth?" and, [3] "The son of man **came** eating and drinking"; and, "The hour **shall come** when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Since Faustus has heard these things so often, I judge rather that he wished — not as an unskilled man, but as among the unskilled — to pour out fog, hoping that he would capture the more, who did not know these things.

2. But the Anabaptists, we do not doubt, are deceived through unskilfulness when they say this gospel is not Matthew's because it does not appear to have been written in Hebrew, but in Greek — as the aforesaid interpretations of Hebrew names show. For they do not understand that interpretations of this kind were added by the interpreter who turned Matthew into the Greek tongue. Nor is the interpreter rendered suspect on this account — that by like example he added very many other things within the context of Matthew: for if it be permitted to suspect this of Matthew's interpreter, the same also, for the same cause, will be permitted to be suspected of those most ancient and most holy interpreters of the Old Testament — which would surely be impious, since the Apostles by their attestation have approved their interpretation to us. For they themselves also frequently interpret names of this kind: as in Genesis they expound the name Galaad, saying: "Therefore was the name of it called Galaad, that is, *the heap of witness*"; [4] and in the same book: "His mother called his name בן אוני *ben oni*, that is, *the son of my sorrow*; but his father called him בן ימין *bin iamin*, that is, *the son of the right hand*"; [5] and in Exodus: "For it is פסח *Pesach*, that is, *the passage of the Lord*." [6] This very thing also, as Jerome attests in the book On the Best Manner of Interpreting, the apostles and evangelists sometimes did — as we read in Mark, who, when he had brought in Christ [coming] to the dead girl, saying, "Thabitha cumi," immediately subjoined: "which is interpreted: Girl, I say to thee, arise" — in the interpretation of which sentence he added of his own two words, namely "I say to thee," which are not in Christ's Hebrew [Aramaic] utterance, that he might express more clearly and strongly the sense of the one calling and commanding. If therefore the Anabaptists' argument concludes anything, by the same reasoning it follows that neither the book of Genesis nor of Exodus was written by Moses in the Hebrew speech — against the judgment of all ecclesiastical writers. Matthew, therefore, set forth the evangelical history in

Hebrew speech and letters, as both Irenaeus attests, book 3, chapter 1, and Eusebius, from the judgment of Papias, [7] relates in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History; the same [Eusebius] confirming it in the fifth book from Pantaenus, and in the sixth book from Origen.

3. The **third** argument is most futile, which is taken from the difference of time. For if those two fathers be rightly inspected, they disagree in nothing between themselves. For what Eusebius says — that Matthew first wrote his gospel in Judaea — in no wise fights with what Irenaeus says, that Matthew put forth his gospel, written in his native tongue, into the light much later. [8] For both can easily be [true]: both that Matthew first preached in Judaea his gospel, already written by himself in his own tongue, as Eusebius relates; and that long after this he put it forth into the light and published it to be read by all, according to Irenaeus, when he had removed from Judaea to the gentiles. For thus Eusebius narrates of him in the third book of the History, chapter 24: "Matthew first preached the gospel to the Hebrews. But when he was preparing to pass over to the gentiles, he set down the scripture in his native tongue, and, comprehending in it the things he had preached, he left a memorial of them to those from whom he was setting out, that he might preach to the gentiles."

4. Now, returning to Faustus, we say that he lies impudently when he says that the generation of Christ does not pertain to the gospel. [9] For from the doctrine of Paul, which he himself accepts, it is most certain that the generation of Christ according to the flesh, from the seed of David, regards the gospel. For thus he says, writing to Timothy: [10] "Be **mindful** that Christ Jesus rose again from the dead, of the seed of David, *according to my gospel*"; and writing to the Romans [11] he says he was called and set apart *unto the gospel of the Son of God, who was made to him of the seed of David according to the flesh*. And what was the gospel of the apostle Paul, this also is the gospel of Matthew and of the rest of the apostles and of the faithful. But when in the definition of the gospel he concludes only those things which were done by the preaching of Christ, this proceeds from his own error. For all who know Greek even slightly interpret εὐαγγέλιον as *good news* or *a good announcing*. And if that is so, why should that not be gospel which is narrated of this generation, since such good things are announced to us — namely, that the Son of God, for our salvation, that he might make us divine, was made man, his flesh deduced through so many generations from the seed of David? [12] And to that which he calumniates about the "fatal star," as though brought in after the manner of the gentiles, we answer: that we place no man's generation under the fate of the stars, so that we may vindicate the free choice of the will — by which one lives either well or ill — from every bond of necessity, on account of the just judgment of God; [13] much less, therefore, do we believe the temporal generation of *him* to have been made under the condition of the stars, who is the eternal creator and lord of all things. For that star did not rule over Christ unto decree, but did service unto testimony; nor did it subject him to its command, but indicated [him] by its homage; nor was the star fate to Christ, but Christ was fate to the star: for he brought to it, not it to him, the cause of [its] arising.

5. But as for **that** — who would not laugh at what he adduces about the inscription of this Genealogy? — as though this genealogy did not pertain to the gospel because Mat- [14]

---

[1] John 21 (Ioan. 21).

[2] Luke 18 (Luc. 18).

[3] Matt. 11; John 5 (Matt. 11; Ioan. 5).

[4] Gen. 31.

[5] Gen. 35.

[6] Exod. 12.

[7] Marc. 9 — i.e., Mark 5.

[8] Eusebius, book 3 of the History, chs. 24 & 39; book 5, ch. 10; book 6, ch. 18 (Eus. li. 3 hist. c. 24 & c. 39 & lib. 5 c. 10 & lib. 6 ca. 18 — i.e., 25).

[9] Augustine, book 2 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Augu. lib. 2 cont. Faust. cap. 2).

[10] 2 Tim. 2.

[11] Rom. 1.

[12] Augustine against Faustus, book 2, ch. 6 (Aug. contra Faust. lib. 2 cap. 6).
[13] Augustine against Faustus, book 2, ch. 5 (August. cont. Faust. lib. 2 cap. 5).
[14] Augustine, book 2 against Faustus, ch. 6 (?); Matt. 1 (Aug. lib. 2 cot. Fau. c. 6; Mat. 1).

(printed p. 586 [PDF p. 591] — Heresy II: Dissolutio, responses 5–7; Africanus on the two genealogies.)

Matthew did not begin in such wise as to say, "The **beginning** of the gospel of Jesus Christ," as Mark says, but "The **Book** of the generation of Jesus Christ." [1] At this rate neither will John be said to have written a gospel, since he says not "The beginning of the gospel," nor "The book of the gospel," but "**In** the beginning was the Word." Unless perchance Faustus was so elegant a coiner of words that he would name this exordium a "Verbidium" [a little Word-book] on account of the "Word," just as he dared to call the other a "Genesidium" on account of the "genesis." [2]

6. Nor did Mark, Matthew's abbreviator, pass over the writing of this genealogy because he thought it either superfluous or repugnant to the evangelical doctrine, but because he had seen that it had already been described fully and abundantly enough by Matthew the evangelist.

7. The **seventh** argument — which, long before Faustus, Celsus the Epicurean, first of all, objected against the Christians in the book which he entitled *Of the True Discourse (Verus sermo)*, and after him Porphyry, and Julian Augustus [the Apostate] took it up again after both [3] — the divine Augustine, writing against Faustus, dissolved after this manner. First: that there is no contradiction between John and Mark [on one side], and Luke and Matthew [on the other], because these say the Son of God was born of a virgin, while those say he was born of God; for both are most true: namely, that the Son of God was begotten of God the Father from eternity, and in time was born on earth, according to his humanity, of a woman — not losing the form of God, but taking the form of a servant. But as to what he says — that Luke and Matthew are implacably discordant between themselves — there is nothing to be wondered at, that Joseph has one father according to Matthew and another according to Luke, and one grandfather according to this one and another according to that one, and so on upward as far as David, through so many generations, some being numbered by this one, others by that one. For the whole question lies in this: how Joseph could have two fathers. If it be demonstrated that this could be done, there is no cause at all why any of those evangelists should be believed to have spoken falsely in enumerating divers generations. For if [he could have] two fathers, it will now be neither wonderful nor contrary that there could also be two grandsires and two great-grandsires, and whatever is above, as far as David — of whom both were sons — both Solomon, who pertains to the order which Matthew has obtained [followed], and Nathan, who is in the series which Luke has set forth. For some attend to these things and see that a man cannot be begotten by two men through the commingling of the flesh, and therefore they think this question cannot be dissolved; [4] nor do they observe what is most certain and most easy: that a man's father is said to be not only he by whom he was begotten, but also he by whom he was adopted. For neither was the bond of adoption alien from the customs of the ancients, since we find that even women adopted to themselves sons not born of their own womb — as Sara from Agar, and Lia from her handmaid, and Pharao's daughter adopted Moses; and Jacob himself adopted his own grandsons, the sons of Joseph. Thus far Augustine.

But because he, writing in this place against Faustus, did not explicate how this series of adoption is to be fitted in the genealogy of Christ, therefore the same blessed Father, in the second book of Retractations, excused himself concerning this, [5] saying that it had been passed over by him because, when he was writing against Faustus, he had not yet read Julius Africanus, who discourses more fully of the series of this generation. Wherefore, since Augustine in this matter remits [us] to the judgment of Africanus, and that judgment is somewhat divergent from Augustine's aforesaid judgment, it will not be beside the point if I subjoin the words of Africanus himself, writing to Aristides *On the consonance of the gospels*, out of Eusebius. They are these:

"Among the nation *(inquit)* of Israel, the names of the generations were enumerated now according to nature, now according to the law: [6] according to nature indeed are had the successions which descend from the truth of seed or blood; but according to the law, when someone, another begetting, is substituted as a son under the name of a brother deceased without children. For since among them the hope of the resurrection had not yet been received, they imitated by these means a certain image of the resurrection — lest the name of the race should be abolished by the fault of sterility. Since therefore orders of generations of this kind were kept among them — so that some, begotten from the very stock, others [begotten] by others through substitution, were reckoned sons to others by benefit of the law — the succession of both modes has been commemorated by the several evangelists: that is, so that the one of them set forth him who had [actually] begotten, and the other set forth him who seemed as it were to have begotten. And so it comes to pass that neither gospel lies, while the one follows the order of nature, the other the rule of the law. For the stock is joined to itself mutually — both that [deduced] through Solomon and that which is deduced through Nathan — by the legal substitutions which were made for those who died without children, and nonetheless by second marriages, whereby one and the same man, begotten of some parents, seemed to be the son of others. And so it comes to pass that each narration of the generations is deduced down to Joseph by most true lines — designated indeed in a diverse, but sufficiently ascertained order. But that what is said may become clearer, we will narrate the sequences of the generations themselves from David through Solomon. The generation which Matthew numbers makes Mathan the third from the end, who is said to have begotten Jacob the father of Joseph; but Luke, weaving the order of the generations from David through Nathan, made Melchi the third of the same place; [7] for he says: 'Joseph, who was of Heli, who was of Melchi.' It lies upon us therefore to show how Joseph, according to Matthew, had Jacob for father, who is deduced through Solomon, but according to Luke, Heli, who is deduced through Nathan; and how these two, that is Jacob and Heli, were two brothers — having, the one Mathan, the other Melchi, for father, coming of a diverse race — and how they [Mathan and Melchi] may be seen to be Joseph's grandsires. The manner, then, is this. Mathan and Melchi, at diverse times, procreated each a son of one and the same wife, Estha by name: because Mathan, who descends through Solomon, first took her to wife, and, one son by name Jacob being left, died. After his death — since the law does not forbid a widow to marry another man — Melchi, who draws his race through Nathan, being of the same tribe but not of the same race [line], took the widow left by Mathan *(relictam Mathae)*; of whom he too received a son, by name Heli; through which — the race of their fathers being diverse — Jacob and Heli are made uterine brothers [brothers by the same mother]. Of whom the one, that is Jacob, [his] brother Heli having died without children,

[1] Matth. 1 a; Matth. 1 (Matth. 1. a; Matth. 1. e).

[2] Augustine, in the same place (Aug. ibidem).

[3] Origen, book 2 against Celsum; Jerome, in the commentary on Daniel and Matthew; Cyril, book 8 against Julian, book 3, chs. 2 & 3 (Origines li. 2 con. Celsum. Hier. in co. Dan. et Mate. Cyrillus li. 8 con. Iulianum libr. 3 cap. 2 & 3).

[4] Augustine, book 2 On the Consensus of the Evangelists, ch. 3 (Augu. lib. 2 de cons. eua. cap. 3).

[5] Book 2 of the Retractations, ch. 7 (2. Retr. c. 7).

[6] Ecclesiastical History, book 1, ch. 6 — i.e., 7 (Hist. ecc. lib. 1 cap. 6).

[7] Luke 3 (Luc. 3).

(printed p. 587 [PDF p. 592] — Heresy II: Dissolutio, responses 7–9 continue.)

taking his wife by the command of the law, begat Joseph — by nature indeed the son of his own stock, on which account also it is written, "But Jacob begat Joseph"; but according to the precept of the law he is made the son of Heli: [1] for Jacob, because he was his brother, had taken [Heli's] wife to raise up his brother's seed. And hereby the generation is found valid *(rata)* and entire — both that which Matthew enumerates, saying, "But Jacob begat Joseph," [2] and that which Luke designates with fitting observance, saying, "who *was thought* to be the son of Joseph." Now these things have not been found by us at random, or commemorated without authors; but the very kinsmen of our Savior according to the flesh — whether from zeal to

demonstrate so great a discourse, or from [desire] to teach — have handed down the things that were done according to the truth. These are the words of Africanus. From which it appears that he solved this question by another way than Augustine did. For what Augustine had distinguished — that Joseph had two fathers, one according to nature, the other according to adoption — Africanus, discoursing otherwise, said that Joseph had two fathers, one according to nature, namely Jacob, the other legal, according to the substitution of the law, namely Heli. And this judgment John Damascene also, in the fourth book [On the Orthodox Faith], chapter six [i.e., in fact ch. 14], and Jerome in the commentaries upon Matthew, have followed.

But perhaps someone will oppose to us, against this solution of Julius Africanus, that Augustine in the second book of Evangelical Questions says that this solution seems weak: [3] because, whenever anyone among the Jews raises up offspring from the wife of a deceased brother or kinsman, that which is born is wont to receive the *name* of the deceased. For so it is written in Deuteronomy: [4] "When brethren dwell together, and one of them shall die without children, the wife of the deceased shall not marry another; but his brother shall take her, and shall raise up the seed of his brother, and shall call the first-born son of her by his name, that his name be not blotted out of Israel." Joseph, therefore, does not seem to have been born of the surviving wife of the deceased Heli; because, according to the order of the law, he ought to have been called not Joseph but by the name of the deceased Heli, whose seed his brother Jacob had raised up.

To whom we answer that the same Augustine, when he retracted this judgment of his in the second book of his Retractations, dissolved the present objection in these words: [5] "In the second book," says he, "of Evangelical Questions, wishing to expound how Joseph — whose spouse the virgin Mary is called — could have two fathers, I said that what is related, that a brother took the deceased brother's wife to raise up seed for him according to the law, was weak [as an explanation]: because the law would command him who was born to receive the name of the deceased — which is not true. For the law commands the 'name of the deceased,' of which it speaks, to avail for this — that he be called *his son* — not for this, that he be called by his very name *(hoc quod ille vocaretur)*."

8. Moreover, in that Faustus thinks this Genealogy is to be cast away because nowhere in it, up to the baptism, has Matthew said that Christ is the Son of God, but only the son of man — he lies most imprudently, after his fashion. [6] For where first the evangelist enumerated the parents of our Savior, he straightway adds that he whom he had called the son of David was conceived and born of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit — applying also to this saying the testimony of Esaias: [7] "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel, which is interpreted, God with us." And in that he says that Christ, in the whole gospel of Matthew, never confesses that he has a mother or a lineage on earth, he proceeds from the same impudence. But since the whole book of Matthew cannot be inserted into this discourse of mine, let him read who will, and see how Matthew leads him whom he called the son of David — while he enumerated his parents — even to the passion and resurrection in his narration, so that he makes him always God and man. [8] And if he therefore thinks that he had no mother or lineage on earth because he said, "Who is my mother, or who are my brethren?" [9] — it remains also that he affirm that his disciples, to whom he offered this example in himself, that they might contemn the tie of earthly kindred for the kingdom of heaven, had no fathers, because he said to them: "Call **no man** your father upon earth; for one is your father, God." [10] What therefore he taught them concerning fathers, this he himself did first concerning his mother and brethren — not denying his mother and brethren as to his humanity, but contemning them [in comparison] for the kingdom of heaven.

9. Now as to that dilemma of Faustus — which that most nefarious Jew also used, the author of the book *Nizahon* [Nizzahon], namely: if Christ is of the tribe of Juda, the son of David according to the flesh, it is asked from whence he deduces that filiation from David according to the flesh — from Joseph, or rather from Mary? [11] — we shall answer: From both. Because both are placed by the evangelist in the series of Christ's progenitors — [Christ having been conceived] of the Holy Spirit, yet without human intercourse. For

he is called, and truly also is, the son of David according to the flesh from *Joseph*: because Joseph is the man and husband of Mary, having her as wife not by intercourse but by affection, not by conjunction of bodies but by the copulation (which is dearer) of souls, and by the confederation of a chaste mind. For so says the angel: "**Joseph**, son of David, fear not to take Mary thy wife." [12] And therefore Joseph is the father of Christ because he is the husband of the parent of Christ. Then, he is the son of David according to the flesh from the virgin *Mary*, without human seed, since Mary draws her origin from the stock of David. And this we believe for this reason: that, since the scriptures say Christ is of the seed of David according to the flesh, and say the same [Christ] was procreated through the virgin Mary of the Holy Spirit, it follows that Mary was of the kindred of David. And what Faustus says — that Mary does not pertain to the consanguinity of David, alleging that she had a father of the tribe of Levi, a certain priest by name Joachim — does not constrain me, because it is not canonical. But even if I believed this, I should rather say that Joachim himself in some way pertained to the blood of David, and in some way was adopted from the tribe of Juda into the tribe of Levi — either he himself or some progenitor of his; or certainly that he was so born in the tribe of Levi that he drew some consanguinity from the stock of David. This therefore, or some such thing, I should rather believe — even if I were held by the authority of that apocryphal scripture where Joachim is read as the father of Mary — than that the gospel lies, in which it is written that our Savior

[1] Matth. 1.
[2] Matth. 1; Luc. 3.
[3] Book 2, ch. 5 (Lib. 2 ca. 5).
[4] Deut. 25.
[5] Augustine, Retractations book 2, ch. 12 (August. 2 li. retr. cap. 12).
[6] Augustine, book 23 against Faustus, ch. 5 (Aug. lib. 23 cotra Faust. c. 5).
[7] Isa. 7 (Esa. 7).
[8] Augustine against Faustus, book 7, ch. 1 (Aug. co. Fau. lib. 7 cap. 1).
[9] Matt. 12.
[10] Matt. 23.
[11] Augustine, book 23 against Faustus, chs. 8 & 9, and book 2 On the Consensus of the Evangelists, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 23 cotra Faust. cap. 8 & 9 & lib. 2 de cons. eua. cap. 1).
[12] Matt. 1.

(printed p. 588 [PDF p. 593] — Heresy II: Dissolutio, responses 9–11; the Anabaptists' three-part argument answered.)

was procreated of the seed of David according to the flesh, and through the virgin Mary. Thus far Augustine. And lest anyone should suppose, on account of the aforesaid words, that he so believed Mary to have been of the stock of David as in no way to have believed she was [also] of the stock of Levi, it has seemed good to add the certain and undoubted judgment of this father, in which he confesses that Mary was of both stocks, of David and of Levi. For thus he says in the second book On the Consensus of the Evangelists: [1] "That **Mary** drew some consanguinity from the stock of David we assuredly ought not to doubt. And since the priestly race of this woman is not passed over in silence — Luke insinuating that her kinswoman was Elisabeth, whom he says was of the daughters of Aaron — it is to be held most firmly that the flesh of Christ was propagated from both races: namely, of the kings and of the priests; in which persons, among that people of the Hebrews, the mystical unction also was prefigured — that is, the chrism, whence the name of 'Christ' shines forth, signified so long before by that most evident token."

10. As to what he says at last — that the apostles are not to be believed concerning this genealogy because they joined themselves to Christ when he was already mature, and did not see [his birth], nor ever said that they heard it from him — this recoils upon himself. [2] For why does he believe John, saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God," etc. — words which please him, though he understands them not? Let him say where John saw this, or where he said he heard it from the Lord himself. For whatever he may say as to whence John could know this, thence we believe that all the announcers of Christ's nativity

could know it also. Next, if Matthew could not know that Christ was born, because he joined himself to him when already a young man, whence could Manichaeus — born after so many years — know that Christ was *not* born? They will say: he knew this by the Holy Spirit, who was in Manichaeus. But why do we not rather believe this of the disciples of Christ — who adhered to him bodily, and gathered the whole origin of Christ according to the flesh — than of the sacrilegious Manichaeus, who, since he has said so many false things, could not have the Holy Spirit?

11. I come now to the argument of the Anabaptists, which has three parts: the **first**, that the genealogy of Christ is wrongly deduced from the stock of David out of Jeconias through Salathiel; the **second**, of the dissonance of the generations between him [Matthew] and Luke; the **third**, of this — that though he said he had placed fourteen generations in each set of fourteen *(quartodenario)*, he has set only thirteen in the last set of fourteen. To the first of these it is answered that Salathiel was the son of Jeconias, whom he begat in Babylon after being led out of prison. For Philo the Jew writes of him in the second book of the Chronography after this manner: "At **the end** of the seventh year, Euilmerodac held in honor Joachim, surnamed Jeconias, led out of prison; and the people surnamed him Neri *(lucerna)*, because the lamp of David, which was feared extinguished, had shone forth. Soon, Neri being freed, a son was given him by God, Mesezebeel, surnamed Salathiel, who in the seventeenth year before the loosing of the captivity begat Barachias, who in the seventeenth year after the loosed captivity was leader of the people, and from that leadership called Zorobabel, in the eighty-first year from the transmigration, and the seventieth from the desolation." And nothing stands against this judgment from the words of Jeremias: since he speaks not of sterility and bereavement of offspring, but of the bereavement of the kingdom — because Joachim left himself no successor of the kingdom. And this the following words of Jeremias show most clearly: [3] for immediately after those words, "**Write** this man barren," he adds: "**Who** in his days shall not prosper; nor shall there be of his seed any man who may sit upon the throne of David, and have power any more in Juda." And that Mesezebeel, surnamed Salathiel, was the father of Zorobabel, as Matthew writes, the book of Esdras, in the second and third chapters, and likewise the book of Nehemias in the third chapter, abundantly attest.

To the **second** part of the argumentation Augustine gives satisfaction in the second [book] On the Consensus of the Evangelists, in these words: [4] "**Therefore** the number of the generations in Matthew and in Luke is diverse, because each, under a diverse person of Christ, wove a diverse genealogy. Matthew indeed, who had undertaken to insinuate the royal person in Christ, enumerates the natural generations of Christ from the kings of the Jews; but Luke, wishing to show the priestly person in Christ, runs through the generations of the adoption of Christ. In the generations of Matthew, according to nature, is signified the taking-up of our sins by Christ; in the generations of Luke, according to adoption, is signified the abolition of our sins by Christ. And therefore the latter narrates them descending, the former ascending. And therefore on both sides the number of the generations with them is diverse, because the series of the generations is diverse."

To the **third** part of the argument — which Porphyry of old had objected against the Christians — Augustine answers one way, Jerome another. Augustine, looking to allegory, says that we ought to enumerate Jeconias twice, that the number of fourteen generations may be filled out; [5] and he rightly says that Jeconias is numbered twice, because from him was made a certain deflection into foreign nations — namely, when the transmigration was made into Babylonia. Now where an order is bent from straightness, so as to go off in a diverse direction, it makes as it were an angle; and that which is in the angle is numbered twice — namely, at the end of the former order and at the head of the deflection itself: so also that Jeconias, who makes the angle, is enumerated twice. But Jerome, coming closer to the sense of the letter, says that no generation is lacking in this genealogy: [6] because under the name of Jeconias — which seems to signify only one person and to embrace only one generation — two kings, and two generations of them, are contained. For there were two kings, father and son, each named Joachim and surnamed Jeconias, of whom it is read in the latter book

of Paralipomenon. [7] And they differ between themselves: because the former is the son of Josias, of whom mention is made in the beginning of Daniel under the name Ioakim, which is written with קים *Kim*; but the latter is the son of Ioakim and grandson of Josias, who is placed in the beginning of Ezechiel, [and his name] is written not with קים *Kim* but with כין *Chin*. [8] The second tessaradecade [set of fourteen], therefore, ends in Ioakim the son of Josias; and the third begins from Ioachin the son of Ioakim — each of whom was surnamed Jeconias. Ignorant of this, Porphyry builds up a calumny against the Church, showing his own unskilfulness,

[1] Augustine, book 2 On the Consensus of the Evangelists, ch. 2 (Aug. lib. 2 de cons. eua. cap. 2).
[2] Augustine against Faustus, book 7, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Fau. lib. 7 cap. 2).
[3] Jer. 22 (Ier. 22).
[4] Augustine, book 2 On the Consensus of the Evangelists, chs. 3 & 4 (Aug. lib. 2 de cons. euan. cap. 3 & 4).
[5] Augustine, book 2 On the Consensus of the Evangelists, ch. 4, and in Questions on the New Testament, q. 5 (Aug. li. 2 de con. Eu. c. 4 & in quest. no. test. q. 5).
[6] Jerome on Matthew, ch. 1, and on Daniel, ch. 1 (Hier. in Mat. cap. 1 & in Daniel c. 1).
[7] 2 Par. 36; Dan. 1.
[8] Ezech. 1.

(printed p. 589 [PDF p. 594] — Heresy II: Dissolutio, responses 12–14; the Magi, the slaughter of the infants, and the prophetic testimonies.)

while he strives to convict the evangelist Matthew of falsity.

12. For the rest, if what Faustus says is valid — that Matthew, testifying of Christ, is not to be believed, because he was not present; and he who was not present does not speak the truth — it follows that no one today speaks true things of Christ, since no one of those who are today has seen and heard him present. [1] Further, if today true things are said of him by his faithful for this reason — that those who heard or saw disseminated them, whether by preaching or by writing — why could not Matthew hear true things of Christ from the mouth of John his fellow-disciple, where the latter was present and he himself was not present? To this is added that the Lord himself also could narrate to Matthew what he had done, before he called him, with those whom he had called earlier. But [says Faustus] John ought to have put this very thing in his own gospel, if he had heard this said by the Lord — he who was present when it was said. As if it could not be that, since he could not write all the things he had heard from the Lord, among the other things he passed over, he passed over this too, being intent on writing other things. Did he not himself so conclude his gospel, saying: [2] "**These** and many other things indeed Jesus did, which are not written in this book; which if they were written one by one, I think that not even the world itself could hold the books that should be written"? Here at any rate he shows that he knowingly passed over many things.

13. He adds moreover that that sentence of Christ which is read in Matthew, chapter eight, has little credit, [3] because Matthew and Luke write that it was said by Christ not at the same time, not on the same occasion and place, but at plainly divers ones between them — Luke, after the interrogation made by the disciples about the fewness of those to be saved; Matthew, after the Centurion's faith was heard. [4] But an argument of this kind is most trifling. For why could it not come to pass that Christ repeated the same sentence once and again in divers places and times, and applied it also to divers causes and occasions? As it is also possible and likely that what Matthew said, Luke passed over; nor is that absurd — that what one has narrated, another has omitted, whether purposely or howsoever. For who, ever, reading two historians writing of one matter, judged that both of them, or either of them, must either deceive or be deceived, if one of them said what the other passed over? or if the one, embracing it more briefly, yet keeping the same sentence safe and entire, has set it forth, while the other has digested all things as it were limb by limb *(membratim)*, so as to intimate not only what was done but also how it was done? — just as Faustus wished from hence to calumniate the truth of the gospels: because Matthew said something which Luke, though narrating the same thing, passed over in

the telling — as though Luke denied that Christ said what Matthew wrote that he said.

14. There remains the last argument of the Anabaptists, whereby they induce suspicion concerning the vaticinations of the prophets falsely adduced, and concerning the coming of the Magi and the slaughter of the infants — because of this history the other evangelists have said nothing. Which argumentation surely, if it avails anything, it follows that the very history also of the resurrection of Lazarus — which John alone writes, and which the Anabaptists themselves dare not deny to be true — is false, because the other evangelists have remembered nothing of it. And they therefore passed it over, God so disposing, that (as Chrysologus says) so grand a miracle — than which none in Judaea was more illustrious — might be left to be described by John, the supreme [latest] of all the evangelists. And John, and Luke, and Mark therefore wrote nothing of the coming of the Magi and of the slaughter of the infants, because they had seen that Matthew had spoken abundantly of both, as much as was needful. But if Josephus, among the other savageries of Herod, did not recount this cruelty of the slain infants, that ought to move a Christian man nothing: especially since Josephus has passed over other things almost innumerable, of much greater moment even, and much more illustrious, whether by oblivion, or by carelessness, or rather by malice — as Hegesippus, that most ancient historian, accuses him: that willing and knowing he kept silence about the divine resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and very many of his divine works. Nay more — the authority of the gospel hangs upon the authority of the Holy Spirit and of the Catholic Church, and not upon the testimony of Josephus or of any other profane writer, however approved. And yet even among those most ancient writers the testimony of this deed would not be altogether lacking, if we had need of the testimony of infidels in this matter. For Philo the Jew, in the third little book of his Chronography, enumerating among the other cruelties of Herod this slaughter of the infants, writes thus of Herod: "**Herod** the Ascalonite, in the thirtieth year of his tyrannical princedom, destroyed the Sanhedrin out of the house of David, and substituted a certain Annalaeus [Ananel], and other [members of the] Sanhedrin from proselytes, who seemed exceedingly erudite in the law; then he slew both Salome his sister and her husband, of the tribe of Juda, and likewise his own son, whom he had received of the same man's wife — because it was said that the Christ promised in the law was [already] born." With whom Macrobius, a celebrated author among the Ethnics [pagans], agreeing — likewise concerning the son, and the boys slain within the two-year age *(intra bimatum)* — speaks thus in the second book of the Saturnalia: "**Augustus**, when he had heard that among the boys whom Herod the king ordered slain in Syria within the two-year age, his own son also was killed by him, said: It is better to be Herod's pig *(porcum)* than his son *(filium)*" — alluding, namely, to this: that the Jews out of religion do not kill pigs. Of which saying Dion Cassius of Nicaea, the Greek author, also made mention in the life of the same Augustus. Likewise of the apparition of the star made to the Magi at Christ's nativity, Chalcidius writes in his second book on the Timaeus of Plato: that that star announced not death and diseases, but the coming of a venerable God, for the grace of human consummation [salvation] and of mortal affairs; which star, when the wise men of the Chaldaeans had beheld it in the night season, they said it signified the recent birth of a God.

But concerning the testimonies of the prophets which are complained of as falsely and violently sent into this gospel, we shall meet each one in order. And first, to that: "For he shall be called a Nazarene" — we answer that Jerome does not say that Matthew cited that from any particularly determined prophet, but indeterminately and indefinitely from "the prophets." For he [Matthew] did not say, "that it might be fulfilled what was said *through the prophet*," but in the plural number, "*through the prophets*"; [5] intimating hereby that he took from the scriptures not the words but the sense

[1] Augustine, book 17 against Faustus, ch. 3 (Aug. lib. 17 cotra Faust. cap. 3).

[2] John, in the last chapter (Io. vlt.).

[3] Matth. 8.

[4] Augustine, book 23 (i.e., 33) against Faustus, ch. 5 (Augu. lib. 23 cotra Faust. cap. 5).

[5] Jerome on Matthew, ch. 2 (Hier. 2 c. in Matth.).

(printed p. 590 [PDF p. 595] — end of Heresy II; Heresy III, on the Gospel of Mark, begins.)

that he took. For thus the very words of Jerome have it: "**If** he had set a fixed example from the scriptures, he would never say, 'What was said through the prophets,' but simply, 'What was said through the prophet.' But now, calling the prophets in the plural, he shows that he took from the scriptures not the words but the sense. For 'Nazarene' is interpreted *holy*; and that the Lord would be holy, all scripture commemorates." We can also say otherwise: that this is written in those same words, according to the Hebrew truth, in Esaias: [1] "There shall **come forth** a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a *Nazarene* [branch, *netser*] shall ascend out of his root." Now concerning those words passed over by the Seventy interpreters, namely "Out of Egypt have I called my son," there is no doubt that they are in Osee, in the eleventh chapter. [2] And they were passed over (as Jerome attests) by the Seventy interpreters by prudent counsel — as also other places like these, which speak of Christ the Son of God — lest Ptolemy and the other gentiles should be scandalized, thinking that God had a son, and hence should suppose there are two Gods; or for other causes indicated by us when we treated of the translations of holy scripture. And as to their saying that Jerome was in doubt where those words might be read in the Old Testament, it is most false; since he himself, in the commentaries on Osee, openly asserts that these words are contained, according to the Hebrew truth, in the eleventh chapter; and in the same place he refutes Julian Augustus — overturning this passage long before the Anabaptists — in these words: [3] "**This** passage, in the Seventy's volume, Julian Augustus — who vomited [wrote] against us Christians — calumniates, and says: What was written of Israel, Matthew the evangelist transferred to Christ, that he might mock the simplicity of those of the gentiles who believed. To whom we shall answer briefly: first, that Matthew put forth his gospel in Hebrew letters, which none could read except those who were of the Hebrews; therefore he did not do it to mock the ethnics. But if he wished to mock the Hebrews, he was either foolish or unskilled: foolish, if he feigned an open lie; unskilled, if he did not understand of whom these things were said. But his folly the volume itself excuses, seeing it is prudently and ordinately composed; and we cannot call him unskilled, whom we know from other testimonies of the scriptures to have had knowledge of the law. It remains therefore that we say this: that the things which precede *typically* (τυπικῶς) in others [in the type] are referred to Christ according to the truth and the fulfillment." Thus far Jerome — whose last words can be so fitted to that vaticination which the Anabaptists oppose to us out of Jeremias, that we may say: the things which of old were said to the letter concerning the captivity of the sons of Israel, over Rachel, [4] those same things, according to the mystical fulfillment of the figure, are referred to the slaughter of the infants.

OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK — Heresy III *(De Marci Evangelio haeresis III)*

That the Gospel of Mark, which the church now reads, does not lack suspicion of depravation and falsity.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is a heresy of the Anabaptists of our time, who in this dissent from Ebion, Cerinthus, and Merinthus, and from Marcion: that those cast away this gospel of Mark entirely, while these, though they confess that they receive it, yet according to their own caprice take up some things out of it, and reject other things — those that fight against their own dogmas — as sent in by falsifiers; affirming that this is therefore lawful for them, because it is certainly established that the gospel of Mark was ill handled by corrupters, some perverting the order of the history, others superadding many things which before were not in it — as is shown by their arguments subjoined.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. In the very exordium it straightway appears that this gospel has been contaminated by corrupters, in those words: [5] "The **beginning** of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, as it is written in *Esaias the prophet*: Behold, I send my angel [messenger], who shall prepare thy way before thee." [6] These words were prefixed to this gospel not by Mark the Evangelist, but by some inept depraver, little versed in the scriptures of the Old Testament, who wished this exordium to agree with the unrecognized testimony of the prophet. For it is not at all likely that Mark was so devoid of the divine scriptures as not to know that this was written not by Esaias but by the prophet Malachias. Nor does that solution avail — namely, that Mark attributed to Esaias what was Malachias's because, if not the words, yet the sense may be found in Esaias; for if this were admitted, it would matter nothing under what title anything is cited from the sacred letters, since the same senses are found almost everywhere, under divers words, in the sacred volumes. Whence Jerome, seeing that the evangelist, if he had written this, could not be vindicated from the calumny of unskilfulness, in the commentaries upon Matthew, the third chapter, threw this error back upon falsifiers, saying: "**We** however think the name of Esaias was added by the fault of copyists; which we could prove also in other places." But let us grant that Mark cited the name of Esaias for the name of Malachias because, as he wrote, another name did not then occur to him: yet it is not credible that he was so unskilled as not to know that Malachias spoke not of John the Baptist but of the prophet Elias *(Helia)* — as his words below, in the fourth chapter, pronounced to the same purpose, attest, namely: "**Behold**, I will send to you *Elias* the prophet, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come; [7] and he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the sons, and the hearts of the sons to their fathers." Which words show that the prophet spoke not of the coming of John — who is read to have come at the first coming of Christ in the flesh — but of the coming of the prophet Elias on the last day of judgment, which in the scriptures is called the great and terrible day of the Lord.

2. And lest perchance the end of this gospel should disagree with its own exordium, the depravers of the scriptures therefore added at its heel *(in calce)* all that which is now read in the last chapter of this gospel concerning the resurrection and ascension of the Lord. And that this chapter was not written by Mark can be known from this: first, because in it things contrary to the other evangelists are related concerning the resurrection and apparition of Christ;

[1] Isa. 11 (Esa. 2 — recte 11).

[2] Osee 11; Jerome in the prologue to the Pentateuch (Ose. 11; Hier. in prol. pentateu.).

[3] Jerome, in the commentary upon Osee, ch. 11, and in the commentary upon Matthew, ch. 2 (Hier. in com. super Os. cap. 11 & in co. super Matth. cap. 2).

[4] Jer. 31 (Hier. 31).

[5] Mar. 1.

[6] Mal. 3.

[7] Mal. 4 (Mal. 4).

(printed p. 591 [PDF p. 596] — Heresy III: objections 2–3 end; the Dilutio begins.)

secondly, because, as Jerome hands down in the third Question to Hedibia, that last chapter is found in none of the ancient Greek codices; **thirdly**, because Jerome and many of the ancient fathers reject the testimony of this chapter as of uncertain authority. For thus Jerome writes of this last chapter of the gospel in the aforesaid place: "We do **not** receive this testimony of Mark, which is related in rare gospels — almost all the books of Greece not having this chapter at the end — especially since it seems to narrate things diverse from and contrary to the other evangelists."

3. And the things which are placed between the beginning and the end of this gospel are related so preposterously, confusedly, and inordinately, that what Matthew the evangelist writes as said or done earlier, this one commemorates as though done later; and contrariwise, what Matthew narrates as having happened much later, this one places long before — no account being kept of times or of things done. Whence it is easily judged that this gospel was not first digested in this order by Mark, but rather according to the order

and disposition of Matthew, whose abbreviator Mark was — as Augustine attests in the books On the Concord of the Evangelists — and whose gospel he contracted into a compendium, with the style of Matthew imitated so closely that Erasmus, in his Apology against Albert, Prince of Carpi, wrote that the writer of both was the same — namely, of the Gospel of Mark and of Matthew; but that afterward, after some time, by the negligence of copyists or the malice of heretics, it was tossed up and down and heaped together without any order. Thus far the Anabaptists.

DILVTIO [The Dissolution]

1. Answering them, we say first that their argument is not new, but was objected to the Christians many ages ago by Porphyry, and noted in the fourteenth book of his volumes; [1] whom the divine Jerome meeting, says the argument can be dissolved in two ways *(bifariam)*: in one way indeed, that — according to the judgment of the ancient ecclesiastical [writers] — we say Mark therefore attributed that testimony to Esaias, because immediately after it there followed that other testimony of Esaias, taken from his fortieth chapter, namely: [2] "The voice of one crying in the desert: prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths." Wherefore, since Mark had made one body out of those two testimonies, he cited the whole of it under the name of Esaias. Which Paul also, writing to the Romans, once did: in which place, when he had woven that testimony out of Deuteronomy, and the thirteenth psalm, and certain other places of scripture — "**All** have turned aside, they are together become unprofitable," down to that place, "there is no fear of God before their eyes" — he cited the whole as if from the psalm; [3] although those words from the verse "Their throat is an open sepulchre" as far as the verse "There is no fear of God before their eyes" are not had in the Hebrew. And in the other way it can be solved thus: that we say the name of Esaias was added by the fault of copyists, since previously it was not there. For it is likely that unskilled copyists, by the nearness of the two testimonies — which were two — could easily be deceived into believing that there was only one testimony, and hence set upon them the name of Esaias, perhaps better known to them. Nor yet does it follow from this that the whole Gospel of Mark is suspect of corruption and contamination because a single word was added from the imprudence of copyists: for [a word] added or subtracted diminishes nothing of the truth of the text. Whence also the Greek codices read the citation of this testimony diversely: some, namely the more recent, the name of Esaias being removed, read ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, "**As** it is written in the prophets"; but the more ancient — as Epiphanius cites, in the second book Against Heresies [4] — read ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἠσαίᾳ προφήτῃ, "as it is written in Esaias the prophet." With whom also agrees the most ancient Greek exemplar of the Vatican Library, written out in majuscule letters.

Now as to what the wicked Anabaptists subjoin — that the testimony of Malachias is to be understood not of John the Baptist but of Elias — it is a comment [fabrication] and fable of the Jews of our time, who understand by "the angel [messenger] sent before the face" that same angel whom immediately after Malachias calls "the angel of the testament," or of the covenant. [5] Him the Jews think to be Elias, because he had zeal for the covenant of circumcision; and hence, whenever they circumcise a boy, at every circumcision they adorn "Elias's chair," thinking that the spirit of Elias goes before the face of the boy to be circumcised, as one zealous for the testament and covenant of circumcision. The Jews also in the time of Jerome interpreted the first part of that vaticination — namely, "**Behold**, I send my angel before thy face" — of Elias; [6] but the following words — "**And** presently the Lord the ruler shall come to his temple, and the angel of the testament whom you desire" — they referred to their ἠλειμμένον [anointed one] (that I may use Jerome's word), that is, to their Christ, whom they believed, and still believe, would come at the last time. But Christ our redeemer teaches of whom this prophecy is to be understood — namely, of his own precursor John the Baptist, who played the angel [messenger] in the dignity of his office and in the sanctity of his life — saying: "**This** is he of whom it is written: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee." Nor does it stand in the way that the Anabaptists, together with the circumcised *(recutitis)* Jews, say that the prophet Malachias himself declares below that he speaks of Elias, when he says: "Behold, I

send to you *Elias* the prophet" — since the angel in Luke, and Christ in Matthew, expound the same words of John the Baptist. [7] "**If** you will know it," says Christ, "he himself is Elias who is to come" — [John being] called Elias by similitude, because he came in the power and spirit of Elias; that is, having an equal measure of the Holy Spirit, or grace, or merit, and the same austerity of life and rigor of mind. And as to what is added — that Elias shall come before "the great and terrible day" — it ought to move no one, as though it could not be fitted to John, who came not at the second but at the first coming of Christ: since in the sacred letters "the great and terrible day of the Lord" is wont to be understood not only of the second coming of Christ unto judgment, in which Elias shall come, but also of the first coming of Christ in the flesh, which John preceded. For the first coming of Christ according to the flesh is called the day of the Lord

[1] Chrysostom, in the first chapter of Mark (Chrys. in primum c. Marci); Jerome, on ch. 3 upon Matthew (Hier. 3 c. super Matth.).
[2] Mar. 1; Isa. 40 (Esai. 40).
[3] Rom. 3; Psal. 13.
[4] Haer. 2 (Her. 2).
[5] Mala. 3.
[6] Jerome, book 3 (i.e., commentary) upon Malachias, ch. 3; Matt. 11; Luke 7 (Hier. 3 super Mal. cap.; Matt. 11; Luc. 7).
[7] Luc. 1; Matt. 11.

(printed p. 592 [PDF p. 597] — end of Heresy III; Heresy IIII, on the Gospel of Luke, begins.)

great and terrible — whether on account of the blinding and the terrible ruin of the Hebrews wrought in it, or (as Bede says) on account of the day of the nativity and of the passion of Christ, which by Peter the Apostle, out of the testimony of the prophet Joel, is called "the great and manifest day of the Lord": [1] seeing that when Christ was born a new star shone forth, and when he was crucified the sun was darkened, the moon gave no light, the earth quaked, the rocks were rent, the tombs were opened, and many bodies of the saints that had slept were seen — to the great terror of the onlookers — to run about through the city.

2. As to what pertains to the last chapter of this Gospel: the Anabaptists, as is the custom of heretics, produce Jerome's sentence truncated — the particle "**Aut** [Either]," which is read at the beginning of his sentence, being removed. For Jerome brought it forth not by way of assertion, but distinguishing the judgment of others from his own, saying: "**Either** we do not receive the testimony of Mark… *or* this is to be answered" — namely according to our [his own] judgment. For Jerome could not reject the scripture of this chapter, which he had translated from the Greek, had given to the church to be read, and had approved, a peculiar exposition being even applied to it. And what Jerome subjoined — that this chapter of old was not in the Greek exemplars, and for that reason was rejected by some, because it seemed to contain things contrary to the other Evangelists — he understood not of the whole scripture of this chapter, but of certain apocryphal periods [sentences] of this chapter, sent into certain codices by uncertain authors; which, because they seemed either doubtful or contrary to the other Evangelists, were therefore withdrawn from the Greek codices by the fathers. And this the divine Jerome himself declares, in the second book against the Pelagians, in these words: "In certain exemplars, and chiefly in the Greek codices according to Mark, at the end of his Gospel it is written: [2] '**Afterwards**, when the eleven were at table, Jesus appeared to them, and upbraided their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who had seen him rising again; and they gave satisfaction, saying: This age is the substance of iniquity and incredulity, which suffereth not, through unclean spirits, the true virtue of God to be apprehended: therefore even now reveal thy justice.'" These words, so cited by Jerome, are now had neither in the Greek nor in the Latin codices. And what the Anabaptists adjoin out of Jerome — that this chapter contains things contrary to the other Evangelists concerning the resurrection of the Lord — the same Jerome solves in this manner: [3] "Concerning the apparent contradiction between Matthew and Mark, it is to be answered that both spoke truly: Matthew [speaks of the time] when the Lord rose — on the evening of the sabbath; Mark, when Mary Magdalene saw him — that is, early on the first day after the sabbath *(mane primo sabbati)*. For thus it is to be distinguished:

'When he had risen' — and, the breath being restrained a little, there is to be added — 'early on the first day of the sabbath he appeared to Mary Magdalene'; so that he who, according to Matthew, had risen on the evening of the sabbath, himself, according to Mark, appeared to Mary Magdalene early on the first day after the sabbath. Which indeed John the Evangelist also signifies, demonstrating that he was seen early on the other day." One ought not, therefore, on account of such most trifling causes, to call back into doubt this chapter, which is read in all codices, both Greek and Latin, and which the church, every year in the sacred mysteries, chants concerning the most holy resurrection and ascension.

3. As to what they oppose about the transposed order of things done, and the rash conjecture of Erasmus — namely, that the author of the gospels of Matthew and of Mark is the same — it is most false. For that Matthew wrote his own Gospel in Hebrew has been proved above; but that Mark also wrote his own, Irenaeus, Clement, Eusebius, and very many other fathers attest — but especially Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, writes thus of Mark: "Mark, Peter's son in baptism and disciple and interpreter in the divine word, who — according as he had heard Peter relating — being asked by the brethren, wrote a brief Gospel; which when Peter had heard, he approved it, and by his own authority published it to be read by the church, as Clement writes in the sixth book of the ὑποτυπώσεων [Hypotyposes]."

But concerning the order, we say that this Gospel was written by Mark in the same series of narration in which it is now read: for he cared not for the order of times, but only for the truth of the narration — even as Papias, the disciple of John the Apostle, attests in the books of the Explanation of the Lord's Words; whose words Eusebius recites in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History in this manner: [4] "**Mark** was the interpreter of Peter, and whatever he remembered as said by him he wrote down; yet he did not digest in order the things that were said or done by the Lord: because he himself was neither a hearer of the Lord nor a follower, but at the last, as I said, adhered to Peter — [who taught] for the use and ministry of preaching, not for the writing-out of the Lord's discourses. And so Mark sinned nothing in this, that he wrote certain things thus, as one who seemed to recall things heard piecemeal *(sparsim)*. And this alone he took sufficient care of: to omit nothing of what he had heard, nor to write anything false." This defense by Papias, on behalf of the order not kept by Mark, is enough to stop the profane mouths of the heretics, who bark against the order passed over by Mark.

OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE — Heresy IIII *(De Lucae Evangelio haeresis IIII)*

To withdraw from the Gospel of Luke certain things added by falsifiers; and to restore certain things subtracted by the same.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is the heresy of Cerdon, of Marcion, and of the Anabaptists; in which indeed Marcion and Cerdon so differ from Cerinthus, Merinthus, and Carpocrates, that as those cast away the Gospel of Luke entirely, so these — the other Gospels being rejected wholly — receive the Gospel of Luke alone. For so Irenaeus in book 1, Tertullian in the book On Heresies, Philastrius in the Catalogue, and Epiphanius relate of them. [5] But Marcion and Cerdon, though they profess this Gospel alone, yet do not accept it entire, but everywhere adulterated, mutilated, amputated — having neither beginning, nor middle, nor end — most like a garment gnawed by moths. Whose depravations, additions, subtractions, and other vices of this kind Epiphanius, in a very long digression which he calls the *Pavement* (*Pavimentum*), most broadly [6]

[1] Joel 2; Acts 2 (Ioel. 2; Act. 2).

[2] Mark, last chapter (Mar. vlt.).

[3] Jerome to Hedibia, question 3 (Hier. ad Heldibiam q. 3).

[4] Book 3 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 39 (Lib. 3 hist. eccle. c. 39).

[5] ch. 45; book 1, heresy 42 (Cap. 45; li. 1 her. 42).
[6] Book 1, heresy 42 (Lib. 1 adu. her. 42).

(printed p. 593 [PDF p. 598] — Heresy IIII: the catalogue of Marcion's depravations of Luke; the Anabaptists' objections begin.)

has set out, confuting in it whatever things had been adulterated and changed by Marcion. That digression, reduced into a compendium more briefly and more distinctly, we have judged should be inserted in this place — not indeed because it much matters to know depravations of Marcion of this sort, but so that the studious of the divine letters may understand, from the confutations of Epiphanius which we have set beside each depravation of Marcion according to the order of the numbers, by what way and with what craft adulterated and corrupted scriptures may be detected [as distinct] from the sincere and uncontaminated ones, and by what arguments depravers of the scriptures of this kind — very like to the Marcionists and the Anabaptists — may be refuted. And they are these, which are here subjoined through the order of the chapters of the gospel:

THE PLACES DEPRAVED BY MARCION IN LUKE (Loca a Marcione in Luca depravata)

1. In the first chapter of Luke he straightway rejected the proem at the beginning, together with those things which are contained in the whole first and second chapter: of Zacharias and Elisabeth, of the conception of John the Baptist, of the nativity of Mary, of Christ's nativity in Bethlehem, of the circumcision of Christ and his presentation in the temple, and his finding in the temple in the midst of the Doctors. All these he cut away, the beginning of the gospel being made from the exordium of the third chapter: [1] "In the **fifteenth year** of the empire of Tiberius Caesar"; and according to the series of the gospel he so persevered as far as the beginning of the eighth chapter, with few and almost no words changed.

2. In the eighth chapter he has not: "And there came to him his mother and his brethren," and, "My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God, and do it."

3. In the tenth chapter, where it is said, "I confess to thee, Lord, Father of heaven and earth," he has neither "Father" nor "of earth."

4. In the eleventh chapter the history of Jonas, Ninive, the Queen of Saba, and Solomon is rejected.

5. Likewise concerning the same [chapter]: the judgment of God being passed over, he has "the vocation [calling] of God."

6. In the same place he has not "therefore said the Wisdom of God, I will send to them prophets," nor [the words] concerning the blood of Zacharias, of Abel, and of the prophets.

7. In the twelfth he has not: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is set in oblivion before God?"

8. In the same place, for "I will confess him before the Angels of God," he reads "before God."

9. In the same place he has not: "God clothes the grass, which is cast into the oven."

10. In the same place, for "your Father," he reads "Father," "your" being cast away.

11. In the same place, for "the second and third watch," he has "the evening watch."

12. From the thirteenth chapter he cut away that: "There came certain men, telling him of the Galilaeans, whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices," as far as where he says, "of the ten and eight, upon whom the tower fell in Siloa."

13. Likewise from the same chapter he cut off: "When you shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God"; and for this he put: "When you shall see all the just in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast out" — he made it — "held out of doors: there shall be weeping and gnashing

of teeth."

14. Likewise he cut away: "They shall come from the East and the West," and what remains of that chapter as far as the end.

15. From the fifteenth chapter he cut off the whole parable of the prodigal son.

16. In the seventeenth chapter he amputated that: "Say: we are unprofitable servants."

17. In the eighteenth chapter, where it is said, "None is good but God alone," he added "the Father"; and for "thou knowest the commandments *(Mandata nosti)*," he made "I know *(novi)*."

18. Likewise he amputated: "When Jesus had taken the twelve, he said: Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things shall be consummated which were written through the prophets concerning the son of man; for he shall be delivered up, and shall be killed, and the third day he shall rise again."

19. In the nineteenth chapter he cut away the history of the Ass and Bethphage, and of the destruction of the city and of the temple, as far as the end of the chapter.

20. From the twentieth chapter he cast away the parable of the vineyard let out to husbandmen.

21. Likewise, in the same place, he amputated this: "But that the dead rise again, Moses also showed, saying: the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."

22. From the twenty-first chapter he cut away: "Then let those who are in Judaea flee to the mountains," and the rest, as far as, "that the things which have been said may be fulfilled."

23. From the twenty-second chapter he drew off that: "For I say to you, I will not eat it hereafter, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

24. Likewise that: "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, was anything wanting to you?"; and this which is written: "that which is written must yet be accomplished [in me], namely: And he was reckoned with the wicked."

25. Likewise he cut off the deed of Peter amputating the ear of the servant.

26. From the twenty-third chapter, to that which it says — "We have found this man perverting the nation" — he added, "and destroying the law and the Prophets"; and after that, "forbidding tribute to be given to Caesar," he set in besides, "and turning away the women and children."

27. Likewise that: "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise."

28. From the twenty-fourth chapter he changed what was said to the disciples: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all the things which the prophets have spoken — ought not Christ to have suffered these things?"; and for that which it says, "which the Prophets have spoken," he made, "which I have spoken to you." **These** are the things which Marcion corrupted out of the gospel of Luke, the rest remaining with him entire and without any depravation.

But the **Anabaptists** of our time — they too babble something or other against this gospel of Luke: namely, that it has fallen away from its ancient sincerity, and now stands otherwise than it once stood — moved by certain frivolous indications, scarcely worthy to be related, of which:

1. The **first** is: that whereas Moses numbers ten generations from the deluge, or from Noe, as far as Abraham, [2] yet in the third chapter of this gospel eleven generations — the generation of Cainan being added — are related from the deluge to Abraham. Which indeed is to be believed to have happened not by the fault of the evangelist, but by the vice of a falsifier.

2. The **second** is taken from a certain testimony of Epiphanius, who, in the first book, in the forty-second heresy, speaking of those words which are contained [3]

[1] Luc. 3.
[2] Gen. 11.
[3] Luke 20 f (the book-name is ink-blotted in the print; the passage cited is Luke 20).

(printed p. 594 [PDF p. 599] — Heresy IIII: the Anabaptists' indications; the Rules for detecting falsified scriptures; the Confutatio begins.)

in the twentieth chapter of this gospel — namely, "But that the dead rise again, Moses also showed beside the bush, when he says: the Lord God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for God is not the God of the dead but of the living: for all live to him" — says that in the codices of the Catholic church these words are replicated twice in the same chapter. Yet these words are now read only once, in our vulgate edition, Greek as well as Latin: from which it appears that those words were subtracted either by Marcion himself — as Epiphanius charges upon him — or by some other corrupter. And the same Epiphanius, in the book which he entitled *Ancoratus*, commemorating that place of Luke in the nineteenth chapter, "Jesus, **seeing** the city, wept over it," [1] hands down that that word, "wept over it," was removed from the text by catholics, as being doubtful and not agreeing well.

The **third** indication is deduced from certain words of Jerome — that he, in the second book against the Pelagians, seems to signify that the history of the angel appearing in the garden for Christ's consolation, which is had in the 22nd chapter of Luke, was not in the ancient exemplars of the church. For Jerome says in that book: "In certain codices, Greek as well as Latin, there is found, Luke writing: There **appeared** to him an angel from heaven, comforting him" — no doubt, the Lord the Savior. Which words, had they been in all the exemplars of the church, Jerome need not have said that those words are read *in certain* codices, but *in all*. And Hilary, in book X On the Trinity, affirms much more openly that not only the consolation of the Angel, but also the history of Christ sweating blood, is not had in the gospel — in these words: "Nor indeed must we be ignorant that in very many codices, both Greek and Latin, nothing is found written of the angel coming, or of the bloody sweat. It being therefore in doubt whether this be wanting in the various books or superfluous, this remains uncertain to us from the diversity of the books." By these most trifling conjectures the fanatical Anabaptists are led.

Before we meet them, it remains that we see in what manner it can be shown that the aforesaid places of Marcion were falsified by him — so that from the confutation of these, the other falsifiers of the scriptures may be convicted concerning the corruption of any codex whatever. And that this may be done more conveniently, we shall set down certain rules, exceedingly necessary for the discerning of falsifiers, which we have briefly collected, scattered as they were through the many and long confutations of Epiphanius. And they are these:

Rules whereby sincere scriptures may be detected from the adulterated scriptures of heretics, and the latter refuted (Regulae, quibus syncerae scripturae ab adulteratis haereticorum scripturis deprehendantur, ac redarguantur)

1. RULE. If any things exist in the codices of the heretics beyond those which are in the catholic codices, and those very things fight either with the antecedent or with the subsequent words preserved in the heretics' codices, it is necessary that they were added or altered by the heretics.

Expositio [Exposition]. As in that place of Luke, chapter 24: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all things which the prophets have spoken" — in which Marcion's exemplar, for that which we read, "which the prophets have spoken," has: "which I have spoken to you." It manifestly appears that it was altered by falsifiers, from the repugnance of the words to what precedes and follows: in which it is said that Christ did

not offer himself to be recognized by the disciples on the way until he had arrived in Emmaus. Christ therefore could not say, "which I have spoken to you," since neither had he yet revealed himself to them, nor did they recognize him for Christ except in the breaking of bread — as Marcion's own codex attests.

2. RULE — the converse of the foregoing. If certain of the things which our codices have are lacking in the exemplars of the heretics, and they follow necessarily upon the preceding, or [connect] with the subsequent — so that without them the later things cannot be knit to the earlier — the consequence is that they were drawn away by the heretics. Or if the things that are lacking have the same sense or the same argument [as the retained context], let the judgment be the same.

Expositio. As when Marcion drew off from his exemplar, out of the 12th chapter of Luke, those words: "Are **not** five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is in oblivion before God?" — he is refuted from the antecedents and consequents preserved in his own codex. For if he concedes the antecedents — that God has care of all things — and the sequents — that the hairs of our head are numbered — he is compelled also to confess that the sparrows fall under divine providence, which is of the same argument.

3. RULE. If anything in the codices of the heretics either abounds that favors their dogmas, or is lacking that fights against the same, it appears that it was either superadded by the heretics as propitious to their dogmas, or drawn away as contrary and hostile to the same.

Expositio. As when in Marcion's codex, in the 13th chapter of Luke, that is not found: "when you shall see all the prophets in the kingdom of God" — it is plain that this was drawn off by Marcion, because it stands against him, who reprobates all the patriarchs and prophets. Similarly, when there is found added in Marcion that [saying] concerning Christ, namely, "destroying the law and the prophets," it appears that this was done by that impostor in support of this same error of his.

4. RULE. If, a collation of exemplars being made, the codices of the heretics are found in no wise to agree with the codices of the catholic church, it appears that the codices of the heretics are not sincere.

Expositio. Than this last rule, among catholics and the pious, none can be more certain and more safe; and it alone can suffice to confirm a sincere and pious mind. Nevertheless, because the heretics contemn the codices of the catholic church with the same facility with which they contemn the church herself, therefore against them one must proceed also by the three preceding rules. We shall set about, therefore, according to the aforesaid rules, to refute the impostures of Marcion according to the assigned series of the numbers.

CONFVTATIO [The Confutation]

First, from the third rule it is openly known that the two first chapters of Luke were cut away on purpose:

[1] Luc. 19 g.

(printed p. 595 [PDF p. 600] — Heresy IIII: the Confutatio of Marcion's 28 depravations; answer to the Anabaptists begins.)

because in them the authority of the old law is confirmed — namely, in Zacharias, Elisabeth, John the Baptist, the circumcision of Christ, the purification of Mary, and the bringing of the boy into the temple — all which things destroy the dogma of Marcion, who denies the Law and the Prophets.

The **second** place is refuted from the second rule: because, since he has conceded the genealogy of Christ's progenitors, he is compelled also to concede that Christ had a mother on earth, and could also have brethren. But Marcion seems to have scraped away *(abrasisse)* these words because he thought some absurdity was contained in them — which is not so. For although Christ, in the words immediately following, may seem to be displeased with those who had announced that his mother and brethren stood without, yet he said this not as denying his mother and brethren according to the flesh, but as turning aside the unseasonable speech of

him who said this while so great a crowd stood around, poured out toward his saving doctrine, and he himself was occupied about preaching and healings. For he who said, "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without," seemed to call Jesus away from the business he had undertaken. [1]

Thirdly, when he casts away that word "Father," he is confuted by the same rule: because immediately below he has: "even so, Father, for so it was well-pleasing before thee." And when he cut off that word, "of earth," he is convicted from the third rule: because he denies that God, the Father of Christ, is the founder of heaven and earth.

The **fourth, fifth, and sixth** places are detected as falsified from the third rule: inasmuch as they confirm the authority of the Old Testament, reprobated by Marcion.

The **seventh** is refuted from the second rule: because in the antecedents and consequents he confesses that divine providence is extended even over the hairs of our head.

The **eighth, ninth, and tenth** places are refuted from the fourth rule: because it is not so read in the exemplars of the catholic church.

The **eleventh** place is refuted from the first rule: for the watches are not of the day but of the night, having their progress from evening to morning, and not from morning to evening.

The **twelfth** is reprobated from the third rule: because Christ, consenting to the judgment of Pilate, shows himself to be the judge of all — which Marcion denies.

The **thirteenth and fourteenth** places are confuted from the third rule: for they destroy Marcion's dogma, [being] contrary to the law and the prophets.

The **fifteenth** place is refuted from the fourth rule: because that parable is read in the codices of the catholic church.

The **sixteenth** place is reconvicted from the second rule: because it teaches the rule of humility, lest the faithful, through elation of mind, lose the reward of their works; and such rules are read everywhere in Marcion's own gospel codex.

The **seventeenth** is argued from the fourth rule.

The **eighteenth** is refuted from the second rule: because from the consequents of his own codex he admits that Christ was crucified; he is compelled therefore to confess that it is not false which we have in our exemplars — that Christ, going up to Jerusalem, foretold to his disciples his passion and death.

The **nineteenth** is overturned from the third rule: because Christ there, against the dogma of Marcion, approves the temple and the worship of the old law, saying: "My house shall be called the house of prayer."

The **twentieth** is cast down from the third rule: because Christ in the parable of the Vineyard attests that the fathers of the Hebrews were the church of God, and cites the testimony of the psalms out of the Old Testament — all which things subvert Marcion's dogma concerning the Old Testament.

The **twenty-first** is convicted from the third rule: because it favors the patriarchs of the Old Testament, reprobated by Marcion.

The **twenty-second** is driven off from the third rule: because it favors the prophets, whom Marcion denies.

The **twenty-third** is confuted from the second rule: because a little below, in Marcion's own text, there is read: "I dispose to you, that you may eat and drink at my table."

The **twenty-fourth** is detected from the third rule: because it is against his dogma concerning the reprobation of the Old Testament.

The **twenty-fifth** is rejected from the fourth rule: because the catholic codices have it.

The **twenty-sixth** is exploded from the third rule: for he set this beside [the text] because it favored his dogma of the reprobation of the law.

The **twenty-seventh** is confuted from the fourth rule.

The **twenty-eighth** is argued from the first rule: because if Christ had not yet revealed himself to his disciples, how can he say, "which I have spoken to you"?

Let these things be said against Marcion. Now, passing to those petty indications of the Anabaptists, we answer briefly: that from one or two places — and those changed only as to the words, and not as to the sense — it must not be concluded that the gospel of Luke which the church now holds embraces anything of falsity or of perverse alteration. For what does it harm either faith or morals, if the words cited by Epiphanius are related either once only, or twice, in the same chapter? Surely nothing: for the same testimony of Christ, expressed once, has the same force and efficacy as if it were repeated twice, and thrice, and even a thousand times. Nor is it any wonder if our exemplar has once what in the codex of Epiphanius was read twice; for it is possible that it so stood in the codex of Epiphanius, and in certain others also, as he himself relates — which perhaps was not had in other Greek codices. It is credible, moreover, that those fathers to whom the office of revising the scriptures *(recognoscendi scripturas)* was committed by the catholic church judged that this place had not been written down twice by the evangelist, but had been repeated once and again through the imprudence and carelessness of a copyist (as very often happens); and accordingly that they removed this place set down the second time, as superfluous, so that thereafter it should be read only once in this chapter. Similarly, of that place also concerning the weeping of Christ, the same Epiphanius attests that it was not taken away from all the codices by catholics, but was always retained in the corrected exemplars; and by the divine Irenaeus, in the books against he-

[1] Matth. 12.

(printed p. 596 [PDF p. 601] — end of Heresy IIII; Heresy V, on the Gospel of John, begins.)

resies, [that place] is cited — although some unskilled catholics rashly *(inconsulto)* drew it out of certain codices, being ignorant of the end and force of that word.

But as regards the other indication, we answer that although in certain codices the words of the angelic consolation were not present, and Jerome and Hilary, or some other one of the fathers, was uncertain about them, yet the truth of this history is not now on that account to be doubted. For we know that the canonical scriptures are not only those of which the fathers never doubted, but those also concerning which there was once controversy in the churches, and which afterward — the matter being more diligently examined — were received by the common authority of the whole church. Of which number is the present history; which, though it was once somewhat doubted of among the ancients, at length was received by the unanimous assent of all the churches, and those rejecting it were condemned with anathema — as may be seen in Athanasius, book 6 On the Beatitude of the Son of God, where among the rest this anathematism also is read: "**If anyone** shall deny that the true man whom the Son of God assumed sweated blood, anathema to him." And Epiphanius brings in and expounds this whole history against the heretics in the book *Ancoratus*.

Finally, to that concerning the added generation of Cainan, we say that the evangelist himself added it out of the edition of the Seventy, although it was not had in the Hebrew truth. But why he did this, it is better reverently to admire than anxiously to inquire — after the example of Bede, writing in the preface of the Acts of the Apostles in this manner: "**Most of all** (says he) do I marvel, and, on account of the slowness of my wit, stricken with the most vehement stupor, I know not how to search out, for what reason — whereas in the Hebrew truth ten generations are found from the deluge to Abraham — Luke himself, who with the Holy

Spirit guiding his pen could in no wise write what is false, preferred to set down in the gospel eleven generations according to the Seventy interpreters, Cainan being added." But if an admiration of this kind by Bede should not quite satisfy anyone, at least the judgment of Aloysius [Lippomano], bishop of Verona, will not be despised by him; who, writing on this matter in the Catena upon Genesis, says it could have come to pass that Moses, moved by instinct of the divinity, passed over the generation of Cainan — which Luke set down in the gospel, and the Seventy received into the catalogue of the posterity of Sem, Genesis chapter 11 — and for a reason hidden from us passed by the name of Cainan in silence; just as the Evangelist Matthew also wrapped in taciturnity the names of certain men in the Genealogy of our Savior. And let these things about the gospel of Luke be enough.

OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN — Heresy V *(De Evangelio Ioannis haeresis V)*

That the Gospel which is carried about according to John, for the very reason that it is in no wise John's, is not to be received; or, if it is to be received as John's, it must be believed that it is contaminated in many places by falsifiers.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The **first** part of this heresy is counted by Philastrius among the anonymous heresies. For thus he writes in his Catalogue: [1] "After these there are heretics who do not accept the gospel Κατὰ Ἰωάννην [according to John] and his Apocalypse; and since they do not understand the virtue of the scripture, nor desire to learn, they remain in heresy, perishing — so that they even dare to say that it is Cerinthus the heretic's; and likewise that the Apocalypse is not of the blessed John the evangelist and apostle, but of Cerinthus the heretic." And Augustine, in the book On Heresies, chapter thirty, says that these heretics were once called *Alogi* — that is, "without the word" (for λόγος in Greek means "word") — because they would not receive the gospel of John, in which the Word of God is described. And Epiphanius first imposed this name upon them; who, writing against them, speaks of them thus: [2] "The Alogi therefore say — that is, those brutish men, and lacking the word (for I impose this appellation on them, and from this day they shall be so called, and thus, O dearest ones, let us impose the name on them): since they do not receive the word preached by John, they shall be called *Alogi*, that is, without the word." And in the very next words he adds that these Alogi affirm that the gospel of John which we now have was put forth by Cerinthus under the name of John. After these Alogi, as Epiphanius relates in the same book, [3] Theodore of Byzantium, the leather-worker *(coriarius)*, succeeded in the same error, who defended the first part of this heresy. But the second part of this heresy Faustus of old with his Manichaeans, and now the Anabaptists of our times, defend — denying that the gospel of John is had among us entire, inviolate, and intact, such as its first author once wrote it; and this by the fault of falsifiers, who, since they had nothing whence they might conciliate credit to their own dogmas, mixed those things into this gospel, that under the name of John they might find credit with readers.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

But it is not very difficult to confute the defenders of the first assertion — the Alogi. For how (as Epiphanius says) shall this gospel be Cerinthus's, [4] which utterly overturns the whole doctrine of Cerinthus? For Cerinthus preaches Christ as a recent and bare man; but John preaches him as the sempiternal Word, God always existing with God, and at the last born temporally according to the flesh. Again — what cause could or should have moved Cerinthus to inscribe a gospel written by himself with another's name, whereby he would defraud himself of the honor of his own labor and honor another for his own works? — and especially John the apostle, his enemy, with whom he had implacable enmities, and to whom he knew himself to be so hateful on account of his heresy that John could not bear even the sight and presence of him. For John (as Irenaeus writes), [5] when he had entered the baths at Ephesus for the sake of washing, and had seen Cerinthus there, straightway leapt out unwashed, saying: "**Let us flee** hence, lest the very baths fall in, in which

Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is bathing." Finally, why should he inscribe his own gospel with the name of John — he who [strove] utterly [to destroy] John's

[1] ch. 60 (Ca. 60).
[2] Book 2, heresy 51 (Lib. 2 her. 51).
[3] Book 2, heresy 54 (Lib. 2 her. 54).
[4] Book 2, heresy 51 (Lib. 2 her. 51).
[5] Book 3, ch. 3 (Lib. 3 cap. 3).

(printed p. 597 [PDF p. 602] — Heresy V: the Impugnatio ends; the heretics' objections 1–5.)

gospel he denies, and besides the Gospel of Matthew — which he called "according to the Hebrews" — rejected every other Gospel, as we have said above? From these things, therefore, the Alogi are convicted. And as for the Anabaptists, they will be sufficiently refuted by us if, when they have produced the things which they calumniate as adulterated in this Gospel, we show those same things to be entire and in every part intact.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. First then (as it is had from Epiphanius), the Alogi said this Gospel was unworthy to be read in the church, because it is insufficient, diminished, disordered *(incompositum)*, and having no [orderly] sequence of things done. [1] Its author, Cerinthus, passed over — as if through ignorance or forgetfulness, or through malice — many things which pertain to the truth of the history. For when he had recounted the eternal generation of the Son of God, saying, "**In** the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was made flesh," he immediately added that John the Baptist, crying aloud in the desert, proclaims: "**This** is he of whom I said to you: Behold the lamb of God," and the rest. [2] But he passes over the conception and birth of John the Baptist, and the annunciation of Christ, and his temporal nativity in Bethlehem, his circumcision, and the purification of Mary, the coming of the Magi with gifts to Christ, the boy's flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the infants, the return of Jesus out of Egypt to Nazareth, the exercise of his boyhood under his parents, the Baptism of John together with his sermons *(concionibus)*, and Christ's fast and the diabolical temptations in the desert, and the other things of this sort of which the other evangelists have spoken.

2. But neither does he say things consonant with the other evangelists. [3] For he writes that the first of Christ's miracles was done in Cana of Galilee, when, the wine failing at the marriage, water was turned into wine (for this, says he, is the beginning of the signs of Jesus in Cana of Galilee); [4] whereas Luke recounts another miracle done long before this one, by Christ while yet a boy, when in the twelfth year of his age he displayed his divine wisdom, sitting in the midst of the Doctors and disputing, to the great stupor of all that heard. Again, John relates that the second miracle was put forth by Christ when he healed the paralytic son of the Centurion; [5] but Luke describes many other miracles done by Christ before this. Thus the Alogi.

3. But **Faustus** asserts that this Gospel is vitiated in various places, but chiefly in the fifth chapter, in which he judges that those words of Christ to the Jews were added by falsifiers: [6] "There **is** one who accuseth you, Moses, in whom you hope; for if you believed Moses, you would believe me also: for he wrote of me." And Faustus is moved to this judgment of his by these conjectures. **First**: because if Christ, when the matter seemed more to demand it, did not use the testimony of Moses before the Jews, much less is it to be believed that he called in Moses as witness when he had no need of his patronage. For when he had called himself the light of the world, and the Jews, indignant, cried out against him — "**Thou** givest testimony of thyself; thy testimony is not true" — then most of all the place demanded that he should say that Moses had prophesied of him; [7] which nevertheless he did not do, but, as having no testimony from Moses, answered as a stranger [to him]: "**In** your law it is written that the testimony of two men is true. I am one who give testimony of myself, and he who sent me giveth testimony of me." [8] Why then did he pass over the testimony of Moses,

which above all would have been more opportune to that cause? **Secondly**: it is not likely that the Jews could have kept silence when Christ said that Moses had written of him, but that straightway — being, as they were, malignant and astute — they would have asked what that might be which he thought was written of him by Moses. Whence this taciturnity of theirs signifies that Jesus said no such thing. **Thirdly** — what moves more — is this: that in Moses there is found no vaticination or testimony concerning Christ. For if Moses wrote anything of Christ, certainly it is that (as we [Manichaeans] say): "A **Prophet** will I raise up to them from the midst of their brethren, like unto thee." [9] But that these things in no wise regard Christ is manifest, because Christ is not a prophet like Moses: seeing that the one was man, the other God; the one a sinner, the other holy; the one born of coition, the other — according to you — of a virgin; the one, his God being offended, is slain on the mountain, while the other, well-pleasing to the Father, suffers of his own will. Since therefore Moses foretold nothing of Christ, the consequence is either to pronounce that chapter false, or to judge — which is impious *(nephas)* — that Jesus, the author of truth, lied. Thus Faustus.

4. After him the Anabaptists complain that many things have been superadded in this same Gospel; and among the rest, the history of the adulterous Woman taken in adultery, written in the eighth chapter of John — which many ancient fathers attest was formerly by no means in this Gospel. And first of all Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 39, speaking of Papias, has these words: "Papias subjoins a certain history concerning an adulterous woman, who was accused by the Jews before the Lord. Moreover, this parable is had written in the Gospel which is called 'according to the Hebrews.'" These words show that not only in the times of Papias, but long after, this history was not in the Gospel of John, but in a certain apocryphal Gospel "according to the Hebrews"; otherwise Eusebius would not have called it "a certain [history] out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews," as signifying it little known to him — rather he would have pronounced it certain and undoubted, of the Gospel of John. Jerome likewise, in the second book against the Pelagians, sets down these words concerning this history: "In the Gospel according to John, in many codices both Greek and Latin, there is found [the history] of the adulterous woman, who was accused before the Lord" — signifying by these words that there were many Greek and Latin exemplars which did not have this history. Which the commentaries of the Greeks upon John also indicate: in which, while the other chapters of John are found explained, of this history no mention — much less exposition — is found in them. Whence it is well enough established that it was translated into this Gospel by some audacious fellow out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Epiphanius, book 2, attests was composed by Tatian the heresiarch. [10]

5. And the Anabaptists say that the comment [fabrication] of the same audacious man was that history of the sick man lying at the Probatic pond, which the passage in which

---

[1] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 51 (Epiph. lib. 2 her. 51).
[2] Ioan. 1.
[3] Epiphanius, in the same place (Epiph. ibide.).
[4] Ioan. 2; Luc. 2.
[5] Ioan. 4.
[6] Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 2; John 5 (Aug. lib. 16 contra Faust. cap. 2; Ioan. 5).
[7] Ioan. 8.
[8] Deut. 17.
[9] Augustine, in the same place, ch. [4]; Deut. 18 (Aug. ibid. c.; Deut. 18).
[10] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 45 (i.e., 46); Ioan. 5 (Epiph. lib. 2 Her. 45; Ioan. 5).

(printed p. 598 [PDF p. 603] — Heresy V: objection 5 ends; the Dilutio, responses 1–3.)

John writes that it was done renders altogether suspect of falsity: both because in the Old Testament nothing whatever is recorded of this pond with five porches; and because Josephus — the most diligent writer of the Hebrew antiquities, and especially of the three constructions of the temple, namely under Solomon, Zorobabel, and Herod — writes nothing either of the pond or of the water frequently and divinely troubled

by an angel. Nor is it likely that Josephus, favoring his own Hebrews beyond measure, would have passed over so signal a favor of the divine goodness toward his fatherland — he who in other matters of lighter moment, and which seemed to make less for the beauty and glory of his city, wrote even to superfluity — if the miracle of so great a thing had taken place, and that in his own time and on his own natal soil. And this suspicion the very explicators of this history increase, while they adorn it the more with certain fabricated appendices, seeking out many things about the place, about the virtue of the place, and the cause of the virtue. Some write that this pond was in the courtyard of the temple; whereas that is read neither in the books of Kings, nor in the books of the sacred Annals [Chronicles], or of Esdras, in which the structure of the earlier as well as of the later temple is described. Others, placing it beside the walls of the city, and contending among themselves about the cause of its virtue, add much more uncertain narrations: of whom Petrus Comestor, the author of the Scholastic History, affirms that the healing virtue was put into the water from the presence of the wood from which afterward the Lord's cross was fabricated; which wood, as it lay in the bottom of this pond, an angel, moved with reverence for that wood, descended from heaven and troubled *(agitabat)* the water. Now Solomon (he says) had ordered that wood to be sunk in that pond many ages before, the queen of Saba admonishing it, who had foreseen that from that wood the final ruin threatened the city of Jerusalem. But the author of the history of the Lord's cross adds certain fabulous things about Adam and Seth, who first planted this wood, being warned by God that in it the sin of them [both] should be blotted out through Christ. Others again, laughing at the fable of this wood, hand down that this virtue was planted in the water not from the wood of the cross, but from the sacred hosts and victims, which, before they were burned on the altar, were washed by the priests in that pond — against that which is written in the fourth chapter of the second of Paralipomenon: that the victims were wont to be washed not in a pond, but in ten bronze basins *(conchis)* constructed for that work by Solomon. Narrations so various and so uncertain seem to call this whole history back into doubt.

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. "They are ignorant (says Epiphanius), erring and blinded in mind, the Alogi — of how John, who wrote fourth and last after the other Evangelists, now an old man and an octogenarian, did not care to put forth the things which before him had been honestly *(probe)* expounded by others, but wished to insist chiefly upon those things which had not been related by them. [1] Wherefore, since he had seen that the eternal generation of the Son of God and the divine colloquies of Christ had not been sufficiently explicated by the others, therefore — his temporal nativity being passed over, together with the other things which the Alogi commemorate — he bent himself wholly to this one thing: to describe Christ, the Son of God, [begotten] from eternity, equal in all things to the Father, against the impious doctrine of Ebion and Cerinthus — beginning his Gospel from the eternal generation of the Word." But perhaps the demented Alogi will say: If he passed over the writing of these things because they had already been abundantly explicated by the other Evangelists, why did he not by the same reasoning pass over many other things also which he wrote of Christ, since of these too the Evangelists before him had treated fully and more than enough? To whom we answer: that this was done, God willing it, for the certitude of the faith and for our salvation — [God] who would not grant to the individual Evangelists that each one of them should recount all things both universally and singly, but so distributed to each of them, in proportion of writing, through parts, that sometimes one would say those same things which another Evangelist had already narrated — so that, from the things which two, or three, or four had said consonantly and equally, they might show that they had received from one and the same fountain of truth; and sometimes one would pass by certain things in silence and leave them, which another by explication would supply — lest perchance, if we had all the things that are written of Christ in one or two Evangelists, we should disdain the other Evangelists as repeating the same things superfluously, and, embracing only those who had written out everything, should neglect the labor of the other Evangelists as useless and superfluous. And in this manner that holy four-horsed chariot *(quadriga)* of the Evangelists

would be dissolved, which the Lord willed to be indissoluble. Therefore, that it might remain indissoluble, he so tempered the harmony of the Gospels themselves that the narration of one cannot stand without the narration of another, but from all joined together at once there results the most consonant and most perfect history of our salvation. In vain therefore do the irrational Alogi complain of the things which by John — through the will of the Spirit — were passed over, or were narrated together with the other Evangelists.

2. But it is **ridiculous** and futile what they oppose to John — that he writes things contrary to the other Evangelists — since there is no contradiction between him and Luke. For John does not say that that miracle of the marriage was absolutely the first of all Christ's miracles, but the first *sign* which Jesus did after his baptism and the taking-up of his disciples; [2] meanwhile not denying that many miracles were also done by Christ before his baptism — of which Luke described that one which was done by Christ, yet a boy, in the temple, together with many others — for the confuting of the heresy of those who deny that Jesus was God before his baptism, but affirm that he was then first deified when, he being baptized, the Spirit, the heavens being opened, with the paternal voice attesting, descended upon him. In like manner is solved what they object about the Centurion's boy: that John did not say this was the second miracle of Christ after the disciples were taken up, but the second after he had removed from Judaea into Galilee — the Evangelist himself saying: "This **again** is the second sign that Jesus did, when he was come from Judaea into Galilee." [3]

3. Further, not less feeble and nerveless is the argument which Faustus brings against the fifth chapter of John, saying that Christ ought then to have used the testimony of Moses — if he had known anything attested of himself by Moses — when the Jews objected to him that he [4]

[1] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 51 (Epiph. lib. 2 her. 51).
[2] Ioan. 2.
[3] Ioan. 4.
[4] Ioan. 5.

(printed p. 599 [PDF p. 604] — Heresy V: Dilutio, responses 3–5; the Probatic pond defended.)

gave testimony of himself. For if we diligently inspect what Christ then answered the Jews, we shall see that he brought forth a grand testimony about himself out of Moses. [1] For when he said, "In your law it is written that the testimony of two is true; I am one who give testimony of myself, and there giveth testimony of me the Father who sent me" — what else did this sound like, to those who understood rightly, than that that number of witnesses was consecrated in the law of Moses by the prophetic spirit, and commended by Moses, that even thus the future revelation of the Father and of the Son might be fore-announced — of whom the Spirit is, in that inseparable Trinity, the Holy Spirit? [2] But as to what [Faustus] adds — that it is not to be believed that Christ said Moses wrote of him, because if he had said this, the Jews could not have restrained themselves from straightway asking what that might be which was written of him — it is puerile. For just as it could come to pass that, after the miracles they had beheld, the hard infidelity of the Jews remained, so it could come to pass that, when Christ said Moses had written of him, they — fearing in their malignant astuteness whence they might be convicted — would not seek to hear at all what Moses had written of him. [3] And when he subjoins that no testimony is found in Moses which Christ could have produced for himself — because that testimony of Deuteronomy speaks nothing of Christ [4] — he lies most impudently. For there are such and so many testimonies of Christ in the books of Moses (as we shall show in the following book) that Moses plainly wrote nothing which is not referred to Christ as to the last end of the whole law. Nor does that pretty *Antithesis* avail anything at all, with which he wished as it were to paint and color his muddy discourse, while, comparing Christ to Moses, he strives to show him unlike: as though, when something is called "like," it must be understood as like in every part and in every manner, so that no unlikeness at all should remain between the things that are alike — as happened in Christ, who, the unlikeness of divinity being reserved to himself from Moses, is in this called like Moses: because he was man; because he was

made in the likeness of flesh, born of a woman; because he was sent to free the people of God — not from Egypt, but from the captivity of sins; not from Pharao, but from the power of darkness. Like again, because he died by a true death on the mount [of Calvary]; but unlike, because [he was] God, born of the Holy Spirit from a virgin, dead on the mount not for his own sins, but that he might placate the wrath of God, offended by us, bearing the crimes of men in his own body.

4. But let the Anabaptists rave as much as they will: since Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and most of the Greeks attest that this history [of the adulteress] always stood in the ancient codices of the Greeks, just as it now stands in these; and the catholic Church has bestowed on it authority equal with the other chapters of John the Evangelist. Nor, because Papias cited it out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is it to be believed that it was not written in the Gospel of John, or that the same is not true because it is read in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: otherwise nothing in the sacred books will be true that is found written in the other scriptures of the nations. Vain are these arguments, and unworthy of response. But they press on: the history is rendered suspect for this reason — that it is produced out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is the work of Tatian the heresiarch. But these unskilled men are deceived out of ignorance of the histories. For the Gospel according to the Hebrews cited by Papias, and the Gospel commemorated by Epiphanius, differ much between themselves. For Eusebius, writing of both, says that the Gospel which Papias remembers was of old, in that primeval church, in great authority, and that — although it was not in the canon — the Jews converted to Christ were accustomed to use it; [5] but the other, which Epiphanius relates, put forth by Tatian the heretic, he says was altogether exploded by the church.

But as for that which the same heretics bring forward to shake the credit of the history — namely, that the Greeks do not have this history in their commentaries — I know not whence they could know it, since there are extant in the present age no entire commentaries of the Greeks upon John except those of Chrysostom alone, and of Theophylact and Euthymius, his abbreviators; in which, though that history is not explicated, yet it is not repudiated by them; and it is possible that Chrysostom did expound that history, and that that exposition was afterward drawn out of the codex of Chrysostom by some heretic whom either the history itself, or the explanation of the history, did not please. Concerning the words of Jerome, there is nothing else I care to answer except what we have said elsewhere: that those consecutions are ridiculous — from a particular affirmative to a particular negative — namely: "this history is in many volumes: therefore in many volumes it does not exist." These things are certainly cheap and elementary, unworthy to be answered; but we are to be excused, in that the improbity of the heretics compels us to descend to this pettiness.

5. But who would not laugh at the madness of those men, in that they refuse to believe the history of the languid man at the pond for this reason — that they have read it neither in the Old Testament nor in Josephus? [6] As though the Miracles of Christ were not to be believed by us because Josephus did not write them! "But nothing," say they, "is written of this pond in the Old Testament." We concede that nothing is openly affirmed of it in the Old Testament — but neither is it openly denied. Nay, if we diligently consider the things which are written in the second book of Paralipomenon, the fourth chapter, we shall gather by necessary consecution that there was a certain pond, or receptacle of waters, at Jerusalem in the region which by John is named Probatica [the Sheep-place]. [7] For thus in Greek, says he: ἔστι δὲ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα ["Now there is at Jerusalem, by the Sheep-gate, a pond"]. This pond perhaps had been built at the lowest roots of the mount which sustained the temple, so that into it might flow all that force of waters which was daily poured out, as much from the brazen Sea in which the priests washed as from the ten basins in which the holocausts were washed. For — to say nothing of the basins — the Sea alone, as is read in the same chapter, held three thousand measures *(metretas)*. It was needful, therefore, that there be certain grand receptacles of waters into which so many vessels might be discharged. With which reasoning the testimony of Aristeas, a most ancient writer, also seems to consent: for he, concerning water-receptacles of this kind serving the temple of Jerusalem, speaks in this manner in the book On the Seventy Interpreters,

[addressed] to Philocrates:

[1] Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. lib. 16 contra Faust. cap. 6).
[2] Deut. 17.
[3] Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 13 (Aug. lib. 16 co. Fau. c. 13).
[4] Deut. 18.
[5] book of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 25; book 4, ch. 29 (lib. hist. eccl. cap. 25; lib. 4 ca. 29).
[6] Ioan. 5.
[7] 2 Par. 4.

(printed p. 600 [PDF p. 605] — Heresy V concluded; Heresy VI (Acts of the Apostles); Heresy VII (Epistles of Paul) begins.)

(the quotation of Aristeas, begun on the previous page, continues:)

> ***The receptacles** of the waters — which [water] is poured out in great abundance for washing away the blood of the slaughtered victims — are hidden in convenient places. For on feast days many thousands of victims are slain; and indeed so great is the continual flux of the waters led in, that you would think a perennial fountain was overflowing. But more marvelous, and almost unspeakable, is the magnitude of the subterranean reservoirs, which penetrates everything round the whole circuit of the temple for as much as five stadia; and leaden pipes descend to them everywhere through the walls and the floor of the temple, by which all things are washed away and made clean. There are also at the base of the Altar frequent apertures, unknown to all except those who minister, by whose influx and rush all the gore from the multitude of victims is purged. Now the multitude of the waters received we conjectured in this manner: for when they had led us four stadia beyond the city to a certain place, they bade us listen to the sound of the waters flowing together beneath — which to me indeed seemed the confluence of great vessels.*

Thus far Aristeas. From whose words I conjecture that it could easily have come to pass that those waters flowed through hidden pipes into this pool, and again out of it were poured forth through other channels outside the city. But that no mention of this pool was made in the Old Testament is not to be wondered at: because that place, at that time, was not so celebrated as to seem worthy of a particular narration. But after that, in the last times of the Hebrews, it had been made illustrious by the nobility of the miracle, it is verisimilar that the place itself was then first adorned with five porches, for the convenience of the languishing who lay beneath them, awaiting the motion of the water. Wherefore nothing ought to derogate from the faith of the Evangelical history, if the aforesaid authors dissent somewhat among themselves about the site and the virtue of the place — especially since the author of the Scholastic History, in that he reports out of the opinion of others what concerns the wood of the cross, does not himself assert it, but only writes it as a thing learned by fame, and not by certain truth. For us it is enough that this history of the languid man has always stood in all codices, as well Greek as Latin; that it was expounded by the Greek and by the Latin fathers; and that it has been approved by the authority of the whole Church through so many ages. Wherefore there is no cause why we should hereafter call it back into doubt on account of certain empty conjectures of dreaming Anabaptists. And concerning John, thus far.

OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES — Heresy VI *(De Actis Apostolorum haeresis VI)*

Not to receive the Acts of the Apostles.

This heresy Eusebius, in the fourth book of the Ecclesiastical History, attributes — out of the opinion of Irenaeus — to Tatian and to Severus, from whom the Severian heretics were named. [1] Philaster likewise, in his Catalogue, ascribes it to Cerinthus. [2] Augustine, in the book On the Utility of Believing, to Honoratus, assigns the same heresy to the Manichaeans, [3] who for this reason would not accept this book: because its author wrote that the Spirit, the Paraclete, promised by Christ, came on the day of Pentecost — long before

the times of Manichaeus, whom they believed to have been that Paraclete Spirit promised by Christ. "But since that book" (says Augustine) "has in itself so many things similar to those which the Manichaeans accept and believe concerning the divine scriptures, it seems to be a mark of great folly that they do not believe and accept this one also." Jerome, in the Catalogue of Illustrious Men, writes that this book was of old corrupted by a certain Asiatic presbyter, saying thus: "Therefore the *periodoi* [travels] of Paul and of Thecla, and the whole fable of the baptized lion, added to the book of the acts of the apostles, we reckon among the apocryphal scriptures. But Tertullian also, near to the times of the apostles, relates that a certain presbyter in Asia, a σπουδαστὴν [zealous devotee] of the Apostle Paul, was convicted before John of being the author of the book, and confessed that he had done this for love of Paul." In the confutation of this error, therefore, no labor need be expended by me: because, since I have found among no writers any reasons on account of which the heretics cast this book away, there is no need that we make them any answer — save that this heresy of theirs is condemned by the long-continued use of the church, by the approbation of all the fathers, and by the authority of all the Councils — especially that of Laodicea, the third of Carthage, and, last of all, that of Trent — in whose catalogues this book is recounted among the other divine scriptures.

OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE IN GENERAL — Heresy VII *(De epistolis Pauli Apostoli in universali. Haeresis VII)*

To repudiate the Epistles of Paul the Apostle.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Under this nefarious heresy there are many errors of heretics. Some reject all the epistles of Paul; and their leader and standard-bearer, as Irenaeus and Eusebius write, [4] was Ebion, poor in understanding (for so his name sounds to the Hebrews); who — since he taught that the whole old law, together with the new, was to be observed by Christians, and perceived that Paul most vehemently cried out against him in this — cast away his epistles altogether, and (as Epiphanius relates) called the Apostle himself, by way of contumely, now "the Tarsian," now "the Greek," now "the Apostate of the law": [5] accusing him that, whereas he was a Greek, and of a Greek father, he went up to Jerusalem; and when he had remained there for some time, he desired to take the daughter of a priest to wife, and for her sake was made a proselyte and likewise circumcised; and then, when he had not obtained the girl, stirred up with wrath, he wrote against circumcision and against the law. To this Ebion there succeeded in error the Helcheseite heretics, in the time of Philippus Augustus, the first Christian Emperor; [6] who, Eusebius being witness, repudiated all the epistles of Paul entirely. There were other heretics who did not dare to reject all the epistles of Paul, but only those which they had recognized as most hostile to their own dogmas: such as the Encratites, the Severians, the Marcionites, the Manichaeans, the Arians, the Aerians, the Anabaptists, and very many other heretics. Of whom the Encratites — whose prince was Tatian, once the hearer of Justin the martyr — rejected the epistles to Titus and to Timothy; [7] Arius, the epistle to the Hebrews;

[1] ch. 29 (cap. 29).
[2] ch. 36 (cap. 36).
[3] ch. 2 (cap. 2).
[4] book 1 against heresies, [ch.] 2; book 3 of the Ecclesiastical [History], ch. 27 (lib. 1 adu. her. 2; lib. 3 eccl. cap. 27).
[5] book 1, heresy 30 (li. 1. hær. 30).
[6] book 6, ch. 27 (lib. 6. ca. 27 — the final digit is ink-clogged; the passage is Eusebius, Hist. eccl., bk. 6, on the Helkesaites).
[7] Eusebius, book 4 of the [Ecclesiastical] History, ch. 29 (Eus. li. 4. hi. cap. 29).

(printed p. 601 [PDF p. 606] — Heresy VII: the assertors continued; the heretics' objections 1–3.)

Marcion, moreover, of Pontus, by fatherland a Sinopean, cast away entirely four out of the fourteen epistles of Paul which the Church has: namely, the two to Timothy, one to Titus, and the other to the Hebrews. [1] Now

of those who [receive] some epistles of Paul: some accept those which they receive as entire and incorrupt; but others contend that even those which they receive have been falsified and vitiated in many places — as Marcion, who held those ten epistles of Paul which he accepted to be adulterated in numerous places, mutilated, truncated, and interlarded with very many foreign additions *(ascititiis additamentis)*. And he compacted out of them a certain volume, which he called the *Apostolic* book; at the end *(in calce)* of which he added also a certain epistle to the Laodiceans, inscribed with the name of Paul. But those who keep certain epistles uncorrupted and uncontaminated (although they believe them to be Paul the Apostle's, and confess that they have come down to us entire), yet do not accept all the things that are written in them, but reprobate some altogether: as a certain anonymous disciple of Fabritius, against whom Augustine, under the name of "the adversary of the law and the prophets," put forth two books. [2] This man, as the same Augustine relates, said that Paul, according to the qualities of men's wits, spoke under five diverse persons: of which the first was that of the Jews; the second, of those who are under the law; the third, of those who are not under the law; the fourth, of the infirm; and the fifth, of the perfect; and that in the four first persons he said many things which ought not to be received by the perfect. The Aerians also, as Epiphanius notes, [3] distinguishing the sayings of Paul, asserted that he said and wrote certain things full of the Holy Spirit, and that these were to be received without any contradiction; but that some things the same Paul spoke as a bare man, destitute of the Holy Spirit, and these they judged were to be cast away. But since the aforesaid heretics render no causes why they cast away all the Pauline epistles, or why they accept some and spurn others, or why in these epistles these sayings rather than others have been falsified, or why these things were said by Paul according to man rather than according to the Spirit, nothing occurs for us to say against them, except what Jerome writes against these rash men in the preface of the commentaries on Titus: "If they rendered causes" (says he) "why they did not think these epistles to be the Apostle's, and worthy of the Apostle, we should attempt to answer them somewhat, and perhaps satisfy the reader. But now, since they pronounce by heretical authority, and say, 'that epistle is Paul's, this is not,' let them understand themselves to be refuted, for the truth's sake, by that same authority by which they themselves do not blush to counterfeit falsehoods." In like manner we too can speak against all the aforesaid heretics — especially since elsewhere in this work we have shown that there is nothing in the divine scriptures which the holy men of God did not write from the breathing *(afflatu)* of the Holy Spirit, and that there is nothing in them which can be marked with any suspicion of falsity.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. Faustus contends that the epistles of Paul have been falsified in all those places in which it is read that Christ was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, as is written in the beginning of the epistle to the Romans. [4] "For it is not credible," says he, "that the Apostle of God could write things contrary to himself, and hold now this, now that opinion concerning Christ — so that, writing to the Romans, he should say that Christ was the son of David according to the flesh, [5] and afterward, writing to the Corinthians, should correct that opinion as false, or rather reject it, saying: 'We know no man according to the flesh; and if we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know him no longer.' [6] Wherefore, since there is so great a difference between these two passages *(capitula)* — that the one affirms Christ to be known according to the flesh, the other not known — it remains either that Paul erred in the first passage, and then in the second, making progress, changed his opinion; or that the epistle of Paul was corrupted by the falsity of those who inserted that first place, and others like it, into the epistles of Paul. But since it is not lawful [to hold] that the Apostle of God destroys what he once built up, it is better to say that the epistle of Paul was vitiated by the depravity of another than that it was made vicious by his own error."

2. But that unnamed disciple of Fabritius added to this calumny of Faustus a much graver blasphemy, saying that there are many things in these epistles to be rejected, in which Paul, accommodating himself to the infirmity of his hearers, brought forth an opinion other than what he really thought. [7] "For it is well known that the Apostle spoke in five persons, according to the qualities of men's wits: for, insinuating the things of

God to a people as yet rude, he ought not to have begun from the more perfect things, and — excluding from them their long-accustomed usage *(consuetudinem vetustatis)* — to commence from the more difficult, lest he should disturb those yet new to the faith with perfect doctrine. Which is proved out of the Apostle's own words, when he says: 'For **whereas I was** free as to all, I made myself the servant of all, that I might gain the more: and I became to the Jews as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; and to those who are under the law, as if I were under the law, that I might gain those who are under the law; and to those who were without the law, as if I were without the law (though I am not without the law of God), that I might gain those who are without the law. I became to the infirm, infirm, that I might gain the infirm. I became all things to all men, that I might gain all.' [8] To which four persons — namely, one of the Jews; another of those who are under the law; a third of those who are not under the law; a fourth of the infirm — he added also a fifth, the person of the perfect, saying: 'We speak **wisdom** among the perfect'; [9] indicating by these words that he spoke many things in favor of those whose persons he had assumed, concerning which he thought far otherwise in his heart; and that he often feigned himself to be something other than he was."

3. The Aerians next, and certain other unnamed heretics, whom Jerome recounts in the preface of the commentaries on Titus, [10] contemn many things in the epistles of Paul as said by Paul humanly *(humanitus)*, and not divinely; and among the rest they cast away even the whole epistle of Paul to Philemon — because, even if it be Paul's, yet it has nothing that can edify, since it was written only in the office of a familiar communication, and not for the sake of teaching. They say that the Apostle did not always speak all things with Christ speaking in him; because his human weakness could not have borne always the same tenor of the Spirit; but that there was at times a season in which Paul spoke and acted as a common man, and either spoke something of the necessities of his own poor body *(corpusculi)*,

[1] Jerome, in the preface [of the commentaries] on Titus; Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 42 (Hier. in præ. ad Titum; Epiph. lib. 1. Hær. 42).
[2] book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 2 (li. 2. co. adu. legis cap. 2).
[3] book 3, heresy 76 (li. 3. hær. 76).
[4] Augustine, book against Faustus, 11, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. con. Fau. 11. ca. 1).
[5] Roma. 1.
[6] 2. Cor. 5.
[7] Augustine, against the adversary of the law and the prophets, book 2, ch. 2 (Aug. con. ad. leg. & pro. li. 2. cap. 2).
[8] 1. Cor. 9.
[9] 1. Cor. 2.
[10] Jerome, in the preface of the commentaries on Titus (Hier. in præ. com. ad Titu).

(printed p. 602 [PDF p. 607] — Heresy VII: objection 3 concluded; the Dilutio, responses 1–2.)

or acted [as a common man] — as when he arranged a meal, when he took food, was hungry, was filled, digested what he had eaten and evacuated what was spent, and either asked from others the things necessary for his body, or commanded others [to provide them]. For at such times Paul, being as the rest of men, would not have dared to say: "**Do you seek** a proof of him who speaketh in me, Christ?" and, "**I live**, now not I: but Christ liveth in me." [1] Nor did they think it any wonder (they added), if Paul at times lived and spoke as a common man, without the Spirit of God, since this is read to have happened in the prophets also: as the scripture says of Ezechiel and the other prophets — "The word of the Lord **was made** to Ezechiel" [2] — who, after the vaticination was completed, returning again into himself, became a common man out of a prophet; and, except in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit remained permanently in no one — which sign John the Baptist also had received, that upon whomsoever he should see the Holy Spirit descend, and remain upon him, he should know that this was he. [3] From which it is shown that the Holy Spirit indeed descends upon many, but that this is the proper ensign of the Savior — that he remains in him. Therefore in the epistles of Paul (they say) many things were written by him when, destitute of the Holy Spirit, he spoke as a pure man — as those passages indicate which are found scattered throughout them: namely, to the Galatians, "**Would that** they were even cut off who trouble you"; [4] and to Timothy, "**The cloak** which I left at Troas, with

Cyprus [sic — the print reads *apud Cyprum* for the Vulgate's *apud Carpum*, 'with Carpus'], bring with thee when thou comest, and likewise the books and the parchments"; [5] and to Philemon, "**Prepare** me a lodging," etc. [6] — examples of this sort of human weakness: in which, since no proof of Christ speaking in Paul is recognized, it will be lawful (they say) at one's own judgment either to receive them or to cast them away.

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. "Something, says Faustus, has been falsified in Paul: because both cannot be true — both what he writes in the epistle to the Romans, and what in the epistle to the Corinthians. [7] Let us then demonstrate that both can be true, and that these two are not contrary to one another. For that one of them is not Paul's we can in no wise say, since in that place the authority of the codices nowhere varies. For although in certain Latin exemplars there is read not FACTVS ['made'] but 'born of the seed of David' — since the Greek [books] have FACTVS, whence the Latin interpreter wished to translate not word for word but according to the sense, saying 'born' — nevertheless, that Christ is of the seed of David according to the flesh, the authority of all books and all tongues agrees. [8] But that Paul at some time erred in this, and afterward, making progress, changed his opinion — far be it from us to say. Neither passage, therefore, is dissonant from the other; but both agree soundly in the same rule of faith. [9] For that the Son of God was made of the seed of David, the same Apostle says in more places than one, and the other holy scriptures most openly proclaim. And as to what he says — 'and if we have known Christ according to the flesh, but now we know him no longer' — the very circumstance of that place of scripture sufficiently shows what the Apostle is speaking of: for after his own manner [he speaks of] our future life, which is already completed in the man Christ himself, the mediator, our head, now risen again; so that with sure hope it is meditated upon, as though it were already present, and held as a thing at hand — which life assuredly will not be according to the flesh, even as the life of Christ is not according to the flesh. For by 'flesh' in this place he wishes to be understood not the very substance of our body — which the Lord even after his resurrection calls flesh, saying: '**Handle** and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have' [10] — but the corruption and mortality of the flesh, which will not then be in us, as it is now no longer in Christ. We **knew** Christ, therefore, according to the flesh — that is, according to the mortality of the flesh — before he rose again; but now we no longer know him according to the quality of carnal corruption: because, as the same Apostle says, '**Christ**, rising from the dead, now dieth no more, and death shall have dominion over him no longer.' [11] We knew him according to the flesh while he was yet to die; for there was in his body a mortality, which the Apostle properly calls flesh. But now we know him [thus] no more: for that mortal part of him has now put on immortality; whence, according to its former mortality, it can no longer be called flesh. But if Faustus holds himself to the propriety of the words, then Paul lied when he said, 'We **knew** Christ according to the flesh' — if Christ, as Faustus says, never existed according to the flesh. For no one ever *knew* what was not. And he did not say, 'we *thought* Christ according to the flesh,' but, 'we *knew*.' Nevertheless, not to press upon a word — lest anyone should affirm that the Apostle spoke by abuse [of language], so that for 'we thought' he said 'we knew' — this I marvel that blind men do not attend to (or rather I marvel not that the blind do not see): that if Christ therefore had no flesh because the Apostle said that he now no longer knew Christ according to the flesh, then neither did those men have flesh of whom he says in the same place: '**Therefore** henceforth we know no man according to the flesh.' 'Henceforth,' says he, 'we know no man according to the flesh' — that is, we hold so certain a hope of our future incorruption and immortality that henceforth, in the very contemplation of immortality, almost forgetting all the corruption of mortality, we rejoice. 'Henceforth we know no man according to the flesh' is understood not yet in fact *(in re)*, but in hope: because our hope is in Christ, because in him is already completed what we hope for as promised to us."

2. Next, the disciple of Fabritius rises up against Paul; who turns what the Apostle said out of the affection of one suffering-with *(compatientis affectu)* into a detestable deceit. [12] "But how openly this impious fellow blasphemes, who does not see? For if the Apostle had feigned himself such as this madman barks — namely,

without the law among the gentiles, who were without the law — he would not have proposed to them, with such great praises *(præconiis)*, the faith of Abraham for imitation: [Abraham] whom they knew not, being a foreigner, the father of the Hebrew nation, far removed from their manners, far from their rites and kinships; rather he ought to have found some prince, whether of the Romans or of the Greeks, or some one of the Philosophers, whom he might set before them for imitation. Likewise, if to those who were under the law — the Jews — he had deceitfully become as one under the law, why did he say that they are not heirs by the law? and, 'The **law** worketh wrath'? and, 'The **law** is a ministration of death'? and, [13]

[1] 2. Cor. 13. a; Gal. 2. d.
[2] Ezech. 1. a.
[3] Ioan. 1. d.
[4] Gal. 5. b.
[5] 2. Tim. 4. c.
[6] Philem. 1.
[7] Augustine, against Faustus, book 11, ch. 4; Roma. 1 (Au. co. Fau. lib. 11. cap. 4; Roma. 1).
[8] 2. Cor. 5.
[9] Augustine, in the same place, ch. 7 (Aug. ibi. c. 7).
[10] Luc. 24.
[11] Rom. 6. b.
[12] Augustine, book 3 against the adversary of the law and the prophets, ch. 9 (Aug. lib. 3. co. adu. legis & pro. cap. 9).
[13] Rom. 4. c; Gala. 3. c.

(printed p. 603 [PDF p. 608] — Heresy VII: Dilutio 2–3 concluded; Heresy VIII, on the Epistle to the Hebrews, begins.)

'The **law** was set in place because of transgressors'? — things which those who gloried in the law could not bear with an even mind. Never, therefore, did Paul put on diverse persons out of a zeal to deceive; but keeping always the same person of a teacher, as well among the gentiles as among the Jews, he preached the same God, the same law and prophets, and the same gospel, to Israelites, gentiles, the infirm, and the perfect. But someone will say: In vain, then, did the Apostle say, 'I was **made** all things to all men'; and, 'I **could not** speak to you spiritual things, but as it were to carnal men I gave you milk, and not meat.' [1] But far be it from us to think that the Apostle did these things so as to deceive some men by feigning to be others. He was made all things to all men, not by the cunning of a deceiver, but by the affection of one who suffers-with *(compatientis affectu)*, coming to the aid of the diverse diseases of souls with diverse affections of mercy: giving, namely, to the little ones little things — not false things — milky things, not noxious; nourishing, not destructive; that is, the first rudiments of the faith; but to the perfect, grander mysteries: accommodating to each what was healthful according to his capacity."

3. For the rest, the Aerians err greatly, together with the other heretics their followers, if they think that Paul did not have the Holy Spirit when he spoke of the necessities of human weakness, or that he was destitute of the Holy Spirit when he was fulfilling the needs of the body: thinking that to buy food, to prepare a lodging, to procure garments, is sin, and that the Holy Spirit is put to flight from us if we serve for a little while the necessities of our poor body. [2] For the Holy Spirit is saddened and driven from us not by the ministries of this life, but by unclean works and by many vices; which when the Prophet had set out in order, he brought in at the end: "In **all these things** thou didst sadden me." But to offer a cup of cold water, to wash feet, to sacrifice a calf, to prepare a meal — so far are these from being sins, that we read that by these things certain men were adopted as sons of God. Accordingly, it is by no means to be believed that Paul was at any time destitute of the Holy Spirit on account of things of this kind; but it is to be held most firmly that, from that day on which the Apostle of Christ was made Paul out of Saul — and, out of a vessel of contumely, a vessel of election and of grace, that he might carry the name of Christ among the nations — the spirit of Christ never failed in him for any space of time; by which spirit all the things that he wrote were marvelously

dictated.

OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE HEBREWS — Heresy VIII *(De epistola Pauli ad Hebræos hæresis VIII)*

That the epistle to the Hebrews is neither Paul's, nor to be numbered among the canonical scriptures.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Philastrius, in his catalogue of heresies, recounts this error among the anonymous heresies, saying: "There **are** some who do not assert that the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is his, but say that it is either the Apostle Barnabas's, or Clement's, bishop of the city of Rome." [3] But Epiphanius, in the first [book] against heresies, writes that the author of this error was Marcion, [4] who rejected the present epistle, together with the epistles to Titus and to Timothy, as unworthy of the apostle. Tatian, Eusebius being witness, succeeded him in the same error. [5] Then after these (as Epiphanius, Theodoret, and Jerome narrate), Arius, the Aerians, and the Ariomanites, seeing that this epistle was most repugnant to their dogma, denied it to be Paul's, and on that account cast it out of the canonical scriptures as adulterine and suspect. [6] Whose perfidy the fanatical Anabaptists and the atheist Servetians, imitating, have repudiated it for the same cause. But Luther, as also Calvin, and others out of their workshop, although they do not exclude it from the canon, yet deny it to be the apostle Paul's, saying that it is worthy neither of the spirit of Paul nor of the majesty of an Apostle; whence, as often as it befalls them to cite some testimony out of this epistle, always passing over the name of Paul, they adduce in his place "the Author of the epistle to the Hebrews."

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Since this heresy asserts two things — namely, both that this epistle is not Paul's, and that it is not Canonical — therefore each must be confuted by us particularly. Beginning, then, from the author of the epistle, we show first that this most holy epistle is the apostle Paul's, from the testimony of Blessed Peter: who, himself also writing to the Hebrews dispersed through Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, discloses at once the name of the author of this epistle and its intention, while he exhorts the Hebrews to patience and longanimity, mention being made of the things which are contained in this most sacred epistle; saying thus: "**Wherefore**, dearest, expecting these things, be diligent that you may be found immaculate and inviolate before him in peace; and count the longanimity of our Lord Jesus Christ as salvation — even as our dearest brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you." [7] Which Paul had assuredly done throughout this whole epistle, ever bent wholly upon this one thing: to lead them to the toleration of present afflictions, and to a firm and certain hope of future rewards. For as Theophylact says, explicating the argument of this epistle: "Paul proves two things in this epistle: both that whatever things befall are to be borne manfully, and that rewards for labors are to be expected. For the Lord will not neglect those whom from eternity he has destined to holiness." And although Paul pursues this most amply through the whole epistle, yet he treated it more ardently and more vividly in the tenth, twelfth, and thirteenth chapters.

Secondly, it manifestly appears that neither Luke, nor Clement, nor Tertullian, as some have thought, were the authors of this epistle, but Paul himself; and this from the words placed at the end *(in calce)* of the epistle, in which the author exhorts the Hebrews to pray to God for his welfare, that he may the more quickly return to them. For thus he says: "The **more** do I beseech you to do this, that I may the sooner be restored to you." [8] These words cannot suit Clement, who was a Roman, and had never been away from Rome, nor had lived among the Hebrews; nor yet Barnabas — for although Clement, in his itinerary (which is reckoned among the apocryphal scriptures), writes that he was at Rome, yet the greater part of writers denies that he came into Italy. Whence [these words] indicate that this epistle was written by Paul,

[1] Augustine, in the same place, ch. 2 (Aug. ibid. cap. 2).

[2] Jerome, in the preface of the commentaries on Titus (Hier. in præ. com. ad Titum).

[3] ch. 89 (cap. 89).

[4] book 1, heresy 42 (lib. 1. hær. 42).

[5] book 3 of the History, ch. 29 (lib. 3. hist. cap. 29 — so printed; the passage is Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 4.29).

[6] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 69; Theodoret, in the preface of the epistle to the Hebrews; Jerome, in the preface of the epistle to Titus (Epiph. li. 2. hæresi 69; Theod. in præfat. epist. ad Hebr.; Hier. in præfat. epist. ad Titum).

[7] 2. Pet. 3.

[8] Heb. 13. c.

(printed p. 604 [PDF p. 609] — Heresy VIII: the Impugnatio continued — Pauline authorship and canonicity of Hebrews.)

the subscription of the epistle itself, which is had in the Greek codices: ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, διὰ Τιμοθέου — that is, "written from Italy by Timothy"; and Chrysostom attests that it was written at Rome, and sent thence to the Hebrews by Timothy. But neither can those words be fitted to Tertullian: both because before the times of Tertullian there are found in the writings of the Fathers many testimonies taken out of this epistle; and because Tertullian himself, as Jerome notes in the book On Illustrious Men, brought forth his own opinion concerning the author of this epistle. To this is added that the author, among other things, making mention also of his own chains, writes thus in the tenth chapter according to the Greek truth: καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε — that is, "For you also had compassion on my chains." Which words do not seem to suit Clement. And the same [author] asserts at the end of the epistle that he delivered this epistle to Timothy to be carried to the Hebrews; which surely is a great indication that Paul wrote it, and gave it to be borne by Timothy his disciple, to whom he was joined by a most holy intimacy *(necessitudine)* — which Clement perhaps would not have done, seeing that he was not joined to Timothy by so great a bond of fellowship in the building up of the churches.

But the author himself also closes the end of this epistle with that most happy prayer of grace, saying: "The **grace** of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." Which prayer Paul himself, at the end of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, attests to be his sign and token *(tesseram)*, with which he was accustomed to subscribe all his epistles: "The **salutation** (says he) of me Paul, with my own hand; which is the sign in every epistle: so I write: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." [1]

There persuades us also that this epistle is Paul's that most ardent zeal and fervor with which the whole soul of Paul burned for the conversion of the Hebrews to the truth of the faith; which, writing to the Romans, he openly indicates, saying: "I **wished** to be an anathema for my brethren, who are my kinsmen, of whom is Christ according to the flesh." [2] And again: "As **long as** I am the Apostle of the gentiles, I will honor my ministry, if in any way I may provoke my flesh to emulation — that is, the Jews — and may save some of them." [3] How then should Paul not write to his own Hebrews, whom he loved so ardently? And since he had written many epistles to others who were not joined to him according to the flesh, why did he not write at least one epistle to his own? And if he wrote it, this is certainly that one: in which Paul, stirred by that divine fire, exhorts the Hebrews that, the oldness of the law being laid aside, they should hasten, through patience and the endurance of labors, to that heavenly Jerusalem, and to that more perfect tabernacle of eternal redemption, designated in the shadows of the Mosaic tabernacle. That this same epistle is Paul's, the common testimony of all the most ancient fathers proves. And before others, Blessed Dionysius, the disciple of Paul, in his works cites a testimony out of that epistle as composed by his own (as he calls him) preceptor, leader, and instructor. To him subscribes Blessed Clement, third after Blessed Peter bishop of the city of Rome; of whom Eusebius, in the third book of the History, speaks thus: [4] "**Clement**, in the epistle which he writes to the Corinthians, remembers the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, and uses its testimonies. Whence it is well established that the Apostle wrote it in his native speech, as one to be sent to Hebrews; and (as some hand down) Luke the evangelist — but others say this very Clement — interpreted it [into Greek]. Which latter is

also the more true: because both the very style of Clement agrees with this epistle, and the sense of each writing indeed preserves a very great likeness." [5] Thus far Eusebius. With whom Clement of Alexandria agrees, who in the books of his ὑποτυπώσεων [Hypotyposes] asserts that this same epistle was written by Paul, and afterward translated into Greek by Luke. And Origen, on the first psalm, writes of the author of this epistle in this manner: "**Although** some have doubted concerning the epistle written to the Hebrews, on the ground that there does not seem to be preserved in it that opinion of his which he pronounces of himself, saying that he is unskilled in speech — yet I say, as it has been handed down to me from my elders, that it is most manifestly Paul's, and all our ancient elders always received it as the Apostle Paul's." The same is the judgment of Chrysostom; whose abbreviator Theophylact inveighs thus against those who deny this epistle to be Paul's: "**I cannot** indeed but marvel at the impudence of many men, who, although they understand that by the exordium of this epistle so many heresies have been confuted, nevertheless do not cease to affirm that this epistle does not befit blessed Paul, as though foreign to the rest of his epistles. But I would have them not be ignorant that both the sense of this epistle, and its profundity, and that irrefutable force, can be no other's than Paul's, who has Christ speaking in him." And that I may not recount the several testimonies of the Fathers — namely of Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and others, who confess it to be Paul's — let one single testimony of the whole catholic church suffice us: which, in the natal solemnities of our Lord Jesus Christ, sings the beginning of this epistle in the divine mysteries under the name of Blessed Paul the apostle. From all which it becomes perspicuous that this epistle is no other's than Paul's.

But that the present epistle is to be received in the canon of the divine scriptures, the sacrosanct decrees of the Councils show first of all: above all, the most sacred Synod of Nicaea received it among the sacred volumes as written by the apostle Paul; and the Council of Laodicea related it in its catalogue; and the third Council of Carthage, and the Council of Orange *(Aurusicanum)*, inserted it in the canon. To which subscribe the decrees of Innocent the first, and of Gelasius, and of Eugenius the fourth, which enumerate this epistle in the catalogue of the divine scriptures. And that it was also always received in the church as canonical, and reprobated by none except heretics, the common consensus of the Greek fathers demonstrates; of whom — lest I run through all their testimonies — I shall adduce the single sentence of Theodoret, which he expressed against the Arians who repudiated this epistle: "They accomplish **nothing** (says he) who labor under the Arian disease, if they rage against the apostolic letters, and separate the epistle to the Hebrews from the rest, and call it adulterine. For they who move their tongues against God and our Savior — what would they not have dared against his well-wishers, the grand-speaking heralds of the truth?"

[1] 2. Thess., last chapter (2. Theß. vlt.).
[2] Rom. 9.
[3] Rom. 11.
[4] ch. 38 (cap. 38).
[5] Eusebius, book 6 of the History, ch. 11; Eusebius, book 6 of the History, ch. 18 (Eus. li. 6. his. cap. 11; Eus. li. 6. his. cap. 18).

(printed p. 605 [PDF p. 610] — Heresy VIII: Impugnatio concluded; the heretics' objections 1–7 against Hebrews.)

"…heralds of the truth? For it is the voice of the Lord himself: '**If** they have persecuted me, they will persecute you also.' And it behooved them, if nothing else, at least to reverence the long duration of the time through which the fosterlings of the truth have read this epistle perpetually in the churches. For from the time when the churches became partakers of the apostolic letters, from that same time they receive also the profit of the epistle to the Hebrews. But if not even this suffices to persuade them, they ought at least to believe Eusebius of Palestine, whom they call the patron of their own decrees; for even he confessed that this epistle is the most divine Paul's. But bidding farewell to all these, they impudently fight against the truth, not bearing the splendor of the apostolic Theology with which he adorned the proem. For since they could not resist the things which had been openly said concerning the divinity of the Only-begotten, they dared to

reject the whole epistle; although both its decrees and its sentences have a great kinship with the other epistles of the same [Paul]." Thus far Theodoret. And Augustine, when he had heard that certain Latins did not receive this epistle, said that he preferred to follow the authority of the eastern churches, among whom there was never any ambiguity concerning this epistle. And Jerome, writing to Dardanus, judges the most efficacious argument of its authority to be this: that the longest-continued use of the church has approved it by unbroken reading. Let these things suffice against the enemies of this epistle. Now let us pass to the things which they object against its authority.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

There are two kinds of adversaries with whom our contest concerning the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews lies: the first (as we have already said) cast the epistle — whosesoever it may be — out of the canon as adulterine; the others, although they receive it as sacred and divine, yet deny it to be the apostle Paul's. Those, then, who explode it from the canon of the divine scriptures are moved by these causes (as Philastrius relates): [1]

1. First, the epistle to the Hebrews is to be disowned because its author, immediately in the very exordium, seems to think ill of the only-begotten Son of God, together with the Arians: both because he makes the Son diverse from the substance of the Father, when he names him not the substance of the Father, but "the splendor of his glory, and the image of the substance of the father" — of which assuredly neither is the substance; and because he shows the Son not begotten of the Father, but made together with the other creatures, when he adds: "Being **made so much** better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name above them." [2]

2. To this is adjoined that the same author, in the sixth chapter of this epistle, seems to favor the cruelty of the Novatians, which denies pardon to the lapsed. For he says: "It is **impossible** for those who were once illuminated, have tasted also the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, have tasted moreover the good word of God and the virtues of the world to come, and have fallen away — to be renewed again to penance." [3] And again, in chapter 10 of the same epistle, confirming this same thing, he adds: "For if we sin **willfully** after having received the knowledge of the truth, there is now left no sacrifice for sins." [4] Which sentences are so cruel that they lead the weak consciences of sinners into desperation. These things Philastrius relates as objected by the ancient heretics.

3. But **the more recent** Anabaptists and Servetians infest it with other calumnies, accusing first its author of interpreting the testimonies of the old testament perversely, and of introducing them far from their purpose: as he did in the beginning of the epistle, where, intending to demonstrate that Christ is the son of God, he violently wrested that testimony out of the second volume of Kings, namely: "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" [5] — which words were uttered not of Christ, but of Solomon. For thus in that place the Lord speaks to David through Nathan the prophet: "I will **raise up** thy seed after thee, which shall go forth out of thy womb, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house to my name, and I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son. And if he commit any iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and with the stripes of men; but my mercy I will not take away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I removed from before my face." [6] Which sayings — so far is it from being the case that they speak of Christ — cannot be accommodated to him without the greatest contumely. For how could those words be fitted to Christ: "**Who, if** he commit any iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men" — since Christ not only never committed sin, but could not even sin?

4. Next, the author assumes certain fictitious things out of uncertain assertions of the Hebrews, asserting that in the ark of the covenant of the Jews there was a certain golden urn with the manna that rained in the desert, and that rod of Aaron which had budded; [7] whereas it is written in the third volume of Kings that there was nothing else in the ark except the two stone tables which Moses had placed in it at Horeb, when he made the

covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt. [8]

5. Hence it appears to have come about that the Latin church did not receive it into the canon, and did not take it up for the proving of dogmas — as is discerned from the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, and Arnobius, who never used its testimony. And Jerome attests that even down to his own times it had not been taken up into the canon. For he says, upon the sixth chapter of Isaiah: "Whence **also Paul** the apostle, in the epistle to the Hebrews — which the Latin custom does not receive…"; and upon the eighth chapter of Isaiah: "But **for the rest** (says he), the blessed Apostle, in the epistle which is written to the Hebrews — although the Latin custom does not receive it among the canonical scriptures…" Nay, Jerome himself seems to attribute little to the authority of this epistle, since he is accustomed always to cite it with a mark of doubt prefixed. And these are the arguments used by those who endeavor to break the canonical authority of this epistle.

6. But **those** who receive the epistle, yet deny Paul to be its author, strive to persuade this by many conjectures and by testimonies of the fathers — but especially from this (as Philastrius says): that its author wrote in a plausible style, rhetorically, [9] with a more splendid oration and a grander style, by no means observing that sentence which Paul pronounces of himself, saying that he is unskilled in speech; and, "I **came not** to you in loftiness of speech" [10] — inasmuch as he was more eloquent [than Paul], and could not imitate the simplicity of Paul which appears in his epistles.

7. But lest anyone should perhaps say that Paul, writing in Hebrew,

[1] Philastrius, in the catalogue, ch. 89 (Philast. in cat. ca. 89).
[2] Heb. 1.
[3] Heb. 6.
[4] Heb. 10.
[5] Heb. 1.
[6] 4. Reg. 7 (so printed; the passage is 2 Reg. [2 Sam.] 7, as the text itself says).
[7] Heb. cap. 9.
[8] 3. Reg. 3 (so printed; the passage is 3 Reg. [1 Kings] 8:9).
[9] cap. lib. 29 (so printed).
[10] 1. Cor. 1 (the passage quoted is 1 Cor. 2:1).

(printed p. 606 [PDF p. 611] — Heresy VIII: objections 7–13; the Dilutio, responses 1–2 begin.)

[lest anyone should say that Paul,] writing [in Hebrew], was more eloquent in this epistle than in the others written by him in the Greek tongue, it must be known that it was first composed not in Hebrew but in Greek. Of which thing these are the indications. First, because it is not found written in Hebrew; nor was there ever anyone who testified that he had read or seen it in the Hebrew language; nor is it at all established who turned it from the Hebrew tongue into Greek — some asserting, with uncertain authority, that Luke, others that Clement, was its interpreter. Next, because its author, in the seventh chapter of the epistle, interpreting the name of Melchisedech king of Salem, says: "which is **interpreted** king of justice, and of peace." [1] But if he — himself a Hebrew — was writing to Hebrews, and in Hebrew speech, I ask, for what reason did he wish to explicate what the word, most well-known to Hebrews, showed of itself? And then, in what language did he interpret it? Not in Hebrew — lest he should expound the same by the same, with a superfluous fault of trifling. It remains, therefore, that the epistle was put forth in Greek, and that the name Melchisedech — as being unknown to Greeks — was interpreted in the Greek tongue. To these things is added that the author uses testimonies of the old instrument not according to the Hebrew truth, but according to the Greek edition of the Seventy; which it is by no means verisimilar that a Hebrew writer, writing chiefly in Hebrew to Hebrews, would have done. For why, forsaking the fountain of the Hebrew tongue, should he have begged Hebrew testimonies from the rivulets of foreign interpretations?

8. This moreover seems to persuade that the epistle is not Paul's: that he did not prefix his name to this epistle, as he was accustomed to do in his other epistles. Nor is the occasion of doubting removed by what they say — that the Apostle did this deliberately, lest the Hebrews, hostile to him, upon seeing the name of Paul on the front of the epistle, should straightway cast it away. For the Apostle, if he had feared this, could have inserted his name either in the middle of the epistle or near the end, as he was wont to do in all his epistles. [2]

9. To these are added many testimonies, and first of all of the author himself: because in the second chapter of this epistle he numbers himself among those in whom the evangelical salvation was confirmed through those who heard it from the Lord Jesus; the opposite of which Paul proclaims of himself, saying that he learned neither from man nor through man, but through the revelation of Jesus Christ, the apostles conferring nothing upon him. [3]

10. But neither can that suit Paul which the author writes at the end of the epistle concerning Timothy: "**Know** that your brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." For how is it fitting that Paul — who had already appealed to Caesar, and for no other cause than to slip out of the hands of the Jews — should so suddenly be changed, and wish to return to them again, and promise that he will return the more speedily to the very place whence a little before he had fled for fear of death?

11. Furthermore, the testimonies of the scriptures, adduced by the author otherwise, and otherwise understood, than they are wont to be adduced and understood by Paul, indicate that someone other than Paul wrote it. For what the writer of the present epistle took out of Psalm 2 to show that Christ is greater than the angels, saying: "To **which** of the angels said he at any time: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?" — Paul understood otherwise, taking it up to prove the resurrection of Christ, when he expounded it in the synagogue of Antioch, saying: "And **we** declare unto you that the promise which was made to our fathers, this God hath fulfilled to your children, raising up Jesus again, as it is written in the second Psalm: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." [4]

12. The common consensus also of all the Latins, and of some Greeks, shows that the author of this epistle was not Paul — as Jerome has noted repeatedly: as in the book On Illustrious Men, where he says, "This epistle, among the Romans even to this day, is not held to be Paul's" [5] — and again in the same book: "The epistle (says he) which is carried about as 'to the Hebrews' is believed not to be Paul's, on account of the distance of style and speech, but either Barnabas's, according to Tertullian, or Luke the evangelist's, according to some; or even Clement's, of the city of Rome." The same he confirms also in the epistle to Paulinus, and in the epistle to Evagrius, and in very many other places. And among the Greeks, as Eusebius relates, Gaius — by no means to be contemned among the ecclesiastical writers — rejects it from the other epistles of Paul the apostle. [6]

13. Finally, whosesoever it may be, it matters nothing. For we can affirm, without any crime of heresy, that it is not Paul's; nor ought he who believes otherwise to be reckoned a heretic — Jerome so determining in the epistle to Dardanus, where he speaks thus: "**That** epistle most men judge to be either Barnabas's or Clement's. But it makes no difference whose it is, since it is an ecclesiastical man's, and is celebrated daily in the reading of the churches." These things the adversaries of this epistle are wont to bring forth.

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Answering these, we say, to the first: that those words of Paul are so far from favoring the Arians that they are opposed to them in the highest degree. For, as Theophylact says, [7] these words — according to the explanation of Gregory of Nyssa — Paul, teaching that the Son is the splendor and the figure of the Father, does not signify him to be less than the Father; but by "splendor" he shows the unity of essence, whereby the Son is coeternal and consubstantial with the Father, no otherwise than splendor is to light; and by "figure,"

the equality of nature: because neither does the subject *(suppositum)* exceed its figure, nor is the figure exceeded by its subject; for the subject does not transcend the lines of the figure, nor do the lineaments of the figure go out beyond the amplitude of the subject. And when he said the Son was "made," he did not understand him made in divinity (says Philastrius), but demonstrates him made in body and in humanity. [8]

2. Nor do those words of the sixth chapter agree in any way with the dogma of Novatus. For when Paul says that those who have fallen away cannot be renewed to penance, he does not exclude sinners from repentance, but (says Philastrius) shows the diverse grade of dignity between him who has kept himself whole and him who has sinned. [9] For it is more glorious not to have fallen into the deformity of sin than to rise again from the deformity of sin after a fall. There is therefore a detriment of dignity in him who has sinned, but not a loss of salvation. For just as, when the ensign of virginity's [10]

[1] Heb. 7.
[2] Heb. 2. a; Gal. 1. a.
[3] Heb., last chapter, d (Heb. vlt. d).
[4] Psal. 2; Heb. 1; Act. 13.
[5] In [the entry on] Gaius; In [the entry on] Paul (In Gaio; In Paulo).
[6] Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 16.
[7] Theophylactus on the 1st chapter of [the epistle to] the Hebrews (Theophylactus super 1. cap. ad Heb.).
[8] Philastrius, ch. 89 (Phila. ca. 89).
[9] Phil. ca. 89; Heb. 6.
[10] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 59 (Epiph. lib. 2. hær. 59).

(printed p. 607 [PDF p. 612] — Heresy VIII: Dilutio, responses 2–5.)

[just as, when the] beauty [of the ensign of virginity has been lost,] it is impossible to be corporally renewed to it again, so, when the dignity of pristine justice has been lost, it is impossible to be renewed again through penance to that same dignity of justice and innocence. For it cannot come to pass that he who has even once fallen into sin should any longer be able to glory that he has never at any time fallen into sin. But just as to him who has lapsed from virginity there still remains the second honor of continence, so to him who has fallen after the laver [of baptism] there still remains a second remedy. [1] Moreover, Paul in these words excludes not absolutely all penance, but the penance of the rebaptizers, who did not receive sinners to penance after a lapse except by a baptism reiterated a second and a third time after sin; which Epiphanius witnesses that Marcion did not long after Paul's time, expiating penitents by a threefold washing of baptism for the remission of each grave fault. [2] And since this had begun to be done even in the time of Paul, the Apostle pronounced that it cannot be that sinners should be renewed to penance through the iteration of baptism. [3] And that the words of the tenth chapter are to be understood in this sense, Chrysostom shows, whose words are these: "**Here** again rise up those who take away penance, saying: it is not safe to give the sacraments to sinners, since there is no second remission after sin. What then shall we say? That in this place he excludes neither penance, nor the propitiation which is made through penance; nor does he repel and cast down the delinquent by desperation — for he is not such an enemy of our salvation. But what then? He excludes a second laver. For he did not say, 'there is no further penance'; nor did he say, 'there is no further remission'; but, 'a victim *(hostia)*,' says he, 'there is no more.' There is no second cross any more — for by 'victim' he here means this."

3. But **as to** the calumny of the Anabaptists and Servetians against Paul — that he violently wrested that scripture of the second of Kings to Christ — it is beyond doubt most false. For many things which were said to the letter of certain persons in the old testament have been fulfilled, according to the spirit and the perfect truth, in Christ; and most of all the present testimony, which, as Lactantius says, cannot according to the letter be understood at all of Solomon. [4] For neither can the kingdom of Solomon — which failed in the transmigration of Babylon — be called perpetual, as the words of that vaticination promise, when God says: "I will **establish** the throne of his kingdom even for ever"; nor can the words which follow be understood

wholly of Solomon: "And thy house shall be **faithful**, and thy kingdom for ever" — because the house of Solomon was full of foreign women, worshipping false gods and driving Solomon himself to the same. It remains, therefore, that these things were completed in Christ, the son of David according to the flesh: whose house — that is, the assembly of the faithful — has been and will be faithful unto everlasting; whose kingdom — that is, the church of the Christians — is perpetual, according to the sentence of Daniel: "His **power** is an eternal power, and his kingdom [a kingdom] that shall not be corrupted." [5] Wherefore, just as the preceding and the following words of that vaticination are understood of our Savior, so also those which are placed in the midst of them — namely, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" — are to be understood of the only-begotten Son of God. Nor do the subsequent words at all stand in the way: "**If** he commit any iniquity, I will correct him": because, although the very person of Christ cannot sin, yet the mystical Christ — that is, his members — can sin, and do sin at times, and their iniquities are visited with a rod, and their sins with stripes (as the Psalm says); but the mercy of the Lord is not taken away from them. [6]

4. To that which they commemorate concerning the ark of the testament, Theophylact, in the explanation of the ninth chapter to the Hebrews, meets them in this manner: [7] "**You will ask**, perhaps — since it is well known that it is recorded in the letters of the book of Kings that nothing else was laid up in the ark besides the tables — why Paul has now joined to them both the Urn, and concluded that rod of Aaron [to be there]? Perhaps he said this because, as one instructed by Gamaliel, he was excellently versed in Hebrew history, and had received by the tradition of the elders that the matter stood thus; especially since the Hebrews who follow the Pharisees both think and profess this very thing — not, however, in the very beginnings, but a long time afterward, when it was necessary that in the times of Jeremiah the ark should be hidden: [at that time,] they say, both the urn and the rod were stored away in it." [8] Thus far Theophylact; who, a little above, rendering the cause why these three things were placed in the ark, says it was done by divine providence, that in it the chief monuments of Jewish ingratitude might be preserved. His words stand thus: "**These** things without doubt are all monuments of the ingratitude of the Jews. For that the manna was preserved in the urn — that manna at which they had once murmured while being nourished by it — was ordained to this end, that the fame of this thing might pass to posterity, and that it might be handed down to memory how they had exasperated God; the rod of Aaron, that their contumacy might be made known, and how they had once withstood Aaron himself; and the tables of the testament convicted them of infidelity and inconstancy — for it was on their account that those [first tables] were worn away [broken], because they had molten a calf for themselves and had served idols."

5. But **concerning** that which they say — that this epistle is not cited by the ancient Latins, as being one which was not in the canon among them, and that by their example it is lawful for us to cast the same out of the canon — we answer that the opinion of the heretics is as rash as it is false. False indeed, since we read it cited by the most ancient fathers of the Roman church: and first of all by Clement of Rome, who, in the first epistle to James the brother of the Lord, produces out of it those words which are had in the eleventh chapter: "**Without** faith it is impossible to please God." And Evaristus, the first Pope [of that name], in his second epistle, cites from the fourth chapter of this epistle that sentence: "**There is not** any creature invisible in his sight: and all things are naked and open to his eyes." And Hyginus, the first Pontiff of that name, in his epistle to all the faithful of Christ, brings forth a testimony from the 2nd chapter of [the epistle to] the Hebrews in this manner: "For **in that** wherein he himself hath suffered and been tempted, he is able to help those also who are tempted." [9] And lest I weary my readers in recounting all the testimonies which are found received among the most ancient fathers concerning the present epistle: let us grant to them that this epistle was nowhere cited by the ancient fathers, and (what is more) that even by them there was at times doubt

[1] Philastrius, ch. 89 (Phil. ca. 89).

[2] Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 42 (Epiph. lib. 1. hær. 42).

[3] Heb. 10.

[4] Heb. 1; 3. Reg. 3; Lactantius, book 4 of the Divine Institutes, ch. 13 (Lactan. li. 4. diu. instit. c. 13).

[5] Dan. 7.
[6] Psal. 88.
[7] Theophylactus on Hebr., ch. 9 (Theophylactus Hebr. cap. 9).
[8] Heb. 9.
[9] Heb. 2.

(printed p. 608 [PDF p. 613] — Heresy VIII: Dilutio, responses 5 concluded, 6–8.)

[that even by them there was at times] doubt concerning it. What then? Will it therefore be lawful for us also to doubt of it again? By no means, assuredly. For although those most ancient fathers, before the universal determination of the whole church, were permitted to entertain doubt about this epistle, and not rashly to receive it into the canon, yet to us, after so many decrees of councils and the common sanction of the catholic church, it is by no means lawful to do the same: since by these all those causes of doubting have been removed which could induce Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, and other fathers not undeservedly to hesitate about this epistle, and accordingly not to produce testimonies out of it for the confirmation of our faith. Now among the other occasions of suspicion the first was this: that this epistle was of the kind of those scriptures which came to the notice of the whole catholic church not immediately from the beginning of the nascent church, but a little later. Of which sort are the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Apocalypse of the same; concerning which, before they were placed in the canon, there was deservedly disputation among the fathers, lest they should decide a matter of such moment without long and diligent examination. And the other cause is this: that since the authority of the whole church had not yet decreed anything about this epistle, it was free for anyone, without peril of heresy, to doubt and to discourse about it. But now, when this epistle, after so great a multitude of years, has been taken up into the canon by the decrees of so many councils, it is not only rash but heretical to call its authority into doubt again. And as for what they subjoin — that this epistle in Jerome's time was not in the canon, and that Jerome himself attributed little to its authority — they lie. For Jerome himself brings forth both his own opinion and that of the church of his time, in the epistle to Dardanus concerning the land of promise, speaking thus: "The **epistle** which is inscribed 'to the Hebrews' is received as the apostle Paul's not only by the churches of the East, but by all writers of the Greek speech; although most judge it either Barnabas's or Clement's. But it makes no difference whose it is, since it is an ecclesiastical man's, and is celebrated daily in the reading of the churches. And if the custom of the Latins does not receive it, neither indeed do the churches of the Greeks receive the Apocalypse of John with the same liberty. And yet we receive both — by no means following the custom of this time, but the authority of the ancient writers, who for the most part use the testimonies of each, not as they are sometimes wont to do with the Apocrypha, but as ecclesiastical and canonical." From which words it is plain that although the irrational custom of the vulgar in the time of Jerome did not receive this epistle, yet Jerome, and the other presidents and moderators of the church — whose office it was to decide concerning the authority of the divine letters — contemning the custom of the uncertain vulgar, received the epistle to the Hebrews as canonical. So much for those who cast this epistle out of the canon.

6. I come now to those who, receiving the epistle, deny it to be Paul's: because its author, wandering at large through Rhetorical places, uses a more splendid style than the Apostle is wont. [1] To whom we say that this is not to be wondered at, since it is natural to each man to be stronger in his own than in a foreign tongue. For the Apostle composed the other epistles in foreign speech — that is, in Greek — but this one, being a Hebrew, [he wrote] in Hebrew, that is, in his own eloquence, in which he was the more fluent, the more eloquently. And it is credible also, as Origen says on the first psalm, that what Paul had written eloquently in the Hebrew tongue, the Greek interpreter (whoever he was) translated into the Greek speech even more eloquently.

7. Now as for what they allege — that this epistle was not written in Hebrew, because neither is the name of the interpreter known, nor is it found written in Hebrew — it is of very little moment. For what does it matter whether it be found written in Hebrew or not, since all consent that it was turned out of Hebrew into Greek?

And who the interpreter was — whether Luke, as Clement of Alexandria thinks in the book of the Hypotyposes *(Hypotiposeon)*, or, as others judge, Clement of Rome — is a matter of such trifling weight that it needs no consideration; but, as Origen says, if it be asked by whom its speech was composed, "God assuredly knows for certain; [2] yet the opinion which has come down even to us is either that Clement, the disciple of the Apostles and bishop of the city of Rome, polished it in Greek speech (though not in its senses), or that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and adorned the Acts of the apostles." And **as to that** which they say — that the interpretation of the name Melchisedech betrays a Greek writer — it is most trifling: since no one but will straightway recognize that this was done by the Greek interpreter, if he considers that it is a thing most usual in the sacred letters for interpreters frequently to interpret names of this kind, as was done in Genesis and in Exodus with the names Benoni, and Beniamim, and Phase: of which the Seventy turned the first "son of my sorrow," the second "son of the right hand," the third "the passover of the Lord." And what we say of the interpretation of these names — that it was done by the interpreter — the same we say also of the testimonies of the old testament adduced in this epistle according to the Seventy. For it is verisimilar that the interpreter (whoever he was), in turning the testimonies of the old scripture which Paul had cited according to the Hebrew truth, used the edition of the Seventy, as being more familiar to himself, who was a Greek.

8. But concerning the name of Paul — that it is neither prefixed to the epistle nor written within it — D. Jerome gives satisfaction, saying: [3] "**But if** this epistle is not Blessed Paul's because it does not have his name prefixed, then it will be no one's, since no other man's name is prefixed to it. How much more prudent, then, even for this very reason to judge it to be Blessed Paul's — because there was in it a singular reason for suppressing the name." And that reason was twofold: one, that writing to those who had believed out of the circumcision, as the Apostle of the gentiles and not of the Hebrews — knowing also their pride, and himself demonstrating his own humility — he would not set the merit of his office before them. For in like manner the apostle John, on account of humility, for the same reason did not prefix his name in his epistle. The other cause is that Paul was odious to the Hebrews, to whom he seemed both the Apostle of the Gentiles and a destroyer of the law. And so he did not set his odious name at the head of the epistle, lest the envy of the prefixed name should shut out the profit that was to follow,

[1] Origen on Psal. 1 (Origines in Psal. 1).

[2] Origen on Psal. 2 (Origines in Psal. 2).

[3] Jerome, in the preface of the epistle to the Hebrews (Hieron. in præf. epistolæ ad Hebræ.).

(printed p. 609 [PDF p. 614] — Heresy VIII: Dilutio 8–13 concluded; Heresy IX, on the Canonical (Catholic) Epistles, begins.)

should shut out [the profit] of the reading; and for that cause he neither wrote his name within nor subscribed it, as he had done in his other epistles, so that the epistle might travel more safely among the Hebrews who were hostile to him, without the impediment of his own name, and might the more willingly be read through entire, from beginning to end, by all.

9. Now concerning the words of the Apostle by which he seems to number himself among those who received [the faith] not from Christ but from the apostles: it is said that Paul in these words asserts that he learned from others not the doctrine, but the salvation — which salvation was confirmed in him through those who heard from the Lord; namely by Ananias, the disciple of the Lord, to whom he was sent, that through him the Salvation might be confirmed in him by the washing of baptism and the restitution of his sight. And yet, if we speak of his doctrine, this too was confirmed through those who seemed to be the pillars of the church: even as he himself testifies to the Galatians that he conferred with the apostles his gospel, which he preached among the gentiles, lest perhaps he should run in vain. [1]

10. Nor should it seem marvelous to anyone if Paul — who for fear of the Jews had appealed to Caesar — desired, as if his counsel were changed, to return again to the Jews; seeing that Christ willed to return into Judaea, whence a little before he had scarcely escaped from the hands of those who would stone him, even while the apostles reproved him: "for there are **twelve hours** of the day," as Christ then said. [2] Whence it is also possible that Paul, then admonished by the Spirit of God, desired that from which his mind before shrank — especially since, the two years at Rome being completed, he believed he might more safely return to Jerusalem: either because he hoped the envy of the Jews was now calmed; or, if he believed it not yet calmed, nevertheless, being now released, he could easily promise himself, from Caesar, a safe return to his own people.

11. But **that** which is objected concerning the testimony of the second Psalm — that it is adduced here otherwise than by Paul in the Acts — Bede most easily dissolves, saying that the testimony of the psalm recited by Paul in the Acts pertains not to the resurrection of Christ, of which the Apostle was about to speak next in his discourse, but to both nativities of Christ — namely the eternal and the temporal — of which he had spoken a little above in the same discourse, saying that he was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and was proclaimed by John, as the Messiah, the true Son of God. [3]

12. To all the testimonies of Jerome we answer, as was already said above: that he speaks not according to his own opinion, but according to the opinion of certain Latins, and especially according to the custom of the vulgar, introduced at that time by usage rather than by reason or by the judgment of the learned. And although at that time some even of the illustrious among the Latins doubted concerning this epistle, whether it should be received into the Canon, yet in our age, after the church's determination, so long-continued and so certain, it is no longer lawful to doubt of it.

13. And lest anyone should say that he can at least doubt of the author of this epistle without the crime of heresy, because Jerome said, "**Whosesoever** it may be, it makes no difference" — it must be known that he brought forth that word not in the manner of one asserting and determining, but out of the opinion of his adversaries: so that, according to the law of disputants, he might show the absurd inference of those who, from the uncertainty of the author, inferred that this epistle is not canonical. Jerome, then, rejecting this consecution, says that whosesoever the epistle may be, it neither matters nor hinders but that it can be canonical, provided it be an orthodox and ecclesiastical man's. Let these rash men therefore cease to marvel if we pronounce them heretics when they refuse to believe, against so many testimonies. And let them no longer say: "What great matter is it, if one doubt about the author of this epistle?" For it matters enough, and much. For the Arians, Servetians, and Anabaptists took from this their first handle for rejecting this epistle — which assuredly they would not have dared to do, had they seen it received by all, for certain, as the apostle Paul's. Moreover, many books of holy men have been rejected by the church from the canon for no other cause than that it was not believed that they were the works of those authors under whose names they were fore-noted: as happened with the book of Enoch, and very many other books which are cited in the holy scriptures, which Augustine says the church spurned — not because it reprobated the authority of those men who pleased God, but because it did not believe those books to be theirs whose they were said to be. [4] Finally, it matters very much that the authority of so many fathers, who have attested this to us, be preserved whole, undoubted, and immune from every suspicion of deception. For if we concede that in this one thing so many fathers were deceived, what hinders but that in other things also they be rendered suspect of error and imprudence? — since he who is deceived, and deceives, in one thing, must be believed capable of being deceived and of deceiving in others also. Thus far concerning the epistle to the Hebrews.

OF THE CANONICAL OR CATHOLIC EPISTLES — Heresy IX *(De Canonicis siue Catholicis Epistolis. Hæresis IX)*

To reject the Canonical Epistles.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This heresy is bipartite. Some cast away absolutely all the Canonical or catholic epistles — as Marcion, and all those who receive nothing of the new testament besides the gospel of Luke. Others reject only some of them — as Luther: who, having left untouched only two Canonical epistles (moved by what religious scruple I know not), namely the first of Peter and [the first] of John, raves freely against the five others: casting out of the canon, first, the epistle of James, for no other cause than that it is opposed to his dogma of Justification by faith alone. He asserts, moreover, that it is falsely inscribed with the name of James, because it contains nothing of the apostolic spirit, but is wholly (that I may use his words) dry and straw-like *(arida ac straminea)*, full of swelling and of contention. He denies also that the epistle of Jude is canonical, or worthy to be numbered among the catholic scriptures; and in like manner he calls into doubt the three other Canonical epistles — namely the second of Peter, and the second and third of John — maintaining that they are not theirs by whose name they are fore-noted, but some uncertain author's, who wished to illustrate his own offspring with the splendor of another's name. But the Anabaptists and Serve[tians]

[1] Gal. 2. a.

[2] Ioan. 9 (so printed; the saying is John 11:9).

[3] Bede on the 13th chapter of Acts; Act. 13; Heb. 1; Psal. 2.

[4] Augustine, book 18 of the City [of God], ch. 38 (Aug. li. 18 de ciu. cap. 38).

(printed p. 610 [PDF p. 615] — Heresy IX: the assertors concluded; the Impugnatio — patristic and papal testimonies for the Catholic epistles.)

[the Anabaptists and Serve]tians, perceiving that the impiety devised by them against the majesty of the most holy Trinity is laid prostrate *(prosterni)* by the first epistle of John, asseverate that it was adulterated by the assertors of the Trinity, certain things being added in it by which they might defend their own assertion.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Whose audacity we, pressing it down with the weight of ecclesiastical authority, show that not only are all these epistles canonical, but that they are also theirs by whose names they are inscribed. First, then, that the first of John and the first of Peter are canonical, and are also those authors' under whose name they are carried, the perpetual consensus of the church and all the venerable antiquity of the fathers [affirm] so constantly that it would be superfluous to attempt to show it — which antiquity, as Eusebius asseverates, never doubted concerning these two epistles, and always recounted them in the order of the sacred letters under the name of Peter and of John. [1] But as for the other five epistles: although there was at one time doubt about them among the fathers — because they came to the notice of the whole Church not immediately in the very times of the apostles, as the first two epistles did, but long after — yet these also at length, by the unanimous will of all the fathers and the consensus of the whole church, were received into the number of the sacred volumes under the same name of the apostles which is now read on their fronts; and all the holy councils, from the council of Laodicea and the third of Carthage down to the most recent holy Tridentine Synod, have numbered them in the Catalogues of divine scripture — although even long before the aforesaid councils, those most ancient fathers of the nascent church used the testimonies of these epistles, not as of apocrypha, but as of Canonical scriptures, for the confirming of ecclesiastical dogmas. And first of all Clement, third pontiff after Peter, in his second epistle took from the fourth chapter of James those words: "But **if** thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a Judge." And again: "Be **humbled** in the sight of the Lord, and he will exalt you." And Anacletus the Pope, in his first epistle, cites under the name of James a testimony out of the second chapter, saying: "**Whosoever** (as the apostle James saith) shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all." And Alexander the first, Pope, bringing in James as witness out of the fifth chapter of this epistle, says: "For **much** availeth (as Blessed James the Apostle saith) the assiduous supplication of a just man." Urban I, in his first epistle, alleges the words of the second chapter

of this epistle under the title of James, saying: "**What** doth it profit, my brethren (saith James the apostle), if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works?" And what makes most of all for confirming the majesty of this epistle is chiefly this: that the authority of the whole universal catholic church confirms, out of this one epistle, the Sacrament of extreme unction, first intimated in the gospel of Mark — as appears from the decree of Innocent, first of that name, and as is established from the Councils which were after Innocent.

In like manner also, from the second epistle of Peter, Anacletus in his third epistle adduces certain words of the third chapter as uttered by Peter, saying: [2] "**Wherefore**, dearest, expecting these things, be diligent (as Peter saith) to be found immaculate and inviolate before him in peace." Reason also shows this 2nd epistle to be Peter's: because, if it be not his, it will assuredly be the work of some most impudent trifler and fable-monger. For the author there testifies that he was one of those who were on the holy mount, and saw the magnificent glory of Christ borne down from the cloud. But if this mountebank *(circulator)* had so basely imposed upon us as to vend himself to all the faithful in place of Peter, how could it ever have come to pass that the church — which cannot err — should have computed this impostor among the sacred writers, and ordered him to be read in the assemblies of the faithful, even in the sacred mysteries? To this is added that the author of this epistle, when he rendered that most laudatory testimony concerning the epistle of Paul written to the Hebrews, calls himself not only Paul's brother, but his dearest brother, saying: "Our **dearest brother** Paul hath written to you." And certainly no one among the apostles was dearer to Peter than Paul; who, as he had always loved him in life, so neither in death was he separated from him — on one day, and in one place, having the same man as companion of his passion whom he had always had as fellow of his evangelical preaching.

Now concerning the two later epistles of John the apostle, it is well known that Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine frequently take testimonies from the second of this apostle. And of the third (that I may pass over the other ancient writers), Dionysius, the most ancient of all, in the book of the celestial Hierarchy, chapter three, cites certain words from the first chapter of this epistle.

Of the epistle of Jude the apostle, likewise, Anacletus in his third epistle takes those words: "**These** are they who segregate themselves, animal men, not having the spirit," etc. And Alexander the first, in his third epistle, brings forth a testimony with the name of Jude the apostle set upon it, citing in this manner: "**Behold** (saith Jude the apostle), the Lord will come amid his thousands, and the rest." But he whom I ought to have named before all — D. Dionysius, in the book On the Divine Names, took a testimony from this epistle; [3] and D. Epiphanius, in the first book against heresies, citing a testimony from this epistle against the Gnostics, says: "**Wherefore** concerning these men I judge that the Holy Spirit was moved in the apostle Jude — in the catholic epistle, I say, written by him: now this Jude is he who is called the brother of James, and of the Lord." [4] And Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, writes thus of this same epistle: "**Jude**, the brother of James, left a small epistle, which is of the seven Canonical ones; and because in it he takes testimonies from the book of Enoch, which is apocryphal, it is rejected by very many. Nevertheless it has now merited authority by antiquity and use, and is computed among the holy scriptures." And the same [Jerome], in the epistle to Marcella, brings forth a testimony concerning it in these words: "In the canonical epistle, Jude the apostle, the brother of James, writes, saying: 'But I **wish to remind** you,' etc." And **concerning all** the Canonical epistles together — their number, authority, and authors — the same Jerome, expressing his own opinion and that of the whole church, in the epistle to Paulinus says thus: "James, Peter, John, and Jude wrote seven epistles, as mystical as they are succinct — both brief and long: brief in words, long in sentences." And in the prologue of the seven Cano[nical epistles]

[1] Book 3, ch. 25 (Lib. 3. c. 25).
[2] 2. Pet. 3.
[3] ch. 4 (cap. 4).
[4] heresy 26 (Hær. 26).

(printed p. 611 [PDF p. 616] — Heresy IX: Impugnatio concluded; the heretics' objections 1–7.)

[in the prologue of the seven Cano]nical [epistles], to Eustochium, explaining singularly their number and order, he says: "The order among the Greeks — those who think soundly *(integre)* and follow the right faith — is **not** the same as that of the seven epistles which are called canonical as it is found in the Latin codices: so that, because Peter is first in the order of the apostles, his epistles should also be first in the order of the rest. But as we have long since corrected the evangelists to the line of truth, so, God helping, we have restored these to their proper order. For the first of them is one of James; two of Peter; three of John; and one of Jude." From which things it appears clearer than light that all these epistles, even to the very times of the apostles, were always in the greatest authority, and were always believed to be theirs by whose name they are fore-noted.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. Against the epistle of James, which is first in order, the profane Luther, rising up, objects first that its sentences conflict with the doctrine of Paul. For Paul, writing to the Romans, says that man is justified not by works, but by faith, [1] proving this by the example of Abraham, who was justified before God not by works but by faith, as it is written: "Abraham **believed** God, and it was reputed to him unto justice." [2] The opposite of which the author of the present epistle teaches, asserting that Abraham was justified not by faith, but by works, saying: "Was not **Abraham** our father justified by works, offering Isaac his son upon the altar?" [3] — and a little after: "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." James, therefore, teaches the contrary of what Paul taught.

2. Next, that this epistle is far distant from evangelical piety appears from this: that its author — more than befits an evangelical man, one freed from the yoke of the law by the benignity of Christ — shows himself bitter and harsh, while he again threatens *(intentat)* the faithful with the most severe malediction of the Mosaic law, already abolished through Christ, saying: "**Whosoever** shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all." [4] Which sentence, if it be true, how will it be true that Christ exchanged the most bitter hardness of the law for the sweet yoke of the gospel, and the light burden, for the quiet of souls? Again, since in many things (as the same author says) we all offend, [5] shall we not through our whole life be defendants *(rei)* of the whole law — and after this life be excluded also from eternal life?

3. Nay, the very style of this epistle argues that it is not James the apostle's: for its phrase does not carry that apostolic majesty and gravity, nor so much of Hebraism as it is credible was present in James, the bishop of Jerusalem. Then, the salutation of the epistle is so plain *(pura)*, and so void of all Christian spirit, that it is conformable to none of the apostolic epistles — announcing nothing of God, nothing of Jesus Christ, nothing of grace, nothing of peace, as the other epistles of the apostles do, but offering greeting *(salutem)* only, in the profane manner. Nor does he name himself apostle in the title of the epistle, but only "James" — although in our Latin codices the surname of "apostle" has been added, against the truth of the Greek exemplars, in which such a surname is nowhere read. From all which things joined together, the author of this epistle is rendered less certain, and its authority is not a little diminished.

4. There are present, moreover, testimonies not to be contemned of ancient writers who turn the authority of this epistle into doubt; among whom Eusebius of Caesarea, in the second book of the Ecclesiastical History, speaks thus: [6] "**Thus far** concerning James, whose is held to be that epistle which is written first among those that are called Catholic. Yet it must be known that it is not received by some; nor does any one of the ancients easily make mention of it — as neither indeed of that one which is said to be Jude's, which is itself also one of the seven." And D. Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, wrote thus: [7] "**James**, the brother of the Lord, wrote only one epistle, which is of the seven Canonical ones; which also is itself asserted [to have been put forth] by some other under his name, although little by little, as time proceeded, it obtained authority." From which words of Jerome two things offer themselves to be gathered: one, that this epistle is

another man's, who adorned himself with the name of James; the other, that the epistle cannot have canonical authority: because neither the long duration of time, nor the custom of the faithful, nor the tacit permission of a conniving church, can bring it about that any doctrine whatsoever should begin to be true, canonical, and divine, if of itself it was not such. For it is not in the power of men to make things that have not been revealed by the divine spirit to be divinely published, or things not written by a certain author to be written by that author. Thus Luther against the epistle of the apostle James.

5. Concerning the second epistle of Peter the same man doubts whether it be Peter's: because Eusebius, in the third book of the History, sets down these words about it: [8] "**Peter** the apostle left very few monuments of his preaching. For there is one epistle of his, of which no one at all has doubted; but of the second it is uncertain to many." And D. Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men: "The second epistle of Peter," says he, "is denied by very many to be his, on account of the dissonance of its style with the first."

6. Concerning the epistles likewise the second and third of John, it is certain (says he) that they are not his: because the author himself, in the salutation of each epistle, calls himself John — not the apostle, but the presbyter — the name of John being even left unsaid: "The **presbyter**, to the elect lady"; and, "The **presbyter**, to the dearest Gaius." Whence Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, says: "John wrote one epistle, whose exordium is, '**That which was** from the beginning' — which is approved by all ecclesiastical and erudite men. But the remaining two — of which the beginning of the first is, 'The **senior**, to the elect lady,' and of the following, 'The **senior**, to the dearest Gaius, whom I love in the truth' — are asserted to be John the presbyter's; whose second sepulchre is shown at Ephesus even today."

7. But **the very first** epistle of John the Anabaptists contend to have been falsified with foreign additions, the argument being taken from this: that in its fifth chapter that sentence has been added: "**There are three** who give testimony in heaven: the father, the word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." [9] Which sentence they say was inserted in that place by the favorers of the Trinity — all the ancient exemplars of Greece crying out against it, in which those words of old were not; and even Jero[me…]

[1] Roma. 4.
[2] Gen. 15.
[3] Iac. 2.
[4] Iac. 2.
[5] Iac. 3.
[6] Cap. 23.
[7] Cap. 3 (so printed; the entry on James is ch. 2 in modern editions).
[8] Cap. 25.
[9] Ioan. 5 (1 John 5).

(printed p. 612 [PDF p. 617] — Heresy IX: objection 8; the Dissolutio, responses 1–4.)

[even] Jerome has testified in the preface of the canonical epistles. And Erasmus — who in his first edition of the New testament does not have it — affirmed on that account that he had passed it over, because in the Greek codices those words were not read.

8. Now concerning the epistle of Jude: besides the fact that Eusebius, in the third book of the History, and Jerome, in the book of illustrious men, assert that it was doubted of by the ancients, [1] and that the ancient Fathers cite no testimonies from it — as being apocryphal — this also shows the epistle to be apocryphal and unworthy of credit: that it confirms its doctrine with Apocryphal testimonies, adducing for this the uncertain writing of Enoch, saying: "And **Enoch**, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, [saying]: behold, the Lord will come amid his holy thousands, to do vengeance against all," etc. To these things he cites also the altercation of Michael with the devil over the body of Moses, which is read nowhere in the sacred letters. Wherefore, since the author of the epistle — the fountain of canonical scripture being left, whence he could have received innumerable testimonies for his argument concerning the perpetual punishment of the impious

— borrows helps from an uncertain writing, he has deservedly made his epistle suspect, as one that leans upon the uncertain testimonies of apocryphal scripture. To which absurdity he has added another yet more absurd: that he has approved by his own testimony the apocryphal books of the prophecy of Enoch and of the devil's contest, and has conferred upon them an authority equal with the canonical scriptures, since he took testimonies from them to prove canonical doctrine, as from books certain, approved, and canonical. Thus the heretics.

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Luther, blinded by malice, errs most widely when he believes the sentence of James to be contrary to the doctrine of Paul. For he ought to have read Augustine, who, in the preface on Psalm 31, reconciles Paul and James to one another in these words: [2] "**Concerning** Abraham himself, we find [something] in the epistle of another apostle, who wished to correct men who had ill understood the apostle Paul himself. For James, in his epistle, against those who would not work well, presuming upon faith alone, commended the works of that same man whose faith Paul commended; and the apostles are not adverse to each other. For since Abraham, according to Paul, was justified by faith, as by a root and foundation, [and] according to James was justified by works, as by fruit and superstructure — these two apostles, understood in this manner, are entirely concordant between themselves."

2. Nor is the sentence of James so severe that it makes us defendants of the whole law for any lightest fault whatsoever, as Luther complains. For James, by that single "one," does not understand in one defect any least and venial sin whatsoever, but that one grave and great delict by which one sins against the law of the charity of God and of neighbor, and against the lawgiver — not from human fragility, but from contempt of the lawgiver; against which charity and lawgiver if anyone commit a crime, he deservedly becomes guilty of the whole law: because the fullness of the whole law is charity, and on it the whole law hangs. So Augustine expounded this place, in sermon 4 De tempore, saying: [3] "'Whoso offendeth in one, is become guilty of all.' What is this 'one,' except that which the Apostle says — that the whole law is completed in one discourse: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and thy neighbor as thyself?" And in epistle 29 to Jerome he says: "He who offends in one is become guilty of all, if he acts against charity, whence the whole law hangs; for he becomes guilty of all by doing against that on which all things hang." From which it appears that the severity of his sentence is promulgated not against all sinners who offend in something, but against those alone who offend against the law of charity and its lawgiver, God — out of contempt and despite of the law and the lawgiver, not from fragility of the flesh, but from the iniquity of malice and malignity. Again, according to the exposition of Cyril, it can be said that those who have failed in one are pronounced guilty of the whole law, not because they are to be punished for the other precepts which they observed, as if they had transgressed them (for that would be altogether unjust), but because on account of the transgression of one command they will be deprived of the eternal reward no otherwise than if they had contemned all the divine precepts. D. Thomas, not differing much from this interpretation, says that the sinner failing in one is made guilty of all the commandments for this reason: that in the transgression of one he contemns him who is the author of all the precepts.

3. But **in that** he accuses the salutation of the epistle, as one containing nothing of God and of Christ, he openly raves: for there is set in it, "James, the servant of God and of our lord Jesus Christ" — than which what could be said more Christian? "But," says he, "he prefixes to the epistle that word of greeting *(salutis)* in use among the gentiles." O insane and stolid Luther! Does not Luke, in Acts 15, testify that the apostles, writing from the council of Jerusalem to the gentiles, prefixed the same word to their epistle, in these words: "The **Apostles** and elders, to the brethren out of the gentiles who are at Antioch, and in Syria and Cilicia — greeting *(salutem)*"? [4] And yet he is not ashamed to propose such ineptitudes in public. He urges also, with a like insanity, that the epistle should be rejected because it is very like [profane] salutations; and yet he has before his eyes the third epistle of John, whose salutation is like none of the apostolic epistles; likewise also

the first epistle of John, in which the Apostle, no salutation being prefixed, begins as it were abruptly: "**That which was** from the beginning." This profane fellow says, moreover, that there is not in the epistle so much of the apostolic spirit as would befit James. But far otherwise judge the catholic fathers — Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and all the others — who decree that it was composed at the dictation of the Holy Spirit; whom we believe rather than the insane Luther. He says the surname of "Apostle" is lacking in the Greek exemplars; but his rash impudence is refuted: because all the most ancient of the Latin codices, and besides these also some Greek exemplars, have it — which is a manifest indication that the ancient exemplars of the Greeks had that very surname of the Apostle in the salutation of the epistle, and that afterward, either by chance or by malice, it fell out.

4. He adduces also the words of Eusebius — but truncated, according to the custom of the heretics — passing over that which Eusebius straightway adds: "**We know**, nevertheless, that this epistle, with the rest, is received by all the churches." With these

[1] Cap. 25.
[2] Augustine, in the preface on Psal. 31 (Aug. in præfa. psal. 31); Rom. 4; Iac. 4.
[3] Aug. ser. 4. de temp.
[4] Idem [Augustine] de ver. & fals. poen. cap. 14 (Ide de ver. & fals. poen. cap. 14).

(printed p. 613 [PDF p. 618] — Heresy IX: Dissolutio 4–8 — James, 2 Peter, 2–3 John, the Johannine comma, Jude.)

With these [words] he also sets down the saying of Jerome — which nevertheless in no way patronizes his cause: since it is well enough established, from very many other sentences of Jerome, that he reports not his own but others' opinion. Nor are the following words of Jerome to be interpreted so perversely that from them we should deduce, with Luther, that this epistle was made divine, and ascribed to James, either by the succession of times or by the dissimulation of the church, when of itself it was not such (for this is utterly impossible); but rather they are to be expounded thus, according to the true mind of Jerome: that this epistle — about which at first it was disputed among some whether it was written by the divine spirit, and whether by the apostle James — the church of Christ, little by little as time proceeded, discovered to be true, and canonical, and the genuine work of James himself; and so what the church herself, illuminated more and more with the progress of time, after the manner of the dawn, had found, she manifested and declared openly to all the faithful: namely, that the epistle is truly the apostle James's, and was composed by him at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. So much for the epistle of James.

5. Now concerning the second epistle of Peter: when Luther contends that it is to be doubted of, on account of the words of Eusebius and Jerome, the argument is vain and puerile. For besides the fact that each of them reports not his own but others' uncertain opinion — if on this account it is now lawful to be in doubt about this epistle, because certain men once doubted of it, it will be lawful also to doubt of the divinity of Christ, because at one time, before the reception of the Holy Spirit, it was doubted of by the apostles themselves, not yet fully believing. Wherefore, if in the time of Eusebius the second epistle of Peter was uncertain to many, because the church had not yet defined anything about it, now, after the definition of the church, it is so certain that no place of doubting about it is left any longer — except to heretics. And as to the diversity of style by which the two epistles of Peter differ between themselves, Jerome, in the Questions to Hedibia, gives satisfaction in these words: "The **two epistles** which are carried about as Peter's disagree between themselves in style and character and structure of words: from which we understand that Peter, according to the necessity of things, used diverse interpreters." Which sentence of Jerome shows that from the diversity of the style there is inferred a diversity not of authors, but of interpreters.

6. That likewise which Luther opposes against the two epistles of John, from the fore-notation of "presbyter," has no weight. For in these epistles that John the presbyter is the same who is both Apostle and

evangelist; and he calls himself presbyter, or senior, on account of the notable long duration of his age. For he lived, as Jerome hands down in the book On Illustrious Men, until the sixty-eighth year after the passion of the Lord, and died at Ephesus, worn out with long old age, after he had founded the churches of Asia. Nor does the testimony of Jerome at all harm these epistles, since it is certain that he spoke not according to his own mind — which he himself expressed in places adduced above by us — but out of the opinion of others; as he himself testifies in that very place, straightway subjoining to his aforesaid words these: "**On which matter**, when in due order we come to Papias, his hearer, we shall discourse." And in [the entry on] Papias, when he was speaking of the twofold John, he subjoined: "Now this we have said on account of the above opinion, which we have related as handed down *by very many* — that the two later epistles of John are not the Apostle's, but the presbyter's."

7. Now to that which the impious Anabaptists and Servetians contend concerning those words added (as they say) in the fifth chapter of the first of John, we answer: that those words have always been of undoubted truth among catholics, and were read in all the Greek exemplars from the very times of the apostles. Nor is there need to doubt anything of their perpetual integrity and sincerity, since Hyginus, the first Pope [of that name], adduces them against heretics as an invincible testimony for the supreme Trinity. For thus he writes, in the epistle to all the faithful of Christ: "And **again**, John the evangelist himself, writing to the Parthians, saith: There are three who give testimony in heaven — the father, the word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." Nay, holy mother church also chants that testimony every year, through the octave of Easter, in the sacred mysteries, as from the true and genuine epistle of the same evangelist. Nor did Jerome anywhere say that it was lacking in the Greek codices of the Catholic Church; on the contrary, in the prologue of the canonical [epistles], to Eustochium, he complains that these words were not turned into Latin by unfaithful and heretical translators, although they were read everywhere in the Greek volumes. For these are the words of Jerome in that prologue: "Which epistles, namely, if they had also been faithfully turned into Latin eloquence by interpreters just as they were digested by them — that is, by the Greek authors — they would neither cause ambiguity to readers, nor would the variety of their language impugn itself; especially in that place where we read set down, in the first epistle of John, [the passage] concerning the unity of the trinity: in which also we find that much error has been committed by unfaithful translators, against the verity of the faith — they setting down in their edition only the names of three [witnesses], that is, of the water, the blood, and the spirit, and omitting the testimony of the father, the word, and the Holy Spirit, by which above all both the catholic faith is strengthened, and the one substance of divinity of the father, the son, and the Holy Spirit is proved." Thus far Jerome. And as for what they add out of the first translation of Erasmus, the authority of this man moves us nothing — not a few of whose sentences the catholic church has lately condemned — since those words were always in the Greek exemplars, as we have shown, and even now are openly read in our Greek codices in this manner: τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατὴρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. And Erasmus himself, in his annotations, confesses that these same words are had in most ancient Greek exemplars of Britain, of Spain, and of Rhodes.

8. Finally, concerning the epistle of Jude, it is no marvel if some of the ancients doubted of it, or rarely brought forth testimonies from it, since it also is of the number of those scriptures which came late (as we have already said) to the notice of the whole church. Nor is anything subtracted from its authority because its author cited apocrypha out of the book of Enoch: since Paul the apostle (as Jerome prudently observed) adduced testimonies in confirmation of his doctrine not only out of the apocrypha, but also out of the books of the gentile poets — such as that, when he disputed in the court of Mars [the Areopagus]: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν — [1]

[1] Act. 17; 1. Cor. 15; Tit. 1.

(printed p. 614 [PDF p. 619] — Heresy IX concluded; Heresy X, on the Apocalypse of John, begins: assertors and Impugnatio.)

that is, "For we are also his offspring"; and that other, φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί — that is, "Evil colloquies corrupt good manners"; and that, writing to Titus about the Cretans: Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί — that is, "The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies." [1] Of which the first hemistich Jerome attests to be the poet Aratus's, in the exordium of the Φαινομένων [Phaenomena]; the second, an iambic from a comedy of Menander; and the third, entire, from the book of oracles of Epimenides the Cretan, or from Callimachus of Cyrene, in the things which he sang of the praises of Jove. Nor on that account did Paul use the testimonies of the gentiles as though divine testimonies from the sacred books failed him, but that he might convict the students of gentile books even from the reading of their own books. Which it must be believed the apostle Jude also did, with a certain scholastic art, prudently: while he wished to persuade those to whom he was writing by testimonies produced even from those books which had authority among them. Nor does it therefore follow that Jude approved the books of Enoch because he took testimonies from them — just as neither did Paul approve the books of Epimenides, Menander, and Aratus when he received testimonies from them. For each of them approved those authors' books not whole and entire, but received only those testimonies from their books, the rest of what was read in them being omitted. Whence Jerome, in the commentaries on the epistle to Titus, confuting those who reprehended Paul because he had used the versicle of Epimenides against the Cretans, speaks thus: "**Some think** the Apostle is to be reprehended, in that he imprudently slipped: while he was convicting false teachers, he approved their versicles. To whom it must briefly be answered: in that he said 'Evil **colloquies corrupt** good manners,' and in that other, 'We are **his** offspring,' he did not straightway approve the whole comedy of Menander, and, in the present place, not the whole work of Callimachus or of Epimenides — of whom the one sings the praises of Jove, the other wrote of oracles — but by the one versicle he rebuked the Cretans only as liars, from the vice of the race; not on account of that opinion for which they are convicted by the poets, but confuting them, from their own native facility of lying, out of their nation's own author. Now those who think that one must follow the whole book of him whose versicle one has used, seem to me to receive also the apocryphon of Enoch — from which the Apostle Jude set a testimony in his epistle — among the scriptures of the church." Thus far Jerome; from whose words it is had that Jude did not therefore approve the whole book of Enoch, because he approved that one testimony in it. And let these things have been said concerning the Canonical epistles.

OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST — Heresy X *(De Apocalypsi Ioannis Euangelistæ hæresis X)*

That the Apocalypse is neither John the Apostle's, nor to be received among the canonical scriptures.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Both parts of this heretical assertion were first carried into the church by the Alogi, or A[nti]logiani, whom we remembered again when we treated of the Gospel of John. These men (as Epiphanius, Philastrius, and Augustine relate) judge this book to have been fabricated by Cerinthus the heresiarch, the adversary of the Apostles, and stuffed with innumerable figments and juggleries *(præstigiis)*; [2] whose blasphemy Theodore of Byzantium seconds, the prince of the Theodotians, against whom Epiphanius writes in the second book. But Luther and his fellow-conspirators — although they dare not openly condemn this book by themselves, against the universal assertion of the catholic church — nevertheless cunningly vituperate it under the person of others, and endeavor to shake it with many reasons, which they leave undissolved: saying that it was of old exploded by most erudite and most grave men, as the narration of a fabulous and made-up matter, in which there was nothing of the apostolic breast. And they are in doubt also about the author of the book —

whether it was a certain John the presbyter, buried at Ephesus, or some other; for they say they have it as a thing ascertained that it is not the work of John the Apostle.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Against the rash error of these men fight the testimonies of the most ancient fathers, the determinations of councils, and the authority of the whole catholic church. And first of all Dionysius the Areopagite, the disciple of Paul, first showed this book to be John the Apostle and Evangelist's. For he, in the book on the ecclesiastical Hierarchy, setting down a universal partition of holy scripture, speaks thus of the Apocalypse: "**Or** that arcane and altogether mystical vision of the beloved disciple, divine, of the lord Jesus — and it expounds the most lofty theology to those who merit to become gods *(dii fieri)*, and uplifts and confirms them through the sacred and divine mysteries." [3] By which words assuredly Dionysius has most clearly designated the holy Apocalypse of John. But because Luther, with his Academics, who call all things into doubt, contemns the testimony of Dionysius — saying that he is not that Dionysius the Areopagite, Paul's disciple, because he wrote no volumes; and that this is a new and supposititious Dionysius, sent forth into the light by some Greekling scarcely five hundred years ago, and adorned with the counterfeited surname of the Areopagite — let him know that he is refuted by the testimony of many ancient writers, and condemned besides by the authority of many Councils. For Gregory the Great, in the homily on the hundred sheep; and Pope Agatho, in the epistle to the sixth synod, and the sixth synod itself; and Pope Martin, in the synod celebrated at Rome; likewise John Damascene, in the books on the orthodox faith and against the Iconomastics [image-breakers] — make mention of Dionysius the Areopagite and of his books, and prove ecclesiastical dogmas out of them, as from the authority of a most holy and most ancient man. And after Dionysius, Justin the philosopher and martyr not only attested that the Apocalypse is John the Apostle's, but also (as Eusebius in the Chronicles and Jerome in the book On illustrious men are witnesses) pursued it with a most luminous exposition. Irenaeus also, in the fifth book against heresies, attested that the Apocalypse was written by John the Evangelist near the end of [the reign of] Domitian Caesar [4]

[1] Jerome on 1 [i.e., the first chapter of the epistle] to Titus, and in the epistle to Magnus (Hier. in 1. co. ad Titum, & in epist. ad Magnum).

[2] ch. 60 of the catalogue [Philastrius]; book 2, heresy 50 [Epiphanius — her. 51 in modern editions]; in the catalogue of heresies, ch. 22 [Augustine, De hær. — ch. 30 in modern editions]; heresy 54 (cap. 60. catalogi; li. 2. hær. 50; in catal. hær. cap. 22; hær. 54).

[3] ch. 3, part 1 (cap. 3. par. 1).

[4] Cap. 8; Lib. 4. c. 54 (as printed).

(printed p. 615 [PDF p. 620] — Heresy X: Impugnatio concluded; the heretics' objections 1–3.)

attested [that the Apocalypse was written by John near the end of Domitian], and put forth commentaries upon it. Theophilus likewise, bishop of Antioch, as Eusebius writes, used the testimonies of this book, as of the canonical scriptures, against the heresy of Hermogenes; and Melito of Asia, bishop of the church of Sardis, composed commentaries on this book as on a canonical work. [1] The Council of Ancyra also, celebrated under Diocletian Augustus, uses the sentences of this book for the confirmation of dogmas under the name of John the Apostle, whom it also asserts to be the author of this book. For thus it speaks in the sixth volume of Eusebius: [2] "John the Apostle saw the sacrament of the Apocalypse in the spirit, not in the body, as he himself says: 'I **was** in the spirit on the Lord's day,' etc." Dionysius also, pontiff of the church of the Corinthians, noble among the ecclesiastical writers, speaks of the Apocalypse of John, in the same Eusebius, in this manner: [3] "**But I**, so far as pertains to my own opinion, in no wise dare to spurn or cast away the scripture of this book — especially since many of the brethren think with me; and this rather is my judgment of it: that the things written in it exceed and rise above the measure of human hearing, and that there is in it a certain arcane and recondite and admirable sense, which I too admire and venerate even if I do not understand it; and I so think, that certain divine sacraments are covered over by human words: not so much discerning this by my own judgment as believing it by faith; and thus I do not reprobate the things I do

not understand, but admire them the more, the less I attain to them." But John Damascene also, in the fourth book On the Faith, after he had woven together a catalogue of the divine volumes, placed the book of the Apocalypse last in it, under the name of John the evangelist. [4] And Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, has this of the Apocalypse: "In the fourteenth year, therefore, Domitian stirring up the second persecution after Nero, John, relegated to the island of Patmos, wrote the Apocalypse, which Justin Martyr and Irenaeus interpret." And in the epistle to Paulinus, weaving an encomium of this same book: "The Apocalypse of John," says he, "has as many sacraments as words. I have said too little: in proportion to the merit of the volume, all praise is inferior. In its single words lie hidden manifold intelligences." The divine Augustine also, in the thirty-sixth tractate on John, says that the Apocalypse is that same John's whose is the gospel; and in the book On holy virginity he asserts that the Apocalypse is his — the beloved disciple, who reclined upon the breast of the lord at the supper; [5] and in the second book On Christian doctrine he numbers it among the canonical books — upon which he also put forth particular Annotations in a separate volume. I pass over the testimony of Ticonius the African concerning the Apocalypse, and his commentaries upon it, which Gennadius writes that he read [described] in his catalogue; likewise the joint attestation of Epiphanius, and of Isidore in the sixth book of the Etymologies; [6] of Ambrose too, and of the divine Gregory, of Bede, of Haymo, and of writers without number. I am silent also concerning the decrees of the fourth Synod of Toledo, and of other councils, on behalf of the venerable authority of this book — observing that I have produced far more testimonies than was needful; but the rash assertion of the Innovators *(Nouatorum)* compelled me to do so, who proclaim this book as scarcely acknowledged by the ancient fathers, and especially by the Greeks. We have wished, therefore, to show that through all the successions of the fathers, from the very first beginning of the nascent church even to our own times, it was always received, as the true and legitimate work of John, Apostle and Evangelist, into the number of the sacred volumes.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. To begin with, it is established again and again (they say) that the Apocalypse is not John the Apostle's, from the inscription of the work, which in all the Greek codices is had thus: ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου — that is, "The Revelation of B. John the Theologian." [7] But that this "theologian" was one far other than John the evangelist, Papias, the hearer of John, attested, writing — in the books which he entitled OF THE **LORD'S SAYINGS** *(Verborum Dominicorum)* — that there were two Johns: the one the apostle; the other outside the number of the Apostles, whom, a certain distinction being made, he called John the presbyter, and associated with a certain Aristo. From which words when Eusebius of Caesarea, in the third book of the ecclesiastical history, chapter 38, had fallen into the suspicion that perhaps [this] John [the presbyter], and not John the Evangelist, was the author of the Apocalypse, he said: "**By these things** it is proved to be true, what certain Asians write: that there are two sepulchres at Ephesus, and each is called John's. To which if we attend more diligently, perhaps this second will be the John — if the first is not believed [to be he] — under whose name is had the revelation which is called John's." Moreover — because Eusebius brought forth [his view] concerning the author of this book under doubt — Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, Eusebius witnessing in the seventh of the History, expressed himself most clearly, not only affirming that it is not John the Evangelist's, but also showing this with reasons adduced; namely: [8]

2. From the very style of the writing: both because the phrase and manner of speaking of the two volumes — namely of the Gospel of John and of the Apocalypse — is diverse; and because John, who wrote the Gospel, nowhere in his Gospel made mention of his own name, nor signed himself by name; but this man, who wrote the Apocalypse, makes mention of his own name at almost the third word, often repeating that: "I **John**; I **John**" — [9] as though he were writing us not a book but a promissory note *(syngrapham)* — contrary to the custom of the other Apostles, and his own, who in the Gospel, keeping his name unsaid, indicates the author only, saying: "**This is** that disciple whom Jesus loved," etc.

3. Next, those very ecclesiastical writers who ascribe the Apocalypse to John the Apostle so disagree among themselves about the place and time in which and when John wrote it, that it evidently appears John the Apostle could not have been its author. For Irenaeus, at the end of the fifth book, handed down to memory that the Apocalypse was written near the close of the empire of Domitian; consenting with whom, Eusebius in the chronicles and Jerome in the book On Illustrious Men assert that it was written by John on the island of Patmos in the fourteenth year of Domitian. But Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, Arethas and Andreas, bishops of Cappadocia, and very many others of the Greeks, [say that it was written] under [10]

[1] Eus. lib. 4. cap. 25.
[2] cap. 7.
[3] Libr. 7. hist. eccl. cap. 23.
[4] Cap. 18.
[5] Cap. 27; Cap. 8.
[6] Lib. 2. hær. 51. cap. 2.
[7] Eus. lib. hist. cap. 38.
[8] Lib. hist. 7. cap. 23.
[9] Apoc. 1. b.
[10] Lib. 2. lib. 1. hær. (as printed).

(printed p. 616 [PDF p. 621] — Heresy X: objections 3–7; the Dissolutio, response 1 begins.)

hand down that it was put forth under Claudius Nero, almost forty years earlier. And Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, handed down to memory that the gospel was written by John on Patmos, but the Apocalypse by no means [there]. Nay, the author himself, in the very beginning of the book, narrating the time of his vision, says that he heard his revelation on the holy Lord's day: "**I** John" (says he) "was in the spirit on the Lord's day"; [1] but it is most certain that in the time of John the Evangelist there was as yet no institution or appellation of the Lord's day, which was decreed by the fathers much later. Wherefore, since concerning the author, the place, and the time of this revelation nothing certain is had, it remains that it cannot be affirmed by us as ascertained that the Apocalypse is John the Apostle and Evangelist's. On these and suchlike things they lean who deny this book to be John the Evangelist's.

4. But **those who** cast this very volume out of the canon and ascribe it to Cerinthus the heretic — the Alogians — taking their occasion from the things which are treated in this revelation, arm themselves against it with these weapons (as Dionysius and Epiphanius recite), saying: [2] First, that there is nothing in it agreeable to the sanctity and majesty of John, but all things vain and well-nigh ridiculous, of no utility or fruit. "For what utility" (say they) "comes to us out of this Apocalypse, which teaches us nothing besides certain empty things about seven stars, seven angels, seven eyes, seven candlesticks, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven seals, and frivolous things of this sort? — which, since they are covered over with a certain thick veil of ignorance, under wrappings of visions and enigmas of dreams, are worthy to be called not a *revelation*, but rather a *veiling* and an *enveloping (non reuelationis, sed velationis & obuolutionis)*."

5. To these add that in some places it is even manifestly caught lying, writing to churches which exist nowhere, nor ever did exist, saying: "And to the angel of the church which is in Thyatira write: These things saith the son of God, who hath eyes…" etc. [3] But in Thyatira — a city which is in Mysia, on the left side of the river Caycus — there was never, in the time of John, any church of Christians. How then does he write to her who is nowhere?

6. Besides these things, moreover, it contains the heretical dogmas of Cerinthus: namely, the restoration of an earthly kingdom in Jerusalem, and of the temple, and of the Jewish festivities, when he says: "I saw the holy city Jerusalem, new, descending from heaven, prepared by God as a bride adorned for her husband; and I heard a voice: behold the tabernacle of God with men, and he will dwell with them." [4] And a little after: "And the kings of the earth shall bring their glory into her; and the nations shall walk in her light; and her

gates shall not be shut by day." [5] Likewise a satiety of foods and abundance of cups, when he says: "They shall **not hunger** nor thirst any more; and he shall lead them to the fountains of waters"; [6] and again: "To him that **overcometh** I will give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of my God; and I will give him the hidden manna." And again, future nuptials, and the pleasures of wedlock, and the other enticements of the flesh, saying: "Let us be **glad** and rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath prepared herself. Blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." [7] And then, after these things, the time of the kingdom of Christ and of the saints, according to the heresy of the χιλιαστῶν [Chiliasts], he designates as destined to endure through the space of a thousand years on earth, when he says: "And **I saw** the souls of the beheaded, for the testimony of Jesus; 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 hath part in the first resurrection: in these the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." [8] All which things Cerinthus — that greatest friend of the flesh and of lusts — dictated according to the lasciviousness of his own wit; and, that he might strengthen them with the authority of an apostolic name, he divulged them under the title of John. These things the Alogians, in Epiphanius and Dionysius.

7. But **the Lutherans** superadd to these arguments of the Alogians that Eusebius, in the third volume of the History, relates that Gaius, a most ancient and most celebrated writer of the catholic church, wrote in the dialogue of his disputations that Cerinthus the heretic composed the book of this Apocalypse under the name of John, that by the authority of the apostolic name he might confirm an earthly kingdom of Christ, to endure through a thousand years. [9] To which they add also another disadvantage *(incommodum)* for this work: that none of the Greek churches receives it in the canon of the sacred volumes — as Jerome says to Dardanus: "**Nor** indeed do the churches of the Greeks receive the Apocalypse of John with the same liberty." And neither Anastasius the Greek author, nor the Council of Laodicea, enumerates the Apocalypse in the catalogue of the divine letters.

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. From how light causes these heretics cast away the holy Apocalypse is shown first of all by that lightest of conjectures which they produce concerning the inscription of the book — not knowing that B. John the Theologian is the same who was both Apostle and evangelist; who, on account of the sublimity of his gospel, in which he touched the most lofty things concerning the divinity of the Word, and raised himself higher than the other evangelists, has been celebrated by the ancient writers under the name of "the Theologian" — by Dionysius the Areopagite especially, whose tenth epistle is still extant, fore-noted with these words: "To **John the Theologian**, Apostle and Evangelist, relegated on the island of Patmos"; in which Dionysius himself, speaking of the theology of John the Evangelist, inserts these words: "But **us** no storm, no adversity shall deprive of the most bright ray of John — [we being] indeed destined to attain it by the memory and renewal of thy most true theology," etc. In like manner invalid is the conjecture which they draw from the suspicion of Eusebius and the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria, perversely understood. For Eusebius, in his Chronicles and in very many chapters of the ecclesiastical history, so openly confesses the Apocalypse to be John the apostle's, that he easily frees himself from this suspicion, and shows that he brought forth those words out of the opinion of others. And Dionysius does not deny that the Apocalypse is John the apostle's, but says only this: that he knows the author of the Apocalypse to be called John, and that it was written through the Holy Spirit; but that this is not clearly established for him — whether Jo[hn…]

[1] Apoc. 1. b.
[2] Epiph. lib. 2. hær. 51.
[3] Apoc. 2. c.
[4] Apo. 21.
[5] Ibidem.

[6] Apoc. 21; Ap. 7. & 1.
[7] Ap. 19.
[8] Apoc. 20.
[9] Cap. 28.

(printed p. 617 [PDF p. 622] — Heresy X: Dissolutio 1 concluded, 2–4 — style, chronology, the Lord's day, and the spiritual sense of the sevens.)

whether it be John the apostle's, on account of the diversity of style and the frequent repetition of his own name. And even if of old there was some doubt or other about it, before the decree concerning it was made in the Church, we, after so long an approbation of the church and of the fathers, can no longer be in two minds about it.

2. Now concerning the diversity of style, which these Innovators always inculcate and repeat in almost all the books of scripture, we answer that the conjecture from style is feeble, seeing that style must needs be varied according to the diversity of the argument. Wherefore, since in the Gospel of John and in the Apocalypse the argument is diverse, it would not be greatly to be wondered at if John had kept a diverse manner of speaking in the two. And yet the character of the two volumes does not very much disagree: for both were written in the common dialect of the Greeks, and with the same phrases and idioms of the Hebrew tongue. And if in the Apocalypse he makes frequent mention of his own name, of which he had never made mention in his Gospel, it is no wonder. For in the Gospel he was writing another's history — namely, Jesus Christ's — wherefore there was no need to name himself; but in the Apocalypse he was writing revelations and visions narrated to himself, in which to interpose his own name frequently was not at all beside the matter.

3. Nor is the argument less infirm which they adduce from the controversy of fathers dissonant among themselves about the time and place. For it does not follow that the Iliad of Homer was not put forth by Homer himself, because concerning the time and place in which Homer wrote, and likewise concerning Homer's fatherland, there has always been contention among his expositors, the suit still hanging before the judge. Wherefore, even if the sentences of the fathers differed about the place and time of the scripture, not on that account would the scripture itself have to be doubted. How much less, then, is there now to be any wavering, when the aforesaid sentences of the fathers, diligently considered, differ nothing among themselves? For Dorotheus does not deny that the Apocalypse was written on Patmos, but is silent and passes it by in silence. But if from his silence they would conclude that the Apocalypse is not John the Apostle's, by the same reasoning they will have to conclude that the first epistle of John the apostle is not his, because this Dorotheus made no mention of it. And as for what they object concerning the Lord's day — that it was not yet instituted in the time of John — it is most false, the consensus of the whole church crying out against it, which believes that the solemnity of the Lord's day was founded by the apostles themselves in memory of the Lord's resurrection. Of whose institution by the apostles Augustine testifies, in sermon 25 De tempore, in these words: "The apostles, therefore, and apostolic men, decreed that the **Lord's day** was for this reason to be held in religious solemnity: because on it our redeemer rose from the dead." Nor does that derogate from the authority of the Apocalypse, that even to the times of Eusebius there was disputation in the Church about its author and its authority; nay rather, this lends it much greater credit. For since John had begun a new kind of writing, and was writing things future — not things done, as the other writers of the new testament had — the novelty of the matter furnished a handle of admiration and of ambiguity to those first fathers; and that doubt yielded to the credit of the greater work: because this book was received by them into the order of the sacred volumes only after the matter had been diligently examined and discussed. Wherefore, even if it was at one time doubted of, it ought not now to be of less authority than the other sacred books, since the church has received it into the canon with a veneration equal to the rest. And let these things be said to those who deny that John the Apostle is the author of the Apocalypse.

4. It remains now that we confute the calumnies of those who accuse the Apocalypse as useless and pernicious, and full of the dogmas of Cerinthus: vituperating the things that are obscurely narrated in it of the seven trumpets, candlesticks, and angels — as if they were to be understood Judaically, that is, carnally, and according to the dead letter (as they perversely suppose), and not rather spiritually and mystically, according to the mind of the author; who at the beginning of his narration teaches that he saw the things which he wrote not carnally and corporally, but spiritually — since he was rapt in the spirit on the Lord's day, [1] and, the divine spirit thoroughly showing them, beheld the sacraments of intellectual visions not with the eyes of the body but of the mind. For he himself, in that same place, calls his visions "Sacraments" — that is, sacred secrets — that from this we may know that, just as in all sacraments one thing is seen and heard outwardly, but another is understood inwardly and spiritually through allegory, so in his visions one thing is represented without, another is found and uncovered within. So that by the seven golden candlesticks we should understand the seven churches, burning with divine charity and illuminated by the wisdom of the divine light, to which John writes; and by the seven stars and seven angels, the rulers and bishops of the seven churches (as John himself expounds), who ought to shine for others with the splendor of doctrine and of work; by the seven eyes of the Lamb, the seven gifts of the holy spirit, with which the Lamb — Christ — as with seven most bright rays, irradiates the darkness of our souls; [2] by the seven seals, the seven revelations of things to be carried on in the church through seven future times — sealed and shut up in the book of the divine mind to such a degree that, unless the Lamb had opened the book of his own arcana, we could never have either read or understood them; by the seven trumpets, the seven orders of preachers and teachers, who through the seven coming ages, even to the consummation of the world, were to succeed one another in turn: to uncover, by the sound of the evangelical voice, the ambushes of the heretics; to frighten off, by the clangor of the divine word, the rebel minds of tyrants; and to stir up the souls of the faithful, that they might sustain the assaults of the enemies and fight fiercely against their endeavors; and by the seven vials, the seven plagues and seven tribulations which the Church, through seven ages succeeding one another, was to suffer even to the end of the present world. All and each of which things were written by John the apostle not in vain, nor without any profit to the Church (as the heretics calumniate), but for the perpetual consolation of the faithful and the stability of the Christian faith. For the Apostle wished to hand down to the memory of posterity the things God revealed to him concerning the future tribulations and persecutions of the church, lest the faithful, terrified by the unforeseen arrival of these things, should suffer scandal,

[1] Apoc. 1.
[2] Apoc. 1.

(printed p. 618 [PDF p. 623] — Heresy X: Dissolutio 4 concluded, 5–7; end of Book VII: "Septimi Libri Finis.")

and should fall away from the faith of Christ, thinking that the church of the Christians, oppressed with such great slaughters, was of no care to God, and that, its affairs being altogether despaired of, it was rolling down to final destruction. Meeting this scandal of the faithful, therefore, John prophetically foretold the calamities and hardships impending over the church even to the end of the world: so that, when the fullness of their time should arrive, the elect of God, already forewarned out of his writing, might not be troubled or waver at all, but might persevere firmer and more stable in the faith, seeing those things then being fulfilled in the Church which, long before they came to pass, the Holy Spirit had foretold through the mouth of his Apostle; and might come forth daily more robust in hope and in patience — hoping, again, after a little while, both the brief labor of the Church, and the promised rest for those who labor, victory for those who contend, the palm for the victors, and, the palm being obtained, the crown of eternal felicity. And this is the admirable utility of this book: that the punishments denounced in it terrify us, and the promised rewards gladden us. Yet John wrote these things obscurely and in wrapped-up fashion *(inuolutè)*, lest his prophetic scripture should grow cheap, and lest there should lie open to the heretical robbers *(latrunculis)* a place for perverting it. And he

called it by the most fitting name of *Apocalypse* for this reason: that all the things contained in this book were revealed and manifested to him, and he himself also revealed some of them to us. Whence in vain do the heretics make it a crime, [saying] that it ought rather to have been inscribed an *involution* than a *revelation*.

5. But **as to what** they reprehend concerning the Church which (they say) was by no means in Thyatira in John's time, Epiphanius answers: that John, in the prophetic spirit, wrote not to that [church] which then was not, but to that which afterward was to be there; and fore-announced to it how it was to err, deceived by the false prophetesses of the Phrygasters [Montanists] — namely Priscilla, Maximilla, and Quintilla — whom he designated under the name of Jezabel the prophetess, seducing the servants of Christ. [1] And the same Epiphanius writes that this church, in his own times, had been purged again from every heresy of the Phrygasters.

6. Finally, as to those things in which they accuse this book of the dogmas of Cerinthus, they gravely err — being ignorant that the things related in this book about the restoration of Jerusalem, and the nuptials of the Lamb, and the satiety of hunger and thirst, are to be understood not corporally and carnally of that corruptible Jewish Jerusalem, but of the heavenly and sempiternal Jerusalem — that is, of the Church, the bride of Christ; which John saw adorned with the ornaments of immortality and impassibility and the other divine dowries, together with her spouse Christ, in sempiternal felicity, to come after the judgment — [2] yet not before that first resurrection should take place, which is not corporal but spiritual, namely of the soul from sins; and this indeed he called the *first* resurrection, to distinguish it from the second, general resurrection, in which all sou[ls] will rise again with their bodies — just as by the *second death* he understood the perpetual damnation of soul and body; and by the thousand years of that [first] resurrection he designated the space between the seventh tribulation of the church and the coming of Antichrist: so that he took a determinate number (which is most frequent in the divine letters) for an indeterminate number of years. And that John wrote of the heavenly and spiritual Jerusalem, and not of the earthly, he himself discloses, when he adds that he saw no temple in her — "for the Lord God omnipotent and the lamb was the temple thereof" — nor Sun nor Moon to shine in her, "for the clarity of God illuminated her, and her lamp was the Lamb"; [3] at whose glorious conjunction with the church, in eternal beatitude, those saints rejoice, saying: "Let us be **glad** and rejoice, for the marriage of the lamb is come" — in which, namely, the Church was joined to Christ: she who, while she before was warring *(militando)*, had been the spouse of Christ in hope, then at last, triumphing, was made the spouse of Christ in reality *(in re)*; whose bridal garments and mystical ornaments are the justifications (as John says) and the merits of the saints. And the Nuptials to which the saints are invited are filled not with corporeal banquets and the other enticements of gluttony and of the flesh, but with the hidden manna — that is, with the presence of the divinity of Christ, which is the true manna — and with the tree of life, that is, the presence of the glorious humanity of Christ: in the sight of which things there will be present the end of all our desires, nor will there any longer be in us groaning or weeping, but a perpetual and stable beatitude, of soul and of body alike, destined to endure into everlasting.

7. Now finally, what the Lutherans adduce concerning the words of Gaius is altogether futile. For neither can that be deduced from the words of Gaius, nor does Eusebius affirm it; nor does the sentence of Gaius recited by Eusebius commemorate any such thing, but indicates only this: that Cerinthus had introduced his own heresy through certain revelations, as though written by a great Apostle. [4] Which words do not assert that Cerinthus was the author of those revelations, but that out of those revelations of the great Apostle, perversely understood, he introduced the falsity of his own dogma — as the words of Dionysius, bishop of the Corinthians, adduced by Eusebius immediately after these, show clearer than light; and Dionysius, in the same Eusebius, narrates it more at large. And concerning the catalogues of Anastasius and of the Council of Laodicea, in which the Apocalypse is not recounted, there is nothing to be wondered at, since in those times the Catholic Church had not yet decreed anything concerning its authority — as she afterward decreed that it was to be received in the Canon of the holy volumes. [5] Let all the heretics therefore cease to assail the holy

Apocalypse of John with maledictions, and let them acknowledge themselves overcome by these things which, God aiding, have been said by us.

*

Septimi Libri Finis. *(The End of the Seventh Book.)*

[1] Lib. 2. hære. 51; Apoc. 1 (recte 2).
[2] Apo. 21.
[3] Apo. 21.
[4] Eus. lib. hist. 3. cap. 28.
[5] Lib. 7. his. (as printed).

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VIII

On those who have assailed the volumes of the Old Testament

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, BOOK VIII

TABLE OF HERESIES

The 13 heresies confuted in this book, in order, with the parts of each. The page number is the page of this English translation.

Page 4: OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy I *(De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis I)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 4
- The Refutation — p. 5
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 10
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 13

Page 18: OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy II *(De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis II)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 18
- The Refutation — p. 18
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 20
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 23

Page 25: OF THE BOOKS OF THE MOSAIC LAW — Heresy III *(De Libris Mosaicae legis. Haeresis III)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 26
- The Refutation — p. 26
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 26
- The Diluting of the Objections — p. 28

Page 32: OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS — Heresy IV *(De Libris Propheticis. Haeresis IIII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 32
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 33
- The Diluting of the Objections — p. 34

Page 36: OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS — Heresy V *(De Libro Psalmorum. Haeresis V)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 36
- The Refutation — p. 36
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 38
- The Objections Are Dissolved — p. 40

Page 42: OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL — Heresy VI *(De Libro Danielis. Haeresis VI)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 42
- The Refutation — p. 43
- Objections of the Heretics — p. 44
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 46

Page 49: OF THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES — Heresy VII *(De Libro Ecclesiastis. Haeresis VII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 49
- The Confutation — p. 50

Page 51: OF THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES — Heresy VIII *(De Cantico Canticorum. Haeresis VIII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 51
- The Confutation — p. 52

Page 53: OF THE BOOKS OF WISDOM AND OF ECCLESIASTICUS — Heresy IX *(De Libris Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici. Haeresis IX)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 53
- The Refutation — p. 53
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 56
- The Solution — p. 57

Page 57: OF THE BOOK OF JOB — Heresy X *(De Libro Iob. Haeresis X)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 57
- The Refutation — p. 58
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 58
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 60

Page 64: OF THE BOOKS OF ESDRAS, TOBIT, JUDITH, AND ESTHER — Heresy XI *(De Libris Esdrae, Tobiae, Iudith, et Esther. Haeresis XI)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 64
- The Refutation — p. 64
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 65
- The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 67

Page 71: OF THE BOOKS OF MACCABEES — Heresy XII *(De Libris Maccabaeorum. Haeresis XII)*
- The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 71
- The Refutation — p. 72
- The Objections of the Heretics — p. 73

The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 76
Page 81: OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF SACRED SCRIPTURE — Heresy XIII *(De Translationibus Sacrae Scripturae. Haeresis XIII)*
The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 81
The Refutation — p. 81
The Objections of the Heretics — p. 90
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 96

(printed p. 619 [PDF p. 624] — Book VIII opens: title-block, Praefatio, Catalogue of 13 heresies; Heresy I begins, with its Assertores, Impugnatio, and first Proposition.)

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VIII

Of Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On those who have assailed the volumes of the Old Testament, or, Against the destroyers of the old Scripture *(De his qui veteris testamenti volumina oppugnarunt, sive adversus veteris scripturae destructores)* — the Eighth Book of the *Bibliotheca Sancta*

PRAEFATIO [Preface]

We demolished *(Destruximus)* in the preceding, seventh volume all the heresies which, from these times down [to our own], have arisen against the evangelical and apostolic scriptures of the New Testament: now, the order of disputation leading on, we subjoin to this work the Eighth and last book, pursuing in it the exposition and confutation of those heresies which, at various times, divers heretics stirred up against the Mosaic, the Prophetic, the Parenetic [hortatory], and the Historical books of the Old Instrument. Which being completed — the divine power favoring [us] — our labor will find the wished-for end of our whole work.

CATALOGUE OF THE HERESIES which are confuted in this eighth Book *(Haereseon quae in hoc octavo Libro confutantur catalogus)*

Of the Old Testament in general	Heresy 1
Of the Old Testament	Heresy 2
Of the books of the Mosaic law	Heresy 3
Of the Prophetic books	Heresy 4
Of the book of Psalms	Heresy 5
Of the book of Daniel	Heresy 6
Of Ecclesiastes	Heresy 7
Of the Canticle of Canticles	Heresy 8
Of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus	Heresy 9
Of the book of Job	Heresy 10
Of the books of Esdras, Tobias, Judith, and Esther	Heresy 11
Of the books of the Maccabees	Heresy 12
Of the Translations of divine Scripture	Heresy 13

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy I *(De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis I)*

To cast away the whole Old Testament — [as] made for the Jews alone, founded by the evil God of the Jews, and augmented by his followers with fabricated narrations; of no profit in any part to the Christian faith; noxious moreover to good morals; and contrary to the evangelical doctrine.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The first authors of this prodigious and abominable heresy were those, whosoever they were, that introduced two Gods: one, namely, of the Hebrews, evil and false; the other, of the Christians, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, good and true. Of whom the chief (Epiphanius being witness) was Simon Magus the Samaritan, the first heretic after the ascension of Christ, who taught that the old testament — namely the law and the prophets — was put forth by a sinister power *(virtus)* and by evil angels. [1] To whom, in the same error, there succeeded Basilides, Carpocras, the Valentinians *(so printed "Valerini")*, who are also [called] Gnostics, the Ptolemaeans, the Heracleonites, the Cainites *(Caiani)*, the Archontics, the Cerdonians, the Marcionists, the Apelleians, and the Severians — who by the same assent cast away the old testament, either wholly *(ex integro)* or in part. [2] After [these] others, in the times of the Emperor Aurelian, a certain Persian named Cubricus, surnamed Manes, so exalted this heresy — [which had] somewhat subsided — that his name has almost remained upon it. [3] Then his disciples, who for honor's sake called their teacher MANICHAEVS — that is, the pourer-out of manna *(mannae effusor)* — having sent forth the pernicious books of the same error, spread the now-famous heresy more widely over the whole world. Of their number the more eminent were a certain Addas, surnamed Adimantus, a disciple of Manichaeus while he was yet living; and, many years after him, Faustus the African, a Milevitan by fatherland; and a certain unnamed disciple of Fabritius, far worse than the Manichaeans of old — fragments of whose volumes are still preserved in the books of Augustine among the confutations of the Manichaeans. [4] There were also, as Augustine relates, certain Patrician heretics, named from a certain Patricius, who subscribed to the same heresy. After whom, through many ages of years, the Bogomil heretics of the Bulgarian nation, and at last the Albanenses [the Albanensian Cathars], called this same error — buried [as it had been] through so long a length of times — back again into the light. [5] And these are they who thought that the whole old testament was to be rejected wholly.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

The present assertion of the heretics comprises five detestable and blasphemous propositions, which we shall endeavor to destroy in order, with as much brevity as may be.

Proposition the first. The first proposition is: THAT THE WHOLE OLD TESTAMENT IS FROM THE EVIL GOD OF THE HEBREWS, WHO IS THE DEVIL. And it is destroyed

[1] Epiphanius, in the Anacephaleosis (Epip. in Anacephaleosi); Jerome, in the preface to Titus (Hier. in praefat. ad Titum).

[2] Augustine, in the catalogue of heresies [De haeresibus], and book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 12 (Aug. in catalogo haere. & li. 2. co. adu. leg. cap. 12).

[3] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66).

[4] Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law and the prophets, ch. 12 (Aug. lib. 2. co. adu. legis & pro. cap. 12).

[5] Euthymius [Zigabenus], book 2, Panoplia [Dogmatica], title 23 (Euthy. li. 2. panoplia tit. 23).

(printed p. 620 [PDF p. 625] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 1 (one God of both testaments); Proposition 2 and Proposition 3.)

And **moreover** this execrable opinion is destroyed by the testimonies of the new testament, which make one and the same God the author of each testament. For Paul, saying that Abraham had two sons — one of the handmaid, and the other of the free woman, which by allegory signify the two testaments — shows that, just as there are two women and one man, so also there are two testaments, and one God, who bequeathed both. [1] And the same Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, making a mutual comparison of the two testaments, calls the one new and the other old; and says that the new was confirmed by its own testator, unto the imitation and completion of the old, in blood, through the death of Christ — so that, his death intervening for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the old testament, we might receive the promises *(repromissiones)* which were signified in it. [2] Therefore, unless Christ, the mediator of the new testament, had seen that the old testament was from the good God, he would by no means have completed it by

imitating it. But he imitated it for this reason: because, as he himself says in the Gospel: "**Whatsoever** the son seeth the father do, this the son also doeth in like manner." [3] And that the same God spoke in each testament, the same Paul everywhere openly teaches, saying: "**Paul**, an Apostle, set apart unto the Gospel of God, which he had before promised by his prophets in the holy scriptures concerning his son." [4] And again: "**In many ways** *(multifarie)* and in many manners God, of old speaking to the fathers in the prophets, hath last of all spoken to us in [his] son." [5] And elsewhere: "**Having** the same spirit of faith, as it is written: I believed, for which cause I have spoken" — intimating by this that both testaments were inspired by the same spirit. [6] And Zacharias testifies that he is the same God of Israel who spoke in the old testament by the mouth of the holy prophets, and who in the new testament visited and wrought the redemption of his people; [7] with whom Mary, consenting in her Canticle, sings: "**He hath received** [taken up] Israel his servant, being mindful of his mercy: as he spoke to our fathers, Abraham, and to his seed for ever." [8] And lest we should perchance believe that there had been some prophet in whom God did not speak, therefore Peter added: "**God**, who by the mouth of all the prophets foretold that his Christ should suffer, hath so fulfilled it." [9] To which testimonies this demonstration also is joined: since the Mosaic law — on which the whole old testament depends — was founded by its author for this reason, that it might lead its cultivators to Christ as to the end of the law, Paul saying: "**The end** of the law is Christ"; [10] and, "**The law** was our pedagogue in Christ." [11] How can it be that that evil God of the Manichaeans, the perpetual enemy of our Lord Jesus Christ, should have promulgated the law and the testament by whose leading his followers were led to the worship of Christ — by whom he himself was to be cast out of [his] kingdom, Christ saying: "**The prince** of this world shall be cast forth"? [12] The one and only author, therefore, of both testaments is God, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ. [13]

Proposition the second. The second proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT PERTAINS NOT TO CHRISTIANS, BUT TO THE JEWS ALONE ONLY. The absurdity of this is caught from this: that a testament pertains to those to whom the gifts and promises of the testament pertain, and who fulfill the conditions of the testament. But it is certain both that the conditions of the old testament are not kept by those who are Jews according to the flesh only, and that the promises of that same testament were not made on account of such [men]; but on account of the true Israelites, content with the promise of the seed of Abraham — that is, on account of those who believe in Christ, who is the sum and end of all the promises of the old testament, Paul saying: "**For however many** are the promises of God, in him they are [yea]." [14] And again: "**I say** that Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the confirming of the promises of the fathers" — which promises, indeed, pertain not to those who are only of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, [15] but to those, as Paul says, who are the sons of the promise of Abraham, and are reckoned in the seed of Isaac, of whom it was said: "**In Isaac** shall thy seed be called" — who is Christ. [16] For to **Abraham**, as the same Apostle writes to the Galatians, were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not, "and to seeds," as of many, but as of one, "and to thy seed," which is Christ. [17] Concerning whose salvation, as Peter says, all the prophets searched and inquired, who prophesied of the grace to come upon us. [18] And that not only the promises of the old testament, but also all its other mysteries, were made on account of us, the heirs of these promises — that we might be rendered fit for obtaining them — Paul, to the Corinthians, openly expressed in these words: "**I would not** have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized in Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink: for they drank of the spiritual [rock] that followed them, and the rock was Christ. Now these things were done in a figure of us." [19] And a little after: "**All** these things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our sake, upon whom the ends of the world are come." And to the Romans again: "**Whatsoever** things were written, were written for our instruction, that through patience and consolation we might have hope." [20] And that the true understanding of the old testament, taken away from the Jews, has passed over to us, the same Apostle testifies, saying: "**Even unto** this present day the selfsame veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away, which in Christ is made

void; but even unto this present day, when Moses is read, the veil is laid upon their heart." [21] Wherefore, since they themselves neither understand nor keep the will of the testator and the conditions handed down in the testament, it is manifest that that testament pertains to us, who hold Christ, the end of its promises, know the will of the testator, and keep the conditions of the commandments set forth by him.

Proposition the third. The third proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT HAS BEEN CONTAMINATED BY THE JEWS WITH FABRICATED NARRATIONS. Against a proposition so wicked and impious all the evangelical and Apostolic scriptures cry out — taking from the old books innumerable testimonies and examples for the confirmation of doctrine, for exhortation, correction, and consola-

[1] Gal. 4; Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Gal. 4; Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66).
[2] Heb. ch. 9 (Heb. cap. 9).
[3] John 5. a (Ioan. 5. a).
[4] Rom. 1. a (Rom. 1. a).
[5] Heb. 1. a (Heb. 1. a).
[6] 2 Cor. 4; Psalm 115 (2. Cor. 4; Psal. 115).
[7] Luke 1 (Luc. 1).
[8] Luke 1 (Luc. 1).
[9] Acts 3 (Act. 3).
[10] Rom. 10 (Rom. 10).
[11] Gal. 3 (Gal. 3).
[12] John 12 (Ioan. 12).
[13] Augustine, book 19 against Faustus (Aug. lib. 19. contra Faust.).
[14] 2 Cor. 1 (2. Cor. 1).
[15] Rom. 15 (Rom. 15).
[16] Rom. 9 (Rom. 9).
[17] Gal. 3 (Gala. 3).
[18] 1 Pet. 1 (1. Pet. 1).
[19] 1 Cor. 10 (1. Cor. 10).
[20] Rom. 15 (Rom. 15).
[21] 2 Cor. 3 (2. Cor. 3).

(printed p. 621 [PDF p. 626] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 3 concluded; Proposition 4 (that the OT is useless for faith and adverse to morals) refuted.)

[for the confirmation of doctrine, for exhortation, correction, and] consolation of the faithful — not as [drawn] from fabulous [writings], but as from most truthful scriptures, composed at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. To these, as to an uncontaminated fountain of truth, Christ sent those skilled in the law, saying: "**Search** the scriptures; for they give testimony of me." [1] To these, as to intact letters of incorrupt faith, he called back his disciples, when — beginning from Moses, and running through the psalms and the prophets — he expounded all the things that were written of him in the old books, and demonstrated them fulfilled in his very self with a most certain outcome. [2] Out of these [scriptures], as out of sincere and inviolate writings, the two evangelists Matthew and Luke briefly gathered the two genealogies of our Lord — the one beginning from Abraham and descending, through the successions of the patriarchs and kings, down to Christ; the other ascending, through the several generations and times of the old testament, up to Adam: to wit, that from a compendium of the histories of the whole old testament, which each genealogy had touched upon, they might signify that the whole sum of the entire ancient scripture is to be received with undoubted certitude. Paul likewise — who gloried that at the feet of Gamaliel he had learned not the fables but the truth of the old testament — confirmed by his own authority very many sayings and deeds of the old instrument, and especially those histories which the Manichaeans deride, in that most brief compendium of the old scripture which he most artfully drew together in the epistle to the Hebrews; [3] where, summarily enumerating almost all the histories of the ancient testament, from the beginning of Genesis down to the last volume of the

Maccabees, he says: "By **faith** we understand that the ages were framed" — and the rest, which throughout that whole chapter he so commemorates that he seems purposely to wish to point out with his finger the deeds of the old testament. [4] I pass over now the innumerable testimonies of the same Apostle, and of the other apostles, upon this matter, lest I heap loathing upon the reader in a thing most well-known, and to which all the letters of the new testament, and the stable and perpetual consensus of the Catholic Church, bear witness. But if anyone desires more for the confirmation of this proposition, let him read what is said by us below, in the confutation of the second heresy.

Proposition the fourth. The fourth proposition asserts: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT IS USELESS FOR THE CONFIRMATION OF OUR FAITH, AND ADVERSE TO THE ATTAINING OF GOOD MORALS. Which impiety all the letters of the new testament most openly confute. And first of all Paul professes that the old testament is necessary both for faith and for morals, writing to Timothy in these words: "But **thou**, continue in the things which thou hast learned and which have been committed to thee — knowing of whom thou hast learned [them], and because from infancy thou hast known the sacred letters, which can instruct thee unto salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. For all scripture, divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice: that the man of God may be perfect, furnished unto every good work." [5] By which words the Apostle shows the old scriptures to be most necessary in two things especially, namely for instructing faith and for forming good morals. For since the whole Christian profession is placed in two things — namely in contemplation, which insinuates faith, and in action, which teaches morals — the Apostle accommodates the scriptures of the old testament to each business. To contemplation, indeed: since, whereas there are two offices of Christian contemplation — that is, to teach truth and to refute falsehood — Paul embraced both, saying: "**All** scripture is profitable to teach" — namely truth — "and to reprove" — namely falsehood. [6] But to action the old scripture is profitable, because — since two parts complete the whole of action, namely that each one, according to the prophet's saying, should decline from evil and do good — therefore Paul says that those scriptures are profitable "to correct," that is, to snatch men away from sins, and "to instruct in justice," that is, to instruct men in justice and goodness. [7] Accordingly Christ, seeing how necessary the old scriptures are for the confirmation of faith, when he spoke of himself to those skilled in the law, brought in to them the books of Moses, saying: "**If** you believed Moses, you would believe me also; for he wrote of me." [8] And when he spoke to his disciples of his passion, he confirmed it from the prophets, saying: "**All things shall be accomplished** *(Consummabuntur)* that were spoken by the prophets concerning the son of man." [9] And when he had risen from the dead, he established almost all the Evangelical truths from the authority of the old books. For when he had given himself as companion to the two disciples going to Emmaus: "**Beginning**," says Luke, "from Moses, and running throughout by the prophets, he interpreted to them all the things which were foretold of himself in the old testament." [10] And again, when — the doors being shut — he had stood in the midst of the disciples, and had offered himself not only to be beheld by the eyes of the disciples but also to be handled by [their] hands: yet, lest they should think that anything was being done deceitfully with their mortal eyes and carnal senses, he strengthened them the more from the testification of the old books, saying: "**These** are the words which I spoke to you when I was yet with you: for it is necessary that all things be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." Then he opened to them the understanding of the scriptures, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said to them: "Because thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations." [11]

With these testimonies, therefore, just as Christ showed that the old testament is necessary for the firmness and certitude of our faith, so he demonstrated it to be most useful for the institution of the moral life — since from it he received so many examples for the shaping of an honest life: such as they are, when he rouses the sloth of his hearers to vigilance by the example of those who in the days of Noe were drowned by the unforeseen inundation of the deluge; [12] or when he admonishes those relapsing into sins by the example of

the wife of Loth, saying: "**Remember** Loth's wife"; [13] or when he deters the obstinate minds of the Jews by the recollection of the Sodomites and the Ninivites and the queen of the South; [14] or when he reproaches the Pharisees that they do not the works of Abraham, whose sons they boast themselves; [15] or when, out of the words of Abraham, he calls back to penance the imitators of that rich man buried in hell, saying: "They **have** Moy-

[1] John 5 (Ioan. 5).
[2] Luke 20 (Luc. 20 — so printed; the passage is Luke 24:27, 44).
[3] Acts 22 (Act. 22).
[4] Heb. 11 (Heb. 11).
[5] 2 Tim. 3 (2. Tim. 3).
[6] Augustine, book against Faustus (Aug. lib. co. Faust.).
[7] Psalm 33 (Psal. 33).
[8] John 5 (Ioan. 5).
[9] Matt. 20 (Matt. 20 — so printed; the passage is Luke 18:31).
[10] Luke 24; Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Luc. 24; Aug. lib. 4. cont. Faust. cap. 2).
[11] Luke 24 (Luc. 24).
[12] Matt. 24 (Matth. 24).
[13] Luke 17 (Luc. 17).
[14] Matt. 11 (Matt. 11).
[15] John 8 (Ioan. 8).

(printed p. 622 [PDF p. 627] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 4 concluded; Proposition 5 (that the OT fights point-by-point against the NT) refuted; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS begin.)

"They have **Moses** and the prophets; let them hear them." Paul likewise, drawing the whole old testament to the instruction of morals, says that all the things which are written in it "happened in figure for our sake, that we should not be desirers of evil things, nor idolaters, nor fornicators, nor gluttons, nor murmurers, nor tempters of God — lest we perish as they did, who in the old testament perished for such misdeeds, whose scourgings *(flagella)* are written," says the Apostle, "for our correction, upon whom the ends of the ages are come." [1] Which things, and innumerable others which could be produced for this sentence, I pass over: they most efficaciously convince [us] that the old scriptures are greatly necessary both for faith and for morals.

Proposition the fifth. The fifth proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT FIGHTS, POINT BY POINT, AGAINST THE NEW TESTAMENT. And this above all Adimantus the Manichaean strove to establish, having published a book in which, to the several sentences of the old instrument, he opposed the several contrary sentences of the new testament. But that in the divine scriptures nothing can be contrary or repugnant is manifestly convinced from the things said above. For since the old scriptures were written by God inspiring [them] — Peter saying, "**Not** by human will was prophecy brought at any time, but the holy [men] of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Spirit" — [2] and God is the highest truth, from which proceeds the spirit of union and not of dissension, it is necessary that in the scriptures composed by his afflatus nothing adverse or dissonant be found. For as from the highest truth nothing but the true can possibly proceed, so it is impossible that the true, which proceeds from it, should fight with itself. Moreover, as Augustine rightly infers, if the divine scriptures had been fighting among themselves and discordant, how could it ever have come to pass that so many and so great peoples should have believed scriptures so dissonant among themselves and conflicting — not the unlearned only, and those accustomed to the fields, but [men] worn [in study] in the cities, in the schools, and in the gymnasia amid contentious disputations? [3] who, whereas the garrulous [philosophers] ever dissented about the dogmas of philosophy — disciples from [their] masters, and fellow-disciples among themselves — at last, unanimous, came together under the concord of these scriptures: which is read never, either before or after, to have befallen any writings of the philosophers. For Plato dissents from Pythagoras in most things, Aristotle opposes Plato, and even his own disciples contradict Aristotle. But our writers are always concordant among themselves, nor do the apostles preach anything else

than what the prophets pronounce. Who, although they be not so many as the writers of the gentiles — lest, like those, they should grow cheap by multitude — yet are not so few that their consensus is not to be wondered at. Yet we confess that many things are found in the sacred letters of which, although the meaning is the same, the words nevertheless apparently disagree: divine wisdom so disposing, unto the exercise of our faith, that while we know not how to reduce them to concord, we may pray to him who made both one, that he may open to us the reconciliation of the apparent contradiction. [4] And let these things, said against the five propositions of the heretics, suffice.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. No cause presents itself to us why we should receive the Old Testament. For if we consider the person of the testator — which is first sought in every testament — deservedly, on account of it, do we execrate the old testament. For the founder of this testament is that evil God of the Hebrews, the perpetual enemy of the good God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ; from whom [come] all evils, slaughters, thefts, and concupiscences; who kills, blinds, hardens, and injects evil concupiscences into the minds of men and of women; who gives evil laws — as he himself testifies through his own prophets — and precepts not good, in which the cultivators of the law cannot live. [5]

2. Then also the inheritance left in that testament is so wretched, and corporeal, and far from the goods of the soul, that after that blessed promise of the new testament — which promises us the kingdom of the heavens and perpetual life — even if his own testator should thrust it upon me gratis, I would of my own accord loathe [it]. For since so many immortal goods have been left me in the new testament, the carnal goods which the old promises to its own — namely riches, and fullness of the belly, sons and grandsons, and long life — I willingly and gladly permit to the Jews as their own, content, forsooth, with the splendid inheritance of the new testament alone, and of the kingdom of the heavens. [6]

3. Moreover, the testament is to be accepted [only] by those to whom, together with the testament, an inheritance is consigned. But since the old testament not only does not constitute us heirs, but rather even disinherits [us], what impropriety it is to usurp for ourselves the tablets of the old testament, which — the inheritance being transmitted to others — testify us to be disinherited! For who is ignorant that the old Testament promises the land of the Canaanites, and that to the Jews alone — that is, to the circumcised, and to those sacrificing, and abstaining from swine's [flesh] and the rest of the meats which Moses calls unclean, observing the sabbaths, and the solemnity of the unleavened bread, and the rest of this kind, which the testator himself commanded them to observe? which, because they have pleased none of the Christians (for neither does any one of us keep them), it is fitting that, the inheritance being refused, we should give back the tablets also.

4. In vain, also, is a testament accepted by those who will not keep the will of the testator and the conditions of the testament. But since the conditions of the testament are that the heirs of the testament be circumcised, sacrifice, and abstain from unlawful foods, etc., and we keep not those things — I fear lest a Jew, rightly upbraiding me, should say: Why, wicked one, dost thou usurp for thyself the old testament, whose precepts thou keepest not? and what hast thou to do with the old testament, whose commands thou despisest? [7]

5. Furthermore, if there be any cause on account of which the old testament is to be received, this surely will be it: on account of the testimonies which are had of Christ in the law and the prophets. But since none such are found in them, by right their scriptures are seen to be worthy of contempt. And that there are in them no prophecies of Christ appears from those very testimonies which are wont to be brought forward, out of the old testament, for the confirmation of the faith concerning Christ. Out of which [8]

---

[1] Luke 16 (Luc. 16); 1 Cor. 10 (so printed "2. Cor. 19"; the passage is 1 Cor. 10:6, 11).

[2] 2 Pet. 1 (2. Pet. 1).

[3] Augustine, book 18 of the City of God, ch. 41 (Lib. 18. de ci. Dei. cap. 41).

[4] Augustine, in the same [work], ch. 7 (Aug. ibi. c. 7).

[5] Manes, in Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Manes apud Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66); Judges 9; 1 Kings [Samuel] 18; 2 Chron. 18; Isaiah 6; Isaiah 4 (Esa. 4, so printed); Exodus 14; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 22; Ezekiel 10 (Iud. 9; 1. Reg. 18; 2. Par. 18; Esai. 6; Esa. 4; Exod. 14; 3. Reg. 22; Ezech. 10); Faustus, in Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 1, and book 10, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 4. cont. Faust. cap. 1. & lib. 10. cap. 1).

[6] In the same place (Ibidem).

[7] Faustus, in Augustine, book 10, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 10. cap. 1).

[8] Faustus, in Augustine, book 16, ch. 41 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 16. cap. 41).

(printed p. 623 [PDF p. 628] — Heresy I: the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS continue (objections 5 concluded through 10).)

together with that most common testimony brought out of Deuteronomy — "**A PROPHET**, namely, like unto thee will I raise up for them," etc. — [this] in no way looks to Christ. What, I ask, is to be thought of the other testimonies which are subjoined to this testimony by a like example? which certainly cannot be understood of Christ: for Christ is not a prophet, nor like to Moses — since that one [Moses] was a man, this one [Christ] God; that one a sinner, this one holy; that one born of coition, this one (according to you) born of a virgin; that one, his God being offended, is slain upon the mountain, this one, well-pleasing to his father, suffers by his own will. How therefore will he be a prophet like to Moses? But if there is no testimony of Christ in the old testament, then it is useless for the confirmation of our faith. [1]

6. But if it confers nothing to the certitude of our faith, much less will it help toward morals. For how can those most wicked examples — worthy of all hatred and loathing — which the old testament everywhere sets before us in the lives of the patriarchs and prophets, profit us for the instruction of living well? namely, that fathers-in-law sleep with their daughters-in-law, like Judas; fathers with [their] daughters, like Loth; prophets with harlots, like Osee; the Nazarites of God with whores, like Samson; husbands to behold the nights of their own wives [given over] to lovers, like Abraham; a married man to be mingled with two german sisters [full sisters], like Jacob; rulers of the peoples, and those most inspired *(entheos)* voices, like David and Salomon, to wallow with harlots by thousands and by hundreds: and many other examples of like foulness, which it would be long to enumerate. [2]

7. The old testament also narrates many fabulous and fabricated things, which shall be told by us in their own place; on account of which Paul, not unjustly, calls the old scriptures profane, and old-wives' fables, and foolish genealogies. For concerning these he said to Timothy: "Avoid **PROFANE** *(Prophanas)* and old-wives' fables." And again: "**Attend NOT** *(Ne intendas)* to Jewish fables, and interminable genealogies, which furnish questions rather than the edification which is in faith; as certain [men], wishing to be doctors of the law." And again: "Avoid **FOOLISH** *(Stultas)* and undisciplined questions, knowing that they beget strifes." And, writing the same things to Titus, he says: "Avoid **QUESTIONS** *(Quaestiones)* and genealogies and contentions: for they are useless and vain." All which things are said by Paul concerning the utterances of the law and the prophets. [3]

8. To these is added, that the old testament is so hostile and repugnant to the new testament that the two cannot come together into one. And indeed, first, in Genesis it is written that God by himself made heaven and earth; but in John it is written that the world was made through our Lord Jesus Christ, where it is said: "**And** the world was made through him." In Genesis it is read: "The Lord **rested** *(Quievit)* on the seventh day from every work which he had wrought"; but in the gospel, on the contrary, Christ says: "**My Father** *(Pater meus)* worketh until now." In Genesis it is written: "**Let us make** *(Faciamus)* man to our image and likeness"; but Christ says to the Jews: "**You** *(Vos)* are of your father the devil" — yet they cannot be sons of the devil [and] made to the image and likeness of God. The old testament forbids separation from a wife, saying: "**Therefore** *(Ideo)* shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh"; the contrary of which Christ persuades, saying: "**There is no one** *(Nemo est)* who

leaveth wife and children for the kingdom of the heavens, who shall not receive much more in this time, and in the world to come life eternal." In Exodus it is said: "**Honor** *(Honora)* thy father and thy mother"; but Christ, to him who wished to perform the office of burial for his father, commands the contrary, saying: "**Let** the dead *(Sine mortuos)* bury their own dead." In the old testament it is said that God was seen by Jacob, by Moses, and by many others, face to face; but on the contrary in the gospel it is said: "**God** no man hath seen *(Deum nemo vidit)* at any time." The old testament describes God as hating the evil and avenging sins, when it says: "**I God** *(Ego Deus)*, a Zealot, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the sons unto the third and fourth generation, upon those who hate me"; but Christ asserts him to be benign upon the evil, when he says: "**Who** *(Qui)* is benign upon the good and the evil." And he himself commands that we forgive a sinning brother, not only seven times, but seventy times seven. The old testament commands vengeance, saying: "**An eye** for an eye *(Oculum pro oculo)*, a tooth for a tooth"; but Christ, in the gospel, destroying this precept, says: "**You have heard** *(Audistis)* that it was said to the ancients, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you, resist not evil; and if any one strike thee on one cheek, offer him also the other." Out of which, and other things like to these, in which the old scriptures fight with the new, it becomes manifest that not unjustly is the old testament disdained by us as contrary to the new testament. [4]

9. They exhort us moreover to the reprobation of the old testament, no less the Evangelical and Apostolic exhortations than [their] examples — but especially the example of the Apostles; who, lest they should be pressed any longer by the intolerable servitude of the old testament, although they were Jews and born under the old testament, nevertheless shook off its yoke. But we, on the contrary, having obtained by the benefit of nature that we should not be born under the law of servitude — Christ forthwith meeting us with the full gift of liberty — how wretched and foolish shall we be, and moreover ungrateful, if of our own accord we addict ourselves to servitude? Indeed Paul thereupon rebukes the Galatians, that, relapsing into circumcision, they went back to the weak and needy elements, which they wished to serve anew. How therefore shall we admit in ourselves that for which we see others reprehended? It is base, certainly, to go into servitude; but baser to return. [5]

10. Frequent, finally, are the admonitions of Christ and of his Apostles that admonish us of the same. "**No one**," says Christ, "seweth a new patch to an old garment, otherwise a greater rent is made; neither doth he entrust new wine to old, musty *(veternosis)* wineskins" — intimating that Christian newness is not to be mixed with Hebrew oldness. For since it is sordid, when one is clad in new garments, not to give the old garments to inferiors, therefore he admonished us to leave the old vestment — that is, the old testament — to the Jews as to the lowest servants, and likewise the law; and he compared the prophets to dried-up and inveterate trees, saying: "**The Law and the Prophets** [were] until John" — namely, that, according to Paul, he might show us that everything which grows old and ages is nigh to destruction [6]

[1] Deut. 18 (Deut. 18).

[2] Faustus, in Augustine, book 32, ch. 4 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 32. cap. 4); Gen. 38; Gen. 19; Osee 1; Judges 14; Gen. 12; Gen. 20; 2 Kings [Samuel] 11; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (Gen. 38; Gen. 19; Ose. 1; Iud. 14; Gen. 12; Gen. 20; 2. Reg. 11; 3. Reg. 11).

[3] Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 1 (Lib. 2. co. adu. legis c. 1); 1 Tim. 4; 1 Tim. 1; 2 Tim. 2; Titus 3 (1. Tim. 4; 1. Tim. 1; 2. Tim. 2; Tit. 3).

[4] From Augustine against Adimantus (Ex Aug. co. Adimantum); Gen. 1; John 1; Gen. 2; John 5; Gen. 1; John 8; Gen. 2; Luke 18; Exod. 20; John 1; Gen. 32; John 1; Exod. 20; Luke 6; Matt. 18; Exod. 21; Matt. 5.

[5] Faustus, in Augustine, book 9, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 9. c. 1); Acts 1 (Act. 1); Faustus, in Augustine, book 8, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 8. c. 1); Gal. 4 (Gal. 4).

[6] Faustus, in Augustine, book 8, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 8. c. 1); Marcion, in Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 4 (Marcio apud Epiph. lib. 1. her. 4); Matt. 9 (Matth. 9); Manes, in Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Manes apud Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66); Luke 16 (Luc. 16); Heb. 8 (Heb. 8); 2 Cor. 3 (2. Cor. 3).

(printed p. 624 [PDF p. 629] — Heresy I: objection 10 concluded; then the DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS begins (refutations 1–4).)

to be [nigh to destruction]. And Paul, for this cause, called the old testament the "ministration of death," when he said: "The **MINISTRATION** *(Ministratio)* of death, or the testament of death, formed in letters upon stones" — so that we should shun that [testament] no otherwise than [as a thing] put forth by the author of death; knowing that that law (as the same [Paul] says in another place) is not set for the just, but for parricides, matricides, and perjurers — but not for those who live justly in Christ. [1]

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS *(Dissolutio Obiectorum)*

1. If the rash heretics had commemorated, particularly and expressly, in those things which with unbridled tongue they utter against the good God, when, how, and in what place these things were done by God himself, we should indeed refute [them] likewise particularly and member by member, responding to the several [points]. But now, since they themselves touch upon certain things universally, as it were fleeing [glancingly], we too respond generally and universally. We say that the evil concupiscences are not from the God of the old testament. For how should he inject concupiscence who says: "Thou shalt **NOT covet** *(Non concupisces)* the things which are thy neighbor's, nor his wife, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor whatsoever are thy neighbor's"? If therefore he takes away concupiscence, he is not a supplier of concupiscence. But if he hardens and blinds the minds of some, he is not therefore to be called evil; otherwise Christ also would be evil, who says: "**For judgment** *(In iudicium)* I came into this world, that they who see not may see, and they who see may become blind." He therefore, who — according to the apostolic sentence — has mercy on whom he will, and hardens whom he will, without doubt illuminates whom he will, and blinds whom he will. But there is no iniquity with God, to whom the Church says: "**Mercy** *(Misericordiam)* and judgment I will sing to thee, O Lord." He illuminates, therefore, by mercy; he blinds by judgment — most equitable, though most hidden; for inscrutable are his judgments; to whom nevertheless it is said: "**Thou hast sat** *(Sedisti)* upon the throne, who judgest justice." But when those wretched [men] say, "How is the God of the Hebrews good, who commands thefts?" — the vain men know not that with God nothing perishes, and that his judgment is just, and that God "is not led by the nose" *(naso non suspenditur)*, as the Egyptians thought, who wished the Jews to have labored without wages — and that indeed not for a few years, but for two hundred and fifteen years. It was equitable, therefore, before God and men, that a reward should at the last be rendered to them. And for this cause the just God commanded his own [people] to plunder the Egyptians, and to go out thence with the spoils; and for the same cause [he ordained] most just slaughters, and havoc as great among his own as among strangers, so that no crime of any sinner of his own should remain unavenged. But, they say, "How is the God of the law good, who glories that he gave to his own precepts not good?" — and the most unskilled scoundrels *(nebulones)* do not perceive those vital and holy precepts of the old law, of which Paul said: "The **LAW** indeed [is] holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good" — [and that they are] for this reason called "not good," not because in themselves they are evil, but because, a comparison being made of them with evangelical perfection, they are less good, and in a certain manner evil: by the usual mode of speech of divine scripture, namely, which frequently is wont to call those things which are less good, not only "not good," but even "evil"; just as Christ [called] so many good men, who were in the world, — by intuition of the divine goodness — [and] denies them to be good, saying: "**No one** *(Nemo)* is good, but God alone"; and just as the apostles, who by the merit of election excelled the goodness of the human race in many ways, [yet] compared to the goodness of God are called evil — the Lord saying to them: "**If you** *(Si vos)*, being evil, know how to give good things to your sons, how much more shall your father from heaven give the good spirit to those asking him?" The Apostle also thus affirms that the glory of the law was blunted by the light of the new testament, so that — by comparison with the evangelical splendor — he pronounces it not to have been glorified, saying: "For **neither** *(Nam nec)* is that glorious which was glorified, by reason of the excelling glory." Good, therefore, and holy, and just is the God, the testator of the old testament. [2]

2. Whose testament, indeed, we do not receive for this reason — that our hope should be fixed in the promise of temporal things — since we do not even believe those saints of that time, and spiritual men, the patriarchs

and prophets, to have been given over to these earthly things. For we have heard a prophet casting away such felicity, and singing that one must flee for refuge to the one Lord: "**Deliver** *(Erue)* me from the hand of the sons of strangers, whose sons are as new plantings established in their youth; their daughters set round about, and adorned as the likeness of a temple; their storehouses full, bursting out from this into that; their sheep fruitful, their oxen fat; there is no ruin of the wall, nor passage, nor cry in their streets. They have called the people blessed to whom these things are." Which felicity David, deriding, forthwith on the contrary added: "**Blessed** *(Beatus)* is the people whose Lord is its God." But just as those old fathers understood, in these promises — the Spirit revealing [it] — the future things which were being foretold through those very [temporal goods], and on this account were kindled to the desire of the new testament: so we also, knowing that the things which were signified through them have been completed in us, for this cause venerate and receive the memory of the old testament as [it were] the promise of our present felicity. [3]

3. Not, therefore, do we hold his scriptures for obtaining that earthly inheritance, but we receive [them] for understanding in them the promises of the new testament; for the testification of the old reconciles faith to the new. For we know that the promises of temporal things are contained in the old testament, and that for this reason it is called the "old testament"; and [we know] that the promise of eternal life, and the kingdom of the heavens, pertains to the new testament — but that in those temporal [things] there were figures of things to come. In which manner, indeed, Paul taught that the old testament is to be received by us, when he says: "**All** *(Omnia)* things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our sake, upon whom the ends of the ages are come." [4]

4. Neither is there danger that a Jew should rightly upbraid me. For to him saying, "Why holdest thou the old testament, whose precepts thou keepest not?" I will answer, that in those books there are two kinds of precepts: precepts, namely, for signifying life [the life to come], and precepts for acting out life [the moral life to be lived]; of which the latter are now observed by Christians, but the former were then rightly observed by the Jews, when they foretold those things which now have been revealed. But now, after the Light — Christ — has come, [it is] superfluous [that they should be observed] by us [5]

[1] 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1).

[2] Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66); Exod. 20; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law and the prophets, ch. 8 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. leg. & proph. cap. 8); John 9; Rom. 9; Psalm 100; Rom. 11; Psalm 9; Epiphanius, in the book Anchoratus (Epiph. in lib. Anchorato); Exod. 21; Ezek. 20; John Cassian, Conference 23, ch. 4 (Ioan. Cassia. col. 23. cap. 4); Rom. 7; Luke 18; Matt. 7; 2 Cor. 3.

[3] Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2, and against Adimantus, ch. 18 and 20 (Aug. lib. 4. con. Faust. c. 2. & con. Adiman. cap. 18. & 20); Psalm 143.

[4] Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Aug. li. 4. co. Faustus c. 2); 1 Cor. 10 (1. Cor. 10).

[5] Augustine against Faustus, book 10, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 10. cap. 2).

(printed p. 625 [PDF p. 630] — Heresy I: Dissolution of the Objections continues (refutations 4 concluded through 8 begun).)

[it would be superfluous] that those shadows should be observed by us. Nevertheless we hold them — not for religion, but for testification; just as we also hold the carnal promises which are contained in them, since through them the spiritual things to be hoped-for by us have been revealed.

5. But they say: what need is there of the old testament for the certitude of our faith, in which there is no testimony of Christ? For what is written in Deuteronomy pertains not to Christ, because Christ is not like to Moses. To these [objections] we thus meet [them]: that which is called "like" is not understood [to be] like in every part and manner. For not only those things which are of one and the same nature are said to be like among themselves — as olive to olive — but also those which are of disparate nature, as olive to wild-olive *(oleaster)*, and spelt *(far)* to wheat. So also the Son of God, who is so far distant from mortal things, is called in the scriptures "Lamb" and "Lion"; as in John it is read, "**Behold** *(Ecce)* the lamb of God," and in Paul, "The **rock** *(Petra)* was Christ" — which [names] they by no means would have spoken, unless Christ took

upon himself some likeness with those [things]. Since therefore Christ was made like to a sheep, what wonder if he disdained not to be made like to Moses, who was unlike to Moses? Like, indeed, because man; unlike, because God: like, because made in the likeness of the flesh of sin; unlike, because holy and without sin: like, because born of a woman; unlike, because born of the Holy Spirit: like, because by true death he died upon the mountain; unlike, because he died not on account of his own sins, but by his own power: like, because — his God being offended on account of the crimes of men — he bore the offenses of the human race, dying in his own body; unlike, because it was not — [his] God being offended — on account of his own fault that he died. [1]

6. To those things which the most impure heretics vituperate in the lives of the patriarchs and prophets, we respond, that although — out of those vices which are narrated concerning the fathers in the old testament — it be conceded that certain [of them] were grave crimes, not on that account is the authority of scripture diminished; nay rather, it is the more commended to us, that it not rashly, but for most just causes, wisely narrates such vices — namely, that by the consideration of them we may obtain these four [things]: to wit, the instruction of faith, fear, and hope. First, faith: that we should doubt nothing of the truth of that history, seeing that it — as the brightness of a faithful mirror [reflecting] the persons brought before it — indicates not only those which are fair and whole, but also those which are deformed and vicious; and it excepts no person to be flattered, but the deeds of men, as much to be praised as to be blamed, it either itself judges, or proposes to be judged by the readers; nor only intimating the men themselves as either laudable or blameworthy, but also not keeping silent certain things praiseworthy in the blameworthy, and certain things blameworthy in the praiseworthy. Secondly, it refers the vices of the fathers to our instruction — not indeed that we should imitate and follow them, but that we may know those things to be shunned and fled which the scripture blames. Thirdly, to fear: that the fall of the greater should be the fear of the lesser. For if those so holy men the pernicious blandishments of this world overcame, how much more is it to be feared by us, [who are] weaker? Fourthly, to the consolation of hope: that we may learn, in such lapses, that salvation is not to be despaired of; for certain [persons], having fallen into sins, sin the more by desperation, and not only neglect the medicine of repenting, but, for the fulfilling of dishonest and nefarious desires, become slaves of lusts and of wicked cupidities, as if they would lose [their labor] if they did not do what lust tracks out — whereas already a certain damnation awaits them. Against this exceedingly perilous and destructive manner [of sinning], the commemoration of the sins into which the just and holy [men] fell is of avail. [2]

7. But as to what pertains to the fables which the impious confirm from the testimony of Paul — who, [understanding it] thus, unless a much-blinded heretic, would err? Why did the Apostle himself not do this, if he judged these to be old-wives' fables? Why, writing to the same Timothy, does he say: "**We know** *(Scimus)* that the law is good, if any one use it lawfully"? And why does he command the same [Timothy] to remain in the sacred letters which he had learned from infancy, [they] instructing unto salvation through faith? But let those insane [men] know that the Jews have, besides scripture, certain traditions called δευτέρωσιν *(deuterosin)* [the "repetition," the Mishnah], in which they hand down that God at first created two women for the [first] man, out of whom they weave various genealogies, contending that some descended from the one, others from the other woman. Concerning which traditions, when once the Pharisees interrogated Christ, saying, "**Why** *(Quare)* do thy disciples not walk according to the traditions of the elders?" they were refuted by him, saying: "Why do you also transgress the commandment of God for your traditions?" Which words the divine Epiphanius, expounding, said that those traditions are four kinds of expositions which are among the Jews: of which one is borne under the name of Moses; the second is [that of] Rabbi Aciba; the third [that of] Adda, or Juda; the fourth [that] of the sons of Asamonaeus [the Hasmoneans]. Concerning which — and also concerning the genealogies of the Jews and the Talmudic questions condemned by Paul — Annius, most skilled in antiquities, wrote some things worthy to be known, in the commentaries on the Chronography of Philo; to whom, for brevity's sake, we send the reader eager for this knowledge, passing on to those places which the Manichaeans adduce out of both testaments as [things] fighting among themselves. [3]

8. Whose contradiction — because it is placed in words alone — is dissolved with easy effort. The **first** opposition, therefore, which looks to the exordium of Genesis, is removed in three ways. First, when it is said, "**In the beginning** *(In principio)* God created heaven and earth," by "God" is signified the Trinity, in which not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit, are understood. Secondly, when in the same place it is written, "God said, Let there be light; and light was made," it is necessary that we understand God to have made, through the Word, that which he made; but the Word of the Father is the Son. Thirdly, if for this reason the Son is not there understood — because it is not said that God made the world through the Son — neither in the gospel does God through the Son feed the birds and clothe the lilies, and the other innumerable things which Christ says the Father does, although he does not say that he does them through the Son. The **second** contradiction is removed, because it is not written that God rested from all his works so that thereafter he should work nothing whatsoever, but that he rested from all the works which he had then made — that is, from instituting the natures of things — so that he should no longer make the world [anew]; from which work, after [its] perfection, he had ceased: but in administering [governing] the world [he works] many [things] [4]

[1] Augustine against Faustus, book 16, ch. 15 (Aug. co. Faust. li. 16. cap. 15); Deut. 18; John 1; 1 Cor. 10.

[2] Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 60 (Aug. li. 22. co. Faust. c. 60); Augustine against Faustus, book 22, ch. 65 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 22. c. 65); Augustine, book of 50 homilies, homily 21 (Aug. lib. 50. hom. 21); Augustine, book On Nature and Grace, ch. 35 (Aug. lib. de nat. & grat. cap. 35).

[3] Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 1. con. adu. leg. cap. 1); 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1); 2 Tim. 3 (2. Tim. 3); Mark 7 (Mar. 7); Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66).

[4] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 1 (Aug. con. Adiman. ca. 1); Gen. 1; Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 2 (Aug. cot. Adiman. cap. 2).

(printed p. 626 [PDF p. 631] — Heresy I concluded: Dissolution of the Objections, the resolution of the scriptural "contradictions" (third through eighth) and refutations 9 and 10.)

[in administering the world he works] many things, always. And in this work Christ intimated him to be, when he said: "**My Father** *(Pater meus)* worketh until now." [1]

The **third** contradiction also is thus loosed. In three ways, in the scriptures, the name of "sons" is taken: according to nature, as Isaac [is] son of Abraham; according to doctrine, as the Apostle calls "his sons" those who learned the gospel from him; thirdly, according to imitation, as the Apostle calls us "sons of Abraham," because we imitate his faith. The Jews, therefore, by discipline and by imitation are sons of the devil, but by nature sons of God. [2]

The **fourth** is thus removed. When the cause of obtaining the kingdom of the heavens is not present, if any one leave [his] wife, it is disapproved by the Lord; but when the wife impedes the man from the possession of the kingdom of the heavens, then the wife is commanded to be left: because the wife is joined to the man, that together they may merit the kingdom of the heavens. [3]

The **fifth** is settled in the same manner: that on account of the kingdom of the heavens we should honor [our] parents, and the same [parents] — when it shall be needful, on account of the announcing of the kingdom of God — we should contemn. For the love of parents is a certain step to the love of God; whereby it is manifest that the honor of parents in its own degree is to be kept, and yet that they, in comparison with the divine love — especially if they are an impediment — are with no doubt to be contemned. [4]

The **sixth** is thus loosed. When it is said, "**God** *(Deum)* no one hath seen at any time," it is understood of God according to the immutable essence of his divinity, which cannot be seen except by a most purified and most simple heart; but when we read that he was seen, and heard, and spoke to many, we understand this to have been done by him through some visible creature: as in certain places scripture testifies that an angel was seen, where it says that God was seen — as in that wrestling of Jacob, scripture calls him an angel whom Jacob calls God, saying, "**I saw** *(Vidi)* the Lord face to face." And that God, whom Moses said had appeared

to himself in the bush, and on Sinai with the law, Stephen — in the Acts of the Apostles — testifies to have been this same angel. [5]

The **seventh** is settled in this manner. God is a Zealot and benign: benign indeed, as Paul says, when by his benignity and patience he invites the evil to penance; a Zealot, and punishing unto the third and fourth generation, when by his justice he punishes those who — correction being despised — wished to persevere in the same perversity of [their] parents; but indulgent and pardoning he is, not only seven times, but seventy times seven, toward those who — the correction of God being accepted — are reconciled through penance. [6]

The **eighth** is thus reduced to concord. In these two sentences [the "eye for an eye" and "turn the other cheek"] not a contrariety of the testaments is shown, but a diversity of them in perfection. For since there are two degrees of leniency — the first, that the measure of the received injury should in no way exceed the sorrow of the avenger; the second, that one should forgive the whole injury with placated mind — the old testament, as [being] less perfect, constituted carnal men at the first degree, of measuring vengeance; but the new testament, as [being] more perfect, led spiritual men even to the second degree, of complete remission. [7]

9. But concerning the example of the apostles renouncing the legal precepts, we say that they did not fall away from those precepts for signifying the life [to come] according to faith — as though they did not believe them to have been figures of things to come — but that they desisted only from the observation of those [precepts] whose shadows had fled away, the evangelical light already coruscating. Neither do we, believing those things, relapse again into servitude: because we do not observe the things which once were commanded to the fathers for the foretelling of us, but in liberty we read the things which were written for the confirming of us. But Paul rebukes the Galatians, not as [men] reading the scripture of circumcision religiously, but as [men] wishing to be circumcised superstitiously. [8]

10. Neither do those testimonies of Christ and of Paul have any weight. For the new patch, and the old garment, and the new wine, and the old wineskins, do not signify two testaments, but two lives and two hopes. For if any one should think that two hopes are to be had — that he should serve God both on account of earthly felicity and on account of the kingdom of the heavens — this [hope] does not contain that [other]; for when this [earthly hope] shall have been disturbed by some tribulation, the failing man will lose that [heavenly] one also. Thence is that [saying]: "**No one** *(Nemo)* can serve two masters," which Christ expounded, saying: "You **cannot** *(Non potestis)* serve God and mammon." He mixes, therefore, the new patch with the old garment — not [he] who mixes the old testament with the new, but [he] who wishes to have spiritual continence, and has not yet laid aside the carnal hope. But as to what they add — that "the **Law** *(Lex)* and the prophets endured until John" — it is not so to be understood, that after John both are altogether to be cast away; but that the law and the prophets were until John as preparers and fore-announcers of the advent of Christ, which [advent] coming, their preparation and fore-announcing ceases. Yet both remain for the confirmation of the fore-announced things, that we may know the advent of Christ to have been foretold by them, by divine disposition, long before it came to pass. They remain also for the conserving of the gratitude of our mind, that we may render thanks to those who foretold to us so happy an advent of Christ. For just as, if any one should have a pedagogue (as also the Apostle says that the law was a pedagogue to us unto the advent of Christ), when he shall have come to [full] age and shall have received a teacher, he does not altogether reject the pedagogue as an enemy: so we also, since we were led [as children] in the law and the prophets until the advent of the teacher Christ, the teacher being found, do not reprobate the pedagogue, but confess gratitude to him, that he led our childhood [along], and dismissed [us] to more perfect disciplines. There remains, therefore, the law — which Paul for this reason says is not set for the just: because it is not against the just, inasmuch as the just [man] has already anticipated to fulfill the things which are of the law; but it is set for the unjust, that is, against the unjust, unto condemnation; and on this account [it is] called "the testament of death" — not because it was given by the author of death, but because it commands death to be given to homicides, adulterers, and the transgressors of its precepts. For thus it was fitting that the testament

of death should go before, so that, first being dead to sins, we might live to justice. [9]

[1] John 5 (Ioan. 5).
[2] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 5 (Aug. cot. Adiman. cap. 5).
[3] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 3 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 3).
[4] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 6 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 6).
[5] Against Adimantus, ch. 9 (Con. Adim. cap. 9); Gen. 32; Exod. 3; Acts 7 (Act. 7).
[6] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 7 (Aug. co. Ad. cap. 7); Rom. 2.
[7] Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 8 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 8).
[8] Augustine against Faustus, book 9, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 9. c. 2).
[9] Augustine against Faustus, book 12, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 12. cap. 2); Mark 9 (Mar. 9); Matt. 6; Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66); Luke 16; 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1).

(printed p. 627 [PDF p. 632] — Heresy II opens: title, heresy statement, Assertores, and the beginning of the Impugnatio.)

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy II *(De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis II)*

That in the Old scriptures, which the Church now holds, many things have been falsified — as much by the Jews as by the Christians — and that many things also have partly been super-added, and partly been subtracted.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This most pestilent error the more recent Anabaptists profess in our age; with whom, in the same error, consent the Servetans — so called from a certain impious Michael Servetus, a Spaniard, whom, in the year 1554 *(so printed "M.D.LIIII"; Servetus was in fact burned in 1553)*, on account of his execrable heresies, those same Lutherans burned by public fire in the city of the Allobroges, Geneva — [those Lutherans] who [nonetheless] contend that heretics, however pertinacious, are by no reason to be killed. These Servetans, therefore, since they know that many testimonies concerning the divinity of CHRIST and the holy Trinity (which they themselves deny) are written in the old testament, and those [testimonies] so open that they cannot be eluded, say that those testimonies were vitiated [corrupted] by the "Trinitarians" — for so those impious [men], by way of contempt, call the Catholic assertors of the Trinity.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

It cannot be said that the divine scriptures of the Old instrument were falsified by the malignity either of the Jews or of the Christians. For if we should say that they were corrupted by the Jews, then it is deservedly asked (says Origen) whether the Jews corrupted them before the advent of Christ, or after his advent. If before, then surely Christ and the Apostles — who accuse the scribes and Pharisees of the other crimes — would never have kept silent about this crime, which was the greatest; nor would Christ have sent his hearers to them, saying, "**Upon** *(Super)* the chair of Moses have sat the Scribes and Pharisees: whatsoever they shall say to you, do" — if he had known them to bring forth falsehoods from the chair of the Mosaic reading. But if any one should say that, after the advent of the Lord Savior and the preaching of the apostles, those books were falsified by the Hebrews, I shall not be able to hold my laughter *(cachinnum)*: that the Savior, and the Evangelists, and the Apostles brought forth [their] testimonies just as the Jews were afterward going to falsify [them]! [1] And if any one should say that those books were depraved by the Christians after Christ, Augustine responds that it was done by divine providence that not all the Jews were killed, but dispersed through the world by the power of God, so that from their intact volumes we might be able to recognize that ours are not falsified. And lest the Jews themselves should be able to hide those books from us, or to show [them as if] corrupted, God — two hundred and fifty years before the advent of Christ — inspired Ptolemy

Philadelphus, king of Alexandria, to take care that those scriptures should be translated by the seventy renowned interpreters of the Hebrews; and, through Demetrius, the prefect of the Library, [inspired] that [the volumes], together with the Hebrew exemplars, should be placed in his Library and diligently kept: which volumes, together with the Hebrew [2] exemplars, Tertullian in the Apologetic testifies to have been, down to his own times, in the same Library, and frequently read by the Jews, and by them judged most faithful. Neither can any prudent [man] believe that the Jews — dispersed in codices so many, and so far and wide — should have come together into one [conspiracy] out of whatsoever perversity and malice, and, by hatred of the Christians, should have conspired in the corruption of their own volumes; namely, so that, while they envied to others the truth of scripture, they should deprive themselves of the truth. Who, even if they had wished to do this by unanimous consent, [it] can be persuaded to no one that Christ our Savior would have permitted so grave a crime by the hands of the enemies of his Church — lest the Church, founded in the truth of his word, should receive so great a detriment of the truth from her own enemies, and be held in the perpetual error of deception, embracing false things for true. Nor even is it credible that God would have wished to deny to the Church of his beloved Son, after the advent of Christ, that which — before his advent — he had conceded to the Synagogue of the Hebrews: namely, that no one should dare to add to, or take away from, his scriptures — evident miracles being also applied against those who presumed to attempt it. [3] For we read, in Aristeas and Josephus, that certain illustrious men, for this cause, were long afflicted with an adverse state of mind and a languor of body — as Theodorus [Theodectes] and Theopompus: of whom that one, the writer of tragedies, when he wished to refer some things out of the Jewish scripture, in [his own] words, into a certain fable, was deprived of the [light of his] eyes; but this other [Theopompus], when he had begun to translate something out of the divine law into the Greek tongue, was struck by a certain disturbance of mind and soul: whence afterwards, greatly praying to God [to know] why this had befallen him, he received answer through a dream, that he had defiled the divine scriptures. [4]

To these are added so many labors and vigils of the most ancient fathers of the Church, who by unwearied studies applied themselves that they might leave to us the Hebrew scriptures free from all falsification and from the suspicion of vice — having for this cause bought, at great expense, the most ancient and most emended codices, with which they might compare our exemplars, and, having collated them, might translate [them], emend [them], and expound [them]; lest thereafter the infidels and heretics should be able to reprehend us concerning the falsity of the old scriptures. For "God knows" (says Jerome) "that I have sweated in the erudition of a foreign tongue, lest the Jews should any longer insult his churches concerning the falsity of the scriptures." But if any one should again insist that the old books, which we now use, were falsified after the age of those fathers, we shall respond that this would have been to be feared, were it not that the people of the Jews is widely scattered and widely known — among whom their own codices have always been kept with such great diligence that they could not be vitiated by the Christians. For the Jews are our porters *(geruli)*, who carry the books for themselves as a burden, but for us for erudition and faith: so that when a doubt shall arise concerning the sincerity of our codices, it may be removed by the incorrupt faith of the Hebrew volumes. Finally, the irrefragable and perpetual consensus of all the fathers in the reading of the Old Testament takes away every scruple of falsification: for thus, through all the successions of times, the writers and doctors succeeding one another in turn, the old [5]

[1] Origen, book 8 of the commentary on Isaiah (Orig. lib. 8. com. in Esa); Jerome, book 3 of the commentary on Isaiah (Hier. lib. 3. com. in Esai); Matt. 23.

[2] Augustine on Psalm 58 (Aug. in Psal. 58); Eusebius, book 8 of the Evangelical Preparation (Eus. li. 8. Ev. praep.).

[3] Tertullian in the Apologetic, ch. 18 and 19 (Tertul. in Apolog. cap. 18. & 19); Augustine, book 15 of the City of God, ch. 13 (Aug. lib. 15. de ci. Dei ca. 13); Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. li. 33. co. Faustus c. 6).

[4] Augustine, book 2 of On Christian Doctrine, ch. 14 (Aug. li. 2. de doct. Christ. c. 14); Aristeas, in the book on the Seventy interpreters (Aristeas in libr. de LXX interp.); Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 1 (Iosephus l. 11. ant. cap. 1).

[5] Jerome in the preface to Isaiah (Hie. in praef. Esaiae); Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 10 and ch. 14 (Augu. lib. 13. co. Fau. c. 10. & cap. 14).

(printed p. 628 [PDF p. 633] — Heresy II: the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (1–3, objection 3 running on to the next page).)

[the writers and doctors, succeeding one another in turn,] read the old books just as we now read [them], and always cited the same sentences, and with the same words, which we now use in our codices — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. From these, therefore, and from very many other [things] which, on this argument, we set down in the preceding volume [Book VII], in the confutation of the first heresy, the scriptures of the Old instrument are freed from all suspicion of falsification.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. That for many ages now — as much among the Christians as among the Hebrews — the scriptures of the old instrument have been corrupted, and on that account [are] various, and even dissonant among themselves, is convinced from the multitude of the mutually discrepant translations of the old testament. For there are the translations of the Seventy interpreters, and of Aquila, and of Symmachus, and of Theodotion; and, besides these, three others, which are called the Fifth, the Sixth, and the Seventh; and after these also an Eighth, which is believed [to be] of Jerome — so various among themselves, and conflicting, that one of these contains more [things], another fewer, another diverse [things] and perversely transposed, another things contrary not only in words but also in the senses pertaining to faith, and things repugnant to the other editions: which indeed is by no means to be believed to have happened by the fault of so many most erudite interpreters, but rather to have befallen out of the diverse variety of the Hebrew exemplars. But since a dissonant variety never subsists without falsity, it is consequent that the Hebrew codices — whence so manifold a discord of the interpreters arose — were not only various, but even vitiated and falsified.

2. This also argues that the context of the old testament was, by the succession of times, changed from its ancient sincerity: that in the Hebrew codices of our age all the narration of scripture, from beginning even to end, is extended in prose alone; nor in them does there scarcely remain even one of the so many songs *(carmina)* with which many old books are handed down to have been written. For Jerome testifies — in the preface to the Chronicle of Eusebius, in the preface to the book of Kings, and in the preface to Isaiah — that very many Psalms, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and many other [things] of diverse kind of meter, are contained in them. And in the preface to the book of Job he writes that the same book is composed in hexameter verses, running by dactyl and spondee, intermingled sometimes with certain ringing and sweet rhythms; and that there are, in the sacred volumes, various kinds of songs, such as are in the poems of our Virgil and Horace, and of the Greek Pindar and Alcaeus — of which [kinds] the Psalter, and the Lamentations, and almost all the canticles of the scriptures consist. The same [Jerome], writing to Paula of the City [Paula Urbica], adds that the last part of the book of Proverbs is closed with an alphabet [acrostic], which is reckoned by iambic tetrameter; but the Lamentations, with a fourfold alphabet, of which the second, third, and fourth are written in Sapphic meter, out of three little verses, always with a heroic comma [clausula], or concluded by an Adonic [colon]. Eusebius likewise, of Caesarea, in book 10 of the Evangelical Preparation, affirms that there are found in the old testament most artful songs — as the great Canticle of Moses, and David's hundred-and-eighteenth Psalm, composed in heroic verse, and many other songs, trimeter and tetrameter, most elegantly [1] composed, as far as pertains to diction. Josephus also, in the second book of the Hebrew Antiquities, writes that Moses, after the passage of the Erythraean [Red] Sea, sang that canticle which now exists, in hexameter verse. But now, in the Hebrew volumes, not even any vestige of this kind appears — whether of heroic or of lyric verses. And, to be silent about the other songs, in the whole old testament you will not find one hexameter woven together after the manner of the Latins or the Greeks, by dactyl and spondee; nor will you find two cola similarly [arranged], which are closed according to the custom of rhythm, either by an equal number of syllables, or by the same termination of the final syllable. Which, since they are none [such] in our exemplars, it remains that we say that the context of the old books, and the

face of the whole narration, was changed, and that ancient sublimity of songs brought down into this humility of prose.

3. It makes to this [argument] also the testimony of some of the Latins, of the Greeks, and of illustrious Hebrew authors, who affirm that the Hebrew codices were of old depraved by the Hebrews themselves. Of whose number Justin the Philosopher and Martyr — a thousand four hundred years ago — writing against Trypho, shows that the Jews, in hatred of Christ, cut away and took away many prophetic testimonies from the holy scriptures. Origen, in Homily 12 on Jeremiah, writes that the Jews falsified their own exemplars, especially in the book of Jeremiah, where, for that which was read, "The **sin** *(Peccatum)* of Juda is written," etc., they themselves — unwilling to confess themselves sinners — put, for "the sin of Juda," "their sin." [2] Jerome also, in the commentaries on the third chapter to the Galatians, expounding that saying, "**Cursed** *(Maledictus)* [is] every one who shall not have remained in all the things which are written in the book of the law," says that in the exemplars of the Hebrews of his time those two words, "ALL" *(Omnis)* and "ALL [things]" *(Omnibus)*, were lacking; and that he held it uncertain whether the Seventy interpreters had added them, or whether in the old Hebrew they were so [present] and afterward were deleted by the Jews; but that he was led into the suspicion of believing those particles to have been removed by the Jews — partly, lest the Hebrews should seem to be under the curse, [as being] not able to keep the things which are written; partly because Paul, a man of Hebrew skill and most learned in the law of the Lord, would never have brought them forth unless they were had in the Hebrew volumes; partly because, in his time, in the Hebrew, in the volumes of the Samaritans, there was found written *chal* [Hebrew כל], which is to be interpreted "ALL" *(Omnes)*, or "ALL [things]" *(Omnibus)*. [3] Similarly, that which is read in Deuteronomy, "**Cursed** *(Maledictus)* by God [is] every one who hangeth upon a tree," Jerome judges to have been falsified in the same place by the Hebrews — unto the ignominy of Christ, as much in the Hebrew as in our codices — two particles being interposed, "BY GOD" *(A Deo)* and "EVERY ONE" *(Omnis)*: namely, that they might brand infamy upon the Christians, who would believe in Christ [as] cursed by God. Of which thing Jerome brought no slight indication: that in the old testament in no place is it written that any one is cursed by God; and wherever a curse *(maledictio)* is placed, never is the name of God found joined [to it]. Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, likewise, bishop, in the preface of his enarrations on the psalms, writes that the Hebrews, Arabs, and Chaldees did not of old have either vowels or points in their letters [4]

[1] ch. 8 (Cap. 8); Deut. 32.
[2] Book 4, ch. 12 (Lib. 4. c. 12).
[3] Gal. 3.
[4] Deut. 27 (Deut. 27 — so printed; the "cursed is he that hangeth on a tree" is Deut. 21:23).

(printed p. 629 [PDF p. 634] — Heresy II: objections 3 concluded and 4 (the "Tikkun Sopherim" argument, with Hebrew examples); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins.)

[the Hebrews, Arabs, and Chaldees did not of old have vowels or points in their letters,] but [that] all sacred scripture was written by Esdras [Ezra] without vowels and without points; but that the Rabbis of the Jews, after the conversion of Constantine the Great, in place of the vowels invented points, and, according to their own human senses, perverted sacred scripture — and this especially in those places where manifest mysteries lay hidden, either concerning Christ or concerning the Church. Whence he also concludes that no faith is to be given to the scriptures of the Hebrews [as] thus written by points, and interpreted.

4. But what need is there of external testimonies, when the Hebrews themselves spontaneously confess that their volumes have now, for many ages, been corrupted? — that is, from the very destruction of the city of Jerusalem, but especially when Nabuzardan [Nebuzaradan], prefect of the king of the Assyrians (as is had in the fourth [book] of the volume of Kings), set fire to the house of the Lord, and the house of the king, and burned all the houses of Jerusalem: then those sacred and authentic volumes, which were kept in public

places, were all consumed by the fire, nor could they ever afterward be restored to their pristine sincerity — although many endeavored to do this, certain particular codices, which had remained among some of uncertain authority, being collated together with one another. [1] Witnesses of this thing are very many of the Rabbis, and among others David Kimhi *(Kimki)*, whose opinion a great number of the Rabbis follows. He, in the exposition of the third book of Kings, and in the preface to the Prophets, thus speaks: "In the first captivity the exemplars were corrupted, and they drew out [readings] from one exemplar thus, and from another otherwise. And where they could not clearly have the [right] sense, they wrote one word *(dictionem)* within the context, and another at the margin. The exemplars also perished, and were pulled apart; and, the wise men dying who held the sense of scripture, these who were of the great synagogue endeavored to restore the law to its own antiquity; and, finding dissensions in the exemplars, they gave faith to the more numerous exemplars agreeing [together]. But where they could not have clear cognition, they wrote one word without points, or wrote [it] in the margin and not within the context." [2] These [things] R. David [Kimhi]. But the Thalmudists, almost all, in the Thalmudic books frequently make mention of a certain correction of the old testament, which of old their Rabbis used in emending the text of holy scripture — which תיקון סופרים *(Tikun sophrim)*, that is, "the Correction of the wise scribes," they call [it]; according to which the scribes, even before Christ was born, changed certain things in the books of the law and the prophets — now distinguishing the scripture by certain points, now placing other [words] in the margins, which, in place of those that were written in the context, might, for the sake of urbanity and modesty, be read more honestly and more decently: as, for *coire cum concubina* [to lie with a concubine], "*iacere cum illa*" [to lie with her]; and, for "human dung" *(humano stercore)*, "evacuation" *(egestionem)*. For the sake of which thing, sometimes also that which was written by the prophet they, erasing, put in its place that which they themselves judged more decorous for scripture. Whence it came to pass that a sense far diverse from the Prophet's meaning emerged. Of which thing the witness is Prochetus [Porchetus], a most diligent observer of the Hebrew volumes, in the first book of the *Victory against the Hebrews*, indicating that of old, at the foot *(in calce)* of the first chapter of Malachi, was written אותי *('othi)*, that is, "me"; in whose place the scribes substituted אותו *('otho)*, that is, "him," or "that one" — from which it follows that where we now read, according to the correction of the scribes, "**Behold**, [ye have brought] of your labor, and you have blown *it* away" *(Ecce de labore vestro, & exufflastis illum)*, there it was once said by the prophet, "**Behold**, of your labor, and you have blown *me* away, saith the Lord" *(Ecce de labore vestro, & exufflastis me, dicit dominus)* — or "you have afflicted, vexed, or made *me* to expire, saith the Lord." [3] Similarly, that which we now read in Micah, first chapter, "**In** the house of dust, sprinkle yourselves with dust" *(In domo pulveris, pulvere aspergite vos)*, "roll thyself" *(involue te)* — according to another translation, this (says R. Scelomo [Shelomo]) is a correction of the scribes, who, making the points, corrected [it], and said חתפלשתי *(chit palascithi)*, that is, "**ROLL YOURSELVES**" *(Involvite)*, where by Micah it had been written ִהתפלש *(hith palasci)*, that is, "**ROLL ME**" *(Involve me)*; for thus in the Prophet it was written: "In the house of dust, sprinkle *me* [with] dust." [4] Likewise, that which we now read in Osee [Hosea], the ninth [chapter], "**In my departure** [from them]" *(In recessu meo)*, or "my departure," or "When I shall have departed from them" — R. Scelomo and R. Kimhi say that it is read [thus] according to the correction of the scribes, namely בשורי מהם *(bessuri mechem)*, that is, "**IN MY DEPARTURE FROM THEM**" *(In recessu meo)* — whereas the true text of the Prophet once had בשורי מהם *(besuri mechem)* [pointed otherwise], that is, "**MY INCARNATION [is] to them**" *(Incarnatio mea eis)*. The sense of which sentences, as we now have [it] according to the text corrected by the scribes, differs greatly from the sense of those sentences which the first [original] scripture once had — in which the Son of God, speaking through those prophets, designated the mystery ("according to you") of [his] future incarnation: [he] whom you now say to have, in the house of dust, sprinkled himself with dust, when he put on the dust of our flesh — [he] whom the Jews afflicted and made to expire. These, and very many other [things], Rabbi Scelomo, R. Kimhi, R. Simon, and R. Iohannam [Yohanan] testify to have been of old corrected by the scribes; whose example of scribes the later Rabbis, imitating, did the same, and persuaded their disciples to do the same — as R. Iohannam, out of the opinion of

R. Simeon, said in the book Ievamoth [the tractate Yevamot]: "It is good that thou pluck out one letter from the law, and [that] ח [*Chet*] be pronounced in public." These [things] Prochetus. From all these [things], therefore, it is manifest that the old books were falsified by the correction — or rather the corruption — of the scribes.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS *(Dissolutio Obiectorum)*

1. So foolish is the hypothesis on which the argument of the Anabaptists leans, that nothing [is] more foolish. For the diversity of translations can arise not from that sole cause which they themselves adduce, but from many others — as from the varied talent *(ingenium)* and judgment of the interpreters, or sometimes [their] inexperience, or negligence, or even malice: by all of which it happens that interpretations of the same scripture frequently differ among themselves, and in many [places]. It can also happen that editions of diverse interpreters, which before agreed among themselves, afterward differ among themselves as much as possible — whether by the carelessness, or ignorance, or fraud of the writers and copyists *(librarii)*, who copied them perversely from emended and sincere exemplars: as, in all the editions of the old testament put forth before the times of Jerome, it came to pass that individual [copies] differed from individual [copies], as much on account of the writers as on account of the variety of the interpreters — from which

[1] ch. 25 [4 (2) Kings 25] (Cap. 25).
[2] ch. 13 (Cap. 13).
[3] ch. 15 (Cap. 15); Mal. 1.
[4] Mal. 1; Micah 1 (Mich. 1).

(printed p. 630 [PDF p. 635] — Heresy II: Dissolution of the Objections, refutations 1 (concluded), 2 (the Hebrew poetic meters), and 3 (begun).)

some prudently, some malignly, some through ignorance, changed many things, or kept silent, or added. Prudently, indeed, the Seventy interpreters kept silent about many things — both lest they should betray the secrets of the faith to the heathen, and give what is holy to dogs; and because they did not fully understand many things, being interpreters before the advent of Christ: and the things which they did not understand, or omitted, or brought forth with doubtful sentences, [they did] so, the divine Spirit working in them, who — for [reason of] time and place — willed the forms of the mysteries to be covered over *(obtectas)* in the scriptures, so that the manifestation of them might be reserved to the Evangelists and apostles, Christ being manifested. But maliciously, indeed, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and very many other Judaizing and heretical translators, permuted, subtracted, and added many things — whose editions the Church of Christ cast away, content with the sole edition of the Seventy interpreters down to the times of Jerome. Many things also, through inexperience and negligence, the drowsy copyists *(librarii)*, copying perversely the things which had been well edited, perverted. Whence, all these causes concurring into one, it came to pass that, from one and the same fountain of Hebrew truth, so great a variety of editions and of codices emanated. Concerning the diversity of these editions — and how and when the Church used them — we shall speak more fully at the end of this work, when we shall treat of the editions of holy scripture. [1]

2. But concerning the diverse kinds of songs *(carmina)*, with which the Anabaptists say that of old very many books of the old instrument were composed — which now among us are read in loosed [prose] speech — either they lie most impudently, or they are most imprudently deceived out of ignorance of Hebrew poesy: just as of old, for a like cause, Julian the apostate deceived himself, accusing Eusebius of Caesarea, [saying] that he had falsely persuaded [men] that many species of songs are found in the holy scriptures. Yet it is nearer the truth that the unskilled heretics are deceived from ignorance. For since they have neither skill of the Hebrew arts, nor have considered the words of Jerome, they think that those hexameters, and trimeters, and tetrameters, which Jerome, Eusebius, and Josephus commemorate, are of the same kind with the songs of

our poets, and consist of the same quality of feet, quantity, and disposition — because Jerome said that among the Hebrews there are verses running by spondee and dactyl: which words the unlearned Anabaptists do not understand. [2] For neither is Jerome's similitude to be understood thus — that the verses of the Hebrews are in all respects like to the songs of the Greeks and Latins — but in this part only: that that very ancient poesy of the Hebrews has, just as ours [does], not only many feet like to ours, apt for making songs (namely dactyls, spondees, iambs, and many others), but also several kinds of songs — hexameter, trimeter, tetrameter, and others of this sort — which proceed with an equal number of feet as our hexameters and trimeters, but differ from ours by the varied quality, position, and order of the feet: because the hexameters of the Hebrews often receive, among the dactyls and spondees, also other feet, the order of the feet in which among us they are wont to be placed being also varied. For frequently (as Jerome says) the hexameters of the Hebrews, [3] on account of the property of the tongue, receive other feet besides the dactyl and the spondee — not of the same syllables, but of the same times [durations]. The Hebrews also, against the custom of our poets, interpose in their songs certain unusual rhythms, which (as Jerome says) the simple reader cannot understand, but only one most skilled in the metric art. Wherefore let not the Anabaptists wonder if in the old testament they have not found rhythms like to ours, and having an equal number of syllables, and recurring [each] into the same final syllable after a certain compass of verses — since not even among us do the several kinds of rhythms retain the same number of syllables and the same endings of songs: but some (as is in use among the Etruscans [the Tuscans]) consist of eleven syllables, accommodated to chanting heroic [verse]; others of seven syllables, most apt for odes to be modulated to the lyre, and most delightful; others of twelve syllables, always ending in a dactyl, hurried and slippery, wonderfully serving the stage; and out of all these rhythms, again, others [4] — among the Etruscan poets — always keep the law of rhythm, closed by the similitude of the final syllables; but others, loosed from that law, and the similitude of the final syllables being neglected, are moved [along] — whence they are called "loosed" rhythms. So, therefore, in the Hebrew divine scriptures there are many kinds of such rhythms and verses, whose canons and measures to narrate now would be long and superfluous. But if any one is held by desire of them, let him read the Hebrew poets, and among others Rabbi Scelomo, surnamed Gabirol [Ibn Gabirol], an eminent poet among his own, and the poem of Rabbi Iosephi Hyssopaeus, written in iambic song, which is inscribed "The Silver Dish" *(Scutella argentea)*: among which two [poets] he will find almost all the aforesaid songs. But why the sacred interpreters, in translating the divine letters, did not keep the laws of the Hebrew songs, Augustine, in the epistle to Memorius the bishop, assigns the cause in these words: "For neither did the interpreter wish to express the [metrical] numbers out of the Hebrew tongue, lest he should be compelled, by the necessity of meter, to digress from the truth of interpreting further than the reason of the sentences [meaning] allowed: yet I believe the Davidic Psalms consist of certain measures. For that holy man loved pious music, and himself kindled us to those studies more than any other author."

3. But as much as pertains to the testimonies of the fathers which indicate that the old books were of old falsified, we freely confess that they were, in some places, depraved by certain Jews; but we do not believe such a depravation to have been of such moment but that it could easily be emended by Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and the other fathers skilled in the Hebrew tongue — a collation being made with the other most ancient exemplars of the Hebrews: both because very few were those places corrupted by the Jews, and because the corruption of those same places was not so universal that, in all the exemplars of the Hebrews at once — dispersed over the whole globe of lands — the selfsame places and the selfsame words should be corrupted (divine providence of Christ not permitting this, lest the Church, his spouse, should be defrauded of the truth of the divine scripture). Wherefore, since the corruption of the old scripture was neither universal nor great, easily, out of the more numerous codices in which the integral

[1] Jerome in the preface to the Pentateuch and to Isaiah, and in the Apology against Rufinus (Hier. in praefat. Pentat. & Esaiae, & in Apol. contra Ruff.); Jerome in the preface to Job (Hier. in praefac. Iob); Irenaeus, book 3, ch. 24 (Irenaeus lib. 3 cap. 24); Jerome in the prologue to Paralipomenon [Chronicles] and in the prologue to the four Gospels (Hier. in prol. Paral. & in prol. 4. eua.).

[2] Book 1, heresy 4 (Lib. 1. haer. 4); Cyril, book 7 against Julian (Cyrill. lib. 7. advers. Iulia.).
[3] Jerome in the preface to Job (Hier. in praefac. Iob).
[4] The variety of Etruscan song (Hetrusci carminis varietas).

(printed p. 631 [PDF p. 636] — Heresy II concluded (refutation 4, with Jacob ben Chayyim's rebuttal); then Heresy III opens: Of the books of the Mosaic law.)

[out of the more numerous codices in which the] integral [text] had remained — [those] which in others had been vitiated — the Hebrew reading could be restored to its pristine sincerity; and in very fact it was restored by Jerome and other erudite fathers. Whence it is foolish, and without reason, to wish now to assert that the Hebrew codices were of old falsified in those places in which all the codices of all the Hebrews — as much the recent as the ancient — agree. Neither does the addition of vowel-points, made by the Jews, derogate anything from the perpetual sincerity of the divine volumes. For although now the Hebrews, points being added beneath the consonants, may interpret otherwise, and understand the scripture otherwise than they ought, yet they cannot, by this addition of points, so universally deprave and contaminate that [scripture] that it does not always retain its old integrity; for, the points of the Rabbis being removed, it is necessary that the old scripture always remain, with its radical and servile letters, in its purity, integral and incorrupt. Although (that I may confess the truth) it has never befallen me to see any volume of the Hebrews in which the points added to the consonants so rendered the signification of the words diverse from that ancient signification and sense which they had in the time of Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, that from that diversity anything absurd should follow in those [things] which pertain to the dogmas of our faith.

4. To the last [argument], which they adduce concerning the תיקון סופרים *(Tikun sophrim)*, it pleases [me] to respond nothing else, except that we do not receive the portentous testimonies of the Thalmudic volumes — inasmuch as [they are the testimonies] of those books which are full of every lie, contumely, and blasphemy, not only against Christ, whom they themselves hold for an enemy, but also against God the creator of heaven and earth, whom the Jews alone confess themselves to worship: which [books] also have been damned by the public decree of the whole Church, and, through all the cities of the Christians, in recent years have been burned in the midst of the marketplace. Whose testimony even if we should receive, nevertheless the Anabaptists would obtain nothing thence for the defense of their cause. For the individual [things] which the *Sophrim* — that is, the scribes — are said to have erased are, in many and authentic Hebrew commentaries, annotated, and diligently handed down to memory. Out of which annotations (as has already often been seen, and can still be seen) all the things which were erased by the scribes in the Hebrew exemplars, which now exist in the whole world, have been restored down to the least jot or apex; and the Jews themselves damn the opinion of those who dared, among them, to say that the sacred books were at some time corrupted. Whence Jacob Benhaym [ben Chayyim], of the kingdom of Thunetum [Tunis], reproving the aforesaid opinion of R. Kimhi introduced by the heretics, writes against it in this manner: "The opinion of those is far from me; for I cannot be led to believe, and confess with [my] lips, that Ezra the scribe found the book of the divine law, and the books of the prophets, doubtful, corrupted, and confused. Nay rather, this is my opinion: that Ezra and his colleagues found the sacred Bible integral and unharmed; and that Ezra, by his own judgment, recognized which books were written by that excellent wisdom [inspiration], and why certain letters should be written, but certain [others] not — why also certain extraneous words *(dictiones)* were written; and he left them in the very text as they were written, adding in the margin, as it were, a gloss which might explain the nature of the extraneous word." These [things] R. Jacob [ben Chayyim]. From which the delirious trifles of the Anabaptists are exploded.

OF THE BOOKS OF THE MOSAIC LAW — Heresy III *(De Libris Mosaicae legis. Haeresis III)*

Whosoever [would] repudiate the books of the Mosaic law.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The **Ptolemaeite** heretics, who descend from Ptolemaeus the Gnostic, of the sect of the Valentinians (as Epiphanius writes), damned these books, because they believed that the things which are contained in them are not from the good God, but composed by three diverse authors: namely, one part of them by God the maker of this world, who was middle between the good God and the devil; another part by Moses, according to his own mind, and not according to the will of God; a third by the elders of the Jews, devised according to their own talent. But the Manichaeans, far more iniquitous, affirm that they reject those books for this reason: that from the beginning even to the end they were dictated by the evil God of the Hebrews, and were stuffed by his sons, the Jews, with every turpitude and foulness — [the Jews] who, in order to cover those foulnesses, inserted into them a few certain words of that natural law which the good God impressed upon human minds, so that — as if by a veil and a mist of divine words superinduced — they might conciliate faith and authority to their own books. And Faustus, and the Anonymous disciple of Fabritius, collected, for the subversion of these books, whatsoever Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, and the other enemies of the sacred volumes barked out against the divine law. [1]

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Already, in those things which were said above at the beginning of this book, we have sufficiently confuted the present insanity of the heretics, showing that the whole scripture of the old testament emanated from the good God, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ — by whom its writers, inspired, committed to those letters only those things which the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, suggested. Wherefore there is no need that we repeat here again the same things, or things like to the same.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. "We," say the Ptolemaeites, "do not receive the books of Moses as divine: because we know that they were written not according to the mind of the good and perfect God, but partly according to [the will] of men, partly according to the will of the middle God. And first, that that law which is called the Decalogue, engraved on the twin tablets, is not from the good and perfect God, appears [thus]: because the works of the perfect God are perfect; but this [law] is imperfect, and needing completion — for the fulfilling and consummating of whose perfection our Savior testified that he had come. It appears also that there is in these books a certain other legislation, brought not by God, but by Moses, which he dictated following not the will of God but his own understanding, the perfect law of God [2]

[1] Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiphan. lib. 1. haer. 33); Augustine, book 23 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Aug. lib. 23. co. Faust. c. 2).

[2] Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Deut. 31; Matt. 5 (Matth. 5).

(printed p. 632 [PDF p. 637] — Heresy III: the objections continue — the Ptolemaeite objection concluded, then the Manichaean catalogue of alleged unworthy things in Genesis and the Law (objections 2–14); then the Diluting of the Objections begins.)

[dictating] the perfect law of God [otherwise], permuting [it] according to the debility and necessity of those who were pressed by the grave burden of the divine law: lest, while they could not keep it, being driven by desperation, they should precipitate themselves into every injustice. As when, from himself, he gave a law of repudiation [divorce] contrary to the divine law, on account of the hardness of the people; so that, if they could not keep the divine [law] which says, "**What** God hath joined, let not man separate," they might not forthwith be turned to raging unto the slaughter of the wife, but might have a refuge to repudiation as to a lighter fault: which Christ testifies, saying, "**Moses**, on account of the hardness of your heart, permitted [you] to dismiss the wife; but from the beginning it was not so. For God said: **They** shall be two in one flesh; what therefore God hath joined, let not man separate." Again, certain other laws and traditions of the elders are

found wrapped up in these books, against which our Savior is carried [inveighs], the testimony of Isaiah being applied, saying: "**God** says, Honor thy father and thy mother; but you have said (he says, speaking to the elders), whatsoever gift is from me [shall be] turned to thy profit — hypocrites! rightly did Isaiah [prophesy] of you: In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men; for you have made void the commandment of God for your traditions." These [things] Ptolemaeus, in the epistle to Flora. [1]

2. But the **Manichaeans** — among whom Faustus and the anonymous disciple of Fabritius — add that they do not receive the books of Moses, because in them, from the beginning even to the end, are read [things] unworthy of the good God and of his son Christ, [things] destroying piety and morals. And first of all, in the very vestibule of Genesis, Moses describes a certain God turned [busied] in darkness from eternity, saying that darkness was before light was created, and that God walked over the waters beset with darkness through the night, before he made light. [2]

3. He describes also God wondering at the aspect of the unwonted light, and stupefied — and so much [so that], not knowing before what light was, when he first had seen it, then he judged it best. [3]

4. He shows [him] also **malevolent**, who prohibited man from taking the food of the knowledge of good and evil — that is, prudence, by which alone human life seems able to be sustained: as if he had wished him to be equal to the cattle that know not these things; whereas he [the serpent], whom he had made superior to the beasts, had denied this [to man], by which alone man surpasses the beasts. [4]

5. But he makes the **serpent** better, or stronger, than God himself: better, indeed, because, by alluring man to the food of prudence, he made [him] like to God — as God himself is witness, saying, "**Behold**, Adam is made as one of us, knowing good and evil"; but stronger, because he was able to deceive and conquer man, whom God had made. [5]

6. He makes God also either **ignorant** of the future, when he commanded that precept [to Adam] which he did not know whether Adam would keep; or **imprudent**, when he commanded that which he knew Adam would not keep. [6]

7. Improvident likewise, when — man lying hidden in a corner of paradise after his nakedness was recognized — as though he could not see him, he sought [him] with clamors, saying, "**Adam**, where art thou?"

8. Nor less **envious** than fearful, when he armed an angel with a fiery lance *(framea)* for the guarding of paradise, fearing lest perhaps our first parents — who, by the benefit of the serpent, had already been made participants of prudence — should again return into paradise, and taste of the tree of life, whence in future they might enjoy immortality, even himself [God] being unwilling. [7]

9. He describes also God as **desirous of blood and fat**, when — out of every kind of sacrifices, as if greedy of flesh and entrails — he commands [them] to be offered to himself. [8]

10. Likewise **jealous** *(zelantem)*, bearing [it] ill and laboring with jealousy, while to other gods, of whom he is jealous, [are offered] the same things which he forbids to be offered to himself.

11. Wrathful, moreover, threatening, and truculent, and unjust; since so often he is angry, now against his own, now against strangers, destroying so many thousands of men on account of certain slight [things], or no crime committed — threatening that he will come with a devouring sword, and will spare no one, neither the just nor the unjust.

12. Nor only with contumelies of this kind did Moses treat his own God, but — what is more execrable — Christ the son of God, who for the cause of our salvation hung upon the wood, he lacerated with a dire reproach of [religious] devotion [i.e. a curse], pronouncing that every one is cursed who hung upon the wood; who — whether willing, or by chance, he did it — is in neither [case] to be excused. For if unwilling he

cursed Christ, it is agreed that he was not divine, nor a prophet; but if willing, and not ignorant of these future things, he was certainly envious of our salvation, which was to be from the wood, in whose author [Christ] he drew forth the poison of his maledicent mouth. Which reproach touches also all the just and the martyrs, as many as died by a like exit of passion — as Peter and Andrew, and the rest of the same lot: for neither does he say that they are cursed among the common [people] only, that is, among men only, but cursed by God. [9]

13. For so also he pursues all the boys [children] of God, and the virgins, with a like [religious] devotion [curse], saying that every one is cursed who has not raised up seed in Israel. Which reproach principally touches Christ, who, sprung (as is said) from the Jews, nevertheless raised up no offspring for the sake of a posterity to be preserved among them. Then also his disciples, some of whom he [Christ] separated from wives, whom he had found joined [married], and some he forbade to be joined, whom he apprehended untouched [chaste]. [10]

14. Besides these things, Moses also extinguished all hope of the future resurrection in men, who pronounced the soul to be mortal, and said it to be blood, when he wrote: "The **soul** of all flesh is the blood." [11]

THE DILUTING OF THE OBJECTIONS *(Dilutio Obiectorum)*

1. The rash Ptolemaeus contentiously asserted that the books of the law have something from the middle God, something from Moses, something from the elders; yet he cannot anywhere show, from the holy scriptures which he is ignorant of, that the whole law of Moses is not from the best and most perfect God. Which [law], although it was not perfect in every part, and needed a fulfilling made through Christ, nevertheless — according to the distribution of those times and the disposition of persons, as much as its office befitted — was perfect, suiting the rude and carnal people, whom it, as it were a pedagogue, led [down] to Christ the teacher of perfection, for whose sake that law was given to Moses: [Moses] who never commanded or wrote anything in his books outside the will of God. Neither [did he ordain] an inseparable [bond] of marriage [12]

[1] Deut. 24; Matt. 19; Matt. 15; Exod. 20; Mark 7 (Mar. 7); Isaiah 29 (Esa. 29).

[2] From Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. lib. 22. con. Faust. cap. 14).

[3] In the same place (Ibidem); Gen. 1.

[4] Gen. 3; from Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. con. adu. leg. lib. 1. cap. 14); Julian the apostate, in Cyril, book 3 against Julian (Iulian. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 3. co. Iul.).

[5] From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 15 (Ex Aug. co. adu. leg. li. 1. cap. 15); Gen. 3.

[6] From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. con. adu. leg. li. 1. cap. 14); Gen. 2; book 22 against Faustus, ch. 4 (lib. 22. con. Faust. cap. 4); Gen. 3.

[7] In the same place, ch. 4, and Julian the apostate in Cyril, book 3 against Julian (Ibid. c. 4. & Iulian. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 3. co. Iul.); Gen. 3.

[8] In the same place (Ibidem); Exod. 20; in the same place, and Julian the apostate in Cyril, book 4 (Ibid. & Iul. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 4); Ezek. 21.

[9] From Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. lib. 14. con. Faust. cap. 1); Deut. 27.

[10] In the same place, ch. 1 (Ibidem cap. 1); Exod. 23; Deut. 7; Deut. 28.

[11] From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 6 (Ex Aug. co. adu. leg. li. 2. cap. 6); Lev. 17.

[12] Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Gal. 4; Augustine against Faustus, book 9, ch. 26 (Aug. contra Faust. lib. 9. cap. 26).

(printed p. 633 [PDF p. 638] — Heresy III: the Diluting of the Objections (refutations 1 concluded, through 8 begun).)

[nor did he command that] the union of marriage, instituted by God, be dissolved — although he brought [made] a law about giving a bill of repudiation. For *repudium* (divorce) is one thing, and a bill of repudiation another: repudiation is a permission; to give a bill [of divorce] is a precept. Moses did not say, "**Whoever** shall wish, let him dismiss the wife" — which would be contrary to the law of God — but, "**If anyone** shall dismiss [her], let him not dismiss [her] unless a bill of repudiation be first given": so that, namely, by the interposed delay, the mind — [being] headlong into dissension — might, broken by the writing-out of the

bill, desist, and might think what evil it is to dismiss a wife; and, by the wisdom and piety of the judges *(praesides)*, before whom he was bound to read the bill, [the husband] might be recalled to conjugal concord. But if so much hatred intervened that it could not be extinguished and emended, then he permitted a divorce to be made — knowing that a man would not, without cause, dismiss a wife whom he so hated. All the legislation of Moses, therefore, is from God, nor are there in it any traditions of the elders mixed in. For the traditions of which the Savior spoke are altogether outside the law, and are (as we have already said) the fourfold expositions of the Jews — namely of R. Moses, R. Akiba, R. Juda, and of the sons of Asomonaeus [the Hasmoneans]. And that Christ understood these [traditions], his speech openly shows, when he says: "**If anyone** shall say to his father, Korban [Corban], that is, [it is] a gift, etc." — which words, since they are found nowhere in the books of Moses, it is consequent that Christ spoke of the traditions of the elders, which are outside the law. [1]

2. But as much as pertains to the calumnies of the Manichaeans, we respond: first, that although light was not upon the face of the abyss before God created light, God was nevertheless not busied *(versabatur)* in darkness before he made light. For there was not lacking, before this temporal and visible light, another eternal and inaccessible light in which God dwelt — namely God himself, in whom there are no darknesses. This light God inhabited from eternity, alone sufficient to himself for perpetual light. Accordingly, when the Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters still beset with darkness, and cherished them by his own power, he did not lie hidden in the darkness as [one] destitute of light, but in the most clear light — namely, in his very self — he remained. [2]

3. But as to what they calumniate — that God wondered [was astonished] — that is neither written, nor does it follow from the things which are written. For it is read: "**And** God saw the light, that it was good" — which words show God rather [as] the approver of the light created by himself, than the admirer of an unexpected light. But even if the old scripture had said that God wondered, nothing absurd would thence be suffered [i.e. follow], since also in the new testament we read that Christ — whom the Manichaeans confess to be God — the faith of the centurion having been heard, wondered [marveled]: not because he saw anything beyond expectation when he first saw [it] in the centurion, but as [one who] approved that that which he had already before foreknown as future ought so to be done. [3]

4. Now, indeed, to that calumny of malevolence we respond, that the discernment of good and evil is twofold: one through science [knowledge], which is of the blessed man; the other through experience, which is of the miserable man, and is unhappily learned, and happily not known. For diseases and pains — how much more happily should I not know them? Therefore God, who prohibited man from this unhappy discernment, is to be called not malevolent, but benevolent — just as we would call a physician benevolent who would forbid us [4] from some food, by which he foreknew that we, having received [it], would sicken; and on that account, from the very event, would call the same food [the food] "of the knowledge of health and of weakness," because through it man, when he had begun to sicken, would recognize by experience what difference there was between contracted ill-health and lost good health — which he certainly would better have been ignorant of, if he had remained in that health which he lost, believing the physician through obedience, not the disease through experience.

5. If, therefore, that knowledge which God forbade to man is miserable, it sufficiently appears that the serpent was not better than God, as the impious triflers blaspheme, but — beyond what can be said — evil and worst, who showed to man so unhappy a knowledge of all evils. Nor are those words, "**Behold**, Adam is made as one of us," words of God affirming [it], but rather of [God] reproaching: just as that [saying] of the Apostle when he says, "**Forgive** *(Donate)* me this injury" — [which] certainly he wishes to be understood from the contrary, if there be present a learned expounder, not an unlearned calumniator. Nor is the serpent therefore stronger than God, because he deceived the man whom God made: [5] for God would by no means be deceived, if he [man] had not receded from God in [his] heart. Because, therefore, he receded from God,

therefore he was deserted by God, and was conquered by the serpent. But neither did the serpent conquer, since by his very self he is himself deceived and conquered. For as much [as] he who deceived, as he whom he deceived, both are deceived, receding from him who cannot be deceived; and both are conquered, receding from him who cannot be conquered — by whom certainly, whoever recedes more, is conquered more, because he becomes so much the worse, [by] how much the more remote [he is]. And therefore it is necessary that he who seems to conquer by first inflicting evil on another, should himself the more be conquered by losing good; nor can it come to pass that a place should be better for him for whom the cause is worse. And when for a time the devil seemed to have prevailed, man being overcome, even so he is conquered for eternity, man being repaired [restored].

6. But as to that which they proudly deride — that God [was] ignorant of the future — we say that God was not ignorant that man would sin, but at the same time also foreknew, by [his] highest divinity, what of just and good he was going to do concerning the sinner: nor did he institute [that precept] which would be harmful, if man had not wished to harm himself, but rather he instituted that which would profit. Because man would not, without a good reward, have kept obedience, and not without a useful example — that his holy posterity might keep it — [and not without] having paid the penalties of disobedience. [6] Nor did he will [command] that which [man] could not [do]; for he willed this: that man should be either obedient, or, [if] disobedient, not unpunished. Nor did he will fruitlessly that which man was not going to keep — because the penalty of the contemner taught others to obey.

7. Neither was God improvident, because he asked Adam, lying hidden, where he was: for he therefore asked, that he might convince the man by his own response; although he knew not only where he was, but also what he was going to answer to himself, and willed that these things be answered to himself, so that — the confession of the crime being extorted — he might seem not unjustly to punish him. [7]

8. Similarly, neither is God to be argued of envy, because he did not permit the sinners to enter beyond the gates of paradise to the eating of the vital [life-giving] tree; but [he is] as [one] justly to be praised by merit, who from eternity — [+ knew what] justly

[1] Deut. 24; Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Mark 7 (Mar. 7).

[2] Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 8 (Aug. lib. 22. co. Faust. cap. 8).

[3] Augustine against Faustus, book 22, ch. 13 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 22. cap. 13); Gen. 1; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. c. 15).

[4] Gen. 1; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. c. 15).

[5] Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. ca. 15); 2 Cor. 12.

[6] Book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 14 (lib. 1. co. adu. leg. cap. 14).

[7] In the same place, ch. 14 (Ibid. cap. 14).

(printed p. 634 [PDF p. 639] — Heresy III concluded: the Diluting of the Objections (refutations 8 concluded through 14). It closes: "Thus far concerning the books of the law; now let us pass to the prophetic books.")

[who from eternity, what] justly had been given to the obedient, justly prohibited to the prevaricators [transgressors]. Just as neither would the Manichaeans say that Christ [is] envious, or fearful, because he did not permit the foolish virgins to enter into his kingdom, the door being shut; but [that he is] just, who did not admit sinners to eternal life.

9. But to think that God is desirous of blood and fat, because he commands the fat and entrails of animals to be offered to himself, is [the mark] of a man ignorant of the divine sacraments [mysteries]. For God did not command these things as [though] he were delighted by the slaughter of animals and the effusion of blood, or fed by their odor, or desired to be satiated with the blood of victims and the vapors of holocausts; but that, by those sacrifices, he might fore-announce to us that true sacrifice which the one true God-priest — the

mediator of God and men — offered to the one true God, whose promissory figures it behooved to be celebrated in the victims of animals, on account of the commendation of the future flesh [of Christ], through which one victim there would be made the remission of the sins contracted from the flesh. [1]

10. Nothing, moreover, unworthy of God do [the scriptures] attribute, naming him a "Zealot" — since even in the new testament Christ, the money-changers being cast out of the temple, says of himself: "The **zeal** *(Zelus)* of thy house hath eaten me up." For the zeal of God is not that perturbation of mind by which a husband, troubled by the adultery of a spouse, pines away, but the loving care of conjugal chastity to be conserved, which God is wont to apply, when he admonishes his people as a spouse, lest through many false gods she fornicate; or when he exhorts each one that the chastity which the soul owes to the one God be not, through the false enticements of this world, corrupted and prostituted and defiled. Zeal, therefore, is attributed to God, not according to the anxiety of a livid [envious] perturbation, but according to the most tranquil goodness of [his] benevolence toward us; or according to the property of the Hebrew tongue; or according to the abuse [catachresis] of the word, by which virtues are frequently wont to be called, among all nations, by the word of vices. [2]

11. The like also is to be thought concerning the anger and fury of God — who, although he can be troubled by no human passions, is nevertheless said to be angry, when he inflicts on our crimes the penalties of due vengeance. His anger also signifies [his] vengeance, whether by some property of the Hebrew tongue, or by the abuse of the word — which is widely applicable in all tongues, when, by the names by which vices are properly denoted, virtues also are named: [as when] they say cunning for prudence, and cupidity for will. [3] God, therefore, did not — turbidly, like a human [being] — rage by anger, but retributed [something] just, a divine anger, which is named "anger" not on account of the lust of avenging, but on account of the rigor of vindicating [justice], by a certain use of speech. But as to the thousands of men destroyed on account of certain slight [things], or nothing: if those stolid [men] would expressly commemorate them, we would show [these] to be neither slight nor nothing, but most grave. For what greater impiety can there be, than to oppose the creatures to the creator? or to tempt God? or to murmur against him? or to defect from his worship? or to despair of his providence and aid? — all which things those [people] perpetrated, of whom many thousands are read [to have been] slain in the desert. [4] Whence God, who threatens that he will spare no one, neither just nor unjust, is neither truculent nor unjust: because — as we [read] — that vine-dresser [God] otherwise prepares the pruning-hook for the branches in the unfruitful [vines], otherwise in the fruitful; the [fruitful] ones, indeed, to be purged, [5] but those [unfruitful] ones to be cut away — the impious, as branches cut off for burning; but the just he does not spare, for the perfecting of [their] purgation: he spares not the just, nor the sinner — [flogging] that one as a son, [punishing] this one as impious. So, therefore, applying to the just a salutary correction, he is merciful and clement, not truculent and wrathful; but to sinners, retributing due severity on account of [their] sins, he is not unjust, but most just.

12. But now let us see what understanding that [saying] has which the execrable heretics vituperate — [the saying] concerning the curse of [one] hanging on the wood, brought forth by Moses. It is to be known that, just as the tongue and the hand in some manner signify those very parts and members of the body, but in some manner [signify] the works which follow from them — as the speech of men is called "tongue," because it is made through the tongue; and a man's writing is called "hand," because it is made by the hand — so "sin," or "curse" (which is the same), signifies not only that evil work itself, but also, in the holy scriptures, [signifies] death itself: because death is from sin, which is called a "cursed thing." [6] In which sense Moses called Christ "cursed," because Christ, without guilt, took up death, the punishment of us [who are] cursed. In which sense also Paul called Christ "sin" and "a cursed thing," when he said: "**Him** *(Eum)* who knew not sin, he made sin for us" — that is, the punishment of our sin; and, "He was **made** *(Factus)* a curse for us" — that is, dead for us: for it is the same thing, dead, [as] cursed; because death itself is from the curse, and cursed is every sin. [7]

13. But as to [the claim] that Moses is hostile to continence or virginity because he said, "**Cursed** *(Maledictus)* [is] every one who has not raised up seed in Israel" — let him read Isaiah, crying out in the same spirit: "**Thus** *(Haec)* saith the Lord to all the eunuchs *(spadonibus)* who shall have observed my precepts: I will give to them in my house a place named better than [that] of sons and of daughters; an eternal name will I give to them, and it shall not fail them." Or, if they think Isaiah contrary to Moses, let Moses please them, if Isaiah displeases. This is not of little [weight] against those [heretics]: for it suffices us to know that the one God spoke, both through Moses and through Isaiah; and that, according to the spiritual understanding, cursed is every one who has not left seed in Israel — that is, every one who, according to the measure of his own virtue, has not increased [invested] with the dominical gains [talents], and has not left seed which may see God: that is, who has not had either a son, or a servant, or a neighbor, whom he may teach the fear of God upon the earth. Spiritually, therefore, Moses is to be understood. [8]

14. [Moses] who, indeed, if he had believed the soul to be mortal, would not in another place say: "**Every one** *(Omnis)* who shall have touched the dead — and there shall have been a dead [person in his tent] — and he shall not have been purified, his soul shall be cut off from Israel, because he is still unclean." "**Still**" *(Adhuc)*, certainly, he said, even after death, because he is not purified. But he called the soul "blood" not [in respect] of substance, but for the cause of signification — in the manner in which it is said, "The **Rock** *(Petra)* was Christ": not because it was this [literally], but because hence it was signified. Nor did he in vain wish to signify the soul by blood: because, just as blood in our body has the principate [rules] more than the other humors, so the soul invisibly prevails over all the [parts] of which we consist. Thus far concerning the books of the law; now let us pass on to the prophetic books. [9]

[1] In the same place, ch. 17 (Ibid. cap. 17).

[2] Book 22 against Faustus, ch. 18 (lib. 22. co. Faust. ca. 18); Psalm 68 (Psal. 68).

[3] In the same place, ch. 18 (Ibid. cap. 18).

[4] In the same place, ch. 19 (Ibid. cap. 19).

[5] In the same place, ch. 20 (Ibid. cap. 20); Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 3 and 4 (Aug. lib. 14. co. Faust. c. 3 & 4).

[6] Deut. 27.

[7] 2 Cor. 5 (2. Cor. 5); Gal. 3.

[8] Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 13, and in the Questions on the Old and New Testament, question 17 (Aug. lib. 14. con. Faust. ca. 13, et in quaest. vet. & nov. test. quae. 17); Isaiah 56 (Esa. 56).

[9] Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 6 (Aug. co. adu. le. li. 2. c. 6); Num. 19; Lev. 17; 1 Cor. 10.

(printed p. 635 [PDF p. 640] — Heresy IIII opens: Of the prophetic books. Title, Assertores, objections 1–4, and the Diluting of the Objections (1–2 begun).)

OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS — Heresy IIII *(De Libris Propheticis. Haeresis IIII)*

That the books of the Prophets have nothing in themselves for the sake of which they ought to be received.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

And this also is a heresy of the Manichaeans, which before the rest Faustus, and the Anonymous disciple of Fabritius, defended. With these a certain Theodore of Mopsuestia *(Theodorus Mopsuestites)* seems to consent, who — as is read in the Acts of the Fifth Synod — asserted that nothing is contained in the prophets which is evidently pronounced concerning Christ, but that our elders drew, out of their own will, to Christ those things which had been said of other matters; for which heresy he was deservedly condemned in the Fifth Synod. But that in all the prophets there are innumerable prophecies, presages, and oracles concerning Christ — to whom, as Peter says, all the prophets give testimony — and moreover many examples of honest life; and that, for this cause, their books are exceedingly necessary to us, as much for the truth and firmness of faith as for living well and justly: [all this] we have abundantly proved above from the authority of the

new testament. It remains, therefore, that we see how slight are those things which the Manichaeans object against the books of the prophets. [1]

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. If the books of the prophets are to be received, they are to be received chiefly on account of two [reasons]: either that they confer to the testification of faith, or that they confer to the information [instruction] of life; of which, since the books of the prophets furnish neither, no cause offers itself which might make them commended to us. For what need have we of their writings on account of testimonies concerning Christ the Savior, which are none in them? Or, if perchance there be any, we nevertheless neither need them for the confirmation of faith, nor ought to use them. For it is [the mark] of an inert faith not to believe in Christ without witness and argument. For since you yourselves are wont to say that nothing is to be curiously sought out, because Christian credulity is simple and absolute, how is the simplicity of faith not destroyed by propping it up with indications and witnesses — and especially with the Jews? [2]

2. Whose testimonies certainly are so useless to us for faith that they profit nothing, neither after faith nor before faith concerning Christ received. For if to a Gentile, before faith received, it is to be believed in Christ on account of the testimonies of the Hebrew prophets, which you think to be found in their books, then those [Gentiles] will have to believe the prophets before Christ. But say, I ask: if you think that Christ is to be received by me through the prophets, the prophets themselves — through whom shall I receive [them]? and who will make faith for me on their behalf? Certainly not other prophets — because then the question would go off into infinity, we asking again and again who should render testimony on behalf of those prophets [just] recently brought in. But if you say that they are to be received from the testimony of Christ, so that mutually — that is, those prophets commend Christ, and Christ [commends] those [prophets] — the Gentile, certainly, free by [being bound to] the condition of each, would believe neither the scriptures of the Hebrew prophets speaking of Christ, nor Christ testifying about their scriptures. Wherefore it sufficiently appears that the testimonies of the Jewish prophets are useless before faith in Christ; because before faith, when we were Gentiles, [3] we could not believe them, as [being] Hebrews; but after faith, since now we believe in Christ, the testimonies are superfluous, since we no longer need them, that we should believe those things which we have already believed.

3. But if any one should say to us that testimonies are needed, after faith received, for the stabilizing of the undertaken firmness of belief — I ask, what necessity compels that from external, obscure, and uncertain Hebrew witnesses we should beg superfluous testimonies? — as if there were not enough for us the most abundant and most faithful witnesses whom we have. For who can be a more faithful witness to us than God himself concerning his own son? — who, not through a seer, nor through an interpreter, but of his own accord, by a voice bursting forth from heaven, when he sent him upon earth, said: "**This** is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." And Christ himself also says of himself: "**I went out** *(Exivi)* from the Father, and I came into the world"; and many things of this kind. To which [words], when the Jews said, "Thou givest testimony of thyself; thy testimony is not true," he himself responded: "**And** if I testify of myself, my testimony is true, because I am not alone. For also in your law it is written, The testimony of two men is true. I am [he] who testify of myself, and [the Father] testifies of me who sent me." He did not, moreover, say "the prophets," but "the Father." To these things he also calls his own works to himself for a testimony: "**If** you believe not me *(Si mihi non creditis)* (saying), believe the works." He did not say, "If you believe not me, believe the prophets." Wherefore, since we have as witness the Father and the Son, we do not need external testimonies for faith. [4]

4. Then, how can we read them for an exemplar of honest life, whose flagitious deeds we know to have been so openly damned by Christ? For the Savior himself, striking at the life and morals of all the prophets at once by a single sentence, called them robbers and thieves, saying: "**All** *(Omnes)*, as many as came before me, are

thieves and robbers." [5]

THE DILUTING OF THE OBJECTIONS *(Dilutio Obiectorum)*

1. It is [the mark] of a most demented man to say that it is [the mark] of an inert faith not to believe without a witness. For how can the knowledge of Christ come to us without a human witness? How, indeed, will they believe him whom they have not heard? and how will they hear without a preacher? Wherefore, when we say that a simple faith is necessary to the Christian, we do not persuade [men] that the testimonies of the old testament are not to be believed, but we admonish that the Christian mind ought first to be nourished by a simple faith, so that it may be rendered capable of understanding the supernal [things]. For thus says the prophet: "**Unless** *(Nisi)* you shall have believed, you shall not understand." This is that simple faith, by which we believe [6] before we know the super-eminent knowledge of the charity of Christ, in whom are all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God hidden away — which are opened to none, if he shall have contemned, for himself, the food conveyed through the maternal flesh (that is, [the food] through the apostolic and prophetic udders of milk-nourishments), and, as [one] disdaining infantile victus, as if by reason of his over-great age fastidious [squeamish], shall have rushed sooner into the poisons of the heretics than into the wisdom for which he judges himself fit.

2. But as to what they contend — that the prophets of the Hebrews profit neither before nor after faith — asking who indeed [would make], for a Gentile (who believes neither Christ nor the prophets), faith of the prophets out of the scriptures: we easily refute [them], saying that the very scripture of the prophets conciliates [wins] faith for itself, and its own [faith], among all [7]

[1] Faustus, in Augustine, book 12 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 12); Acts 10 (Act. 10).

[2] From Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 4, and book 12, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 16. con. Faust. c. 4. & lib. 12. ca. 1).

[3] From Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 13. co. Faust. ca. 1).

[4] From Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 12. con. Faust. c. 1); Matt. 17; John 16 (Ioan. 16); John 8 (Ioan. 8); Deut. 19; John 5 (Ioan. 5).

[5] From Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 2, and against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 4 (Ex Aug. lib. 16 co. Faust. c. 2. & co. adu. leg. lib. 2. cap. 4); John 10 (Ioan. 10).

[6] Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 45 and 46 (Aug. lib. 12. cot. Faust. cap. 45. & 46); Rom. 10; Isaiah 7 (Esa. 7); Eph. 3.

[7] Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 14 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 14).

(printed p. 636 [PDF p. 641] — Heresy IIII concluded (Dilutio 2–4); then Heresy V opens: Of the book of Psalms.)

[the very scripture of the prophets conciliates faith for itself, and its own faith, among all peoples,] to commend [its] authority to all nations, while it fore-announces all those things which, through the successions of times, came to pass — so long before they were done, as [things] to be done: and those especially which, in these most recent days, the Gentiles themselves both know and confess to have been completed. As concerning the propagation of the Christian religion, which they themselves see; and concerning the persecutions stirred up against it by kings, of which frequent memory exists in the histories of the Gentiles, and the laws of the emperors, committed to their letters, testify; likewise concerning the faith of the emperors, and the most salubrious servitude under Christ, and concerning the name of Christ diffused far and wide into all nations, concerning the abolition of idols, and the blindness and captivity of the Jews. All which things, if I were to press upon a Gentile out of the scriptures of the prophets before those things had been done — so that he might believe those things which he had not yet seen done — he might perhaps deservedly say: "What [have I to do] with these scriptures, from which [source] you [claim to] prove [them] truthful is not shown to me?" But when so great and so many things which they said have now been brought to fulfillment, plainly that [Gentile], if he were perverse, would be unwilling, nor would he in any way contemn those [scriptures] which, by foreseeing so long before, and by fore-announcing with so great an apparatus, deserved to be commended. For we believe nothing more prudently — whether concerning things

past, which were done of old, or concerning future things, which are not yet done — than [those things which] they [the prophets], to us who [take] from them faith of their words in so many and great [matters] (which, foretold by them, are now done), have proved. There are, therefore, the prophetic scriptures, before faith, useful to the Gentiles in [believing] Christ. But neither, after faith, are they on that account superfluous, because we now believe. Otherwise it would behoove those who believe to cast away all the books through which it came to pass that they should believe. For if this were true, I do not see why even the gospel itself should be read by the faithful of Christ: before faith, indeed, it is useless, because that Gentile whom the Manichaeans bring in does not believe in Christ; but after faith, [it would be] superfluous, if even by true preachings concerning Christ it is now superfluously believed, when it has [already] been believed in him. Here perhaps they will say: But the gospel ought to be read [by one] already faithful, lest he forget what he believed. So, therefore, O insane [men], he ought also to read the true testimonies of the prophets, lest he forget why he believed. But if he shall have forgotten [it], that which he believed will not be able to be firm with him. [1]

3. But now, when they ask why, after the testimony of the Father and the Son, we follow the external testimonies of the Jews, we respond: not that this is done by us because we do not believe the testimony of Christ without another witness, or because we prefer the testimonies of others to the testimony of Christ, but because a twofold cause impels us to this. **THE FIRST**, indeed, [is] that I may know why we have believed these things which they handed down to us, [things] which we now believe; and, knowing this, [that] we may be more stably confirmed in the faith of those things which they handed down to us. For since we neither heard that voice of the Father brought from heaven, nor saw the works of Christ, we needed the testimony of those who had seen and heard those things — so that, from their preaching, we might hear that Christ had done such things; and, hearing, might believe in Christ, before unknown to us. And for this cause the preaching of the apostles was made to [reach] all; which — lest it should be contemned by men, and thought fabulous — the vaticinations and testimonies of the prophets were necessary to the apostles, by which they might demonstrate those things which they themselves preached to have been fore-predicted [2] long before by the prophets. For although the miracles put forth by them attested the preaching of the Apostles, nevertheless there would not have been lacking certain [men] (as even now still certain [people] mutter) who would attribute all those things to magic power, unless such a thought of theirs were overcome by the prophetic contestation. For that they [the Apostles] had, by magic arts, constituted prophets for themselves long before they were born, by whom their preaching should be fore-announced, no one indeed would say. This, therefore, is one cause. But **THE OTHER** is, that by the authority of the old testimonies we may sweetly invite all infidels — as much Hebrews as Gentiles — [if] not resisting, to embrace the faith of Christ; or, [if] resisting and contradicting, may strongly repel [them]: the Hebrews, indeed, while we show to them that those [scriptures] which we believe were not written by us as [if] after the event, as [being] afterward warned, but by their own codices we prove that they were most openly proved by their own prophets; but the Gentiles, while — out of the books of our enemies, kept by them with such diligence that they could not be vitiated by us — we show fore-announced, so long a time before, [those things] which the Gentiles themselves now see completed: namely, concerning the vocation of the nations to Christ, concerning the overthrow of idols, concerning the persecutions of the Church (which the histories of the Gentiles describe), and concerning [3] the excellence of our Church, and the rest of this kind — which they have before [their] eyes, and, even if they wish, cannot deny.

4. That also they malignly add — that the Lord said, "**All** *(Omnes)* who came before me are thieves and robbers" — for it is not so written, but thus: "**All** *(Omnes)*, as many as came, are thieves and robbers." For in this place he willed those to be understood who had not been sent — whom Jeremiah also rebukes, saying: "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets who prophesy in my name, and I sent them not." But those [true prophets] whom these insane [men] blaspheme were sent by the Lord, [and] came not of their own accord. Or, if it be written, "All, as many as came before me, are thieves and robbers" — as the Greek now

has, πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον *(pantes hosoi pro emou elthon)* — he wishes those to be understood [as coming] "before" who came not with him, but wished by pride to precede him, and were unwilling to come with Christ (that is, with the Word of God), but, since God did not send them, brought their own lies to men; but the holy prophets came not before Christ, but with Christ, because they did not wish by pride to precede him, but bore him humbly, [him] speaking through them. [4]

OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS — Heresy V *(De Libro Psalmorum. Haeresis V)*

That the book of Psalms is falsely inscribed with the name of David, and composed without any prophetic spirit; and that, besides certain human ditties (cantilenae) *of secular poets, it contains nothing else.*

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Philastrius, in the catalogue of heresies, attributes this heresy to the Nicolaites, the Gnostics, and the Manichaeans, who also said that David was not a prophet of Christ, and a writer of the divine scriptures, but a composer of human and secular song. But in the epistle of the Council of Antioch, which is had in book 7 of the Ecclesiastical History [of Eusebius], the same error is ascribed to Paul of Samosata, in these words: "Paul of Samosata [suppressed] the psalms which were sung *(dicebantur)* unto our Lord Jesus Christ [5]

[1] Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 18 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 18).

[2] From Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 45 (Ex Aug. li. 12. co. Faust. c. 45).

[3] Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 10 and 16 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 10 & 16).

[4] John 10 (Ioan. 10 — so the passage, John 10:8; digit blotted); Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 4 (Aug. li. 2. co. adu. leg. c. 4); Jer. 14; Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 12 (Aug. lib. 16. con. Faust. c. 12).

[5] ch. 127 (Cap. 127); Eusebius, book 7 of the Ecclesiastical History (Euseb. lib. 7 hist. eccl.).

(printed p. 637 [PDF p. 642] — Heresy V: Assertores concluded; then the Impugnatio (the first heretical claim — that the Psalter is falsely ascribed to David — refuted from Scripture).)

[the psalms which were sung unto our Lord Jesus Christ, Paul of Samosata caused to] cease, as [being] modern and recently invented; but those composed by himself he commanded women to sing, in the days of Pascha [Easter], in the midst of the church — especially [those women] whom he himself had before instituted for singing — so that one would shudder if he heard [it]. Theodore of Mopsuestia also (as is noted in the acts of the Fifth Synod) affirmed that nothing about Christ is written in the psalms. Lastly, the Anabaptists of our own times raised up this heresy again, asserting that the psalms were composed neither by David, nor by any holy man divinely, but by certain more recent masters of the Jews after the advent of Christ; and [that they are] filled with many dire [things] and imprecations against Christ, and against the [Christian] people — so that the Hebrews might have, for the solace of [their] captivity, some ditties by which, gathering publicly in their synagogues, by praying and singing, they might imprecate calamities and destruction upon their enemies. [1]

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Two [things] are said by the heretics, of which the first is: that the book of Psalms is falsely entitled with the name of David the prophet. The vanity of which most slight opinion the most weighty testimonies of divine scripture crush. For we read, first of all, that David was an admirable psalmist, and for this cause was summoned by King Saul, that he might soothe his sick mind by songs modulated to the cithara; and when the ark was carried up into Jerusalem, we read that he sang hymns before the Lord upon instruments. Whence in the books of Kings it is written of him: "**The man said** *(Dixit vir)*, to whom it was appointed concerning the Christ of the God of Jacob, the excellent psalmist of Israel." [2] But that he put forth psalms, and gave [them] to be sung in the temple of the Lord, the first book of Annals [Chronicles] testifies, commemorating that

David placed in the temple four thousand psalmists, singing to the Lord upon instruments, and that he chose out of them especially the sons of Asaph, and Heman, and Idithun, who beside him should sing canticles in the temple upon citharas, psalteries, and cymbals. [3] There are found also, here and there, in many books of holy scripture, very many psalms out of this book of psalms particularly cited under the name of David: so that it cannot be denied that the book is his, by whose name it is inscribed. In the second volume of Kings [2 Samuel], there is recited an entire psalm from the mouth of David, which in the book of psalms is numbered the seventeenth [Ps 18]. And in the first [book] of Annals is similarly related the whole hundred-and-fourth psalm [Ps 105], which David, when the ark was being brought back, gave to Asaph the chief of the singers to be sung. [4] And in the 1st book of Esdras it is written that, after the restoration of the temple, the Levites, the sons of Asaph, praised God upon cymbals, "by the hands of David the king" — that is, by the psalms composed by David; and that out of these they sang by name those which have the beginning, "**Give thanks** *(Confitemini)* to the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy [endureth] unto the age" — that is, the hundred-and-fifth [Ps 106], the hundred-and-sixth [5], the 117th, and the 135th — all beginning from this one song. [6] And in the new testament Christ, out of this book, under the name of David, brought forth the 109th psalm [Ps 110] against the Pharisees, saying: "**How** *(Quomodo)* then does David, in [the] Spirit, call him lord, saying: The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand?" — which words, lest anyone should suspect [them] to be cited by our Savior rather from another book of David than from this one, Luke in the Acts [added]: [7] "David himself says in the book of Psalms: The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, etc." And Peter, in the Acts, ascribed the fifteenth psalm of this book [Ps 16] to David, saying: "**David** says in the book of psalms: I foresaw the Lord in my sight always." Of which [David] also the Apostles testified the second psalm to be, saying: "**O Lord** *(Domine)*, who by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of our father David thy servant, hast said: Why have the nations raged?" — which psalm Paul by name called "the second," saying: "**As** *(Sicut)* it is written in the second psalm: My son art thou; I this day have begotten thee." [8] And elsewhere the same Apostle testified the thirty-first psalm [Ps 32] to be David's, and likewise the sixty-eighth psalm [Ps 69]. It is manifest also, from some inscriptions by which certain psalms of this book are prefixed, that David — besides the psalms already mentioned — sang with his own mouth also many others: namely those whose arguments and histories are read in the books of Kings; as are the third psalm, to which is prefixed the title, "**A psalm** *(Psalmus)* of David, when he fled from the face of Absalom his son," whose history is written in the second [book] of Kings; [9] and the psalm of like argument to which is titled, "A psalm of David, when, fleeing from the face of Absalom, he was ascending the Mount of Olives with bare feet and covered head"; and the 32nd psalm [Ps 34], having for [its] title, "A psalm of David, when he changed his countenance before Abimelech, and cast him out, and, being dismissed, went away," whose argument is had in the first volume of Kings; likewise the fiftieth psalm [Ps 51], and the 51st [Ps 52]; and many others, whose occasions are related in the books of Kings and of Annals. [10]

The **second** [thing] asserted by the heretics is: that this whole book, composed without any prophetic spirit, contains nothing divine in itself. Whose stolidity the other books of divine scripture refute — but especially the books of Kings, in which David himself, with open voice, proclaims that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit, that he might fore-sing the Christ to come, saying: "**The man said** *(Dixit vir)*, to whom it was appointed concerning Christ, the excellent psalmist of Israel: The Spirit of the Lord hath spoken through me, and his speech through my tongue. The strong [one] of Israel said to me, [that there should come] the ruler of men, the just [one], the ruler in the fear of God" — which our Savior confirmed, when he said to the Jews: "**How** *(Quomodo)* then does David call him, in [the] Spirit, lord, saying: The Lord said, etc.?" [11] And after his resurrection, when he opened the sense of the scriptures to his disciples, he testified that the Holy Spirit had spoken, in the book of psalms, concerning [his] life, passion, death, and resurrection, and the preaching of the gospel. [12] And the apostles call David, the author of this book, a prophet, and everywhere bring forth his vaticinations as [those] of a truthful prophet. "**A prophet** *(Propheta)*," says Peter, "since he was, and knew, because God had sworn to him with an oath, etc." And the apostles, in the Acts: "**O Lord** *(Domine)*,

who by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of thy servant David, hast spoken." And Paul: "**I will give** *(Dabo)* you the holy faithful [things] of David" — that is, I will give you to recognize that the vaticinations of David were faithful. [13] But, although it may have been doubtful among the Catholic fathers (as Augustine writes in the seventeenth book of the City of God) whether all the psalms of this book were put forth by David, or whether per-[haps some by others] [14]

---

[1] Thomas Aquinas in the preface to the Psalms (Tho. Aquin. in praef. Psal.).
[2] 1 Kings [Samuel] 16 (1. Reg. 16); 2 Kings [Samuel] 23 (2. Reg. 23).
[3] 1 Chron. 6, 15, 16, 23, 25 (1. Par. 6; 1. Par. 15; 1. Par. 16; 1. Par. 23; 1. Par. 25).
[4] 2 Kings [Samuel] 22 (2. Reg. 22); 1 Chron. 16 (1. Par. 16); Esdras 1 (Esd. 1).
[5] so printed "306," a slip for 106
[6] Psalm 105 (Psal. 105).
[7] Matt. 22 (Matt. 20, so printed); Luke 20; Psalm 109; Acts (Act. 20, so printed); Acts 2; Psalm 15.
[8] Acts 4; Acts 13; Psalm 2; Psalm 13; Rom. 4; Rom. 11; Psalm 68.
[9] ch. 116 (Cap. 116).
[10] 1 Kings [Samuel] (1. Reg.).
[11] 2 Kings [Samuel] 23 (2. Reg. 23); Matt. 22 (Matth. 22).
[12] Luke 24 (Luc. 24).
[13] Acts 2; Acts 4; Acts 13 (Act. 2; Act. 4; Act. 13).
[14] ch. 14 (Cap. 14).

(printed p. 638 [PDF p. 643] — Heresy V: the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (1–4) that the Psalter is not David's and not prophetic.)

[whether] several of these were composed by certain [other] holy men, whom David had ordained [as] psalmists in the temple of God — namely by Asaph, Heman, Idithun, Chore [Korah], and their sons (because many of their psalms are prefixed with their names): nevertheless it behooves to believe that those too, by whomsoever they were [composed], were dictated by the Holy Spirit. For it is written in the first book of Annals [Chronicles] that all those singers — namely Asaph, Heman, Idithun, Chore, Moses — and their sons, were prophets, and holy doctors, in the temple of God. Whence Christ and the apostles approved their psalms as [things] put forth by the prophetic spirit, and confirmed their own preaching by the authority of them. [1] Of the psalms inscribed [to] Asaph, we find that our Savior cited that [saying] of the eighty-first psalm [Ps 82]: "**I said** *(Ego dixi)*, you are gods"; and [we find] that Matthew similarly called Asaph himself a prophet, when — a versicle of his psalm being produced — he said: "**All** these things *(Haec omnia)* Jesus spoke in parables, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables." [2] Of the psalms inscribed [to] Moses, Paul took a testimony, saying: "**As** *(Sicut)* the Holy Spirit says: Today, if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts." And of the psalms attributed to Chore [Korah], the same Apostle received that testimony: "Thy **throne** *(Thronus tuus)*, O God, [is] unto the age of the age." [3] From all which it evidently appears that all the psalms were composed by the Holy Spirit, and sung through the mouth of David and of his singers. But the present Book of Psalms is inscribed with the name of David the prophet, either because the first and nobler part of the book was composed by David through his very self, or because — David suggesting the matter of the psalms to his singers — the greater part of the book was written and sung by them.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. Those who affirm the book of psalms to be David's are led (say the Anabaptists) by no certain conjecture. For neither does the inscription of the book show this, in which the name of David is not [always] placed; nor in the whole of holy scripture is there ever mention of the author of this volume; nor is it ever read that any psalm was composed by David, except one only — when God had freed him from the hand of Saul — whose beginning is: "The **Lord** [is] my **rock** *(Dominus petra mea)*," which is written in the 2nd book of Kings [2 Sam 22]. And concerning this one psalm, whether it truly be his, it scarcely is agreed: because the Book of

Psalms judges otherwise about it, and the second [book] of Kings otherwise; in which it is written that this psalm was the very last of all [4] the words which David spoke; but in the book of psalms it is written that the last of all the psalms of David was that one which is placed in the seventy-second number [Ps 72], at whose foot it is written: "**Finished** *(Finitae)* are the prayers of David, son of Isai [Jesse]." [5]

2. There are, moreover, in this book very many psalms which are ascertained to have been composed neither by David nor in David's time — both from their inscriptions containing the names of men who were long after David's time, and from those things which are related in them [as] done many years after David: as the destruction of Jerusalem, of which the seventy-third psalm [Ps 74] speaks as of a thing already past; and the mourning of the captives at the rivers of Babylon, which is commemorated in the 136th psalm [Ps 137]; and the return from the captivity of Babylon into Jerusalem, of which [is] the 125th psalm [Ps 126], as [the psalter] speaks of it as already completed. Which [things] also seven-and-forty psalms more openly indicate — namely, from the hundred-and-eleventh even to the end of the book of psalms — which are inscribed "**Reversions** *(Reversiones)*" of Aggaeus [Haggai] and Zacharias [Zechariah], because through these two prophets they were sung for the return of the sons of Israel from Babylon into Jerusalem.

3. To this it accedes [is added], that almost all authors, as much Jews as Christians, affirm that the greater part of this volume is not David's. R. David Kimhi thinks those only to be psalms of David to which is prefixed the title לדוד *(le David)*, that is, "of David himself" *(Ipsi David)*; but the others to be [the psalms] of those by whose name they are entitled — whom Aben Ezra [Ibn Ezra], calling into doubt, says that it is uncertain whether every psalm to which is prefixed the name לדוד *(le David)*, that is, "of David himself," be his, or rather of some singer who composed it concerning David. Jerome also, in the epistle to Cyprian, says: "They **err** *(Errant)* who think all the psalms to be David's, and not [the psalms] of those by whose names they are inscribed — as David, Asaph, Idithun, the sons of Core [Korah], Heman, [Ethan] the Ezrahite, Moses, and Solomon, and the rest, whom Esdras comprehended in the first volume." But Augustine, in the preface to the 2nd psalm, judges that David sang only nine psalms, but that the others, to which his name is prefixed, were sung by his singers. John Chrysostom, in the preface to the psalms, asserts [the same]. The inscriptions which are now prefixed to the psalms, he asserts to be for the greater part false. Which consensus of opinions makes faith [gives assurance] that this book is not David's.

4. But as to [the claim] that nothing prophetic is in this book, the Hebrews themselves testify, who exclude it from the prophetic scriptures. And you [Christians] also confirm the same, when you make David the author of the book — [David] who was not a prophet, but a king assumed for the governance of the kingdom. For those are called prophets in the scriptures who are divinely called to the office of prophesying, or are sent to a king, or to some people, with the public dignity of an office, that they may announce future things to them — as Moses to Pharaoh, and Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets to the people of Israel: but David we nowhere read to have been called to this dignity of prophesying. But also the psalms of this book themselves most clearly show that nothing is found in this book which pertains to prophecy. For those testimonies which are wont to be brought forth from the psalms as presages of Christ agree to none less than to Christ. For how do those words pertain to the crucifixion of Christ: "They have **dug** *(Foderunt)* my hands, and they **divided** *(Diviserunt)* my garments" — which can in no way be adapted to Christ? [6] For, besides that the Hebrews read those words otherwise, saying, "**Like** *(Sicut)* a lion my hands and my feet they have observed [watched]," it is also evident that Christ was not crucified with nails driven through hands and feet — because it was not the custom in Israel that those who were hanged on wood should be fastened to the cross with hands and feet transfixed by a nail, but the law so prescribing, that [men], suspended and transfixed, should hang on the cross. Likewise, that which is taken from the eighteenth psalm [Ps 19]: "**Into** *(In)* all the earth their sound went out" — how can it be twisted to the preaching of the apostles, when [7]

[1] 1 Chron. 25 (1. Par. 25).

[2] John 10 (Ioan. 10); Psalm 81 [Vulgate], "I said, you are gods" (printed "Psal. 18," apparently transposed); Matt. 13 (Matth. 13); Psalm 77 [= Ps 78] (Psal. 77).

[3] Heb. 3 (printed "Heb. 13"); Psalm 94 [= Ps 95] (printed "Psal. 64"); Psalm 44 [= Ps 45] (Psal. 44); Heb. 1 (Hebr. 1).

[4] 2 Kings [Samuel] 22 (2. Reg. 22); Psalm 17 [= Ps 18] (Psal. 17); ch. 23 (Cap. 23).

[5] Psalm 72 (printed "Psal. 27," a slip).

[6] Psalm 21 [= Ps 22] (Psal. 21).

[7] Psalm 18 [= Ps 19] (Psal. 18).

(printed p. 639 [PDF p. 644] — Heresy V: objection 4 concluded, objection 5 (the "imprecation" psalms); then the Objections are Dissolved (responses 1–3 begun).)

[how can "Into all the earth their sound went out" be twisted to the preaching of the apostles,] when it [the psalm] speaks expressly of the heavens themselves, according to a certain poetic prosopopoeia? By which two testimonies, if the matter be more attentively inspected, there are found also other testimonies like [these], which our elders referred to the vaticinations of Christ.

5. The sentences, moreover, and words of this book so abhor from the mind of every pious man that it appears its author was not divine, but a certain barbarous, inhuman [man], greedy of slaughter, of vengeance, and of blood, who everywhere sends against his enemies dire [things], imprecations, execrations: "**Judge** *(Iudica)*," he says, "O Lord, those who harm me; overthrow those who impugn me; pour out the lance *(framea)*, and shut up [the way] against those who persecute me. Let them become as dust before the face of the wind, and let the angel of the Lord straiten them. Let their ways become darkness and slipperiness, and let the angel of the Lord persecute them." [1] And, "Let **death** *(Veniat mors)* come upon them, and let them descend into hell living." And again, "**Make** *(Fac)* them as Madian [Midian], and Sysara [Sisera], and as Iabin [Jabin], in the torrent of Cyson [Kishon]; let them perish, and become as the dung of the earth. Make their princes as Oreb, and Zeb, and Zebee [Zebah], and Salmana [Zalmunna]. My God, make them as a wheel, and as stubble before the face of the wind; as fire which burneth the wood, and as a flame burning the mountains, so shalt thou persecute them in thy tempest, and in thy wrath shalt thou trouble them." [2] With which indignations and maledictions almost all the psalms are so full, that they bear a similitude of those imprecations with which Callimachus devoted [cursed] Apollonius of Rhodes, and Ovid [devoted] his *Ibis*.

THE OBJECTIONS ARE DISSOLVED *(Diluuntur Obiecta)*

1. So inept are the objections of the Anabaptists that a response seems in some manner superfluous. For if the book is on this account denied to be David's — because it does not bear his inscription — then neither will Moses be the author of the five books of the law, because they are not titled with the name of Moses. The opposite of which thing Christ teaches, saying: "**Moses** wrote of me"; and all authors, as much Hebrew as Christian, confirm it. [3] And lest most unskilled men wonder that the name of David is not prefixed to this book, let them know that among the Hebrews the divine volumes are inscribed in various ways: either from the name of the author, as the book of Joshua; or from the first word of the book, as the book of Genesis, which from its first word is entitled בראשת ברה *(Berescith barah)* [that is, בראשית ברא, "In the beginning [God] created"]; or from the matter contained in the book, as the book of Kings, and the present volume of Psalms — which, from the hymns and odes contained in it, the name of the author being omitted, is called ספר תהלים *(Sepher theillim)*, that is, "the book of psalms, or of hymns, or of prayers": which book, nevertheless, our Savior testified to be David's, when he said to the scribes, "**David** himself says in the book of Psalms: The Lord said to my lord." And we have already shown that the author of all the psalms which are in it was David, who — besides those psalms which he sang with his own mouth — supplied (as Augustine and Chrysostom say) all the subjects of the other psalms to those singers, who sang them, and inscribed them with their own names, and, the subjects being received from him, explained [them] in songs. [4] But those are confuted who say that David put forth one [psalm] only, through the very same words which they bring against us. For if that psalm which is read in the second volume of Kings [2 Sam 22] was the last of the

psalms, then it behooved that before it more other psalms were composed by David; for neither would it be called the last, unless others had preceded it. But as to [the fact] that after the end of the seventy-first psalm it is written, "**Finished** *(Finitae)* are the prayers of David," it is not so to be understood, that I should believe the psalms of David to be there finished, and that [psalm] to be the last of all the psalms; but that we may know those prayers to be finished in that place, by which he besought God for the safety and the kingdom of his son Solomon. Similarly concerning the psalm of the book of Kings it is to be thought, that it was not the last of all David's psalms, but only of those which he composed during the persecution of his enemies.

2. To the **second** objection of the Anabaptists — concerning the psalms which seem to have been composed after David's time — Augustine, in the seventeenth [book] of the City of God, responds in these words: "It seems to **me** *(Mihi)* more credible to esteem that those [men] who attribute all these psalms to the work of David — and [say] that he prefixed some [of them] also with the names of others, prefiguring something which pertains to the matter [thereby dealt with] — [judge rightly]. Nor ought it to move [anyone] to this disbelief, [5] that some names of prophets who were after the times of King David are read inscribed on certain psalms in that book, and [that] the things which are there said seem, as it were, to be said by them: for the prophetic Spirit was able to reveal to David these names also of future prophets — as King Josias [Josiah], who was to reign after more than three hundred years, was revealed by [his] own name to a certain prophet." These [things] Augustine. But the Anabaptists say that those things which are contained in the psalms are not fore-announced as future, but narrated as past. Whom the divine Jerome meets, saying that this is set among the prophets as a custom: that, on account of the certitude of the prophecy, they should pronounce future things as if already past. [6]

3. To the **third** objection we respond, [that] three [things] are to be considered in the psalms: the invention, the disposition, and the pronunciation. If we inspect the invention, it is certain that David found out [devised] the matter and subject of all the psalms, and, [it] being found, supplied it to his singers — as the books of Kings and Paralipomenon [Chronicles] testify, and Aben Ezra [Ibn Ezra] in the preface to the psalms, and Augustine in the 17th [book] of the City of God, and Jerome, and Chrysostom in the preface to the psalms, confirm. If the discourse is about the disposition of the psalms, the aforesaid authors rightly judge that not all the Psalms were disposed by David through songs and modulations, but by Asaph, Chore [Korah], Idithun, Moses, and Samuel his son, and other singers accommodated to the meters, and fitted to the songs, and adapted to diverse musical instruments. But if the discourse is about the pronunciation of the living voice, Augustine, in the second preface to the psalms, best said that David alone sang nine psalms with his own mouth. But concerning the titles of the psalms, which Chrysostom said to be false, it is not to be believed that he himself thought the true titles to have been erased, and in their place other false titles substituted; but that he rather esteemed those titles to have been transposed, and — the order of the history being confused — permuted [rearranged], as his following words indicate, when he says that Esdras, after the Babylonian

[1] Psalm 34 [= Ps 35] (Psal. 34).

[2] Psalm 54 [= Ps 55], "let death come" (Psal.; printed digit unclear); Psalm 82 [= Ps 83] (Psalm. 82).

[3] John 5 (Ioan. 5).

[4] Luke 20 (printed "Luc. 12"); Augustine, book 17 of the City of God, ch. 14 (Aug. li. 17. de ciu. Dei c. 14); Chrysostom, in the second preface to the psalms (Chrysost. secund. praef. in psalmos).

[5] Augustine, book 17 of the City of God, ch. 14 (Aug. lib. 17. de ciu. Dei ca. 14).

[6] 3 Kings [1 Kings] 13 (3. Reg. 13); Jerome on Psalm 21 (Hier. in Psal. 21).

(printed p. 640 [PDF p. 645] — Heresy V concluded (refutations 3–5); then Heresy VI opens: Of the book of Daniel.)

[that Esdras, after the Babyloni-]an [captivity], collected these psalms — dispersed here and there — into one volume, the order of the history being omitted. Which the very series of the book of psalms betrays: in which the third psalm, put forth by David when he fled from the face of Absalom, precedes the thirty-third

psalm [Ps 34], which David had made many years before, when — his madness being feigned — he fled from the hands of Abimelech.

4. But when they add that David was neither a prophet, nor [that] the psalms inscribed to him are divine, they show themselves much worse than the Jews: who, although they do not believe that the psalms fore-announced anything about our Savior, nevertheless believe that the Holy Spirit was the author of this book. And although they do not place it [David/the book] among the prophets, but in the beginning of the books which they call כתובים *(Chetubim* [Ketuvim], *so printed "cherubim")* — that is, ἁγιόγραφα *(hagiographa)*, or "holy writings" — nevertheless they do not deny that many things in it are written by the prophetic spirit: as the second psalm, and the forty-fourth psalm [Ps 45], and the hundred-and-tenth [Ps 110], which they expound of their [own] Messiah. Therefore, to those vaticinations which — as if by us violently distorted — the heretics, together with the author of the book Nizaon [the Jewish *Nizzahon*], calumniate, we respond: [as to] those words of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22], "They have **observed** *(Observaverunt)* as a lion my hands" — so it is read among the Chaldee translator [the Targum], who rendered it as it seemed [good] to them; but in the Hebrew exemplar it is read כארו ידי ורגלי *(Chaari iadai, veragelai)*, that is, "They have **dug** *(Foderunt)* my hands, and my feet." Whence we cast away the Chaldaic translation as repugnant to the Hebrew truth. Nor does it move us at all that the [Mosaic] law did not command the hands and feet of the damned to be fixed to the cross: because, since at that time the power of judging was taken away from the Jews by the Romans, [criminals] were no longer punished exactly according to the Mosaic law, but as the Roman governor *(praeses)*, who was over the province of the Jews, had given sentence, so were the penalties inflicted. Whence also Joseph [of Arimathea] asked Pilate that he would grant him the body of Jesus — which, nevertheless, according to the [Mosaic] law was to be taken down before the setting of the Sun. The breaking of the legs *(crurifragium)* also, and the transfixion of the breast, are not from the [Mosaic] law; and by the same reasoning also the infixion of nails. Truly, therefore, the words of this vaticination were fulfilled in Christ; as also those words of the eighteenth psalm [Ps 19] were most truly fulfilled in the Apostles, according to the mystical and allegorical sense, and most faithfully expounded by Paul in the epistle to the Romans. For the apostles are most truly the "heavens," who through the whole globe of the earth diffused Christ, the Sun of justice, and by his splendor illuminated the whole earth. [1]

5. Concerning the imprecations which are read in the psalms, we say that they are not evil, because they are born not from hatred, but from an ardent affection of charity. For this is the custom of the just: that they seek vengeance from their enemies in two ways — either that, by the occasion of vengeance, those who are predestined to life may be converted from evil to good; or that those who, God foreknowing, are to be damned, may die, and cease to sin, so that by this they may have a lesser penalty in hell (where each one, according to the quality of his works, will sustain the magnitude of the penalties): to which two ways a third also is added, by which, namely, the saints imprecate evils not by the wish of one desiring [them], but by the intuition of one foreseeing [them] — fore-announcing to men future evils, so that, after the fore-announced [things] shall have come to pass, they may know [2] that men suffer [these things] not by chance or fortune, but by the certain deliberation and counsel of God.

OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL — Heresy VI *(De Libro Danielis. Haeresis VI)*

To cut off, from the book of Daniel — which is falsely written under his name — many fabulous narrations.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This heresy, drawn from the fountains of the Manichaeans — although all the Anabaptists most vainly defend it — yet they somewhat disagree among themselves concerning it. For some reject the whole volume of Daniel entirely, as suppositious [spurious] and false; but others receive only those [parts] which the Hebrews believe to be Daniel's, and reckon alone among the Hagiographa, the rest being cast away which are

not had in the Hebrew codices: such as are the hymn of the three boys [the Song of the Three Children], the history of Susanna, the narration of Bel, and the history of Daniel cast into the den [of lions] and of Habakkuk [Abacuch] carried off [thither]. [3]

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

All those things which are read in the book of Daniel by the Church show [themselves] most true — the infallible and most certain outcomes of those matters which in it are found predicted many ages before they came to pass. For Daniel left [behind], as Josephus says, [some] of those things which he wrote, whence the integrity of his prophecy, and no change or variation in those things which he foretold, can be recognized. For he not only predicted future things (which is common to all prophets), but also foresaw most certainly at what time, and under what kings, and — the years being numbered in order — [that] those things ought to come to pass. Whose prophecy had so great credibility, that to incredulous men he seems not to have foretold future things, but to have narrated things past. For almost nothing is contained in the histories of the nations about the four Monarchies — of the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans — which is not read fore-announced in the book of Daniel many ages before. [4] Since, indeed, those things which the same prophet predicted concerning the three prior Monarchies down to the times of Antiochus the Illustrious, even the Gentiles who wrote against his prophecies confessed to have been all most truly fulfilled. For Porphyry — who wrote the twelfth of his fifteen books against Daniel — when he saw all things most faithfully fulfilled just as they had been fore-announced, the histories of the Gentiles attesting to the outcome, overcome by the truth of history, could not deny that Daniel, at least down to the times of Antiochus, had most truly prophesied. But that he prophesied, without any error, concerning those things which came to pass after Antiochus, the same histories of the nations most lucidly show. Whence Jerome, in the preface to the commentaries on Daniel, rightly said that to understand this book there is need of the manifold history of the Greeks and Latins — namely of Sutorius [Callinicus], Callinicus, Diodorus, Hieronymus, Polybius, Posidonius, Claudius, Theon, and Andronicus, and also of Josephus and of those whom Josephus sets down; but especially of our [own] Livy, and Pompeius Trogus, and Justin, who narrates the whole history of the last vision, and, after Alexander, [the history] down to Caesar Augustus, of the [kings] of Syria [5]

[1] Rom. 12 (so printed; the "into all the earth their sound went out," Ps 19:4, is cited by Paul at Rom. 10:18).

[2] Augustine, Sermon 11 on the saints (Aug. ser. 11. de sanctis).

[3] Dan. 3; Dan. 13; Dan. 14.

[4] [Josephus,] book 10 of the Antiquities, ch. 13 (lib. 10. antiq. cap. 13).

[5] Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.); [a dense marginal source-list:] Berosus, book 3, of the Chaldaean history; Metasthenes, book 4, of the Indica; Diocles, book 2; Philostratus … Phoenician histories.

(printed p. 641 [PDF p. 646] — Heresy VI (Daniel): the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (1–5, obj 5 running onto the next page).)

[the kings] of Syria and Egypt — that is, of Seleucus, and Antiochus, and of the Ptolemies — describe [their] wars. All which things defend the truth of this book not only against the heretics, but also against the infidels. To these accedes the consensus of the sacred volumes — as much of the old as of the new testament — attesting to the prophecy of Daniel. In the first book of the Maccabees, Mathathias [Mattathias], nearest to death, exhorts his sons to the observance of the law and to the toleration of hardships, examples being received from this book — of the three boys, who were freed from the furnace of burning fire, and of Daniel, who was saved from the mouth of the Lions. [1] And Christ, in Matthew, out of this book announces the destruction of the city and the abomination of the temple of Jerusalem, predicted by Daniel. And Paul, to the Hebrews, mentions the history of the three boys, and of Daniel in the den of Lions, when he says: "They **extinguished** *(Extinxerunt)* the force of fire, they stopped the mouths of the Lions." To which testimonies is added, that in all the catalogues of the divine books, through all the successions of the churches, the volume

of Daniel was always numbered among the prophets, and — together with the hymn of the three boys, and the history of Susanna, of Bel, and of Habakkuk [Abacuch] — received into authority. [2] For the hymn of the three boys is testified — by Rufinus, in the second book against Jerome, and by Augustine, in the forty-seventh sermon on the saints — always to have been sung, from the very beginning of the nascent Church, in every solemnity, in the sacred assemblies of the faithful. But the history of Susanna, Ignatius the martyr praises in the epistle to the Magnesians; and Rufinus, in the aforesaid book, affirms that the same history was read, for four hundred years before himself, as an exemplar of chastity and of modesty, to the married and the unmarried in the churches. And Origen, in the first homily upon Leviticus, approving the history of Susanna, says: "**But it is time** *(Sed tempus est)*, against the wicked, to use the words of Susanna" — which [words] they [the heretics], as it were repudiating, cut away the history from the catalogue of the divine volumes; but we both receive [it], and opportunely bring [it] forth against them: "**Straits** *(Angustiae)* are on every side for me." But the Church, every year, reads this history at the [appointed] season in the sacred mysteries of the Mass, and with like honor venerates — reading at the same time — the history of Bel, of the Dragon, and of Habakkuk the dish-bearer [discophorus]. [3]

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS *(Obiectiones Haereticorum)*

1. In the first place, it is sufficiently agreed that Daniel — whose deeds and visions the present volume relates — was not that Daniel who is memorialized among the holy men and prophets in certain places of holy scripture, but some other, who falsely usurped his name to himself, to whom [the things] which Ezekiel wrote concerning the prophet Daniel can in no way be accommodated. Who [Ezekiel], when he prophesied in the sixth year of Ioachim [Jehoiakim] king of Juda, reckoned Daniel the prophet among men of more advanced age and now great in birth [i.e. elderly], and among married men, having sons and daughters. But Daniel, of whom this book speaks, was in the same year of Ioachim king of Juda still a boy; and, together with the three boys Annania [Hananiah], Azaria [Azariah], and Missael [Mishael], erudite in the letters of the Chaldeans, the first chapter of this volume commemorates [him], and enumerates [him] among the royal Eunuchs. [4] And Jerome, in the first book against Jovinian, confirms that that one [Daniel] was a eunuch *(spado)*, and [that] in him was fulfilled that vaticination of Isaiah which he brought forth over King Ezechias [Hezekiah], saying: "**Of thy sons** *(De filijs tuis)*, who shall be born from thee, they shall take, and make Eunuchs in the house of the king." Another, therefore, is the Daniel author of this book, [different] from him who is named among the prophets. Which also Jerome — Rufinus being witness — seemed to feel, when in the preface to Daniel he admonished the readers that this book, among the Hebrews, is not had among the prophetic books. [5]

2. It appears also that this book [was] not [written] by the prophet Daniel, but composed by an uncertain author after the times of Antiochus, who did not predict future things, but narrated things already past. The argument of which thing is, that the visions of the lion, bear, and leopard correspond to the things done by Nebuchadnezzar down to Antiochus the Illustrious; but in those things which he predicted after Antiochus, down to these our times — since he was not a seer — he deceived himself, and others who believed him. For nothing has yet been fulfilled of those things which he foresaw concerning the fourth Beast — that is, concerning the fourth Monarchy of the Romans — describing ten horns (that is, ten kings, who at one and the same time were to sit [reign] in the Roman kingdom), and immediately another little horn (that is, a little king about to ascend, and to overthrow three of those kings). [6]

3. The phrase [varied style] of the volume, moreover, indicates that not Daniel, but a certain Greekling *(Graeculus)*, friendly to the Jews, was the author of the book — who, although he lied egregiously, that he might the more easily impose upon the reader by [using] as much Chaldee as Hebrew speech, nevertheless could not so long conceal the imposture but that, at last, at almost the foot [end] of the volume, he betrayed himself [as] a Greek, when he brought in Daniel responding to the elders by Greek word-plays: the word

σχίσαι *(schisai)* — that is, "to cleave" *(scindere)* — being derived from the word σχῖνος *(schinos)*, that is, "the mastic tree" *(lentiscus)*; and the word πρίσαι *(prisai)* — that is, "to saw" *(secare)* — from the name πρῖνος *(prinos)*, that is, "the holm-oak" *(ilex)*: which etymologies can be fitted neither to the Hebrew nor to the Chaldee tongue. [7]

4. But however it be believed concerning the author of this book, it certainly cannot be denied that a great part of this volume was fabricated: as that which is read in it concerning the adoration of Daniel. For — be it that it was not impossible that Nebuchadnezzar, such and so great a king, adored [worshipped] a Eunuch, his own servant (which can scarcely be believed) — nevertheless it is an impiety to believe that Daniel, a good man, suffered himself to be adored, and to be worshipped as God with sacrifice offered by his own most powerful king; when Paul was execrated [and refused], with garments rent, the same honor from the Lycaonians, who wished to sacrifice to him; and [when] the angel rebuked John, prostrating himself at his knees, saying: "**Do not** *(Ne feceris)* do [it], for I am thy fellow-servant." [8] Similarly also the hymn of the three boys is suspected: for, beyond that it is not verisimilar that three boys had so much leisure that, in the midst of the flames, they should play [compose] in hexameters, and invoke all the elements in order to the praise of God — it [the hymn] is also found nowhere in the Hebrew exemplars.

5. Moreover, the history of Susanna — which the aforesaid etymologies of the ilex and the mastic indicate to have been written by a Greek author — the most ancient fathers of the Church reject as fabricated; and Eusebius, in the sixth book of the Ecclesiastical History, relates the opinion of Origen and of Julius Africanus concerning this history, in these words: "**Through** *(Per)* [9]

[1] 1 Macc. 2 (1. Mac. 2).
[2] Matt. 24 (Matt. 24); Dan. 9; Heb. 11.
[3] Dan. 13.
[4] Ezek. 14 (Ezech. 14); Dan. 1.
[5] Isaiah 39 (Esa. 39); Rufinus, book 2 (Rufinus li. 2); Jerome (Hier.).
[6] Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.).
[7] Dan. 13.
[8] Dan. 3; Acts 14 (so the passage, the Lycaonians; printed "Act. 3"); Apoc. 19 (Ap. 19).
[9] ch. 23 (Cap. 23).

(printed p. 642 [PDF p. 647] — Heresy VI (Daniel): objections 5–7 concluded; then the DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS (responses 1–2 begun).)

"**Through** *(Per)* the same time there was also Africanus, a man noble in ecclesiastical scriptures. His epistle is reported [to have been] written to Origen, objecting to him, or proposing [to him], that the history of Susanna, which is written in Daniel, seems fabricated, and alien to prophetic scripture. To whom Origen, most magnificently replying, asserts that in no way are the fabrications and frauds of the Jews to be listened to, but that this alone is to be held for true in the divine scriptures which the Seventy interpreters translated — for that alone is [true] which has been confirmed by apostolic authority." By which words it appears that Africanus thought this history [to be] the invention of a certain Greek; but that Origen esteemed the same to have been the fraud of some Jew — perhaps of Symmachus, or of Theodotion. Besides these things, also the time of the judgment of Susanna does not agree with the age of the boy Daniel. For the deed of Susanna, as is written at the foot of the 13th chapter, happened after the death of Astyages, king of the Medes and Persians, [in] the reign of Cyrus, who succeeded to the kingdom of Astyages. At which time, indeed — as is agreed from the same book — Daniel was not a boy (as he is brought in [introduced] in the judgment of Susanna), but, [being] now greater than sixty years old, lived in honor before Cyrus. [1]

6. But above all [things], the destruction of Bel, and the translation of Abacoch [Habakkuk] to Daniel in the den of Lions, are fabulous. For, besides that that Dragon is feigned to have been slain by a lump of pitch, in imitation of the Cretan Minotaur; and [besides] the fraud of the priests, detected by the sprinkling of ash —

which could have been done, without any prophetic spirit, by whatsoever man even of mediocre talent — this also accedes, that the author of the fable is not consistent with himself: who, when he had first said that Daniel was only one night in the den, and thence in the first morning was drawn out by the King, afterward, little mindful [of himself], writes that he remained in the den for seven continuous days, and was refreshed by a meal by the prophet Abacuch [Habakkuk] — if, nevertheless, it be worthy to be believed that a man of heavy body traversed, in a moment of time, so great spaces of lands from Judea into Chaldea; when nothing ever similar is read to have been done in the [holy] scriptures. [2]

7. Wherefore, most prudently, Josephus — when he wrote out the deeds of Daniel in the tenth book of the Antiquities — omitted narrations of this kind as fabulous. And Jerome, in the preface to Daniel, called them fables, and, as [things] unworthy to be read, transfixed [them] with an obelus, or spit [veru], jugulating [them]; and truncated [them] from the rest of the volume of Daniel; and, the person of a Jew objecting being assumed, confuted those [fables] with many arguments. And in the preface of the commentaries on Daniel, deriding the defenders of these fables, "**I wonder** *(Miror)*," he says, "that certain μεμψιμοίρους *(mempsimoirous)* — that is, querulous [complainers] — are indignant at me, as if I had truncated the book; when both Origen, and Eusebius, and Apollinaris, and other ecclesiastical men and Greek doctors, confess these visions (as I said) not to be had among the Hebrews, nor [that] they ought to respond to Porphyry on behalf of those things which furnish no authority of holy scripture."

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS *(Dissolutio Obiectorum)*

1. The first argument which is brought by the Anabaptists, the divine Jerome, in the first book against Jovinian, dissolves in these words: "We say that Ezechiel [Ezekiel] mentioned Daniel not [as] a man, but [as] still a boy. But if any one should oppose that which is said in Ezekiel — 'Noe [Noah], and Daniel, and Job, in the sinning land could not free their sons and daughters' — it is to be responded that it was said according to a hypothesis [hypothetically]. For neither were Noah and Job [alive] at that time, whom we know to have been many ages before; and the sense is: if such and such men were in a sinning land, they would not be able to free their sons and daughters. But the boy Daniel is numbered among the two aged men, either because he was still known as a boy to the people, or on account of the interpretation of the dreams of the king, or on account of the liberation of Susanna and the killing of the elders. He is also numbered among those married men — not because he had a wife and sons, but because those three men (as the same Jerome, in the fourth book upon Ezekiel, and R. Kimki [Kimhi], upon the fourteenth chapter of Ezekiel, judge) experienced, in three diverse states, a great calamity and felicity beyond [that of] the rest. Noah saw the prosperity of the age before the flood, [its] ruin in the flood, and its reparation after the flood. Job saw his felicity, then saw the destruction of [his] sons and of all his goods, and again saw himself restored. Daniel saw himself illustrious in the palace of his kingdom before the captivity; then saw himself a captive; and after the captivity saw himself exalted to [high] rank." But as to what Rufinus objected to Jerome — that he denied Daniel to be a prophet — Jerome himself abundantly confuted [it], showing that he never denied Daniel [to be] a prophet, whom he had straightway, in the front of the prologue, confessed to be a prophet; but that he had only indicated what the Hebrews say. [3]

2. To the second argument of the Anabaptists — which is taken from the twelfth book of Porphyry, Jerome being witness — the same blessed father [Jerome] satisfied [answered], in the seventh chapter upon Daniel, in these words: "**Therefore** *(Ergo)* we say — that which all the ecclesiastical writers have handed down — [that] in the consummation of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans is to be destroyed, there will be ten future kings, who shall divide the Roman world among themselves; and an eleventh little king will arise, who shall overcome three of the ten kings — that is, the king of the Egyptians, and of Africa, and of Ethiopia (as in the following [passages] we shall say more manifestly); [and] these being slain, the other seven kings also will submit [their] necks to the victor." These [things] Jerome, concerning the sentence of Daniel: to

which are conformable those things which are written in the Apocalypse concerning the beast having ten horns, where thus the angel expounded that vision of Daniel, saying: "The **ten horns** *(Decem cornua)* which thou sawest are ten kings, who have not yet received the kingdom, but shall receive power as kings for one hour, etc." Nor are there lacking [those] who, by the denary [tenfold] number of kings, understand a great and indeterminate number — according to that [saying] in the fourteenth [chapter] of Numbers: "They have **tempted** *(Tentaverunt)* me now ten times." But by the little horn [is understood] the kingdom of Antichrist, which Christ shall destroy in the consummation of the age. Since, therefore, the calumny of Porphyry can be refuted in so many ways, no necessity compels us to suspect the book of Daniel [to be] written after the times of Antiochus: especially since Josephus writes that, to Alexander the Great — who preceded Antiochus — upon [his] entering Jerusalem, [the book of Daniel] was brought forth by the priests [4]

[1] Dan. 13.

[2] Dan. 6; Dan., last [ch.] (Dan. ultim. [Dan. 14]).

[3] Ezek. 14 (Ezech. 14).

[4] Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.); Apoc. 17 (Ap. 17); Num. 14 (Num. 14); Josephus, book 11, ch. 8 (Iosep. lib. 11. cap. 8).

(printed p. 643 [PDF p. 648] — Heresy VI (Daniel): Dissolution of the Objections continues (responses 2 concluded, 3–6).)

[was brought forth by the priest]s the volume of Daniel, in which it was written that a certain king of the Greeks was to destroy the power of the Persians; and [Josephus writes] that Alexander greatly rejoiced, because he judged himself to be [the one] whom the scripture signified. [1]

3. Now, that which they adduce concerning the etymologies of σχίνου καὶ πρίνου *(schinou kai prinou* — of the mastic and of the holm-oak*)* proves nothing. For we confess that the history of Susanna — whose those words are — as Jerome and all the fathers testify, is neither read in the Hebrew codex, nor [was written] by a Hebrew writer, but [was written] by a certain pious Greek, according to the truth of the deed, in the Greek tongue; and then, indeed, by the judgment of the apostolic Church, added under [at] the end of the book of Daniel, as a thing worthy of such a prophet.

4. The fourth argument also, taken by the Anabaptists from the twelfth book of Porphyry, Jerome refutes in the third chapter upon Daniel, in these words: "Porphyry calumniates **this place** *(Hunc locum)*, that a most proud king never adored a captive — as if the Lycaonians also had not, on account of the magnitude of the signs, wished to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas. But this also we can say: that the king himself expounded the causes of adoring, and of immolating victims, and of incense, and of sacrifice, saying: '**Truly** *(Vere)* God seems [to be], the God of Gods.' Therefore, not so much Daniel, as in Daniel he adores God, who revealed the mysteries. Which we read that Alexander the Great, king of the Macedonians, also did before the pontiff Ioiada [Jaddua]. But if this displeases, it is to be said that Nabuchodonosor, confused by the magnitude of the signs and by stupor, was ignorant of what he did — [so] that he, who understood [there was] a true Lord and [that Daniel was] the lord of kings, [nevertheless] adored his [own] servant, and burned incense to him. But in this the calumniator strives to reprehend the prophet: because he did not refuse the gifts, and willingly received the Babylonian honor — not considering that the king had for this reason seen the dream, and [that] the mysteries of the interpretation were revealed through the boy, that Daniel might grow, and in the place of captivity become the prince of all the Chaldeans, and the power of God be known. Which indeed we read was done to Joseph before Pharaoh, and [in] Egypt; and to Mardochaeus [Mordecai] before Assuerus [Ahasuerus] — so that in each nation the captive and sojourning Jews might have solace, seeing a man of their nation to be the prince of the Egyptians, or of the Chaldeans." These [things] Jerome, concerning the honor received by Daniel. [2] To which, when the Anabaptists oppose that Paul and the angel refused such things, it is to be responded that the cause was disparate in each. For Paul tore his garments at the divine honors offered [to him], because he saw that the Lycaonians wished to worship, in those honors,

not God in himself and in Barnabas — as Nabuchodonosor [worshipped God] in Daniel — but himself and Barnabas as the impious gods of the gentiles (namely as Jupiter and Mercury), moved by a certain foolish opinion. For which cause also the angel prohibited John, prostrating himself at [his] knees: because he had perceived that he [John] esteemed himself to have God present; which, lest he should falsely believe [it], the angel indicated, with a rebuke, that he was not God. But concerning the hymn of the three boys — just as we confess that it is not found among the Hebrews, so we believe that it was sung by those boys in the furnace of fire; nor does it seem wonderful to us that, in the midst of the heats of the flames, they could play [compose] in meter, and, in order, invoke the single creatures to the benediction of God; since, by the benignity of God, they could [do] much greater and more wonderful [things] — namely, walk through the midst of the fires with garments intact, and the tips of [their] hair unharmed.

5. Concerning the opinion of Origen and of Africanus, there is nothing why we should be moved: since Africanus, not by deciding, but by doubting, asked of Origen whether this history seemed to be fabricated. But Origen was so far from an opinion of this kind, that he most strongly confuted it in a long and erudite epistle, and at the foot of the same epistle so wrote in praise of this sacred history: "**These things** *(Haec)* have been said by me for the defending of the history of Susanna; and would that I could celebrate an encomium of the scripture of Susanna — as much by dwelling on the single words, as by showing the excellent senses" — that which some private [person], who shall have studiously and abundantly meditated in the divine [scriptures], will be able to compose. But neither does Eusebius relate this history [to have been] rejected by Origen, but affirms only this: namely, that he moved [a doubt], lest the fables of the Jews should be received, but only those [things] which the Seventy Interpreters translated. Which Origenic words indeed are not to be referred to the scripture of Susanna, but to certain other Apocrypha, which Origen enumerates in that epistle. But concerning the times of the boyhood of Daniel, and of the liberation of Susanna — which seem to discrepate among themselves — it is to be known that those words, "**And** king Astyages *(Et rex Astyages)* was gathered to his fathers, and Cyrus received his kingdom" — which are read at the end of the thirteenth chapter — do not pertain to the history of Susanna commemorated just above, but to the history of Bel and the dragon, and to that [which follows] next, in the 14th chapter following, whose time is designated when it is said: "**And** king Astyages was gathered to his fathers, etc." [3]

6. Concerning the diverse number of days in which it is read that Daniel was in the den of lions, certain [men], following the opinion of those whom Jerome relates to have distinguished two Daniels, thus dissolve [it], saying: [that] this Daniel, who is placed in the history of Susanna, and of Bel, and of the dragon, is not he whose deeds are narrated in the book of Daniel, but another — who was not of the tribe of Juda, and a Eunuch of the king of Babylon, but of the tribe of Levi, a priest, concerning whom Abacuch [Habakkuk], son of Jesu [Jesus/Joshua], of the tribe of Levi, wrote. Accordingly there is no contradiction within [the book], since the history of Susanna, of Bel, and of Habakkuk does not pertain to the book of Daniel, but is a part [4] of the prophecy of Abacuch [Habakkuk], son of Jesu, of the tribe of Levi — as, according to the seventy interpreters, is placed in the title of the same history of Bel: "A certain **man** *(Homo)* was a priest, by name Daniel, son of Abda, a table-companion of the king of Babylon" — whereas [distinct from the fact that] the holy scripture testifies that Daniel and the three boys were of the tribe of Juda. These [things] they [say]. But we, approaching nearer to the continuation of the history, take away the controversy in this manner. Daniel was sent into the den not once, but twice, and for diverse causes. First, under Darius Hystaspes (Istaspes), because, against his edict, he adored his own God within the thirty prohibited days; and then — as is read in the sixth chapter of this book — he was one night only in it, and thence, in the following light [morning], was drawn out by the king. But secondly, he was again sent into the den on account of the destruction of Bel and the killing of the dragon, under Cyrus [5]

[1] Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 8 (Iosep. li. 11. ant. cap. 8).

[2] Acts 14 (Act. 14); Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 8 (Iosep. li. 11. ant. cap. 8).

[3] Jerome [on] ch. 13 upon Daniel (Hier. 13. ca. in Danielem).
[4] Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Danielis).
[5] Dan. 6; Dan. 14.

(printed p. 644 [PDF p. 649] — Heresy VI (Daniel) concluded (responses 6–7); then Heresy VII opens: Of the book of Ecclesiastes.)

[under] Cyrus the king — who reigned with Darius Istaspes [Hystaspes] two years, and after him twenty-two years — and [Daniel] was in it [the den] six continuous days, and on the seventh was freed by Cyrus the king. But that Daniel lived after Darius the king, under the reign of Cyrus, is not doubtful: since he himself, in the tenth chapter of this book, testifies that in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, in Chaldea, beside the river Tigris, he saw a vision. Nor is it wonderful that Habakkuk [Abacuch] was carried to Daniel by an angel. For if — God permitting — the Devil could carry our Savior, with the whole weight of [his] body, from the desert into the temple, and from the temple onto the mountain (as Luke says) in a moment of time, why ought it to seem incredible that — God commanding — an angel could, within the space of one hour, bodily transport Habakkuk from Judea into Chaldea? [1]

7. The last [argument], which they oppose from the judgment of Josephus and of Jerome, those same authors refute. For Josephus, in the tenth book of the Antiquities, confesses that he passed over these, and many other sacred histories — not because he judged them unworthy of his narration, but because in the ancient books of the Hebrews they were not written, which alone he had taken to translate. But Jerome, responding to Rufinus (who had noted [reproached] him concerning the cut-off codex of Daniel), writes these things: "**But as to what** *(Quod autem)* I report — what the Hebrews are wont to say against the history of Susanna, and the hymn of the three boys, and the fables of Bel and of the dragon (which are not had in the Hebrew volume) — he who criminates me [as] foolish proves himself a sycophant. For I explained not what I myself thought, but what they are wont to say against us. If I did not respond to their opinion in the prologue — studying brevity, lest I should seem to write not a preface but a book — I think that I straightway subjoined [it]; for I said: Concerning which it is not of this place to dispute. Otherwise, also, from that which I asserted — that Porphyry said many things against this prophet, calling as witnesses of this matter Methodius, Eusebius, [and] Apollinaris, who responded to the many thousands of verses of his madness — he [Rufinus] will be able to accuse me, [saying] that I did not, in a little preface, write against the books of Porphyry." These [things] Jerome. Whom, if any one should again wish to carp at, because he everywhere called these histories "fables," we will respond that he derived the name of "fable" *(fabula)* not from "fabricating" *(fabulando)*, but from "speaking" *(fando)*. For also those who narrate true things are said, by the common speech of the nations, to "fabulate." As, concerning the two disciples speaking on the journey about the death of Christ, Luke said: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτούς *(kai egeneto en to homilein autous)* — which the old interpreter [the Vulgate] translated, "**And while** *(Et dum)* they fabulated [talked] with one another," that is, "conversed." And these things concerning the prophetic books, said against the heretics. Now let us accede to the books which are called Parenetic [hortatory] and Moral. [2]

OF THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES — Heresy VII *(De Libro Ecclesiastis. Haeresis VII)*

To repudiate the Ecclesiastes of Solomon.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Philastrius, in the catalogue of heresies, places this error among the unnamed heresies, whose author is unknown. Hugo of Caro [Hugh of St. Cher] in the preface of this book seems to intimate that [the error] derived from the foolish opinions of certain Jews, who indeed asserted that Solomon put forth this book for the confutation of the ancient idolatry, whose root and cause had been [the belief in] the eternity of the world.

Who [Solomon], since at the time when he wrote this he loved [was enamored of] idolatrous women — as is read in the third [book] of Kings — did not dare to write openly about the vanity of the world, and about its origin and destruction, lest, plucking out the error of those [women] from that very root, he should offend either them, or the nations of them. Whence, as it were studying to please them, he sometimes affirmed all things to have been from eternity, when he said: "**Nothing** *(Nihil)* new under the sun" — adding also many other things similar to these, for the sake of the women whom he loved. [3] Jerome also, at the end of the commentaries on this book, relates that the Jews were about to cast this book from the Canon of the holy letters — because it seems to esteem the whole to be for nothing, and to prefer eating, and drinking, and passing delights to all things; but that they desisted from this opinion, on account of a few words which are found written at the end of this book.

CONFVTATIO [The Confutation]

The heretics damn this book (as Philastrius related), first, because straightway in the very exordium of the book he said that all things which are under heaven are not only vanity, but even vanity of vanities; and [because] he did not deny to himself whatever his eyes desired; and because there was nothing good in the life of man except to rejoice, and to drink, and to eat; and [because] the death of man and of beasts is the same. For which causes (as Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, bishop, in the preface to the commentaries on the Canticle of Solomon relates) certain unnamed heretics said that Solomon lacked the illustration of the Holy Spirit — not only in the composition of the present book, but also of all his books — because his heart in old age was depraved by women, and turned to the magic arts and to idols, as is written in the third volume of Kings: which the Holy Spirit would surely never have permitted, if he had ever dwelt in him. [4]

But far be it that we should think any such thing concerning Solomon — the treasury of the celestial science, through whose mouth the divine wisdom spoke — esteeming that he thought so impiously concerning God: [Solomon] who wholly lay [labored] upon this, that — in the manner of the best preacher — he might provoke the people to the contempt of this world, showing all things which are under the sun to be caducous [perishable], and to be reputed for nothing; [showing] that the world daily grows old, and that all mortals vanish among the errors of this life and the fleeting lapses of times, and that nothing solid, nothing stable, is found in the universe, but that God alone is always the same, [as] he has been; and that those alone are wise and blessed who are joined to God. But that such was the design of Solomon in this book is more manifestly demonstrated in the peroration of the volume — where Solomon, concluding his disputation, says: "Let us all alike hear the **end** *(Finem)* of speaking: Fear God, and keep his commandments; this is [the whole of] every man. All things that are done, God will bring into judgment, for every deed, whether it be good or evil." By which words the whole [sum] of the disputation, and the cata-[logue] [5]

[1] Gregory (Gregorius); Luke 4 (Luc. 4).
[2] Josephus, book 10, ch. 12 (Iosephus l. 10. cap. 12); Luke 24 (Luc. 24).
[3] Philastrius, ch. 132 (cap. 132); 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (so the passage, Solomon's idolatry; printed "3. Reg. 4").
[4] ch. 132 (cap. 132); Eccl. 1 (Eccl. 1); Eccl. 2; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (3. Reg. 11).
[5] Jerome (Hier.); Ecclesiastes, last [ch.] (Eccl. ult.).

(printed p. 645 [PDF p. 650] — Heresy VII (Ecclesiastes) confutation concluded; then Heresy VIII opens: Of the Canticle of Canticles — Assertors (the Pharaoh's-daughter theory; the divine-name argument); the Confutation begins.)

the sum of his catalogue [reckoning], compressing it as it were into this recapitulation *(ἀνακεφαλαίωσις)*, he [Solomon] shows this one thing to have been the argument of his whole discourse [sermon]: that men, the enticements of this world being cast off, might fear and worship the Creator. **But as to what** *(Quod autem)* the heretics calumniate — that the creatures, good by their own nature, are in this volume called most vain vanity — it has an easy solution: for creatures are considered in two ways, either in themselves, or in relation

[comparison] to God. For when they are considered in themselves, assuredly the earth, the seas, and all things which are contained in this circle [orb], are indeed good in themselves; but compared to God, they are nothing, save vanity of vanities, and all vanity, and to be reputed less than nothing. And just as I hold [account] the little flame of a lamp most welcome in the darkness — which, the splendor of the sun being risen, I contemn — so, beholding the elements and the manifold variety of things, I do indeed marvel at the greatness of the works; but reconsidering that all things pass away, and that the world grows old toward its own end, and that God alone is always that which he has been, I am compelled to say, not once, but twice: **VANITY** *(VANITAS)* of vanities; and all is vanity. **But when** *(Cum autem)* they add that Solomon set the destruction [end] of men and of beasts as equal, and placed the highest good in food and in pleasure — let them know that he brought forth such things not out of his own opinion, but according to the foolish opinion of cattle-like *(pecuinorum)* men, who, thinking that man wholly perishes in death like the rest of the animals, for [their] highest beatitude account it to gorge themselves with pleasures, and to be sated with all the enticements of this world. [1]

That likewise which they mendaciously say — that Solomon lacked the inspiration [breath] of the Spirit — is expressly convicted [as] false out of the third book of Kings, in which it is written concerning him: "**Behold** *(Ecce)*, [I have given] thee a wise and understanding heart, so much so that none before thee has been like unto thee, nor shall arise after thee." Who, although he afterward fell, did not therefore fall because he had not before had the Spirit of God dwelling [in him], but because the divine providence permitted him to fall — lest (as Ambrose says) on account of his admirable wisdom and incomparable felicity he should be believed by the Jews to be either God, or the Messiah promised in the law. Whose fall, however grave it was, neither ought, nor was able, to take anything from the authority of his books. Since we know it often to have happened that God spoke true and holy [things] even through evil men; for the malice of men can in no way harm the gifts of God, nor ought the gifts of God to be less commended to us if those be evil through [by] whom they are ministered to us. For the gifts of God are to be inspected, not the minister; and not who, but what is said, is to be attended to. [2]

OF THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES — Heresy VIII *(De Cantico Canticorum. Haeresis VIII)*

That the Canticle of Canticles is an obscene ditty of a shameless lover, composed for the sake of pleasure [voluptuousness].

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This heresy, which the Anabaptists have now renewed, Philastrius, in his catalogue, reckoned among the Unnamed [heresies]. Which Luther, wishing somewhat to moderate, in the exordium of his Annotations upon the Canticle, followed the error of certain heretics — whom Theodoret, in the preface to the Canticles, narrates to have asserted that this little book is nothing else than a familiar colloquy between Solomon and the Commonwealth of the Jews, inviting Solomon her beloved to reign over her. But Castalio [Sebastian Castellio], in the Annotations on the same book, thinks with the Anabaptists that this Canticle is a colloquy of Solomon with a certain lover [amica] of his, a Sulamite [Shulammite], concerning whom it is said: "**Return** *(Revertere)*, return, O Sulamite; return, return, that we may behold thee" — to whose courtly women [ladies of the court] Solomon sometimes directs [his] speech, and they too in turn [direct theirs] to him, and to her. This stolid opinion, Philastrius and Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, bishop, in the preface to this book, explaining more at large, write that of old there existed certain heretics who believed this Canticle [was] composed by Solomon — [when] now depraved by his concubines — in praise of the daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, whom he loved as the most beautiful of all his women; esteeming that Solomon said concerning her: "**To my cavalry** *(Equitatui meo)* [company of horses] in the chariots of

Pharaoh have I likened thee, my love. And there are sixty queens, and eighty concubines, and of young maidens there is no number; but one is my dove, and my chosen one. The daughters of Sion saw her, and proclaimed her most blessed, and the queens praised her." [3]

Which words, [they held,] cannot be referred to a spiritual and divine understanding; and this they confirmed by this token [indication]: that never in this Canticle is the name of God set down. And that this is [so] stands [as agreed], against the custom of divine scripture, in which there exists no book wherein is not written that name — the τετραγράμματον *(tetragrammaton)*, or four-lettered יהוה *(Iehova* [Yahweh]*)* — or at least some other name of God, of which the others are: אדני *(Adonai)*, אל *(El)*, שדי *(Saddai* [Shaddai]*)*, צבאות *(Zebaoth* [Sabaoth]*)*, and others similar to these; none of which, since they found [none] in this book, they pronounced its matter to be profane, and accordingly [held] that Solomon, led by religion [scruple], did not dare to mingle the holy name of God with amatory songs — lest, against the precept of the law, he should take the name of God into vain discourses. [4]

CONFVTATIO [The Confutation]

But how far *(Sed quantum)* the carnal opinion of these men strays from the aim [target, σκοπός] of this divine Canticle, the very words of the Canticle demonstrate — [words] which do not suffer themselves to be expounded according to the letter. For such are the similitudes by which they describe that beloved spouse, that — understood according to the exterior sound of the voice [i.e. the literal surface] — they rather deform and disfigure her than illustrate and adorn her. For what can be said, or feigned, more inept than what is here reported concerning the spouse? — namely, that she has an ample head like Mount Carmel; eyes very like the great fishpools which are in Esebon [Heshbon]; a nose exhibiting, by its magnitude, the tower which looks toward Damascus; teeth like flocks of sheep; a neck like the citadel [tower] of Sion, from which a thousand shields hang; hands like golden spheres [globes]; legs like marble columns erected upon golden bases; and moreover, that she is fair as the place [town] of Tirza [Tirzah], comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army set in array. All which things, if [taken] even of the daughter of Pharaoh [5]

[1] Jerome on Ecclesiastes, ch. 1 (Hier. in eccl. cap. 1).
[2] 3 Kings [1 Kings] 3 (3. Reg. 3).
[3] cap. 133 & 147 (Philastrius, ch. 133 & 147); Canticle 6 (Cant. 6); Canticle 1 (Cant. 1).
[4] Canticle 6 (Cant. 6).
[5] Canticle 7 (Cant. 7); Canticle 6 (Cant. 6).

(printed p. 646 [PDF p. 651] — Heresy VIII (Canticle) confutation concluded (Origen's Epithalamium; the divine-name response); then Heresy IX opens: Of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus — statement, Assertors, and the Refutation begun.)

[if] of the daughter of Pharaoh, or of a Sulamite [Shulammite] they be understood, [these similitudes] are so rude, unpolished, and rustic that far more elegant and polished are those [songs] which that rude Cyclops, among the poets, is feigned most ineptly to sing to his Galatea. It behooves us, therefore — if we would (as is fitting) free Solomon, the wisest of all men, from the mark of ineptitude — to recall the words of this Canticle from the carnal to the spiritual and mystical understanding, and in it to understand the chaste nuptials of the mystic Bridegroom CHRIST, and of his spouse the Church, or of the soul, whose Epithalamium [wedding-song] is sung in the present volume: as all the fathers testify in the preface to it, and especially Origen, who begins his commentaries in this manner: "**The little book** *(Epithalamium)* — that is, the nuptial song — seems to me to have been written by Solomon in the manner of a drama, which he sang after the likeness of a bride about to wed, and burning with heavenly love toward her Bridegroom, who is the Word of God. For he loved him — whether [as] the soul which is made to his image, or [as] the Church. But how magnificent and perfect this Bridegroom [is], [and] with what words he used [speech] toward the soul joined to himself, or [toward] the Church, this same scripture teaches us. The companions also of the bride

— young maidens [ladies-in-waiting] placed with the bride herself — what they say; and what likewise the friends and companions of the Bridegroom [say], we come to know out of the same book, which is entitled 'the Canticle of Canticles.'" These [things] Origen. From which it is most evident that, by the one lover, spouse, and dove of Solomon, is signified the Church, the spouse of Christ; and by the queens and concubines, holy souls joined to Christ through charity — as by "Solomon," that is, "the peaceable," Christ, who is truly peaceable, is designated.

As to the fact *(Quod)* that the carnal readers of this Canticle, not recognizing [it], can find no divine name in it — whereas nevertheless its single songs are full of divine names, by which God names himself, now [as] shepherd, now [as] brother and friend, now [as] bridegroom, now [as] beloved and desirable, of set purpose — those ancient names being passed over (not without the greatest mystery), by which that incomprehensible Majesty had been wont, not without fear, to be circumscribed [bounded] by men: such as אל *(El)*, that is, "the strong"; or אדני *(Adonai)*, that is, "lord"; or שדי *(Saddai)*, that is, "the robust"; or צבאות *(Zebaoth)*, that is, "mighty in arms"; or יהוה *(Iehova)*, which by the Hebrews is reckoned ἀνεκφώνητον *(anekphoneton)*, that is, "unpronounceable" [ineffable]. For when that heavenly Bridegroom, in the present Canticle, wished to console his mystic spouse — [who was] now for so long a time awaiting the kisses of her beloved Bridegroom, and pining away with the deferral of [her] desire — he omitted that most ancient appellation of the divine names, formidable by its very sound, [and] taking in their place new and more gracious names, by the sweetness of whose sounds he might soothe the glowing [ardent] mind of the spouse: calling himself, in place of "lord," [her] brother, friend, beloved, and bridegroom; in place of "mighty-in-arms," the peaceable one, and shepherd; in place of "strong and robust," the wounded and stricken one; in place of "ineffable," poured-out ointment, a little bundle of myrrh, a cluster of Cyprus [henna], a young hart, chosen out of thousands, fairest of all, wholly desirable and lovable: thus in turn calling his spouse — not, as of old he had been wont to call [her], the land of Israel, the daughter of Sion, the land of Juda — [but] handmaid and servant; nay rather, sister, spouse, friend [beloved], dove, beloved one, only one, fairest of women, and by many other new and coaxing appellations of this kind, by which he might sweetly refresh his beloved spouse, worn out with the long desire of the Bridegroom.

OF THE BOOKS OF WISDOM AND OF ECCLESIASTICUS — Heresy IX
(De Libris Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici. Haeresis IX)

That the book of Wisdom is inscribed with the name of Solomon falsely; and that, accordingly, together with the book of Ecclesiasticus, it is [to be] excluded from the canon of the holy volumes.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This proposed error, of old defended by certain remnants of the Pelagians (as Hilary writes to Augustine), and lately restored by the Anabaptists and Lutherans, asserts two [things]. The first is, that the author of the book of Wisdom is not Solomon, but Philo the Jew, an Alexandrian by fatherland, most skilled in the Greek tongue — concerning whom, on account of the likeness of Platonic diction which he had, it was said: ἢ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει, ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει *(e Platon philonizei, e Philon platonizei)* — that is, "either Plato follows [imitates] Philo, or Philo [follows] Plato." The other is, that neither of these volumes is canonical. Which assertions — as the first [we shall show] to be uncertain and rashly asserted, so the second we shall show to be openly heretical. [1]

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

And indeed, if the book of Wisdom was put forth by Philo the Jew, it ought not to be numbered among the books of the Old Instrument [Testament], but to be reckoned among the volumes of the New Testament: seeing that its author, Philo, flourished after the times of Christ, under Caius [Gaius/Caligula] Caesar — to

whom (as he himself wrote in the book concerning his embassy [*Legatio ad Gaium*]) he was sent, [while] a very young man, as legate of the Jews. Wherefore, since the Church places this book back among the others of the Old Testament — which, by the common custom of the Church, are for this reason called books of the Old Testament, because they were composed before the giving of the New Testament — it is manifest that it [the book of Wisdom] is not [the work] of the Jew Philo, who became renowned under the New Testament. [2]

Next *(Deinde)*, in the second chapter of this book, the author, by a prophetic spirit, describes the future attempts of the Jews against Christ, saying: "**Come** *(Venite)*, let us circumvent the just one: for he is unprofitable to us, and contrary to our works, and upbraids us with sins against the law, and defames among us the sins of our discipline [training]. He promises that he has the knowledge of God, and names himself the Son of God. Let us see, therefore, whether his words be true; and let us try what things shall come to him, and we shall know what shall be his last end. For if he be the true Son of God, he will receive him, and will free him from the hands of the adversaries. With contumely and torment let us question him, that we may know his reverence, and may prove his patience; with a most shameful death let us condemn him." Which words, as the Catholic Church believes and preaches, [treat] openly of the future passion [3]

[1] Wisdom 2 (Sap. 2).
[2] (a cluster of source-references, partly illegible); Jerome, On Illustrious Men (Hier. de viris illustr.).
[3] Wisdom 2 (Sap. 2).

(printed p. 647 [PDF p. 652] — Heresy IX: Refutation of the first assertion (that Philo, not Solomon, wrote Wisdom); then proof that both Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are canonical — New-Testament, ecclesiastical, conciliar, and patristic attestation.)

[the words of Wisdom ch. 2 contain a] prophecy [also] of the death of Christ; which, since in the time of Philo it was already fulfilled, it follows that he was not the writer of this prophecy.

To this *(Ad hoc)* also there accedes, that the author of this book, in the same second chapter, detests the envy, emulation, and zeal [malice] of the impious Jews against that same just one, Christ, and execrates their grave malice and impiety — which it is not verisimilar that Philo did, a man most celebrated among his own, and always held in the highest honor, and besides this always versed in the law of the Jews, and alien from the worship of Christ; lest, accusing so freely and openly the so recent crime of his own fathers, he should stir up the hatred of his own [people] against himself. [1]

Besides *(Praeterea)*, the blessed Dionysius the Areopagite brings forth a testimony out of this book, in the first part of the fourth chapter of the book *On the Divine Names*, saying that, among the first institutions [foundations] of the scriptures, [Solomon] said certain things about the divine Wisdom more copiously: "**I became a lover** *(Amator factus sum)* of her beauty" — which is taken out of the eighth chapter of this book. Nor is it to be believed that the blessed Dionysius cited this out of the book of Philo, [as] now newly published, since he calls that book [one of] "the first institutions of the scriptures": which indicates that the book was not then first sent forth into the light, but composed many ages before, in that first institution of the divine scriptures. Which book, even if it were possible that the blessed Dionysius saw it newly published, it is still not verisimilar that so great a father would have deigned to lean, in a most grave matter, upon the authority of Philo. [2]

There exists *(Extat)* also a catalogue of all the works of Philo, in Eusebius, book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18, and in Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men* — in which [catalogue] the book of Wisdom is nowhere named.

But because *(Verum)* some of the Lutherans saw that the aforesaid [arguments] stood in the way of their opinion, therefore, that they might extricate themselves from these [difficulties], they said that there were two Philos: one after the times of Christ, under the emperors Caius [Gaius], and Claudius, and Nero, of

whom Eusebius and Jerome make mention; but the other more ancient, most eloquent in Greek fluency, above a hundred and sixty years before the birth of Christ, in the times of Onias the pontiff of the Jews — and [they say] that this one was the author of the book of Wisdom.

Which opinion those things wholly contradict which the author, in the ninth chapter of this book, writes concerning himself — asserting that he was king of Israel, and in the city of Jerusalem built a temple to God, in these words: "**But thou** *(Tu autem)*, O Lord, hast chosen me [to be] king of thy people, and judge of thy sons and daughters; and hast said [bidden] me to build a temple in thy holy mount, and an altar in the city of thy habitation, a likeness of thy holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning." Which words, assuredly, can be accommodated to neither of these Philos — who were neither kings in Jerusalem, nor built a temple in it — but agree with Solomon alone, who reigned at Jerusalem, and first set up a temple to God; and who, as the wisest of all kings, composed this noble book of Wisdom, in whose aforesaid chapter he wrote that he prayed to God for the obtaining of wisdom, unto the rightly governing of the people, as is written in the third book of Kings. [3]

But above all *(Sed super omnia)*, the authority of the Catholic Church, and the common consensus of the fathers, declare Solomon [to be] the author of this book. For the Church every year, on the fourth feria [Wednesday] of Pentecost, in the most holy mysteries, chants [decantat] the first sentence of this book, saying: "**Solomon said** *(Dixit Salomon)* to his sons: Love justice, you that judge the earth." With whom all the fathers, as well Greek as Latin, agree. And first, of the Greeks, Eusebius, book 4 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 22, thus says: "**But indeed** *(Verum)* this Hegesippus [Egesippus] also, and Irenaeus, and the whole choir of the ancients, called the book which is entitled 'the Wisdom of Solomon,' [Solomon's] — just as also the Proverbs." And Epiphanius, in the book *On Weights and Measures*, believed the book of Wisdom — called πανάρετον *(panareton)* [all-virtuous], from every virtue which is contained in it — to be Solomon's. And John Damascene, book 4, ch. 18, attributed the book of Wisdom, stuffed [full] with the doctrine of all virtues, to Solomon [as] author. But among the Latins, the blessed Ambrose, in the book *On the Four Difficult Questions*, makes Solomon the author of this book, thus saying: "In the book of Wisdom, Solomon relates that he besought the Lord, saying: 'I went to [approached] the Lord, and besought him: Give me, O Lord, wisdom, the assistant [attendant] of thy seats [throne].'" Augustine likewise — when at some time he had asserted that this book was not Solomon's — at length, recognizing his opinion [to be] but little probable, retracted [it] in the second book of the Retractations, ch. 4. From these [things], therefore, it is left proved that the book of Wisdom was composed by Solomon.

And as to the fact *(Quod autem)* that the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach [Syrach] — which is called Ecclesiasticus — are received into the canon of the holy scriptures, it is demonstrated by the attestation of the New Testament, by the authority of the Church, by the determination of the councils, and by the testimony of the most ancient fathers. For Paul, to the Romans in the eleventh [chapter], and to the Hebrews in the eleventh, alleges sentences [sayings] of Wisdom out of the 9th, 6th, and 4th chapters; and Peter and James, each in the first chapter of their epistles, bring forth testimonies out of the 14th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. The same do, of the book of Wisdom, Clement the Roman Pontiff in [his] first epistle, Anacletus in the second, Evaristus in the first epistle to the Africans. Similarly, of the book of Ecclesiasticus, the same do Fabian, Pope [the first], who in [his] second epistle to all the Eastern bishops takes words out of its 10th and 11th chapter; and Sixtus, Pope the first, received out of the 24th chapter of the same volume that [saying]: "**I** *(Ego)* came forth out of the mouth of the Most High, and alone compassed [went round] the circuit of heaven." John Damascene, making mention of each volume, in book 4, *On the Faith*, thus writes: "ΠΑΝΑΡΕΤΟΣ *(Panaretos* [the All-virtuous]*)* — that is, the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, that is, Ecclesiasticus — [these] are indeed virtuous and good, but they are not numbered [in the canon], nor did they lie in the ark; and therefore, although among the Jews they are not numbered, yet among the faithful they are held of the greatest authority." Augustine, in book 2 *On*

Christian Doctrine, says: "Those two books — one which is entitled *Wisdom*, and the other which is entitled *Ecclesiasticus* — since they have merited to be received into authority, are to be numbered among the prophetic [books]." And in book 1 *On the Predestination of the Saints*, ch. 14, of the book of Wisdom he thus says: "**But** *(Sed)*, those who wish to be instructed by [the sayings of] the commentators [tractatores], it behooves that [they consider] also that book of Wisdom, where it is read: '**He was snatched away** *(Raptus est)*, lest malice should change his heart' — [a book quoted] by all the commentators" [4]

[1] Wisdom 2 (Sap. 2).
[2] Wisdom 8 (Sap. 8).
[3] Wisdom 9 (Sap. 9); 3 Kings [1 Kings] 3 (3. Reg. 3).
[4] Augustine, ch. 8 (of De doctrina christiana, bk 2) (Cap. 8); Wisdom 4 (Sap. 4).

(printed p. 648 [PDF p. 653] — Heresy IX concluded: the conciliar/patristic seal on Wisdom & Ecclesiasticus; the Objections of the Heretics (Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Isidore); the Solution; then Heresy X opens: Of the book of Job.)

[they should prefer that book of Wisdom] to all the commentaries [tractationibus] which they [have otherwise] preferred to themselves — [a book] which even the excellent commentators of the times nearest to the Apostles preferred to themselves, who, adducing it as a witness, believed that they were adducing nothing but a divine testimony. Not, therefore, ought the book of Wisdom — which is read in the Church of Christ through so great a multitude of years, in which this [saying] too is read — to suffer injury, nor ought its testimony [sentence] to be repudiated: [a book] which has merited to be recited in the Church of Christ through so long an antiquity of years, and to be heard by all Christians, from the bishops down to the lowest laity, with the veneration of divine authority. To which testimonies of the fathers there accedes, at last, the authority of the third Council of Carthage, and of the great Lateran Council, and the epistle of Pope Innocent to Exuperius, and the catalogue of Gelasius — in [all of] which each book of Wisdom [i.e. both Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus] is numbered [in].

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. That the book of Wisdom is not Solomon's, Jerome testifies in the prologue to the books of Solomon, calling it a book ψευδεπίγραφον *(pseudepigraphon)* — that is, falsely inscribed [ascribed] to Solomon, since it is [the work] of Philo the Jew, and nowhere exists among the Hebrews, and its very style savors of Greek eloquence. To whom subscribing, Augustine, in book 2 *On Christian Doctrine*, thus speaks: "**For** *(Nam)* two books — the first, which is [entitled] *Wisdom*, and the other, which is entitled *Ecclesiasticus* — are said to be Solomon's, from a certain likeness [to him]; for Jesus son of Sirach is most constantly reported to have written them." And in the seventeenth book *On the City of God* he says, to the same effect: "**Two other** *(Alii duo)* books, of which the one [is] *Wisdom*, the other truly *Ecclesiasticus* — on account of some likeness of eloquence, custom has obtained that they be called Solomon's; but that they are not his, the more learned do not doubt." [1]

2. And that neither of these volumes has canonical authority, Jerome, in the aforesaid prologue, is a witness, saying: "**There is reported** *(Fertur)* also the *Panaretos* [All-virtuous] of Jesus son of Sirach, and another pseudepigraphus [falsely-titled book], which is inscribed 'the Wisdom of Solomon'"; and a little after: "As, therefore, the Church indeed reads the books of Judith, and of Tobit, and of the Maccabees, but does not receive [them] among the canonical scriptures — so also [it reads] these two volumes for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of the ecclesiastical dogmas." And again, in the Helmeted Prologue [*Prologus galeatus*], he thus speaks: "**Therefore** *(Igitur)* the *Wisdom* which is commonly inscribed [with the name] of Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach, are not in the canon." Which he confirms also in the explanation of the eighth and eleventh chapter of Zechariah [Zacharias]. But Epiphanius, concerning each book, in the little treatise *On Weights and Measures*, writes these things: "**For** *(Nam)* two

books [are] written in verse — the *Wisdom* of Solomon, called *Panaretos* [All-virtuous] from every wisdom, and the *Wisdom* of Jesus son of Sirach — and of his grandson Jesus, who wrote that Wisdom in Hebrew, so that his grandson interpreted [translated] it, that is, wrote it in Greek: [these] are indeed useful and commodious, but they are not reckoned into the number of the received [books]." Isidore also, in the sixth book of the *Etymologies*, ch. 2, rejects the book of Ecclesiasticus among the apocrypha. But neither Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen], nor Eusebius, nor Origen, nor any of the ancients, reckons these books in the catalogue of the divine volumes.

SOLVTIO [The Solution]

1. Unjustly do the heretics impute to Jerome what he himself does not assert, but writes by way of reporting — not himself believing it, but narrating that certain ancient writers, that is, the Jews, believed it. For he says: "**The Jews** *(Iudaei)* have affirmed it to be Philo's" — so that they thought that Philo collected together the sentences [sayings] of this book, first put forth by Solomon and [then] dispersed, and compressed [them] into one volume, which afterward, from the name of the collector, was by some called "the Wisdom of Philo." But Augustine retracted the sentences [he had] adduced [advanced], in the second book of the Retractations, ch. 8, in these words: "**What** *(Quod)* I said concerning the author of the book which many call 'the Wisdom of Solomon' — that Jesus son of Sirach wrote it also, just as [he wrote] Ecclesiasticus — I afterward learned does not so stand [is not so certain] as was said by me; and I found it altogether more probable that this [man] is not the author of that book."

2. But as to the words of Jerome, asserting that the book of Wisdom is not received into the canon by the Church, we respond — as we have also said elsewhere — that he understood this of the Church of his own times: to which, since it did not yet sufficiently openly stand [established] concerning the authority of these volumes, it [the Church] did not dare to receive them into the canon for the proof of dogmas; but a little afterward, being more fully taught by the Holy Spirit, in the third Council of Carthage it received each volume, and thereupon the following Councils numbered each in the sacred catalogues. But if Origen and certain other fathers rejected these books from the Canon, it does not on that account follow that they are in no way canonical; but this only is gathered from the authority of those fathers — namely, that books of this kind are not of the number of the scriptures which pertain to the first order [rank] of the Canon, and concerning which there was never any doubt: which neither do we deny. For we have placed each in the second order of the canonical volumes. It is plain, therefore, that the Parenetic [hortatory] books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are, by the best right, numbered among the holy writings; concerning which, since enough has been said, let us pass on, at last, to the order of the Historical volumes.

OF THE BOOK OF JOB — Heresy X *(De Libro Iob. Haeresis X)*

That the history of the book of Job is a fiction; and that Job himself never existed among men [in human affairs].

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This also is a heresy of the Anabaptists of our age, who, deriding this book, call it a Tragicomedy of the Hebrews — that is, a fable [fiction], put forth partly according to the laws of comedy, partly according to [the laws] of tragedy: because at the beginning of the history itself the slaughter of the sons and daughters of Job is related (which is customary in tragedies), but at the end (which is proper to comedy) the happy outcomes of Job are set down.

[1] (Augustine, On Christian Doctrine bk 2) ch. 8 (Cap. 8); [On the City of] God, bk 17, ch. 20 (Li. 17. de ci[vitate]. cap. 20).

(printed p. 649 [PDF p. 654] — Heresy X (Job): the Refutation (Job's historicity from Ezekiel, James, and Paul); then the Objections of the Heretics — objection 1, the "comic fable" argument, with the disputed identity and name-etymologies of Job and his friends.)

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

And this *(Atque)* impious error the re-dipped [*retincti* — a pun: the "re-dyed," i.e. re-baptized] Anabaptists received from the circumcised Jews out of בבא בתרא *(Baba Bathra)* — that is, from the third part of the fourth order of the Talmudic books. To which the divine scripture wholly contradicts, which testifies not only that Job existed among men [*in humanis*], but numbers him among the men foremost in sanctity. For in Ezekiel God says: "**If** *(Si)* Noah [Nohe], Daniel, and Job shall have stood in the midst [of a sinning land], they in their [own] justice shall free their souls." And James, in his catholic [epistle], proposing the admirable patience of Job for imitation in adversities: "**The endurance** *(Sufferentiam)* of Job," he says, "you have heard, and you have seen the end of the Lord." Who, if he had nowhere existed in the universe of things, scripture surely would not have so diligently noted his name, and [that] of his city, the number of his sons and of his daughters, his wife too, and the number — item by item — of all his goods, from oxen down to asses, likewise the days of his life, and the names of his friends, and their race, household, and fatherland. [1] To this accedes, that Paul and the rest of the apostles borrowed from this holy history many illustrious sentences — not as from a fabricated fable, but as from a most true scripture — such as these: "**We brought NOTHING** *(Nihil intulimus)* into this world," etc.; and, "**I will COMPREHEND** *(Comprehendam)* the wise in their own craftiness"; and, "**God is NOT** *(Non est)* a respecter of persons"; and, "**God spared NOT** *(Deus… non pepercit)* the sinning angels," and several others of this kind similar. Most true, therefore, and most holy, is this history, and worthy to be held before the eyes by all the pious throughout their whole life — inasmuch as in it is set before us the perfect form of a religious man, and truly wise, who is neither puffed up by prosperous things, nor broken by adverse, nor in either deserts his God, but, immovable in faith and constant in hope, perseveres through all kinds of temptations. [2] Wherefore rightly Moses translated this holy history — written first in Syriac, whether by Job or by his friends — into the Hebrew tongue, for the consolation of his Hebrews when they were being oppressed in Egypt by Pharaoh: so that, while they read those vehement sorrows of the blessed man, they might mutually console one another, and with patience and thanksgiving bear the evils which had surrounded them; and, hearing of the remuneration which God bestowed on blessed Job after [his] endurance, might themselves also hope for liberation, and expect the reward of their labors. And so this holy book — which the Councils so often mentioned received into the Canon, and the perpetual consensus of the Church has approved — is to be received by all the faithful with all veneration. [3]

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. That the argument [plot] of the book of Job is comic, and fabricated according to the laws of the stage [scene], appears from this: that nothing certain can be had concerning the persons, nor the place, nor the time, nor the author of this history — the writers, no less Hebrew than Greek and Latin, dissenting among themselves. And first, concerning Job himself — who holds the chief part in this history, and on whom the argument of the whole narration leans — there is no small controversy. Origen, in the first chapter of the commentaries on Job, writes that this Job was an Arab, of the race of Esau, born in the land of Uz [Vsitis] — moved by certain words which are read in the common Greek edition toward the end of that book, where Job is said to have dwelt in the land of Uz, in the confines of Arabia, whose name before had been Iobab, and [who] was son of Zareth [Zerah], of the sons of Esau, of the mother Bozra, fifth from Abraham, fourth from Esau. To whom Augustine, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, consents. But Ambrose, in the commentary on the epistle to the Romans, thinks he was a king in Edom — from the fact that in Genesis it is read that kings once reigned in Edom, of whom the first was Balach [Bela] son of Beor, after whom Iobab

reigned; whom Ambrose believed to be Job, deceived by the affinity of the words [names], which nevertheless among the Hebrews differ much, not only in the beginning, but also in the end of the word. For Job, from the letter א *(aleph)* with a hiriq point subscribed, is thus written איוב *(Iyyob)*; but Iobab, beginning from the letter Iod, is thus written יובב *(Yobab)*. But Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*, esteems those to judge falsely who believe Job to have been of the seed of Esau, asserting that he descended from the stock of Nachor [Nahor] the brother of Abraham. But others, whom Jerome cites in the same book, said Job to be that Iasub [Jashub] who, in the beginning of Paralipomenon [Chronicles], after Thola [Tola] and Suhal [Shuah], is numbered in the catalogue of the sons of Israel. But all the most ancient of the Hebrews — who, as more skilled concerning their own genealogies, are the more to be believed — hand down that Job never existed among men, but that this book was fabricated by an uncertain author under the person of Job: namely, as an example of patience, unto the instruction of endurance in adversities, and unto the solace of oncoming calamities. To which argument [design] they wish all the persons of the present book aptly to correspond. For there is set, in the first place, a man tossed through all kinds of evils, and oppressed with pains intolerable to human patience, on whom, from the outcome of his own misery, is imposed the name IOB — that is, "grieving, groaning, and howling, and afflicting himself." He is feigned also, not ineptly, [to be] of the land of Hus [Uz], which is interpreted "counsel," that we may learn that by counsel and prudence every kind of misfortune and hardship is easily overcome. But there are sent against so great a man — as if about to contend in the wrestling-school [palaestra] — not any sort of manikins from the lowest commons, but [men] distinguished by splendid names: Eliphaz, Baldad [Bildad], Sophar [Zophar], and Heliu [Elihu]. For Baldad is interpreted "ancient secrets"; Sophar, "watchman, or trumpet"; Eliphaz, "the gold of God"; but Heliu, "God himself": that in these it may be shown that against a man of Uz — that is, [a man] armed with counsel and prudence — no riches of men, however great, nor power, nor wisdom, prevails. Whence also, in the last act of this fable — in which the matter obtains a happier issue, as is wont to happen in comedies — God himself is brought in, who, as the best judge, restored to the most valiant man double for all [the things] which he had lost. And that the fable might be more delightful by the variety of speech, its single parts are so disposed by a certain comic method that its exordium begins in loose [prose] speech; then there follow acts, described after the manner of a drama in hexameter and pentameter verses, sometimes also with certain jingling rhythms [rhymes] interposed; and just as in the comedies, as well of the Greeks as of the La-[tins]

[1] Ezekiel 14 (Ezech. 14); James 5 (Iac. 5).

[2] Job 1 (Iob 1.d); 1 Timothy 6 (1. Tim. 6); Job 5 (Iob 5.b); 1 Corinthians 3 (1. Cor. 3); Job 34 (Iob 34.b); Acts 10 (Act. 10); Job 4 (Iob 4.c); 2 Peter 2 (2. Pet. 2).

[3] Origen, in the preface to [his] tome[s] on Job, [ch.] 1 (Orig. in praef. tom. in Iob 1).

(printed p. 650 [PDF p. 655] — Heresy X (Job): objection 1 concluded (the multilingual/comedy argument; uncertainty of place, time, author); objection 2 (Job made impatient and blasphemous); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins (response 1: significant names pervade all Scripture).)

the diverse kinds of languages of the Latins are sometimes wont to be mixed [in], for the greater delight of the hearers — as in Aristophanes, in the comedy which is entitled *Acharnians*, a certain barbarian is brought in speaking the Persian tongue; and in Plautus, in the *Poenulus*, a certain African, Hanno, speaks in Punic — so in this fable [of Job] various kinds of languages are brought in. And [they say] one part of the narration, Jerome himself being witness, is digested in the Arabic speech, another in Syriac, another indeed written in Hebrew eloquence. And this is the opinion of the ancient Jews concerning the argument [plot] of this book. To the confirmation of which makes [also] the uncertainty of the place and of the time in which Job is reported to have lived — some, with Origen, affirming him to have been contemporary with Moses; others (among whom is Augustine) believing him to have lived long before the giving of the Law. Concerning the place likewise the opinion is varied. The author of this book relates that he was born in the land of Uz [Vsitis]; Augustine [says he was] born in Idumaea, and there brought up and dead; Ambrose [that he] reigned

in Edom; Origen writes that he lived in Arabia and was an Arab. Concerning the author of the present book, similarly, no one of the writers agrees with another. For — as Gregory in the preface to Job, and Isidore in the sixth book of the Etymologies, relate — some judge Moses to be its author; others think that Job himself wrote it after the stroke of his passion [suffering]; others [that it was] the companions of Job; others, one of the prophets. Wherefore, since concerning the argument, the persons, the place, the author, and the time of the book nothing stands [established], it seems to be judged that the present history was written not according to the truth of the deed, but for the sake of example and imitation, unto the commendation of patience. [1]

2. But however the matter itself may stand, the author of this narration could not be so Lynceus [sharp-eyed] but that he strayed much from the aim [σκοπός] of his proposed argument. For he, when he had set out to fashion the person of a perfect man, and above all a most enduring one — whom neither prosperous things should lift up into pride, nor adverse cast down into desperation — nevertheless, in the very course of the narration, against the order of his own design, and against all the laws of patience, more than once draws that most patient man into the crime of impatience and of blasphemy: charging him that he cursed the day of his birth, saying, "**He cursed** *(Maledixit)* his day," and says: "Let the day perish in which I was born, and the night, in which it was said, A man is conceived." And, as if this were a light crime, he describes his indignation against God — that he brought him out of the womb, and that, [Job] having come forth from the womb, he did not straightway slay him. Thereupon feigning him [to be] driven by desperation — indignant words too being premised — to run to the halter [noose], saying: "**My soul** *(Suspendium)* has chosen hanging, and my bones death; I have despaired, neither shall I now live any longer." He makes him also a boaster of his own justice, and an accuser of the justice of God, when he says: "**Would that** *(Utinam)* my sins were weighed in a balance! — as [if] the sand of the sea, [my] punishment which I suffer would be found heavier than my iniquity." Than which — what more iniquitous can be devised against the justice of God? or what more arrogantly could be pronounced than what the author here brought forth out of the mouth of Job? "**My heart** *(Non… cor meum)* does not reprehend me in all my life" — whereas, on the contrary, it is written: "There is **not** *(Non)* a holy [man] on earth, who sins not." And in another place, accusing the providence of God through the mouth of that blessed man — that his patience is not a care to him: "**Where** *(Ubi)* now," he says, "is my expectation, and who considers my patience?" Nor content with this alone, he casts him headlong into that desperation, that he should object cruelty to God — no otherwise than to some most cruel torturer — with reproach, saying: "**Thou art turned** *(Versus es)* to me into a cruel [one]: if thou scourgest, slay [me] at once; or at least laugh not at the punishments of the innocent." Which words indeed, and others of this kind — which everywhere in the book of Job are read, full of indignation, impatience, and desperation — manifestly convince [prove] that the author of this history so far digressed from his own aim that, in place of a most pious and most valiant man, he set before us a most impatient one. [2]

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. If it be permitted us, by conjectures so light, to pronounce concerning the holy letters — [so] that those histories in the sacred volumes be judged false which consist of a variety of languages, of verses [meters], of names, and of persons — no part of divine scripture, in which these and things similar to these are found, will be true. For by this reason the book of Psalms, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the end of the book of Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles of Solomon, and the great Canticle of Moses, will have to be reckoned among fables; and all the volumes, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, will be believed to be fabricated — because so many names are read set down in them according to the properties of the persons. Let the insane Re-baptizers turn over the book of Genesis, and they will find how nearly all human names are mystical, and how, by a certain prophetic spirit and a certain hidden disposition of God, they were imposed by the ancient fathers upon their sons from the very [moment of] birth, so that, from the appellation of the names, the future outcomes of the sons might in some way be fore-noted before they came to pass. Thus the first of all women [was called] Eve — that is, "of [all] the living" — because she was to be the mother of all

living, [and] because she was to be such, she was so called. Thus Abraham — because he was to be the author of so numerous a seed — was called Abraham, that is, "father of many nations." Thus the younger son of Rebecca, by a certain hidden mystery, was called Jacob — that is, "supplanter" — that in the name the supplanting of the brother deceived by him might be noted; and truly of him his brother Esau at some time said: "**Rightly** *(Recte)* is his name called Jacob: for he has supplanted me now this second time." Thus the two sons of David, by [reason of] the future successes of [their] life, thus God inspiring, obtained names of diverse omen: this one, Solomon [Scelomo], that is, "peaceable," was so called on account of the future peace under his reign; but this other, Absalom — namely, "the father's bitterness" — was named by an unhappy augury, that the name might portend the bitterness of sorrow which the rebel son was to bring upon [his] father. And, that I may not wander further afield — thus in the New Testament Simon, by a most happy omen, received the name of Peter, and the sons of Zebedee the surname Boanerges, from Christ: that in him [Peter] the first rock of the Church to be built, [and] in these [the sons of Zebedee] the eminence of [their] future preaching, might be shown. To the likeness of these, then, Job — by a certain secret presaging of his calamities and sorrows, before he suffered them — obtains the name of one "grieving and howling"; just as also his companions, either because they were to have a life like [their] names, thus [it being] wil-[ling] [3]

[1] Job 3 (Iob 3).
[2] Job 7 (Iob 7); Job 6 (Iob 6); Job 27 (Iob 27); Job 17 (Iob 17); Job 30 (Iob 30); Job 9 (Iob 9).
[3] Genesis 27 (Gen. 27).

(printed p. 651 [PDF p. 656] — Heresy X (Job): Dissolution of the Objections continues — response 1 concluded (the significant names; the "three-language" and disputed-homeland objections answered, Uz = Edom = Idumaea); then response 2 (Job's supposed "blasphemies" are not to be read according to the dead letter).)

God willing [it], they were named; or that they might commend the memory of their progenitors to posterity — so, perhaps, were Eliphaz, Baldad, and Sophar named. For we read that some of those who are reckoned in the genealogy of Esau — whence these [men] drew their origin — were called by these very names. There is taken away, therefore, out of these [considerations], all suspicion of a fabricated name. But concerning the variety of languages, by which the most unskilled Anabaptists judge the diverse parts of the book to be written, it must be known that the author of the present history — whoever he was, whether Job, or some one of his friends — was an Idumaean [Edomite] by race, as the history itself testifies, and wrote this book in the Idumaean tongue, as being natural to him. But just as the Idumaean region — Pliny being witness — is partly mingled with Syria (whose farthest part toward the setting sun it is), partly indeed with Arabia Petraea, to which it is contiguous and into which it runs out — so it is to be judged that the Idumaean tongue was compounded partly of the Syriac, partly of the Arabic language; and that the writer of this book used this [tongue], which, when afterward Moses (as it pleases Origen) had turned into the Hebrew speech, and had rendered word for word rather than sense for sense, it came to pass that the book, turned into Hebrew, so abounded in Syriac and Arabic idioms that it seems to be written in a triple tongue. [1] And so, when Jerome, in the preface to Job, writes that his translation, out of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac speech, sounds now the words, now the senses, now both together — his words are not so to be referred to the diversity of three languages that we should believe him to have derived his edition from three fountains of diverse languages, but [are to be understood] as directed [aimed] at the manifold variety of the Hebrew diction, stuffed with innumerable Syriasms and Arabisms. Which Jerome himself also indicated in the preface to Daniel, when he said that the book of Job has very much fellowship with the Arabic tongue — by this saying expressing rather that the book of Job has a likeness to the Arabic, than that any of its parts was written in Arabic. Now indeed, as to what they say — that the writers disagree among themselves concerning the author of this history, and its fatherland — it has so little moment for shaking the truth of the history that it is altogether unworthy of consideration. For, as the blessed Gregory in the preface to Job says: "**Who** *(Quis)* wrote these

things is very superfluously asked, since the Holy Spirit is faithfully believed [to be] the author of the book: he wrote these things, who dictated these things to be written; he wrote [them], who in this work stood forth [as] inspirer, and through the voice of the writer transmitted his words to us, to be imitated." Besides this too, neither are the fathers, [when] diligently considered, at variance among themselves concerning the author of the book and its fatherland. For the same [things] concerning these the author of the book of Job — and Origen, and Ambrose, and Augustine — affirm, although the one may say he lived in the land of Uz [Vs], another in Arabia, another in Edom, another in Idumaea. For the same is the land of Uz and Edom, Jeremiah saying in the Lamentations: "**Rejoice** *(Gaude)* and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz" — and each is in Idumaea, which is joined partly (as we said) to Syria, partly to Arabia. Whence also Origen, in the first chapter on Job, says: "**The Uzzites** *(Vssitidae)* are of the race of Esau, the posterity and tribe of Edom." For the Uzzites, and the Minaeans, and the Eubeans, and the Temanites, and all the rest of the tribes were of the kindred and lineage of Esau, who was also surnamed Edom. [2] And all those tribes were called Idumaeans; but now they are all called by one name, Arabs. Concerning the stock of Job also — which Jerome derives from Abraham through Nachor [Nahor], but Origen, and Ambrose, and Augustine, and Gregory from the same Abraham through Esau — if the mind of each be attentively attended to, either they do not differ at all, or [but] little: since all these spoke according to the sentence [reading] of the old, and of the common Greek and Latin edition, in whose foot [appendix] these words were formerly read: "**And Job was** *(Erat autem Iob)* the son of Zareth [Zerah], of the sons of Esau a son, and of the mother Bozra." But Jerome, as he himself confesses, spoke according to the sentence of the Hebrews, among whom those words are nowhere read in the volume of Job. Nor yet did Jerome wish those to have erred who believed Job to have descended from Esau, but he believed those to be deceived who, to assert this, were moved by no other cause than by the aforesaid words, which the Hebrew verity knew not.

2. I pass now to the execrable blasphemies which the wicked impute to that most holy man — wishing the mentioned sentences to be understood according to the dead letter, which without any doubt are to be expounded according to the mystical understanding of the vivifying Spirit. The very context of the words openly convinces [of this], the preceding and following discourses compelling [us] to it — [discourses] which by no means permit the aforesaid sentences to be understood according to the letter. For how can it be that Job, out of anger and indignation, cursed the day of his birth (as his words outwardly seem to indicate) — [Job] who, after the death of [his] sons, daughters, and all his goods, after the stroke of an incurable plague, answered his ill-counseling wife: "**If we have received GOOD** *(Si bona)* from the hand of the Lord, why should we not sustain evil?" Or how would it be verisimilar that he decided, out of the desperation of [his] soul, to end his life by hanging — [Job] who with so great confidence exclaims: "**Even if** *(Et si)* he shall slay me, I will hope in him"? And how credible [is it] that he wished to proclaim his life clean from every stain — when he said, "My heart does **NOT** *(Non)* reprehend me in my life" — [Job] who confesses with public voice that he sinned, saying: "**I have SINNED** *(Peccavi)*; what shall I do to thee, O keeper of men? why dost thou not take away my sin, and remove my iniquity?" And by what means shall we dare affirm that Job complained of the injustice and severity of God — [Job] who, proclaiming the justice of God, says: "**If** *(Si)* the equity of his judgment be sought, no one can speak testimony for me: for if I shall wish to justify myself, my own mouth will condemn me"? Since, therefore, these words, compared [collated] according to the letter, cannot agree with themselves, they show something else hidden in themselves, which is to be sought. Therefore, if first we understand the words of blessed Job by which he cursed his day according to the outward sound of the voice — as Origen expounds — they suffer no absurdity. For that curse is not of such [weight] that for its sake that holy man should be accused. Since, when he cursed his natal day — which had already passed away, and no longer was — he truly cursed nothing: for a past day is neither in nature, nor in act, nor in its own power, but only an empty name, and altogether nothing. He, therefore, who cursed nothing, sinned nothing. But if we follow the mystical [exposition of Gre-] [3]

[1] (Pliny,) bk 5, ch. 13 (li. 5. c. 13).
[2] Lamentations 4 (Thren. 4).
[3] Gregory in the preface [to] Job, ch. 3 & 4 (Greg. in praef. Iob c. 3 & 4); Job 13 (Iob 13); Job 9 (Iob 9).

(printed p. 652 [PDF p. 657] — Heresy X (Job) concluded: the Gregorian mystical reading of Job's "blasphemies"; then Heresy XI opens: Of the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, and Esther — statement, Assertors, and the start of the Refutation.)

[if we follow the mystical] exposition of Gregory, we shall recognize that a curse of this kind is holy, not depraved — inasmuch as it arises not from a wish of vengeance, but from the rectitude of judgment, and from tranquillity of soul: so that thence we may learn that there is a twofold day of our life. The one, of the first condition and of the human creation, in which man was created in justice and sanctity — that is, the day of justice, of innocence, of sanctity, and of grace. But the other, an execrable day, and obnoxious to malediction — namely, the day of the latter [second] birth, in which man is born in sin and iniquity, the day of sin and of human corruption. When, therefore, Job cursed his day, he did not say: "Let the day perish in which I was **created** [conditus]," but "the day in which I was **born** [natus]." As if he openly said: Let the day of sin and of fault perish, [let] the day of our mortality [perish], and let the day of innocence, of sanctity, and of grace — the day of glory and of immortality — break forth. And according to this sense it is to be understood that Job wished he had perished as an abortive [birth], and had not come into this life — namely, into the life of sin, iniquity, and fault. [1] Similarly, that which he says: "**My soul** *(Suspendium)* has chosen hanging, and my bones death" — is expounded of a spiritual kind of hanging and of death: so that by "the hanging of the soul" we understand its elevation from earthly things to heavenly, from carnal to spiritual. For thus also Paul chose hanging, when he says: "**With CHRIST** *(Christo)* I am fixed to the cross." But by "desperation" are to be understood the renouncing of earthly pleasures, and the casting-off of worldly hope. [2] That also, which he adds: "**Would that** *(Utinam)* my sins were weighed in a balance," etc. — is said mystically of Christ hanging on the cross for our sins. For Job, wishing to show the gravity of the Lord's passion: "Would that," he says, "my sins were weighed in the scale of the divine justice — mine, indeed, not by [my] fault, but by the assumption of a penalty, by which I merited the wrath of the Father; [and] the punishment which I suffer would certainly be found much heavier than the fault of man for which I suffer: because he who suffers is infinite, but he for whom he suffers, finite." [3] But when Job said: "My heart does **NOT** *(Non)* reprehend me" — we ought to consider that there are two kinds of sins: some which can be avoided by the just; but some which cannot be avoided even by the just. And these indeed are the perverse thoughts of sins; but those [others] are the consent and the executions of the perverse thoughts. He, therefore, who slips in the thoughts of sins, if he resists them, and repairs himself before he slips, through consent, into depraved operations, has nothing whereby he may afterward, weeping, be reprehended by his own heart. Thus, then, Job — who according to the sentence of Solomon had confessed himself a sinner — then confesses that he is not reprehended by his own heart: because, even if perhaps by thinking he failed in something unlawful, yet, resisting the thought, he failed nothing either by consenting or by working. [4] Finally, when we hear the words by which he seems to reproach cruelty to God, we ought to believe that they were brought forth by blessed Job not out of anger and indignation. For just as the holy scriptures call God, after the human manner, "zealous without zeal, angry without anger" — so by the holy man Job, after the human manner, God was called "cruel without cruelty." For he is called "cruel" who, striking strictly, spares not: so that, namely, in this place "cruel" may be understood [as] "striking strictly." As also Isaiah — wishing to show that the last day of judgment is to come not now with pardon, but with strictness — said: "**Behold** *(Ecce)*, a cruel day shall come, and full of indignation." But those [words] which he subjoined, saying, "**If** *(Si)* thou scourgest, slay at once," etc., were likewise sent forth not out of hatred and reproach, but out of an ardent desire of human redemption [directed] to God the Father, by a certain prophetic spirit. And that the sense of these may become clearer, it must first be noted what is signified by "the punishment of the innocent," and by "the laughter of God." [5] Accordingly, the laughter of God — or [for God] to laugh — is

[for him] to be unwilling to pity human affliction; but the punishment is the deferral of desire, Solomon saying: "**Hope** *(Spes)* that is deferred afflicts the soul." The "punishments of the innocent," therefore, are those most ardent desires of the ancient fathers, by which, their soul glowing, they longed to see the mysteries of the Incarnation. But for God "to laugh" was not to fulfill their desires. For, so long as, not compassionating, he deferred the vows of his elect, what else was it than to laugh at the punishments of the innocent? And so the holy man, considering the gifts of the coming Redeemer, and patiently tolerating the deferral of his vows, says: "**If** *(Si)* thou scourgest, slay at once, and laugh not at the punishments of the innocent" — as if he openly prayed, saying: Since our life is daily worn away by the scourge of vengeance for [our] fault, let him now come who may once for us die without fault, that God may no longer laugh at the punishments of the innocent, if he himself appear passible in the flesh, in whose desires our mind chastens itself. Enough, therefore, out of these [things], let the blasphemies of the Anabaptists be confuted. [6]

OF THE BOOKS OF ESDRAS, TOBIT, JUDITH, AND ESTHER — Heresy XI *(De Libris Esdrae, Tobiae, Iudith, et Esther. Haeresis XI)*

To cast away the books of Esdras [Ezra], Tobit, Judith, and Esther, as histories of uncertain faith and authority.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The Anabaptists reject these books in general; but Luther says that he doubts whether the book of Tobit and [that] of Judith are to be received into the order of the sacred volumes.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

The authority of the whole Church, the decrees of the Councils, and the testimonies of the fathers, damn this heresy. For the first and second [book] of Esdras — which is called Nehemiah [Nehemias] — not only are found in all the catalogues of the most ancient fathers of the Church, and their testimonies are cited in the decrees of the Pontiffs, but also among the Hebrews are reckoned among the כתובים *(Chetubim* [Ketuvim]*)* — that is, the Hagiographa, or holy writings, which were placed in the ark. But Tobit, although among them [the Hebrews] it is not in the Canon, yet the Church of the Christians, from the third Council of Carthage down to these our times, always had it in the Canon; and all the most ancient fathers of the Church brought forth various testimonies concerning it, as [from] canonical scripture. Among others indeed, Clement the first pontiff of that name, in [his] first and second epistle, and Anacletus in his first decree, [and] Alexander

[1] Gregory, book 4 of the Morals, ch. 6 (Greg. libr. 4. moral. cap 6); (gloss:) "A twofold day: natural and infused" (Dies duplex, naturalis & influxa).
[2] Galatians 2 (Gal. 2).
[3] Isaiah 53 (Esai. 53).
[4] Gregory, book 18, ch. 85 (Greg. lib. 18. cap. 85).
[5] Job 9 (Iob 9).
[6] Gregory, book 9 of the Morals, ch. 20 (Greg. lib. 9. moral. c. 20); Proverbs 13 (Prov. 13).

(printed p. 653 [PDF p. 658] — Heresy XI: the Refutation continues (papal and Hebrew witness to Tobit, Judith, and Esther; the Purim institution); then the Objections of the Heretics — 1: Esdras; 2: Tobit & Judith not in the canon; 3: the chronological difficulties of Judith; 4: Esther begun.)

But Alexander, Pope the first, in [his] first epistle, for the confirmation of the most holy Trinity, uses the testimony of the benediction of Tobit, saying: "If the Trinity is not, why is Tobit — when he sent his son into the city of Rages with Raphael the Archangel — taught to have blessed them, saying thus: 'May God [of] Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, himself fulfill his benediction in you'?" Similarly also Innocent the first, in his decretal epistle to Exuperius; Callistus, Pope the first, in [his] second decree; and

Marcellus, Pope the first, in [his] second epistle, used the testimonies of this history. The book of Judith also, not only the holy Nicene Synod (Jerome himself being witness) received into the number of the holy scriptures, but the Hebrews likewise hold [it] among the histories worthy of faith, placing it, together with the book of Tobit, among the sacred writings which among them were kept outside the ark, and were not guarded within the ark with the rest of the canonical books. They hand down, too, that the author of this book was Joachim the priest, son of Jesus the high priest — whom Philo the Jew, in [his] second booklet of the Chronography, mentions in these words: "**Jesus, then, held** *(Gessit)* the first pontificate up to the twelfth year of Assuerus Priscus [the Elder], thirty-six years; but Joachim his son, in [his] absence, eight years. He also wrote out the deeds of Judith, and instituted the anniversary memory of the liberation, to be kept yearly." [1] But concerning the book of Esther — although of old, among certain Greek fathers, it was doubted whether it was canonical — nevertheless all the Councils reckoned it in the catalogues of the sacred volumes, and the Hebrews numbered it among the holy **Chetubim** *(so printed "Cherhubim"* [Ketuvim, the Hagiographa]*)* books. Most of the Latins think this [book] was published by Mardochaeus [Mordecai]; but Philo the Jew, in the place above mentioned, asserts [it was] written by the same Joachim the pontiff — who, when he was now for the second time pontiff, at the exhortation by letters of Mardochaeus the Hebrew, the adoptive father of Esther herself, committed this history to writing, and instituted the annual solemnity פורים *(Phurim* [Purim]*)* — that is, "of lots" — which is noted in the volume of Esther, and is celebrated by the Jews down to this time, every single year, in memory of the Jewish liberation. [2]

OBIECTA HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. What is to be thought concerning the books of Esdras, Jerome, in the preface to Esdras, indicates in these words: "**Nor let** *(Nec)* any one be moved that one book only is published by us, nor let [any] be delighted with the dreams of the apocryphal third and fourth book: for among the Hebrews the discourses of Esdras and of Nehemiah are compressed into one volume; and those [things] which are not had among them, nor are of the twenty-four elders [books], are without doubt to be rejected." From which words it is manifest that the third and fourth of Esdras contain nothing but mere and vain dreams, and that only two books out of the four remain in the canon: of which the one — namely the second, which is called Nehemiah — Isidore, in the sixth book of the Etymologies, ch. 2, casts out of the canon, affirming that the second and third books of Esdras are not had among the Hebrews, but are by them reckoned among the apocrypha.

2. But concerning the books of Tobit and Judith — that they are not in the canon — Jerome openly testifies in the prologue to Tobit, saying: "**The book** *(Librum)* of Tobit indeed, which the Hebrews record [as] consigned, from the catalogue of the divine scriptures, among the apocrypha"; and in the Helmeted Prologue: "Judith," he says, "and Tobit, and the Shepherd [Pastor], are not in the canon." And lest any one should think that he spoke of the Jewish canon only, in the preface to Proverbs he added: "The books of Judith, and of Tobit, and of the Maccabees, the Church of God indeed reads for the edification of the people, but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures."

3. And deservedly indeed does the Church of God not receive the book of Judith into the canon, on account of the uncertainty of the history — whose neither deeds nor times agree with the approved histories of the nations. For those two kings of the Medes who are named at the beginning of the book of Judith — namely, Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor — in whose times the deeds of the present history are narrated to have happened, are nowhere commemorated in the histories of the nations. Nor does that make anything to the matter, which Lyra, and the author of the Gloss, and Eusebius in the Chronicles bring forward — that those two kings were called by diverse names among the Hebrews and among the profane historians: so that, whom the Greeks call Cambyses, second king of the Persians, the Jews name Nabuchodonosor; and whom the Greeks make Diocles [Deioces], fifth king of the Medes, founder of the city Ecbatana, the Hebrews call that same [man] Arphaxad, founder of Ecbatana. For if it be so, how could Nabuchodonosor — by the Greeks called Cambyses, in whose time Eusebius in the Chronicles writes that this history happened — fight

against Arphaxad (whom the author of the Gloss asserts to be Diocles, the builder of Ecbatana) in the great plain of Ragau, and obtain his kingdom (as is written in the exordium of the present history), when between Cambyses and Diocles more than a hundred and twenty years intervened? in which (as is gathered from the Chronicles of Eusebius) four intermediate kings reigned one after another, namely: Phraortes [Phaartes], twenty-four years; Cyaxares, thirty-two years; Astyages, thirty-eight years; Cyrus, thirty years — which, joined together, comprehend a hundred and twenty-four years. The history of this book is rendered uncertain also by many other [things] which are contained in it. As, concerning Arphaxad, or Diocles — whom Eusebius, and all the later chronographers, write to have held the kingdom of the Medes fifty-four years — but the beginning of the book of Judith narrates that he reigned only twelve years, and that in the twelfth year of [his] reign he was vanquished and cast down from empire by Nabuchodonosor, or Cambyses, king of the Assyrians. [3] And concerning the city Ecbatana — which the author of the book of Judith records that Arphaxad (otherwise Diocles) built most mightily of squared stone — Pliny, book 6, ch. 14, hands down [that it was] founded by King Seleucus a long time afterward. To which so open contradictions accedes also the authority of Josephus, who — although he professed to commit to writing all the Jewish antiquities, whatsoever he believed true — [yet] made no mention of this history, [and thus] rendered it uncertain and suspected of falsity: since no cause ought to have restrained him from transmitting to posterity so magnificent a victory of his own nation, had he esteemed it worthy of faith and of history.

4. Concerning the book of Esther likewise, there is no less suspicion than concerning the book of Judith: because (as Jerome in the pre-[face]

[1] Jerome in the preface to the book of Judith (Hier. in praefat. libri Iudith).
[2] ch. 9 (of Esther) (cap. 9).
[3] Judith 1 (Iudith 1).

(printed p. 654 [PDF p. 659] — Heresy XI: objections 4–5 concluded (the additions to Esther; the chronological impossibility of Mordecai's age); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins — response 1 (the third and fourth Esdras; the Nehemiah/Isidore point); response 2 (Tobit and Judith) begun.)

[as Jerome, in the pre]face to Esther, affirms — the theme of the history being taken, [the book] was written with historical artifice, these [things] being added at the writer's discretion which could, according to the occasion, be said and heard — just as it is customary in scholastic disciplines [school exercises], a theme being taken, to devise with what words he could use who has suffered an injury, or who has done an injury. That this opinion of Jerome is true, the last six chapters of this book show — namely from the tenth to the sixteenth — which are not had in the Hebrew volume, but were fabricated either by Josephus, or by some other writer. For both the copy of the letters of Aman [Haman], which are recited in the thirteenth chapter, and the copy of the epistle of King Artaxerxes, which is recounted in the sixteenth chapter, are excerpted into this book — with almost no word changed — out of the sixth chapter of the eleventh book of the Antiquities of Josephus. For Josephus, as he was skilled in the historical law [method], when he had noticed either that this history was rendered suspect, or that the king could easily be noted for inconstancy and levity — because, after the letters in which he had ordered the whole race of the Jews to be abolished, [being] suddenly changed, he revoked his sentence by new letters sent forth — inserted into the third and eighth chapter, and into very many other places of this history, many [things] by which he might vindicate this change of mind in the king, together with the narration of the history, from all suspicion of calumny or of fiction. But what was done by him in these chapters, it is credible that the same was done in the rest, either by him, or by other corruptors.

5. Besides these [things], the parts of the history are so dissonant among themselves that what before is reported to have been done in it under one king and time, the same is later read to have happened under another king and time. For although in its second chapter it is written that Bagatan [Bigthan] and Thares

[Teresh], royal eunuchs and doorkeepers of the royal palace, who had conspired against the murder of King Assuerus, were detected, and both hanged upon a gibbet — and that after the seventh year of King Assuerus — below, in the eleventh and twelfth chapter, the same is reported to have been done by the same eunuchs, and by Mardochaeus, under a different king and time, namely under King Artaxerxes, against whom those eunuchs are written to have conspired in the second year of his reign. And if any one should say that this Artaxerxes is the same with him who above was called Assuerus (as Eusebius notes in the Chronicles) — thinking this [man] to have been Artaxerxes Memnon, son of Darius Nothus and of Parysatis — then another, greater controversy arises, which overturns the whole authority of the history. For if the present history happened in the time of Artaxerxes, it is consequent that Mardochaeus the Jew was then two hundred years of his life — which exceeds all credit of truth: especially indeed since the history describes him as having exercised the royal services in the palace of the king with strength still entire, and to have ridden vigorously through the city, and to have accomplished many other [things] of this kind not sluggishly — which [things] it is not verisimilar that he could perform in so decrepit an age, [while] passing the two-hundredth year of [his] age. For we find that he lived so many years, if we reckon the time from his captivity down to King Artaxerxes. For Mardochaeus was of the sons of the captivity, whom Nabuchodonosor king of the Assyrians carried over into Babylon, together with Joachim, surnamed Jeconiah [Jechonias], king of the Jews; and that (as Eusebius writes in the Chronicles) in the eighth year of Astyages, the eighth and last king of the Medes. And it is verisimilar that Mardochaeus was then a boy, at least of ten years; to which if there be added the thirty years of Astyages — who reigned thirty-eight years — they will be forty; to which if there be added the number of years in which the eleven kings of the Persians reigned one after another — from Cyrus (who first transferred the kingdom of the Medes to the Persians, their king Astyages being conquered) down to Artaxerxes Memnon son of Darius Nothus — they will be a hundred and ninety-nine years: which sum of years it is necessary that Mardochaeus not only completed, but even survived by many years after. For it is written, in the tenth chapter of Judith [1], that King Assuerus, after the event of this history, waged many wars, and subdued to his dominion all the land and the islands of the sea, and thereupon set Mardochaeus over the rest, [and] made him ruler over his whole empire. Which, since it presents no likeness of truth, it is plain that the history of Judith [2], the theme being taken from an uncertain author, was fabricated for the exercise of style (as Jerome hints).

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Concerning the third and fourth books of Esdras — which Jerome calls "dreams," and does not take into the Canon — although we judge that nothing need be answered to the heretics, nevertheless we do not dare to damn them, and altogether to reject them: especially since the blessed Ambrose (as we already showed in the first book) receives the fourth volume of Esdras, and Augustine indicates that some [things] which are in the third book are to be understood mystically, as of Christ. As is that [passage] where — a question having arisen among certain young men, [as to] what should be most powerful [strongest] in things — one said kings, another wine, the third women, who for the most part command kings; yet the same third demonstrated that truth is victorious over all: which certainly can most fittingly be applied to Christ, who is the highest truth. But concerning the second book, which Isidore seems to exclude from the Canon, we say that it is one book of Esdras which he calls "second" and rejects from the canon, and another that is the second book of Esdras which we receive in the canon. Ours begins: "The **WORDS** *(Verba)* of Nehemiah, son of Helchiah [Hachaliah]" — which among the Hebrews is the same with the first Esdras, and makes one single book with it. But the second [book], according to Isidore, begins thence, whence among us the third Esdras takes its beginning — namely from these words: "**And JOSIAS made** *(Et fecit Iosias)* [the Passover]" — which, together with the following book, does not exist among the Hebrews. But that Isidore receives, as canonical, the book which we, from the name of Nehemiah, made the second, is plain from the very words of Isidore, which he premised a little before, saying: "The book of Esdras is prenoted with the

title of its author, in whose text the discourses of Esdras and of Nehemiah are alike contained." [3]

2. Concerning the books of Tobit also, and of Judith, we briefly respond, that nothing of authority is taken from them because the Jews reckon them among the apocrypha; for although the Synagogue of the Jews does not receive them, yet the holy Church of Christ receives [them] in the Canon; and them like-[wise]

[1] so printed; the reference is to Esther 10

[2] so printed; the argument throughout concerns Esther

[3] Augustine, book 20 of the City of God, ch. 25 (Aug. l. 20 de ciu. dei c. 25); book 18 of the City [of God], ch. 36 (Li. 18. de ciu. cap. 36); 3 Esdras 3 (3. Esdr. 3).

(printed p. 655 [PDF p. 660] — Heresy XI: response 2 concluded (the two orders of the Canon; why Jerome and Augustine differ); response 3 (the chronological objections against Judith and Esther rest on which historians one follows — Herodotus vs. Ctesias, Metasthenes, and Philo; the authenticity of Philo's Chronography defended).)

and them [Tobit and Judith] it reads and venerates with equal veneration with the other holy books. But to that opinion of Jerome, by which he asserts that these books are by no means received by the Church of God among the canonical scriptures, we say [that] his words, thus considered without any distinction, are not wholly true: since Augustine, contemporary with Jerome, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, ch. 8, enumerates each in the order of the canonical books; and the third Council of Carthage, at which Augustine was present, enumerates [them] in the catalogue of the sacred scriptures. From which it most evidently stands [established] that these books were, even in the time of Jerome, received into the Canon by the Catholic Church. Accordingly Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, meeting this argument, says that the "Church" is sometimes taken in two ways among the ancient writers: sometimes for those who preside over the rest in the Church of God — as are the doctors, pastors, and rectors of the Church — of which Church Christ wished himself to be understood, when he said: "**Go** *(Vade)*, and tell the Church"; but sometimes the "Church" is taken for the whole assembly of the faithful, but especially for those who are inferior, and of the flock of sheep which are subjected to the pastors — of which Church Paul, admonishing the pastors, says: "**Take heed** *(Attendite)* to yourselves, and to the whole flock, in which God has placed you to rule the Church of God." And of this Church Jerome spoke, when he said that the Church of God in his time had not yet received these books among the canonical scriptures — certain seditious [men], namely, still making tumult, and, together with them, a certain vicious custom of the multitude resisting — lest they should be received by the whole congregation of the faithful, generally. But among the Church, taken in the first signification, these books were always held as canonical. These [things] Ambrose. [1] But since, in the beginning of this work, it was shown that very many fathers of great name, and leaders of the Church, reckoned the volumes of Tobit and of Judith among the apocrypha, it must be known — as we already warned in the first book — that there are two orders of the Canonical volumes: of which the prior contains the books concerning whose faith and authority there was never any controversy among the prelates and pastors of the Church; but the latter embraces the scriptures not straightway, in the exordium of the nascent Church, recognized and received by the fathers and pastors, but a long time after — when there had first been doubts, and diverse judgments among them, concerning these. Jerome, therefore, together with some fathers, looking to the first order, pronounced the books of Tobit and of Judith not to be Canonical — that is, [not] of the number of the canonical [books] of the first order; but Augustine, with other fathers, having regard to the second order, reckons the same books among the Canonical; nor does Jerome disapprove this.

3. But what they bring forward concerning the uncertainty of the history is easily dissolved, if we consider that all the ambiguity of the alleged difficulty consists in the reckoning of the various times and kings who were [living] through those times — in which [reckoning] the historians of the Greeks (whose prince is Herodotus, whom our Eusebius followed) differ very much from the historians and chronographers of the Jews and of the Persians, such as are Metasthenes the Persian, Ctesias [Cthesias] of Cnidus, and Philo the

Jew: and on account of this diversity, it is necessary to reject some of them. Rejected, therefore, are Eusebius and the rest, who, in reckoning up the kings of the Persians and Medes, and in recounting their names and times, followed the fabler [fabulatorem] Herodotus; but received, for a most just cause, are Ctesias of Cnidus, Metasthenes, and Philo. For Ctesias (as Diodorus Siculus reports in the third book of his history) brought the annals into Greece out of the public faith [record] and Library of the Persians — for which cause Diodorus himself judges that his opinion, rather than Herodotus', is to be stood by. But Metasthenes, for the same cause, is preferred to Herodotus: because (as he himself reports) in numbering the series and time of the kings of the Persians and Medes, he used no other author than the public Susian Library of the Persians, in which the annals of the kings of the Persians were, in his age — that is, in the time of Alexander the Great — still preserved whole and incorrupt. But Philo the Jew is for this reason alone received of the Hebrew writers: because he most diligently collected the times of the four Monarchies, and especially the years and the names of those who reigned in Israel from Moses down to Herod — not following uncertain opinions, as Josephus did, but drawing most certain testimonies out of the books of the seventy Elders, whom the Hebrews call Zanedrin [Sanhedrin].

Nor does it move me, that the Anabaptists, enemies of the truth, object: that the Chronography which is reported under the name of Philo is not his — because neither Eusebius, in book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18, nor Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, made mention of this volume, whereas each of them wove a long enough catalogue of the individual works of Philo. Since [in fact] both confess that Philo wrote more books, besides those numbered by them in the catalogue, which did not come to their hands. To this accedes also that which most declares the book to be Philo's — namely, the very testimony of the author of this Chronography: for the author writes, at the foot [end] of the third booklet, that he, quite a young man, was sent by his [fellow] Jews from Alexandria as legate to Rome, in the twenty-first year of Herod the tetrarch — which words can suit no one but Philo the Alexandrian Jew, whom Josephus, in the eighteenth book of the Antiquities, and Eusebius, in book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 5, hand down was sent, [while] still a young man, to Rome to Caius [Gaius] Caesar, against Apion the accuser of the Jews, and wrote a book concerning that legation, in which the single [deeds] done by him were contained.

These [things] have been said by us for this [reason]: that out of this Chronography of Philo we might open a very broad way to the dissolution, not only of the present difficulty, but of all other ambiguities of this kind which can emerge in the apparent contradictions of the sacred histories. Now, therefore, responding to the proposed difficulty of the Anabaptists, we say that Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor are not those whom they themselves think — namely Diocles and Cambyses — but far others, whom Metasthenes the Persian and Philo the Jew recorded in the second book of the Chronography. For Arphaxad was neither a king of the Medes nor of the Persians, but a certain notable and most powerful favorer (as Philo says) of the Tamyric [Tamyris] faction, who rose up immediately after Cyrus was killed by Tamyris the queen of the Scythians; and into whose place was substituted Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus, who in the book of Judith

[1] Matthew 18 (Matt. 18); Acts 20 (Act. 20).

(printed p. 656 [PDF p. 661] — Heresy XI: response 3 concluded (the identification of Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor via Metasthenes and Philo; the two Ecbatanas; why Josephus omitted Judith); response 4 (Jerome did not call Esther a fiction — only its Vulgate translation "vitiated"); response 5 (the additions are apocryphal appendices; Mordecai's great age defended from Philo).)

who, in the book of Judith, is surnamed Nabuchodonosor — first king of the Medes, the Persians, and the Assyrians, son of Darius Hystaspes [Istaspis], who, together with his colleague Cyrus, had ruled the Medes, Persians, and Assyrians (Baltassar [Belshazzar] king of the Babylonians being conquered), as is had in the first book of Esdras, and in the volume of Daniel. This Arphaxad, then, prince of the Tamyric faction — Cyrus being dead — increased the number of his own [followers]; and, Media being occupied, restored

Ecbatana, the royal seat of the Medes (once built by the kings of the Medes, and afterward half-ruined by Cyrus), and fortified it with squared stones (as is read in the book of Judith). He also compelled the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians to defection [revolt], and armed them against Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus, surnamed Nabuchodonosor, who still kept himself within the bounds of Babylon. Meeting whom, Artaxerxes surnamed Nabuchodonosor — in the twelfth year of his reign (as the history of Judith narrates) — routed him in a memorable battle in the great plain of Ragau; and, vengeance being taken against the rebels, obtained his paternal kingdom, pacified on every side. After which victory, when in the following year he had heard that Holophernes, sent by himself, was beheaded by the Jews, being gravely indignant, by a public edict he forbade the temple to be raised — as is noted in the fourth chapter of Esdras. Nor ought it seem wondrous to any one that this Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus is called Nabuchodonosor in the book of Judith — because (as is written in the book of Judith, and Philo confirms) Arphaxad had invaded the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians; but this Artaxerxes Assuerus held Babylonia alone, where the ruler is, by the common appellation of dignity, called Nabuchodonosor — just as in Egypt the kings were called first Pharaohs, then Ptolemies, and among the Romans, Caesars. These [things], therefore, being disposed according to the order of Metasthenes and of Philo, all the doubt of the Anabaptists is removed concerning Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor, who are not found in the catalogues of the kings of the Persians and Medes among the Greeks. Likewise, concerning the number of years in which Diocles reigned, this alone remains to be discussed: how Pliny says that the city Ecbatana was first built by Seleucus (who reigned after Alexander the Great), and why Josephus did not mention this history. It behooves [us], therefore, to know that the Ecbatana of which Pliny writes is different from that of which the book of Judith speaks, and of which Strabo makes mention in the eleventh book, saying: "**Media** *(Media)* is divided into two parts, the one of which they call the greater, whose metropolis was the city Ecbatana, head of the Median empire, which now the Parthians also use as a royal seat." But the [other] Ecbatana, of which Pliny makes mention, is not in Media, but a city of Syria, founded by King Seleucus near the Caspian gates, twenty thousand paces [distant] — which some, writing it "Epiphania," others "Egbatana" (with a *g*), named. And that Josephus passed over this history is not without reason, since among the Hebrews it is not in the canon: for Josephus took to write only those things which were had in the canon of the Hebrews. Whence Josephus himself, excusing [himself] that he left untouched many sacred histories of the Hebrews, thus speaks: "Let **NO ONE** *(Nemo)*, then, blame me, in that I have thus narrated the single [matters], just as they are found written in the ancient books. For at the very beginning of my history, on account of those who raise questions and strive to blame [me] in something, I asserted, saying that I would translate the Hebrew books into the Greek speech, and open [expound] these — promising neither to add anything apart, nor to subtract." [1] But why the Hebrews do not have this book in the canon, neither does it sufficiently stand [clear], nor is it to be anxiously investigated by us — since the Christian Church willed it to be among the canonical [books]. Thus far concerning Judith.

4. Concerning the book of Esther — which the Anabaptists contend was written upon a fabricated theme — I would not believe them to be so unskilled that they could not see into the meaning of Jerome; but [I would believe them] rather wicked and impudent, who were unwilling to understand Jerome. For he does not affirm that this history was written by its first Hebrew author upon a taken or fabricated theme; but he asserts that its Vulgate translation was vitiated [corrupted] by the fault of the translators, who — a narration-theme being taken (as is the custom in the schools) — mixed in much of their own head [invention] into this translation. For these are the very words of Jerome: "The **BOOK** *(Librum)* of Esther, it is agreed, is vitiated by various translators: which I, disclosing [it] out of the archives of the Hebrews, translated word for word more expressly; which book the Vulgate edition drags out with tattered fringes of words here and there, adding those [things] which could, according to the occasion, be said and heard — just as it is customary in the scholastic disciplines, a theme being taken, to devise with what words he could use who has suffered an injury, or who has inflicted an injury." Thus Jerome. Accordingly, if the translators added something, either from Josephus or out of some other pious intention, this derogates nothing from the Hebrew verity, which

always remained inviolate in its own sincerity, and has come to us in its integrity out of the translation of St. Jerome — who, as appears from his scholia, cut off those last six chapters as adventitious [ascititious], and the Catholic Church neglected the same, as adventitious and apocryphal.

5. From which it becomes plain that the controversy of the Anabaptists, between the second chapter of this book and the eleventh and twelfth chapters of the same book, is null — as [being one] which leans upon the additional and apocryphal appendices of the book. Yet we confess that that Artaxerxes, who is treated of in those apocryphal chapters, is the same with that Assuerus of whom mention is made in the whole book of Esther according to the Hebrew verity: who also (Philo being witness) was called Great Artaxerxes, and Assuerus Darius Mnemon, the fifth king after Cyrus of the Persians, Medes, and Assyrians. In the twelfth year of whose reign this history happened — as is narrated in the third chapter of Esther — Mardochaeus being then nearly in the one-hundred-and-eightieth year of his life. And lest it seem incredible to any one that Mardochaeus could survive so long a time, we have the testimony of Philo, who in the second book of the Chronography thus writes: "Him succeeded Joachim — likewise second [time] pontiff — for forty-eight years, up to the twelfth year of the great Artaxerxes; who wrote the deeds of Esther, and instituted the memory of פורים *(Phurim* [Purim]*)*, at the exhortation, by letters, of Mardochaeus, who by eighteen years exceeded the age of Isaac" — signifying by these words that Mardochaeus lived a hundred and ninety-eight years. For Isaac, as is read in Genesis, lived a hundred and eighty years. [2] Nor is it to be esteemed impossible that a man so long-[lived]

[1] Josephus, Antiquities, book 10 (printed "19"), ch. 12 (Iosephus li. 10. ant. c. 12).
[2] Genesis 35 (Gen. 35).

(printed p. 657 [PDF p. 662] — Heresy XI concluded (God prolonged the lives of Mordecai, Jesus the priest, Tobit, and Judith); then Heresy XII opens: Of the books of Maccabees — statement, Assertors (Luther and the Anabaptists), and the Refutation (their usefulness against modern heresies; the fulfillment of Daniel and Zechariah; patristic witness).)

so long-lived an old man served, with strength still entire, in the royal court — since nothing is impossible with God, who, out of the love with which he most especially cherished his people, led such a man to that age beyond the usual course of human life, that the people, oppressed by the yoke of the nations, might, while he lived, be freed. Thus also he willed Jesus the high priest (as Philo writes) to be a survivor of a hundred and thirty years, that with him — together with Esdras, and Zorobabel the leader — the people might be recalled from Babylon into Jerusalem. Thus he led Tobit the elder (as the last chapter of his history testifies) to the hundred-and-second year, or (as the Greek edition has) up to the hundred-and-fifty-eighth year, that the calamity of those who were in the captivity of Salmanassar might, by him as consoler and benefactor, be partly relieved: as, for that same cause, he prolonged the life of his son Tobit up to the ninety-ninth [year], or (as it is had in Greek) up to the hundred-and-twenty-seventh year; and made Judith reach the hundred-and-twenty-fifth year, that, she surviving, the fatherland, freed by her, might longer enjoy its liberty.

OF THE BOOKS OF MACCABEES — Heresy XII *(De Libris Maccabaeorum. Haeresis XII)*

That the books of Maccabees are neither canonical, nor worthy to be numbered among the sacred books.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is the heresy of Luther and of the Anabaptists. For Luther, since he denied the suffrages of the dead, and the invocation of the saints, and the dedications of temples, and saw that these books opposed his errors, rejected their authority. But the Anabaptists — who, besides these [things], also affirm that the saints sleep

perpetually outside the kingdom of heaven until the day of judgment, and pray for no one — when they noticed that their [own] assertion was destroyed by the testimonies of these volumes, subscribed to Luther in this same heresy.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

That the books of Maccabees are to be received among the divine and canonical scriptures, the authority of the Gospel and of the Church shows, and their vast usefulness persuades. For they are exceedingly useful for confuting especially the heresies of our times. For there are had, in the second volume of Maccabees, most clear testimonies concerning Purgatory, concerning the suffrages to be made for the dead, and concerning the prayers of the saints who have gone hence to immortal life. But to piety, and to all the virtues, they contribute very much — provoking us to fortitude, to patience, and to hope in afflictions, and to the sustaining of death, if need be, for piety's sake, by the example of the noble Eleazar, and of those seven brothers who, for the sacred laws, suffered such dire torments: whom their pious mother, while they were pressed with diverse tortures, not only did not weep [over], but even, rejoicing, exhorted to the glory of [their] passion. [1] These books are also worthy to be reckoned among the sacred writings, for the certainty and confirmation of many things which are found in the other books of sacred scripture. For very many things predicted beforehand by the prophets are read most truly fulfilled in these books. As, that which Daniel foresaw concerning the abomination to be [set] in the temple, these volumes indicate to have been fulfilled in Antiochus — who set the abominable idol of desolation (namely his own statue) upon the altar of God in the temple, and burned the books of the Law, and did other unworthy [things] here and there, which are commemorated in the present history. Likewise, that which God foretold through Zechariah — that he would visit upon the he-goats, and that there would go forth out of Israel [those] who should exact [vengeance from] and vanquish those he-goats in great glory — Jerome, not disapproving the opinion of the Hebrews, expounded [as] fulfilled in the Maccabees, who prevailed mightily against the he-goats, that is, against Antiochus, Demetrius, Gorgias, and Nicanor, who are designated by the he-goats by Daniel, in the kingdom of the Greeks. In the Gospel of John, too, a testimony is adduced concerning the feast of the Encaenia [Dedication] — that is, of the renewal of the temple — of whose institution treatment is made in the first and second volume of Maccabees. [2] Nor are there lacking also most grave authors who, with Theodoret bishop of Cyrus, assert that Paul, writing to the Hebrews, understood [the reference to] the slaughter of the seven brothers, which is reported in the second book, when he said: "But **OTHERS** *(Alii)* were racked [stretched out], not accepting redemption" — which words agree with none more than those seven brothers, without any remission of penalties, torn apart through every kind of torments. Nay, also the most ancient custom of the Church approves these books as canonical, when, in the sacred mysteries which are performed for the dead, it takes out of the latter volume the history of Judas Maccabaeus offering gifts for the sins of the dead. And although so many were just in the Old Testament, nevertheless the Church of Christ, by a certain singular privilege (as Bernard says), decreed an annual solemnity for these alone out of all the ancient just. To these accede innumerable testimonies of the most ancient fathers, drawn out of these books as [out] of canonical scriptures. Origen, in the commentaries upon the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, refuting the error of the Valentinians (who said that in the Old Law no one dared to die for the God of the Old Testament, because they knew that he was not good), using the testimony of this history as canonical, says: "**But** *(Sed)* what will they do? for we find, in the Law also, many martyrs. Let them read the books of Maccabees, where, with all constancy, the blessed mother, with seven sons, underwent martyrdom; who not only receive martyrdom patiently, but even heap reproaches upon the tyrants. And let them see whether what they say be true." [3] Eusebius of Caesarea, in the twelfth book of the Evangelical Preparation — showing that the souls of the saints, loosed from the body, bring us help in [our] necessities — uses the authority of these volumes, saying: "It is to be believed, therefore, that the pious souls of the dead have a certain power, by which, even after death, they aid human affairs. Thus certainly the Jews contend it was handed down concerning

Jeremiah, and the history of the Maccabees related, that he himself was seen, after death, to pray for the people." Ambrose, in the first book of the Offices, builds up [confirms], by the examples of the Maccabean leaders, [that the saints...] [4]

[1] 2 Maccabees 12 (Mac. 12).

[2] Daniel 9 (Dan. 9); Jerome on [Daniel] 9 (Hier. sup. 9); Daniel and [Jerome] on Matthew 24 (Dan. et super 24. Mat.); 1 Maccabees 1 (1. Mac. 1); Zechariah 10 (Zach. 10).

[3] 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 2 Maccabees 10 (2. Mac. 10); Hebrews (Heb.); 2 Maccabees 7 (2. Mac. 7); 2 Maccabees 12 (2. Mac. 12.g); Bernard, epistle 313 (Ber. epi. 313).

[4] 2 Maccabees 15 (2. Mac. 15).

(printed p. 658 [PDF p. 663] — Heresy XII (Maccabees): the Refutation concluded (patristic and conciliar witness); then the Objections of the Heretics — 1: Alexander said to have "first" reigned in Greece; 2: the discrepant regnal years; 3: the contradictory accounts of Antiochus' death; 4: the contradiction over the temple's purification begun.)

[Ambrose, by the examples of the Maccabean leaders, builds up] that warlike virtue befits the saints also. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, writing to the bishops of all Egypt, in the fourth Paschal book, exhorts them to abstinence from meats, by the example (taken from this history) of the seven brothers, who, lest they should feed on unlawful meats, offered their bodies to torments. Augustine also, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, places the two books of Maccabees in the canon of the divine scriptures. And in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, concerning the authority of these volumes he says: "The books of **MACCABEES** *(Maccabaeorum)*, not the Jews, but the Church holds as canonical, on account of the vehement and wonderful passions of certain martyrs, who — before Christ had come in the flesh — contended, even unto death, for the Law of God, and bore the gravest and most horrible evils." And this same [thing] he testifies also in other places of his works, but especially in the book *On the Care to be had for the Dead*, and in the 44th sermon to the brothers in the desert — in which places, out of the twelfth chapter of the latter book of Maccabees, he proves that prayers [and] sacrifices are to be offered for the dead. [1] I omit, for brevity's sake, the third Council of Carthage, the epistle of Pope Innocent to Exuperius, the catalogue of Pope Gelasius, and the decree of the Council of Florence under Eugenius the Fourth — in which, out of the testimony of these volumes, the error of the Greeks concerning Purgatory was condemned — and other innumerable [testimonies] which protect the authority of these books; and, lest I beget tedium for the reader, I betake myself to the objections of the heretics.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. Many things are in these books which discrepate from the common consensus of all histories, and dissent from the truth of the Christian faith, on account of which they seem deservedly to be rejected. And first, as to what pertains to the truth of history, straightway at the beginning of the first volume it is read that Alexander the Macedonian, son of Philip, "first reigned in Greece." To which opinion all the histories are repugnant. For Eusebius of Caesarea, the most diligent reckoner of times, and the rest of the Chronologers, write that many reigned in Greece before Alexander, and especially among the Macedonians: of whom the first was Gramaeus [Caranus], by some also called Carranus [Caranus]; at which time, among the Hebrews, there reigned in Juda Ozias [Uzziah], and in Israel Jeroboam. But Alexander the Macedonian reigned [as] the twenty-fourth in Greece, Jaddo [Jaddua] being high priest among the Hebrews, in the year of the world 4860, in the hundred-and-eleventh Olympiad. [2]

2. There likewise it is written that Antiochus Epiphanes began to reign in the hundred-and-thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks — which began from Alexander. But in the Chronicles of Eusebius, and in the other annals of the Greeks, numbering from Alexander to the beginning of the reign of Antiochus through the individual kings, many more years are found — namely, a hundred and fifty-three. Whence not ineptly

did John Annius [Annius of Viterbo], a most skilled Chronographer, seeing that this controversy could not be settled, write in the commentaries upon the Chronography of Philo, that Josephus rendered these books apocryphal, while he wished to distinguish [set out] their history by ill-reckoned times. [3]

3. Concerning the death of Antiochus likewise — and the kind, cause, place, and time of [his] death — the books of Maccabees narrate things as contrary to the histories of the nations as to themselves. For, concerning the kind of death, in the first volume it is written that he, from sadness of soul, fell into [his] bed, and — a testament being made, and a successor to the kingdom appointed — died: but, on the contrary, at the beginning of the second book, it is read that he perished by a violent death, being struck with stones (namely, by the priests), and, together with his companions, his head cut off, torn limb from limb. Then, in the ninth chapter of the same book, he is reported to have perished by yet another kind of violent death: namely, that, fleeing, he fell from his chariot, and — the members of his whole body crushed, his flesh withering everywhere, and worms swarming over his whole body — amid horrible pains and stenches, miserably expired. But concerning the place of death, in the first book he is said to have departed [this] life at Babylon, in his own bed, worn out by long sickness. But at the beginning of the second book it is written that he was slain by the priests of the temple, within the shrine of Nannaea [Nanaea], in Persia; while below, in the ninth chapter of the same book, he is read to have perished on the journey, having now passed over into Ecbatana. [4] Nor is the diversity less as to time: while the first [book] of Maccabees asserts that Antiochus died in the hundred-and-forty-ninth year of the kingdom of the Greeks; but otherwise, at the beginning of the latter book, it is narrated that the same died in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks; and, from the ninth chapter of the same book, it is gathered that the same died in the hundred-and-forty-sixth year of the kingdom of the Greeks. For he died two years before the purgation of the temple of Jerusalem, made by Judas Maccabaeus; which indeed (as the first [book] of Maccabees testifies) happened in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu [Chislev], that is, of the ninth month. Concerning the cause of his death too, the history of the Maccabees by no means agrees with the external histories of the nations. For Polybius of Megalopolis (whom Josephus names a most excellent man, and Livy calls a not-to-be-contemned author), and, together with Polybius, Diodorus Siculus — both report that Antiochus Epiphanes, trying to plunder the most wealthy temple of Diana in Elymais, and overwhelmed by the guards, and put to flight by the neighboring nations round about, [being] turned into madness by certain phantasms and errors, at last perished of disease for this cause: because he had wished to violate the temple of Diana. But each book of Maccabees casts the cause of all the evils and of the death of Antiochus upon the calamities unjustly inflicted on the Jews, and [upon] the Jewish temple, defiled by him with all impieties. [5]

4. There is also an implacable contradiction concerning the deeds done by Judas Maccabaeus, and concerning his death, between the two books. For, while in the first volume the author testifies that the temple was purged by Judas, and the altar of God restored, in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu — namely, one year before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes — in the second volume the same author writes that the same purification of the temple was made by Judas two years after the death of Antiochus, namely in the year of the kingdom of the Greeks [6]

[1] 2 Maccabees 7 (2. Mac. 7); [Augustine, On Christian Doctrine 2] ch. 8 (cap. 8); [On the City of God 18] ch. 36 (cap. 36); Gaudentius, epistle, ch. 23 (Gaud. epist. cap. 23).

[2] 1 Maccabees 2 (1. Mac. 2).

[3] 1 Maccabees 8 (1. Mac. 8).

[4] 1 Maccabees 6 (1. Mac. 6).

[5] 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); Josephus, Antiquities book 12; Livy, [3rd] decade; Jerome in [his] commentary; Daniel 9 (Dan. 9).

[6] 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 1 Maccabees 10 (1. Mac. 10).

(printed p. 659 [PDF p. 664] — Heresy XII (Maccabees): Objections continue — 4 concluded (the discrepant dates of the temple-purification and of Judas' death); 5 (the "fabulous" hidden-fire/ark stories fathered on Jeremiah); 6 (the suicide of Razis praised); 7 (a profane Greek/Josephus abridger); 8 (the fathers who excluded the books); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins — response 1 (Alexander "first" = first over all Greece).)

[in the year] of the Greeks' [kingdom] the hundred-and-fifty-first. To which Eusebius, in the Chronicles, consents, writing that Judas cleansed the temple from the images of idols in the second year of Antiochus Eupator, three years after it had been contaminated by Antiochus Epiphanes. Concerning the death of Judas likewise, in the first book of Maccabees it is said that he was killed at the outset, in battle against the generals of Demetrius Soter; in the sixth year of Demetrius (as Eusebius notes), that is, eight years after the death of Antiochus the Illustrious, but in the hundred-and-fifty-second year of the Greeks' kingdom. But the beginning of the second [book] of Maccabees shows Judas living thirty years after this time — under Demetrius the fourteenth king of Syria (who reigned fourth after Demetrius Soter) — [and] writing, together with the senate of the Jews, a letter to Aristobulus the tutor of Ptolemy Philometor, in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Greeks' kingdom. [1]

5. There are contained likewise in this history not a few fabulous and uncertain [things] which — what is even worse — are confirmed by testimonies falsely adduced from the books of the prophets. Such is that which is recounted in the latter volume: namely, that the priests, by command of the prophet Jeremiah, hid the fire taken from the altar in a valley where there was a deep and dry well; which, after many years, Nehemiah, returned from captivity, ordered to be dug out by the grandsons of those priests who had hidden it. And again, that Jeremiah, at the same time of the transmigration [exile], hid the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense in a cave of Mount Nebo, onto which Moses, about to die, had ascended. Moreover, it confirms these [things] from the books of Jeremiah the Prophet and of Nehemiah — whereas nothing such is ever read to have been done, or said, in the whole Old Testament, nor was it even possible to be done: because Jeremiah, the whole time of the siege of Jerusalem, up to the last destruction of the city, was in prison (as appears from the 37th and 38th chapter of his book) — who, as he could not do these [things] before the destruction of the city, so neither after. [2] For, the city being taken, the Chaldeans immediately seized all the precious things of the temple, and carried [them] away into Babylon (as is found written in the fourth [book] of Kings); but among the precious things, the most precious were the tabernacle — in which (as is read in Exodus) were innumerable golden rings, [and] boards and columns covered with golden plates, [and] golden and silver bases very many — [and] the ark too, covered within and without with plates of the purest gold. Which, who would believe that the Chaldeans, greedy for plunder, gave to Jeremiah as a gift — [they] who abstained not even from things of lesser price, breaking all the vessels of silver and of bronze, and carrying [them] with them into Chaldea? Which [things], even if Jeremiah had received them from them as a gift, he would not have been silent about — since he was not silent even about lesser benefits received from them, nor passed over in silence the victuals and little gifts received from the master of the Assyrian army. [3]

6. Nor is it to be omitted that in these books some [things] also are proposed to be imitated against the divine and natural law — but especially at the end of the latter book, in which place the author, with quite magnificent words, extols the voluntary killing [suicide] of Razis [Razias], praising him because he bravely laid hands upon himself, and preferred to fall generously by his own hands, by a noble and honest death, rather than basely to live in the power of enemies, and, against the splendor of his birth, to experience insults from unworthy men. [4] Which deed, so far is it from meriting any praise of fortitude, that it is even worthy of the mark of the highest timidity and impatience — not only among the faithful, but also among the pagan [ethnic] philosophers; of whom the chief, Aristotle, indicated what he felt concerning this deed, in the third book of the Ethics [Morals], in these words: "But to procure death for oneself, in order to flee poverty, or love, or anything grievous, is [the mark] not of a brave man, but rather of a timid one. For it is softness to flee

laborious [things]. For [such a one] does not seek death because death is honorable, but because he thinks to avoid an evil." [5]

7. Wherefore not undeservedly the Hebrews cast these books out of the canon of the divine scriptures, as profane, and as written by a profane and gentile author from the lying histories of the Greeks — as the author himself testifies in the second volume, in these words: "The books comprehended [gathered] by Jason of Cyrene into five [books], we have tried to abridge into one volume." Which abbreviator some think was a certain Greek (as the style indicates), before the times of Christ; but others — among whom Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, and in the second book against the Pelagians — esteem to have been Josephus the Hebrew. [6]

8. But of whatsoever author the history be, it is plain that among the ancient fathers it was of no authority. For if we speak of the Greeks: Origen, in the preface to the first Psalm, cut the books of Maccabees from the Canon; Melito, bishop of Sardis, responding to Onesimus (who consulted him concerning the canonical books), made no mention of this history in his catalogue; and Epiphanius, in the book *On Weights and Measures*, did not receive these books into the number of the sacred [books]. But among the Latins, Philastrius explodes [rejects] them from the catalogue of the divine volumes; and Jerome does the same, in the preface to Proverbs, writing these [things]: "The books of **MACCABEES** *(Maccabaeorum)* the Church indeed reads, but does not receive among the canonical scriptures for confirming the authority of the ecclesiastical dogmas." And he repeats this same [thing] in the Helmeted Prologue. Nay, also Gregory, in the nineteenth book of the Morals, excusing himself that he receives testimonies out of the books of Maccabees: "We do **NOT** *(Non)* act disorderly," he says, "if, out of books not canonical, yet published for the edification of the Church, we bring forth testimonies." By which words indeed he indicates that in his time — namely, six hundred years after Christ — these books were not canonical. The Council of Laodicea also does not enumerate them in the catalogue of the holy scriptures. [7]

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. The Anabaptists, deceived by inexperience of histories, hallucinate in a matter clearer than light. For it is not to be understood that Alexander so "first reigned in Greece" [as] that no king was in Greece before him, but [rather] that he was the first who ruled over all Greece throughout — the other kings who reigned in it being excluded — as Metasthenes, a writer of that time, testifies.

---

[1] 1 Maccabees 9 (1. Macc. 9); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1).

[2] 2 Maccabees 1 and 2 (2 Mac. 1. et 2).

[3] 4 Kings 25 (printed "28"); and Exodus 26 (& vlt. Exod. 26).

[4] 2 Maccabees 14 (2. Mac. 14).

[5] Ethics, book 3, ch. 20 (3. Eth. c. 20).

[6] 2 Maccabees 2 (2. Mac. 2).

[7] Eusebius, book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18 (Eus. li. 6. hist. eccl. cap. 18); the same, book 4, ch. 26 (idem lib. 4. cap. 26); Philastrius in the catalogue, ch. 88 (Philastrius in cat. c. 88); ch. 27 (cap. 27).

(printed p. 660 [PDF p. 665] — Heresy XII (Maccabees), Dissolution of the Objections: response 2 (the regnal-year discrepancy resolved by the Seleucid vs. Alexandrian era); response 3 (the kind, time, and place of Antiochus' death reconciled — Nanaea, Persepolis/Elymais, Ecbatana, Babylon); response 4 (Judas purged the temple twice) begun.)

2. But what they assert in the second place, concerning the years of the reign of Antiochus, has so easy a solution that it is not necessary — with [John] Annius — to reject the reckonings of the years of this history as [things] super-added by Josephus: since Eusebius, in the Chronicles, easily recalls the present diversity of the reckonings to a true concord, saying that in each book of Maccabees the years of the kingdom of the Greeks are reckoned, not from Alexander the Great (as the external histories reckon), but from Seleucus

surnamed Nicanor — who, eleven years being completed from the death of Alexander, began to reign in Syria: to which [years], if the five years be added in which Alexander reigned as monarch over all Greece, there results the number of a hundred and fifty-three years, which is had in the histories of the Greeks. Therefore, if according to the first volume of Maccabees we take the beginning of the kingdom of the Greeks, we find that Antiochus entered upon the kingdom in the hundred-and-thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks. But if we reckon the years of the same kingdom of the Greeks from Alexander (as the histories of the Greeks do), we find that Antiochus began to reign in the hundred-and-fifty-third year of the kingdom of the Greeks.

3. But concerning the kind of the death of Antiochus, there are not lacking [those] who believe that that Antiochus — whose slaughter the epistle of the Senate of Jerusalem to Aristobulus reports — is a different [Antiochus] from that one whom the history of the Maccabees narrates to have perished from sickness of soul. We, however — esteeming that the same Antiochus is everywhere described — say that the parts of this history in no way discrepate among themselves; for each is most true: both that Antiochus, dismayed with grief of soul, fell into a languor (as the first [book] of Maccabees testifies), and that, oppressed with the same languor, he fled from Persia, and in flight was thrown from [his] chariot, and — by the collision of [his] limbs, and the convulsion of [his] entrails, amid pains and stenches — perished (as is read in the second [book] of Maccabees). [1] But concerning the diversity of times about the death of Antiochus, there is no dissension, if we recur to the various reckonings of times. For [Antiochus], who in the first [book] of Maccabees is written to have died in the hundred-and-forty-ninth year of the kingdom of the Greeks according to the reckoning begun from Seleucus, that same [Antiochus] is said, at the beginning of the latter volume, to have died in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year — not indeed of the kingdom of the Greeks (as the crafty Anabaptists added), but in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Hebrew reckoning — reckoning, namely, the number of years, not from the beginning of the kingdom of the Greeks, but (as Rabanus, Lyra, and Hugh of St. Cher [Carensis] teach) from the twelfth year of King Assuerus, from which some of the Hebrews began their reckonings; because in that year happened that admirable liberation of the sons of Israel through Esther and Mardochaeus. From which time, if a reckoning be made through the individual years of the kings down to the death of Antiochus, a hundred and eighty-eight years are found. To which two computations a third reckoning also corresponds, which is gathered from the tenth chapter of the second book, where it is written that Antiochus died two years before the purification of the temple made by Judas. But this happened — not (as the Anabaptists dreamed) in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, but in the hundred-and-fifty-first year of the same kingdom — as is gathered from the aforesaid chapter of the second book. Nor does that stand in the way, which is produced by them out of the first book of Maccabees — namely, that Judas purged the temple in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu — since this is to be understood of the first purification of the temple, made by Judas one year before the death of Antiochus; but this [other], which is written in the second book, is to be understood of the second purification of the temple, made by the same Judas, again, two years after the death of Antiochus. [2]

Concerning the place of the death of Antiochus likewise, all controversy is removed, if the words of the latter book — produced indeed by the Anabaptists, but not understood — be more diligently inspected. For they thought that Antiochus was slain in the temple of Nannaea [Nanaea] in Persia, together with [his] companions: because at the beginning of that book it is written: "**And** *(Et)* when Antiochus had entered the temple, [the priests,] casting stones, struck the leader, and those who were with him." But from these words it is not elicited that Antiochus was slain, but only struck with stones. And what is immediately subjoined under the aforesaid words — "**And** *(Et)* they divided [them] limb from limb, and, the heads being cut off, cast [them] forth" — is referred to his companions; upon whose slaughter, while the priests were insisting too much, Antiochus in the meantime escaped. Nor does that discrepate from this opinion which is read in the ninth chapter of the same book — that Antiochus entered Persepolis (which is also called Elymais in the first

[book] of Maccabees), the metropolis of Persia (as Ptolemy writes). And when he had wished to spoil the temple, the multitude running together to arms, [he was] turned to flight; in which, when he had now passed beyond Ecbatana, he fell from [his] chariot. And in the Babylonian region (as is read in the first and second book) — a successor to the kingdom, Antiochus Eupator, being left [behind] — he died, amid torments and stenches: not indeed for the cause written by Diodorus and Polybius, but for the sacrilege of the temple of Jerusalem perpetrated by him. As Antiochus himself, dying, confesses in each book, and Josephus, in the twelfth [book] of the Antiquities, confirms — refuting Polybius in these words: "**I wonder** *(Miror)* that Polybius of Megalopolis, a good man, says that Antiochus perished for this [cause]: that he wished to violate the temple of Diana in Persia. For he who in no way did the sin, but only thought [it], is held by no guilt of the deed. But if it seem to Polybius that Antiochus therefore ended [his] life, it is believed far more verisimilar that he perished on account of the sacrilegious devastation of the temple of Jerusalem." [3]

4. I pass now to the deeds of Judas Maccabaeus, which suffer no difficulty at all, if they be distinguished according to the aforesaid reckonings. For it is agreed (as we warned above) that Judas twice purged the temple: first indeed in the year one before the death of Antiochus, immediately after it had been violated by him — that is, in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus (as is read in the first [book] of Maccabees); but the second [time], two years after the death of Antiochus, namely in the hundred-and-fifty-first year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus — for thus in the second book of Macca-[bees] [4]

[1] 2 Maccabees 6 (2. Mac. 6); 2 Maccabees 9 (2. Mac. 9); 1 Maccabees 6 (1. Mac. 6); 1 Maccabees 1 (1. Mac. 1).
[2] 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1).
[3] Ptolemy, [Geography] book 6 (Ptol. l. 6); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1); ch. 9 (of 2 Maccabees) (ca. 9).
[4] 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4).

(printed p. 661 [PDF p. 666] — Heresy XII (Maccabees), Dissolution continues: response 4 concluded (the two Demetriuses; Aristobulus dated); response 5 (the hidden fire/ark drawn not from canonical Jeremiah/Nehemiah but from lost "commentaries"; apocryphal citation defended); response 6 (Razis — Augustine: his deed narrated, not praised); response 7 (the Hebrews' opinion is irrelevant once the Church receives the books).)

for thus in the second book of Maccabees it is written, and is had in Eusebius, that Judas purged the temple three years after it had been profaned by Antiochus. After which purgation, in six years or thereabouts, Judas dies, in the sixth year of Demetrius (as the first book testifies). But this Demetrius is not that one whom the Anabaptists, falsely transposing the names, lyingly [allege] — namely, the tenth king of Syria, surnamed Soter; but another Demetrius, the fourteenth king of Syria, in whose sixth year Judas fell in war — namely, in the hundred-and-fifty-sixth year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus, or thereabouts (as Eusebius hands down). But he [Judas] had earlier written the letter which is had at the beginning of the second volume, to Aristobulus, while Demetrius Soter reigned, in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Hebrew reckoning from Assuerus — which, according to the Greek reckoning from Seleucus, is nearly the fifty-fifth year: at which time it is openly agreed that that Aristobulus lived — the tutor of Ptolemy Philometor king of Egypt, a Jew by nation, a philosopher by profession, a Peripatetic by sect — who, to the same king of Egypt (Eusebius being witness), wrote commentaries upon Moses. [1]

5. But that which they say — that certain fabulous [things] are falsely introduced into this history from the sacred books of Nehemiah [and] of Jeremiah, which are nowhere read in those sacred volumes of theirs — is a calumny of the heretics: since nothing out of the divine and Canonical volumes of Nehemiah, or of Jeremiah, is cited in the second book of Maccabees, but only certain "descriptions" [records], and "commentaries," of Nehemiah and of Jeremiah. For thus it is written in that place: "It is **FOUND** *(Invenitur)* in the descriptions of Jeremiah the prophet"; and a little after: "But **they were brought in** *(Inferebantur)* in

the descriptions and commentaries of Nehemiah." Which certainly no one who understands the signification of "commentary" will think to be those [books] which are counted in the Canon of the Old Testament. For commentaries, as appears from Cicero's *Brutus*, are books in which the daily events are noted — not more broadly and more diffusely, as they are described in a [formal] history, but as briefly and as strictly as can be. But in the aforesaid books which are had in the canon, the single [events] are extended, in the manner of a history, drawn out into a long narration. It is to be believed, therefore, that there were of old other commentaries in which these [things] about the fire, the ark, and the hidden altar were contained — written either by Jeremiah, or by Baruch his scribe, or by some other; and, because they contained the deeds of Jeremiah, entitled with his name: which perhaps, because they had nothing pertaining to prophecy, were not received among the divine books. For Jerome also, in the 27th chapter on Matthew, testifies that he read a certain apocryphal book of Jeremiah, which a certain Jew of the Nazarene sect had brought to him. Nor is the author to be damned on this account — that he adduced testimonies out of apocryphal writings in true and sacred matters: since Paul, as we showed elsewhere, took testimonies not only out of apocryphal, but out of profane books — namely, out of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides — and Jude, in his epistle, cited the apocryphal book of Enoch. [2] But as to what they say — that it could in no way happen that the ark, the altar, and the tabernacle were hidden by Jeremiah — is asserted by them too impudently. For what forbids that these, before, or in the very destruction of the city, at the exhortation of Jeremiah (existing [then] in prison), could have been concealed by pious men? — as the very words of the history seem to intimate, when they say: "It is **FOUND** *(Invenitur)* in the descriptions of Jeremiah the prophet, that he commanded them to take the fire — [those] who were being transmigrated [into exile], as has been signified — and as he charged those transmigrated." Nor are the ancient fathers lacking who believed this to have been most truly done by Jeremiah — as Theophylact, in the commentaries upon the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews; Epiphanius, in the life of Jeremiah the prophet; and Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, in the Synopsis in which he embraces the lives of the prophets. Nor does it stand in the way, that in the second [book] of Maccabees it is written: "**And** *(Et)* Jeremiah, coming thither, found a place of a cave, and brought in thither the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar, and blocked the door." For it can happen that what was done by others — [when Jeremiah was] detained in prison, at the command of Jeremiah, before the sacking of the city — is said that Jeremiah himself did [it], according to the common custom of divine scripture, which frequently is wont to attribute to the author that which was done by others at the author's command.

6. Concerning the deed of Razis — for whose cause the Anabaptists wickedly vituperate the whole history — Augustine, in the sixty-first epistle to Dulcitius, responds in these words: "In the books of **MACCABEES**, although Razis was praised, yet his deed is narrated, not praised, and set before the eyes rather to be judged than imitated: not by the judgment which we, as men, might have, but by the judgment of sober doctrine, which is clear also in those old books themselves. For that Razis was far from those words where it is read: '**RECEIVE** *(Omne)* whatever shall be applied to thee, and in pain sustain [it], and in humility have patience.' For that man was not wise in choosing death, but impatient in bearing humility [humiliation]. It is written that he wished to die nobly, but not wisely. For God says: 'The **INNOCENT** *(Innocentem)* and the just slay not.'" And the same [Augustine], in the second book against the second epistle of Gaudentius, ch. 23: "Razis — [the text] says — because he could not flee, is perhaps less guilty of his own blood, in that he inflicted death upon himself, than the enemy would have inflicted [on him] if [he had been] captured. Razis was praised as a lover of [his] city, as one very well spoken-of — that is, of good repute — because he was called father of the Jews, and because he held continence in Judaism. But it [Scripture] narrated that death of his [as] more wonderful than [it was] more prudent — how it was done, [it] praised, not as [something] that was to be done." The heretics, therefore, lie, asserting that this deed was praised, and set before us for imitation. [3]

7. Concerning the opinion of the Hebrews about these books — whatever it be — it matters nothing, since the Catholic Church receives them in the canon. Nor is anything derogated from their faith [authority], even if they were written by a profane author — since the faith of a book depends not on the author, but on the

authority of the Catholic Church. And what she has received, it behooves to be true and indubitable, by whatsoever author it be said — whom I would dare affirm neither sacred nor profane; nor did Jerome ever, out of his own opinion, [reprove] those books

[1] 2 Maccabees 9 (2. Mac. 9).
[2] 2 Maccabees 2 (2. Mac. 2).
[3] Exodus 23 (Exod. 23).

(printed p. 662 [PDF p. 667] — Heresy XII (Maccabees) concluded: the "Josephus" attribution corrected (the real Josephan work is 4 Maccabees); the three-author theory of the two books; response 8 (the fathers who excluded them spoke of the Hebrew canon). Then Heresy XIII opens: Of the translations of Sacred Scripture — statement and Assertors (the ancient five heretical versions, and their modern sixth: the Protestant editions).)

[nor did Jerome ever, out of his own opinion, reprove] those books, or affirm [them to be] of Josephus, or of any other; but, "**JOSEPHUS** *(Iosephus)*," he says, "is reported [to be] the writer of the [Maccabaean] history." But that it was thus believed by some, came perhaps thence: because they had heard, in Eusebius or other authors, that Josephus wrote a book of the Maccabees, and thought this to be that [book] which is numbered among the canonical [ones] — which indeed is not so. For that book which Josephus wrote concerning the Maccabees still exists in Greek, and in some Bibles of the Greeks is placed immediately after the two books of Maccabees, with its author's name prefixed — namely, Ἰωσήπου εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβαίους *(Iosepou eis tous Makkabaious* — "Of Josephus, upon the Maccabees"*)*. Of which little book Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, brought forth testimony with such [words]: "There is **also** *(Est)* another elegant volume of Josephus, entitled εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός *(ei autodespotos esti ton pathon ho eusebes logismos* — 'whether pious reason is self-master [autocrat] of the passions'*)* — which little book some have entitled 'of the Maccabees,' for the reason that the contests therein, and the struggles undergone for piety's sake by the Maccabees, are contained." It is plain, therefore, that nothing certain can be affirmed concerning the author of the present history — except that it was written by diverse authors, as the diversity of phrase indicates, and the repeated iteration of the same history, which it is not verisimilar that one and the same author made. For to what purpose would he have wished to repeat again, in the second volume, those same [things] which he had abundantly narrated in the first volume? I, for my part, would believe (as I already indicated in the first volume of this work) that these books were written by three diverse authors: the first indeed by a Hebrew author, and in the Hebrew tongue (as the style shows, and Jerome, in the Helmeted Prologue, affirms that he read it written in Hebrew). But the second — except its first chapter, and the half of the second chapter (the beginning being taken from those words, "**OF JUDAS MACCABAEUS AND HIS BROTHERS** *(De Iuda Maccabaeo et fratribus eius)*," whence the preface of the second book begins) — up to the end, I judge was abridged by a Greek author out of the five books of Jason of Cyrene, as the abbreviator himself affirms in the preface. But the third part of this history — from the beginning of the second book up to the half of the second chapter, in which those two letters of the Senate of Jerusalem are contained — I think was written by a public scribe of the senate, to the Jewish brethren dwelling in Egypt, as the salutations of the letters themselves indicate. [1]

8. Finally, to those [things] which they object concerning the fathers who do not receive these books in the canon, we respond that most of them spoke, not of the canon of the Christians, but of the canon of the Hebrews. For thus Origen says on the first Psalm: "It is **NOT** *(Non)* to be ignored that there are twenty-two books in the canon of the Old Testament, as the Hebrews hand down"; then, after the enumeration of the books, he adds: "**And** *(Et)* in these they conclude the canon of the divine volumes; but the books of Maccabees they have extrinsically [outside]." But as to that which Jerome and Gregory seem to intimate — that neither of these volumes is of the canon of the Christians — I recall that I already responded above: that there are two orders of the canonical volumes, from the prior of which Jerome and Gregory deservedly

exclude the books of Maccabees, because concerning these it was long doubted in the Church. [2] And hence it is that the Council of Laodicea, and many of the fathers, did not number them in the catalogues of the sacred volumes — lest, in a matter so grave (concerning which many were not yet fully instructed), they should rashly define anything. But after — a diligent discussion being made — they recognized these books to be divine, then they referred them into the Canon, and left them to us so approved, that it is now no longer permitted to doubt concerning their certainty.

OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF SACRED SCRIPTURE — Heresy XIII *(De Translationibus Sacrae Scripturae. Haeresis XIII)*

That, all the editions of holy scripture which the Church has hitherto used being rejected, new editions are to be used, as more certain and more faithful.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is **not** *(Non)* a new heresy, or lately invented by the heretics of our time — who rashly boast that the Church of Christ, before this our age, had no sincere and faithful translation of the divine books — but of old too, above eleven hundred years [ago], this same heresy flourished in the Church. Of which Philastrius also, in his catalogue, made mention diffusely enough, enumerating around it five orders of heretics, who — the interpretation of the holy Seventy-two interpreters (which the Catholic Church then used) being cast off — followed the versions of diverse heretics. Of whom the first received only the translation of Aquila of Pontus; the second, another edition of certain thirty men, who had imitated Aquila in many things; the third, another translation of certain six men, full of depraved dogmas; the fourth, the interpretation of Symmachus and of Theodotion, the Ebionites; but the fifth chose a certain version, taken not from the authentic exemplars of the Hebrews, but from certain Hebrew codices, which they said had been found inside a cask [jar] after the Babylonian captivity. To whom, as in a sixth order, can be subjoined certain insolent heretics of our times — namely, the Sacramentarians, the Anabaptists, the Servetans, and the Lutherans — who, the interpretation of the sacred volumes being repudiated (which the Catholic Church has venerated for so many ages), follow the suspect editions of diverse heretics: as, in the Old Testament, [those] of Conrad Pellican, John Oecolampadius, Ulric Zwingli, Martin Luther, Sebastian Münster, and Sebastian Castalio [Castellio]; in the New Instrument [Testament] likewise, translations — or rather "recognitions" [revisions], or certain "castigations" [corrections] — of the same Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Luther, Castalio, and Michael Servetus, the Arian and Manichaean. These editions, therefore, each one embracing according to his own lust, they so prefer to our Vulgate edition, that [they assert] their interpreters alone attained the mind and words [3]

[1] [Jerome] against the Pelagians, book 2 (Con. Pel. li. 2); ch. 10 (cap. 10); (cross-reference:) page 46 (Pag. 46).
[2] [Eusebius,] book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18 (Lib. 6. hist. eccl. cap. 18).
[3] ch. 13 (of Philastrius) (cap. 13).

(printed p. 663 [PDF p. 668] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Refutation — the endless daily proliferation of rival Protestant versions; the need for the Church's judgment on ambiguous words, illustrated at length by the disputed הימים *of Genesis 36:24 (Anah in the desert) and the* קיקיון*/"gourd vs. ivy" riot over Jonah 4.)*

they so prefer [these editions] to our Vulgate edition, that they boast that their interpreters alone understood the mind and words of the prophets and apostles, and truly and faithfully expressed [them].

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

But this is nothing else than to excite new tumults daily in the Church of God. For if, the old editions being rejected, we strive to introduce newer translations into the Church daily, what will be either the end or the measure of interpreting the sacred books — of restoring, of recognizing [revising], of castigating

[correcting], of observing? — while each one daily, according to the opinion of his own mind and the affection of his own dogma, sends forth new subversions [euersiones], castigations, [and] recognitions — now to the Greek, now to the Hebrew verity — pernicious scholia, annotations, and glosses (pertaining to their own dogmas) being everywhere interjected; and while the interpreters, contending among themselves with the highest dissension, each rejects, confutes, and damns the other — so that Luther reprehends Oecolampadius and Zwingli as incautious; Münster in turn accuses Luther, that he dissimulated many errors of the old interpreter; Pellican vituperates Münster, that by his foul barbarity he befouled all the divine scripture; but Castalio [Castellio] explodes all the interpreters before him as ignorant of the Latin speech, and esteems that he alone interpreted the sacred books in the Latin tongue. Which, therefore, of these interpreters will the heretics follow? or whose edition will they bring forth into the midst, if they be compelled — against their own adversaries — either to confirm their own dogmas out of the sacred codices, or to repel diverse [ones]? Assuredly, if the Anabaptists adduce testimonies of the scriptures out of the edition of their [own] Servetus, straightway the Sacramentarians will cry out, and will say that these were derived from the depraved version of the Anabaptists, and are not so read in the emended and true codices of Oecolampadius and Zwingli. And likewise the Anabaptists will answer the Sacramentarians, when they feel themselves pressed by them with testimonies of the scriptures. But if any one, coming upon them, should say that neither edition is to be stood by, but that recourse must be had to the Greek or Hebrew fountains, that by their reading the proposed controversy may be ended — straightway a far sharper contention will arise, while each, pertinacious in his own error, will contend that the Greek or Hebrew word is to be turned otherwise and otherwise — but especially if the word be ambiguous, as almost innumerable [words] are among the Hebrews; and in this manner, altercating, they will never be able to agree among themselves, unless — contention being cast off, and their own judgment renounced — they submit themselves, by unanimous consent, to the judgment of the Catholic Church: that she, as a true arbiter and judge, may pronounce in which interpreter's opinion one ought to acquiesce. For there are, in the sacred codices of the Hebrews, certain words and sentences so uncertain, ambiguous, and so variously explained — even by the highest and most illustrious interpreters — that, however erudite you be, and skilled in tongues, you would nevertheless not know to which side to turn, and would always be compelled to be doubtful, unless the authority of the Catholic Church admonished you to embrace the interpretation of this [one], but to dismiss that of that [one].

And that the matter may become more illustrious by an example applied, there is a place in the thirty-sixth chapter of Genesis, famous by the contention of all interpreters, namely: "**It** *(Ipse)* is Ana [Anah] who found הימים *(haiiemim)* in the desert, while he was pasturing the asses of Zebeon his father." [1] Of whose interpretation (as Jerome reports in the book of Hebrew Questions) there are as many opinions as [there are] interpreters. Some think ימם *(iemim)* [means] "seas" [*maria*] — because "seas" are written with the same letters as this particle of the present sentence; and they hold that Anah, while he was pasturing his father's asses in the desert, found "congregations of waters" — which, according to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, ימם *(iemim)* — that is, "seas" — is called; namely, because he found a pool, the finding of which is difficult in the desert, and [which] Diodorus denies [any] to be found in that solitude. Some — among whom [is] the author of the Vulgate edition — held that "hot waters" [*aquae calidae*] are signified by this word, according to the nearness of the Punic tongue, which is conterminous with the Hebrew, and that it is so to be turned. Others are [those] who judge that "wild asses" [onagri] were admitted by this Anah to the she-asses, and that he found this kind of coupling, so that the swiftest asses might be born from these; and that the word ought now to be turned "swiftest asses." Very many think that he first made the herds of mares to be mounted by asses in the desert, so that from thence new animals against nature — mules — might be born; and, according to this understanding, they esteem [the word] is to be interpreted "mules." But Aquila turned this place thus: "**It** *(Ipse)* is Ana, who found σὺν τῷ σιμὲν *(syn to simen)*"; and Symmachus, "τοὺς σιμὲν *(tous simen)*" — which interpretation signifies the plural number. But the Seventy and Theodotion — only the Hebrew characters being changed into Greek letters — turned [it] "τὸ ιαμὲν *(to iamen)*," which indicates the

singular number. Concerning which word there has been no less doubt among these recent interpreters. Some — among whom Pellican, [following] the Seventy — now think [it] is to be left [untranslated], as a word not yet understood; Münster and Castalio turn [it] "mules"; Sanctes [Pagninus], "congregations of waters"; Galatinus, "wild asses"; others, according to Symmachus, "Symin" [σιμίν]; but some say that "hot mares" — that is, [mares] warm with the ardor of coitus — was formerly written in the emended codices, [and] afterward, by the fault of the scribes, "mares" [*equas*] was changed into "waters" [*aquas*]. Since, therefore, in this place, and in like [places] of this kind, there is so great a variety of translators, how will the wavering mind explain itself, unless it consult upon this the judgment of the Church? or how will the contentions and altercations be settled, if each one goes on to defend the interpreter of his own sect and faction, and each contends to read according to his own edition — unless the definition of the Church supervene, which by its authority may dissolve strifes of this kind?

Nor let any one say that these [things] are so light and minute that from them — howsoever they be interpreted and read — no peril of sedition, or endangering of salvation, could arise. For that name too, קיקיון *(Kikaion* [Kikayon]*)*, which was turned "gourd" [*cucurbita*] in Jonah by the old interpreter, was of small moment; and yet (as Augustine writes in the epistle to Jerome) so small a matter excited a huge tumult in Africa. For when a certain bishop, in the church over which he presided — making words [a sermon] to the people — had read, for "gourd," "ivy" [*hedera*], according to the new translation of Jerome, so great a tumult suddenly arose among the people (especially the Greeks arguing, and clamoring the calumny of falsity), that [2]

[1] Genesis 36 (Gen. — printed "37").
[2] Jonah 4 (Iona 4).

(printed p. 664 [PDF p. 669] — Heresy XIII (translations): the danger of vowel-points (the Arian repointing of John 1:1; Servetus's repunctuation of Romans 9:5); the Council of Trent's decree fixing the Vulgate as authentic; the pernicious editions of Münster and Castalio criticized (the one crudely Judaizing, the other effeminately paraphrastic).)

so that the bishop was compelled first to implore the aid of the Jews, that they might bring forth for him testimony from their codices; then, they answering variously, he was compelled to recant his error before the people. But what is lighter or more minute than points [vowel-points]? And yet such very small things, if they be placed otherwise than in the editions and exemplars received by the Catholic Church, very often provide great fuel [foments] to heresies. Which Augustine also, in the third book *On Christian Doctrine*, showed by an example, in those words of John: "**IN the beginning** *(In principio)* was the Word." Which sentence the heretics — who denied the Word of God to be God — read with the points changed: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and [there] was God"; and here, a point being interposed, there followed: "This **WORD** *(Verbum)* was in the beginning with God." By a like example, in our times, the impious Servetus, in the second of the three books which, with a blasphemous title, he inscribed *On the error of the Trinity*, perverted that sentence of the divine Paul to the Romans, namely: "**Whose** *(Quorum)* [are] the fathers, of whom [is] Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things God blessed unto the ages, Amen." Which, when he — who denied Christ to be God — saw manifestly to gainsay him, [the point being transposed] he wished it to be read thus: "**Whose** *(Quorum)* [are] the fathers, of whom [is] Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things." Then, a point being affixed [inserted], it is to be added: "**GOD** *(Deus)* [be] blessed unto the ages. Amen" — as [if] a certain eucharistic [thanksgiving] epiphonema, by which the Hebrews frequently are wont to close the end of a prayer with thanksgiving and the praise of God: as, at the end of the eighty-eighth psalm, for this cause is placed: "**BLESSED** *(Benedictus)* [be] God unto the ages, Amen, Amen." [1] Therefore, that all altercations, doubts, and heresies (which could arise from the diversity of many editions) may be taken away out of the midst, there must be some one

interpretation, approved by the common consent of the whole [body] of the faithful, and by the determination of the Church — by whose authority all controversies of this kind may be removed.

Accordingly, the sacrosanct Tridentine Synod, observing this, rightly, in the fourth session, second decree, sanctioned that, out of all the Latin editions which are circulated, the old and Vulgate edition alone — which by the long use of so many ages has been approved — be held as authentic, and in the divine offices, and sacred mysteries, and in sermons, and public readings, and disputations, be alone read and cited; and let no one dare to reject it under any pretext. And deservedly indeed: since — besides that it has now been received by the Church with so great a multitude of years [/consecrated by so great a reverence of years] — there is not even, among these editions of the more recent interpreters, [any] which is more certain, safer, and more faithful than this our Vulgate edition. For — to be silent about the other translations of our age (of Pellican, namely, of Zwingli, of Oecolampadius, of Luther, and of other heretics, which the heretics themselves confess to be "recognitions" rather than new translations) — I will name only two editions of the two Sebastians, namely of Münster and of Castalio [Castellio], which the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists hold in price above all [others]. Whereas, nevertheless, they are pernicious, and to be fled by the pious reader like a lethal poison — because everywhere they are full of nefarious annotations, scholia, observations, glosses, little prefaces, arguments [summaries], and like traps and snares set for the destruction of the reader. Of which, because it would be too long to relate all, let it suffice to have indicated only two places: of which the one Münster annotated on the first [chapter] of Malachi, against the true and corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar; the other Castalio annotated on the third [chapter] of Exodus, against the consubstantiality and equality of the Father and the Son — following in it the sentence of Arius, so often already condemned.

But if to these [things] the heretics respond that they speak not of their scholia and annotations, but of the kind [manner] of interpretation, and of the best manner of turning [translating] employed by them; and that for this cause they wish the editions of their [own] interpreters to be preferred to our edition, as more polished and more eloquent, and accommodated, by a more diligent industry, to the Latin custom of speaking — we shall not much resist. For we know that the office of a faithful interpreter is not to affect elegance of speech, that he may seem eloquent, but above all the certainty and truth of the sentence [sense]. And in this we affirm that our Vulgate edition is to be preferred to the rest in fidelity, integrity, and authority — discussing nothing at present about the style, and the choice of words, and the candor [purity] of the discourse: all which, because they are alien to the purpose of the present work, we leave to be judged by the professors of tongues.

Yet we cannot be wholly silent about what very many most learned men — even as regards the kind [manner] of interpreting — vehemently condemn in these two authors: namely, that each is, without measure, extreme. The one, in affecting the Jewish idioms, is hard, rustic, barbarous, and plainly a Jew; the other, on the contrary, in ineptly affecting the individual locutions of the gentiles, shows himself gentile and profane rather than Latin: so that, of their translations, the one may deservedly be called [that] of the Jews, the other of the Pagans. For Münster — everywhere horrid, thorny [senticosus], and rough — so far followed the horror of the Hebrew speech that, although he could have accommodated many things softly to Latin ears, he nevertheless so studied to preserve all the properties and phrases of the Hebrew speech that he was unwilling to omit even the very harsh sounds [stridores] of the Hebrew names: thrusting into Latin ears everywhere — for Ozias, "Vzijhau"; for Ezechias [Hezekiah], "Iehizkiahu"; for Ezechiel, "Iehezechel"; for Cyrus, "Choresch"; for Darius, "Dariauesch"; for Nabuchodonosor, "Nabuchednezzar"; for Baltasar [Belshazzar], "Beltzezzer" — and many other words of this kind, which no Latin can pronounce without a huge straining of breath and of tongue. But Castalio — whom I know not whether I should call a paraphrast rather than an interpreter — is, on the contrary, so delicate and soft that he suffers nothing that smells [olfacere] of a Hebraism; nor does he think that he truly speaks Latin, unless he speak most effeminately, and

— without all the majesty of divine scripture, and the gravity of a divine interpreter — paints, in the manner of little harlots, and sears with a curling-iron [calamistrum], each single sentence, luxuriating in a certain wanton affluence of soft words: as he did in the Canticles of Solomon, in which, whatsoever the old interpreter turned chastely and gravely concerning the divine loves of Christ and of the Church, that man [turned] with every allurement [lenocinium] of words, and with all the voices of little women, and [their] affec-[tions]

[1] John 1 (Ioan. 1); Romans 9 (Rom. 9); Psalm 88 (Psal. 88).

(printed p. 665 [PDF p. 670] — Heresy XIII (translations): Castalio's effeminate diminutives in the Canticle and his paganizing vocabulary catalogued; his "palo deligatum" for the crucifixion and the stir it caused; then the history of the ancient Greek versions — the Seventy, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Fifth and Sixth found by Origen, and the Seventh (the κοινή */ "Lucianic").)*

[and using all the voices and affections of little women,] he translated so impudently (not to say obscenely), as if he had been about to publish the colloquies of harlots and panders — in almost every third word inculcating certain diminished, lubricious, and softly-jingling little words [*voculae*]: such as these are: "**COME hither** *(Huc ades)*, O my little sister, my little friend, my dove, my little heart, in the little holes of the rock, in the hiding-places of the snail." And that: "**HOW pretty** *(Quam bella)* thou art, O little dainty one! Show me thy little face, make [me] hear thy little voice; for thou hast both a charming little voice, and a pleasant little face." And that: "**CATCH** *(Capite)* for us the little foxes, the little ravagers of the vineyards." [1] And again: "**AH, thee** *(Ah te)*, pretty one! ah, thee, comely one! Thou hast a little neck very like an ivory little tower. Thou hast a little head very like Carmel, and little curls like royal purple; and thou hast little dove-like little eyes, interspersed with little curls. Thou hast little cheeks like the rinds of a pomegranate, set among little curls, and little breasts more shapely than a fawn." And that: "**OPEN** *(Aperi)* to me, my little sister; I will bring thee into the house of my little mother, of my little parent." Nor is it wonderful if Castalio so impudently [sported] in a divine matter — even as, with Catullus, he sported about the little sparrow of Lesbia, and the swelling little eyes of the girl, and the golden apple: because (as he himself indicated in the little glosses added at the margin) he never believed that, in that divine Canticle, the mystical loves of Christ and of the Church are described, but that an amatory colloquy was woven of the venereal and profane [loves] of Solomon, and of his lover [*amica*] the Sulamite, and of the loves of the [other] women of the same [Solomon].

And just as he contaminated this book of Solomon with dishonest allurements, so he profaned all the divine scripture with profane, gentile, and impious words, locutions, and sentences — this half-pagan and half-gentile interpreter: who, as if it shamed him to use the words which the Holy Spirit used through the mouths of the saints, changed the name of God, and of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, into "Jove" [*Iupiter*], "Diuus," "Armipotens" [the Mighty-in-arms], "Gradivus" [Mars], and "Coelicola" [Heaven-dweller]; calling his divine charity "Cupid," and his Angels "the genii of Jove," and the temple of God "the shrine and fane of Jove," and the seat of God "the Augustale [palace] of Jove"; putting everywhere — for holy men, "Heroes"; for holy Israel, "the Augustan Israelite"; for the holy prophets, "seers [*vates*] and soothsayers [*fatidici*]"; for the prophetic spirit, "the fatidic spirit"; and for "to prophesy," "to rave [bacchari]"; for the giants likewise, "the offspring of the Titans"; for the Sun, "Phoebus and Apollo"; for lightnings, "the Jovian fire"; for hell, "Orcus and Tartarus"; for the inhabitants of hell, "the Manes"; and for the perdition of hell, "Pluto"; for sanctification, "lustration"; and for the sacred chant, "the Paean" — and innumerable other [things] like these, drawn from the very midst of the impiety of the gentiles, which no one truly pious would hear with equal [patient] ears. I omit, consulting brevity, the violent and ambiguous locutions which prepare matter for heresies: as when, for that which the Church reads in the Gospel of John — "And the Word was made flesh" — I know not whether he turned [it] Latin rather than Sarmatian [barbarous]: "**AND the**

DISCOURSE *(Et sermo)* **WAS EMBODIED** *(corporatus est)*." As if the blessed Jerome had erred, when he turned that καὶ ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο *(kai ho logos sarx egeneto)*: "And the Word was made flesh"; and that which Peter, in the Acts, said of Christ — ὃν προσπήξαντες ἀνείλετε *(hon prospexantes aneilete)*, that is, "**WHOM** *(Quem)*, affixing [to the cross], ye slew" — this half-gentile interpreter, the [self-styled] pillar of the Roman tongue, translated: "**WHOM YOU** *(Quem vos)*, FASTENED TO A STAKE [*ad palum deligatum*], LIFTED UP [*sustulistis*]." [2] Which words, in recent years — among certain Jews received to the faith [converted] by the Anabaptists of the city of Florence, not without huge peril to the Anabaptists — excited a great rumor in their conventicles, those Jews doubting whether Christ, according to the old custom of the Romans and Hebrews, had been affixed to a cross, or rather fixed to a stake [*palus*] (according to the present custom of the Turks), as the edition of Castalio seemed to signify. And such egregious fruits do these Ciceronian editions of the recent interpreters produce — celebrated with such great praises by the heretics. But perhaps I have been more [prolix] in this matter than the reader would have wished.

But since the heretics boast that the Church of God, before these new interpretations, had no faithful and sincere translation of the divine scripture — that we may repress this boasting of theirs, it is worth the while, having begun somewhat higher, to see briefly: first, how many and what kind of translations both the Greek and the Latin Church had; then indeed, of what authority each one of them was in the Catholic Church.

The **FIRST** *(Prima)* Greek edition of the Old Testament, therefore — which the Church first used — was the version of the seventy-two interpreters. The **SECOND**, of Aquila of Pontus, published nearly 120 years after Christ. The **THIRD**, of Symmachus the Samaritan, composed in the year 190 of human salvation. The **FOURTH**, of Theodotion of Ephesus, elaborated in the year 200 from the birth of Christ. Concerning which four Greek translations — since, in the fourth book of this Work, under the proper titles of the same authors, we have spoken copiously — we judge it superfluous to repeat the same in this place. The **FIFTH** Greek edition, together with very many other Hebrew and Greek volumes, was found at Jericho, in jars [*dolia*], by Origen Adamantius; who also, not much after, found another certain translation on the Actiac shore, at Nicopolis, hidden in the same manner in jars, and called it the **SIXTH** edition. And, joining these to the other four translations, he constructed, with wonderful artifice, the Hexapla and Octapla of the Greek editions, in that order which I have already commemorated in the book [already] cited, when I reviewed the writings of Origen. A **SEVENTH** — after all these — a certain Greek edition was found; and it was never placed either in the Hexapla or in the Octapla. This Isidore, in the sixth book of the Etymologies, thinks was found by Origen himself; which was called by the Greeks κοινή *(koine)* — that is, "common and vulgate" — but by some was called λευκιανός *(leukianos* [Lucianic]*)*, or "λευκιαντα": because it was believed to have been published by Lucian the Martyr. Concerning which Jerome, in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela, thus writes: "**BRIEFLY** *(Breviter)* I admonish this — that you may know there is one edition, which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea call κοινήν *(koinen)*, that is, 'common,' and which is now by very many called λευκιανός *(leukianos)*; [and] another, of the Seventy interpreters, which is found in the Hexapla codices, and has been turned by us into the Latin tongue, and is chanted at Jerusalem and in the churches of the East. But that κοινή *(koine)* is, according to the places and times, a corrupt edition, by the will of the old copyists; whereas that [other], which is had in the Hexapla, and which we have turned, is the very one which, in the books of the learned, is preserved [as] the incorrupt and immaculate translation of the Seventy interpreters." These [things Jerome]

[1] Canticle 2 (Cant. 2); Canticle 7 (Cant. 7); Canticle 5 (printed unclear).

[2] John 1 (Ioan. 1); Acts 2 (printed unclear).

(printed p. 666 [PDF p. 671] — Heresy XIII (translations): the two Latin editions (the old "Vulgate/common" from the Greek, and Jerome's new one from the Hebrew); the New-Testament translations and Jerome's revision under Damasus; the five editions received into authority; the Church's

exclusive public use of them; and the threefold pre-eminence of the Septuagint (antiquity; divine inspiration — the separate-cells miracle).)

These [things], therefore, concerning all the famous editions of the Greeks, we have taken from Aristeas, Josephus, Eusebius, Justin, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Jerome.

After which, two other Latin editions of the Old Testament were in the Latin Church — namely, a new and an old: the old indeed received the name of the "Vulgate and common" edition — both because it had no certain author, and because it was taken, not from the Hebrew fountain, but from the κοινή *(koine)*, or from the Septuagint interpretation, as Augustine, in the eighteenth [book] *On the City of God*, and Jerome, in the preface to the Gospels, testify; whose reading the Church used long before the times of Jerome, and also long after, down to the times of Gregory the Pope. But the new was turned by Jerome — not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew verity — into Latin speech: which the Church, from the very times of Gregory, used together with the old edition. For Gregory mentions each in the preface to the Morals, saying: "**The NEW** *(Novam)* translation I defer; but when the cause of proof demands [it] of me, I take now the old, now the new, for testimony: so that — since the Apostolic See, over which, God being author, I preside, uses both — my labor of study also may be supported by each." And let these [things] be said concerning the translations of the Old Testament, both Greek and Latin. [1]

But concerning the **TRANSLATIONS** *(Traductionibus)* of the New Testament — which it is agreed was written in Greek, but sometimes with Hebrew phrases — we cannot know their certain number. Yet that they were many, Jerome indicates in the Preface to the four Gospels; but among others he intimates that there was a certain old edition, vulgate in the Church long before himself, which — when, by dozing copyists, in the progress of times, it had become corrupt — Jerome, at the command of Pope Damasus (a collation of many Greek exemplars being made), corrected, emended, and restored to the Greek verity. Which castigation of Jerome — or rather edition — the Roman Church, from the times of the blessed Jerome down to this day, has perpetually used. So many, then, down to this age, have been the editions in the Church, both of the Old and of the New Testament.

Of whose number the Latin and Greek churches — all other editions being omitted — have hitherto received only five into authority: namely, in the New Testament two, the old and the new; and in the Old Testament three, namely, one only Greek, of the Seventy interpreters, and two Latin, that is, the Old and the New. Of the Septuagint edition alone being received by the Church, Eusebius (book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History) is witness; and Augustine, *On the City of God*, book 18, writes on the same matter in this manner: "**For** *(Nam)* although there were also other interpreters, who translated those sacred oracles from the Hebrew tongue into Greek — as Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion; as also is that interpretation whose author does not appear, and for this [reason is] without the name of an interpreter, [and] is called the Fifth edition — nevertheless the Church so receives this [one], which is [that] of the Seventy, as though it were the only one; and the Greek Christian peoples use [it], most of whom are ignorant whether there be another." These [things] Augustine. But of the Latin translations, it is agreed that only two were received by the Church: [2] first, that Vulgate edition, published in Latin not from the Hebrew origin, but from the translation of the Septuagint — which alone the Latin Church used down to the times of Augustine and Jerome (as Augustine himself testifies in the place already cited), and which (as we already said) Gregory writes, in the preface to the Morals, was in use in the Roman Church down to his own times. After which old and Vulgate edition, the Church began to have (as was said above) the new translation of Jerome, taken from the Hebrew verity; and received also the new castigation of the same [Jerome] into the New Testament, as appears from the third epistle of Augustine to Jerome. And with only these editions, down to the present day, has the Catholic Church publicly used — as authentic, true, and worthy of the highest faith — in the divine mysteries, and sacred sermons, and readings, in confirming the dogmas of our faith, and in refuting the heretics. But the rest the fathers used, not publicly, nor as authentic, but as extraneous, for their particular uses: namely, that from their collation they might

understand the Septuagint interpretation more clearly, and that from the comparison of the Septuagint with the other editions they might refute the falsity of those. [3] And for this cause (as Philastrius and Epiphanius hand down) editions of this kind were never placed in the Hexapla in the middle column, but were assigned to the right and the left, so that — placed on this side and on that, as contrary, and not of full truth — they might be shown [to differ] from the true edition of the Seventy Interpreters, which was placed in the middle. All these translations, therefore, being passed over — which the Church either rejects as heretical, or, as suspect and corrupt, does not accept — let us see only how much authority and faith the aforesaid five translations had in the Church, and what the catholic fathers thought of each of them; that, from the gravity of their judgment, we may cast down the arrogance of those who boast that no entire and certain translation of the divine scripture has hitherto been in the Church.

Concerning the integrity, then, and faith of the Septuagint edition, there are so many and so great testimonies of the fathers, that time would fail me if I should wish to review them. Yet all agree in this: that it is to be preferred to the rest chiefly for three causes. First, because it is the most ancient of all editions. Then, because it was published by divine light, and not by human genius, by the seventy-two men full of the Holy Spirit: [4] since (as Justin Martyr writes, in the *Admonition to the Gentiles*, and Irenaeus in the third book) King Ptolemy — fearing lest the Seventy interpreters should not interpret fully and ingenuously the truth inserted in the divine volumes, but should of set purpose conceal some [things] — separated them each from the other, and commanded [them], placed apart, to interpret the same [texts]. But it was done by divine will that all wrote with the same words, the same names, and sentences, from the beginning even to the end — so that the king, and the gentiles themselves, manifestly recognized that those divine scriptures had been interpreted, not by human, but by divine nod and counsel. But Epiphanius, in the little book *On Weights and Measures*, more fully describing the number, situation, and form of the cells of the twenty-two [*so printed; the seventy-two*] interpreters, [5]

[1] [Augustine, City of God 18] ch. 43 (cap. 43).
[2] ch. 1 (cap. 1); ch. 43 (cap. 43).
[3] Isidore, book 6 of the Etymologies, ch. 5 (Isi. lib. 6. et[ym.] cap. 5).
[4] Jerome in the preface to Isaiah (Hie. in praef. Esaiae).
[5] ch. 24 (of Irenaeus, book 3) (cap. 24).

(printed p. 667 [PDF p. 672] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Septuagint's inspiration (the separate cells) and pre-eminence (patristic testimony, apostolic use); the Old Latin's authority (Augustine, Gregory); Jerome's new version defended in his own and others' words (the Psalter preface, the Helmeted Prologue, Augustine, Isidore); the New-Testament editions; then the Objections of the Heretics begin.)

but it was done by divine will that all wrote with the same words, the same names and sentences, from the beginning even to the end — so that the king, and the gentiles themselves, manifestly recognized that those divine scriptures had been interpreted, not by human, but by divine nod and counsel. But Epiphanius, in the little book *On Weights and Measures*, more fully describing the number, situation, and form of the cells, recounts that the twenty-two [*so printed; the seventy-two*] volumes of the Old Testament were translated by them, and that in diverse, separate cells — the traces of which the martyr Justin left written that he saw on the island of Pharos, in the *Admonition*. With whose opinion Philastrius in the catalogue, Rufinus against Jerome, and Augustine agree. The third cause why this edition is preferred to the others is, that the Apostles and Evangelists took testimonies from it, as from a true and faithful interpretation. And after them the whole Church, down to Pope Damasus, always held it in the highest veneration — as the most frequent testimonies of the most ancient fathers testify. Origen, in the epistle to Julius Africanus, attributed so much to this one alone, that he said that only that is to be held for true in the sacred scriptures which the Seventy interpreters translated. [1] And Augustine, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*: "The **CHURCH** *(Ecclesia)* of Christ," he says, "judges that no one is to be preferred to the authority of so many men, chosen by Eleazar

(the then pontiff) for this so great work: for — even if there had not appeared in them one, without doubt, divine Spirit, but the Seventy, learned [men], had, after the manner of men, conferred among themselves the words of their interpretation, that what had pleased all might remain — no old interpreter ought to be preferred to them." Jerome too, in many places, and especially in the preface to Paralipomenon, asserts that the Seventy interpreters were men full of the Holy Spirit, and wrote by the authority of the Holy Spirit. I pass over other innumerable testimonies of the fathers, lest I inflict tedium on the readers.

But concerning the Latin edition of the Old Testament — which was formerly called the "old and vulgate" — Augustine, in the book already cited, testifies that it was, among the Latin churches, in such authority and reverence, that it was preferred to all other editions. And Gregory, in the preface to the Morals (as we mentioned above), testified that even in his own times it was, in the Roman Church, in the highest veneration — writing these words in the twentieth book of the Morals: "**But nevertheless** *(Sed tamen)*, because this new translation is reported to have transfused for us all things more truly from the Hebrew, whatsoever is said in it is to be believed; and it behooves that our exposition search out its words more subtly." [2]

But concerning the Latin edition of the Old Testament made by Jerome — how faithful, certain, true, lucid, and exact it was — Jerome himself indicates. To whom, since he adduces the reason of his opinion as a pledge, it is fitting that we believe. For thus he speaks of himself in the preface to the Psalter, to Sophronius: "**CERTAINLY** *(Certe)* I will say confidently, and I will cite many witnesses of this work, that I have changed nothing at all of the sentence [sense] from the Hebrew verity. If, therefore, anywhere my edition shall discrepate from the old ones, ask any of the Hebrews, and you will clearly foresee that I am torn in vain by rivals — who prefer to seem to contemn illustrious things rather than to learn [them]." And in the Helmeted Prologue he similarly says: "**To myself** *(Mihi)* I am not at all conscious of having changed anything of the Hebrew verity. Certainly, if you are incredulous, read the Greek and Latin codices, and compare [them] with these little works which we lately emended; and wherever you see [them] to discrepate among themselves, ask any of the Hebrews to whom you ought rather to accommodate faith; and if he confirm ours, I think that you will not esteem him a conjecturer — as [though] to have divined, in the same place, equally with me." [3] But if the heretics will not believe the divine Jerome, bearing testimony as of himself, let them hear Augustine, who, in the 18th [book] *On the City of God*, thus says of Jerome's version: "**There was not lacking** *(Non defuit)* in our times the presbyter Jerome, a most learned man, and most skilled in the three tongues, who translated the divine scriptures into Latin, not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew; whose so great labor of letters the Hebrews confess to be truthful." Isidore, agreeing with Augustine: "**The presbyter** *(Presbyter)* Jerome," he says, "most skilled in the three tongues, translated the divine scriptures eloquently from the Hebrew into the Latin speech, which he transfused: whose interpretation is deservedly preferred to the rest, for it is more tenacious of the words, and clearer in perspicuity of sentence, and — as being a Christian interpretation — truer." To which testimonies of the fathers the Greeks too gave [their] consent — [Greeks] who, while Jerome was yet living, turned his edition from Latin into Greek, as the same Jerome writes in his first Apology against Rufinus.

As to the two Latin editions of the New Testament: the common assent of the ancient fathers, from the beginning of the nascent Church down to Pope Damasus, approved [the old one] by long use. But that the new edition, or castigation, of Jerome was received by the Church with the greatest favor — even while he yet lived — Augustine indicates, in the third epistle to Jerome, in these words: "**ACCORDINGLY** *(Proinde)*, we give no small thanks to God for thy work, that thou hast interpreted the Gospel from Greek into Latin; because in almost all [things] there is no offense, when we have collated the Greek scripture. Whence, if any one shall be contentious of the old falsity, the codices being brought forth and collated, he is either most easily taught, or refuted. And if certain very rare [things] deservedly move [him], who is so hard that he would not easily pardon a labor so useful, to which it does not suffice to render a reward of praise [in turn]?" From these [things], therefore, it is concluded: either that these translations — received by the Church

with such veneration, and celebrated by all the fathers — were true and faithful; or, if they were not such, that the Church of God (which believed them to be such as, in reality, they were not) was gravely deceived through so many centuries of years, and basely deluded. Which no one will ever be able even to conceive in mind, unless [he be] utterly destitute of the ecclesiastical spirit, and wholly addicted to the Lutherans, Sacramentarians, Anabaptists, Servetans, and the rest of the pests of this kind. But now let us pass to their contentions [objections].

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. The purpose *(Pro-[positum])*

[1] [Augustine,] book 18 of the City of God, ch. 43 (Li. 18. de Ci[vit.] Dei, cap. 43); Eusebius, book 6 of the [Ecclesiastical] History, ch. 33 (Euseb. lib. 6. hist. cap. 33).

[2] ch. 43 (cap. 43); ch. 13 (cap. 13).

[3] ch. 43 (cap. 43); [Isidore,] book 6 of the Etymologies, ch. 5 (Lib. 6. etym. Cap. 5).

(printed p. 668 [PDF p. 673] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections of the Heretics — 1: the "Septuagint" is misnamed (the Seventy rendered only the Pentateuch) and was not inspired (Jerome: interpreters, not prophets); 2: it omits many Hebrew passages (the NT-quoted messianic texts absent from it); 3: it adds words not in the Hebrew (Gen 3, Sodom, Ps 22:1, Deut 21/27) — and small additions breed grave heresies.)

1. The purpose *(Propositum)* of our disputation is to show that the churches of the Latins and Greeks, before the editions of the more recent interpreters were put forth, had no interpretation of the divine scriptures which was not deformed by almost infinite faults and errors. Beginning, therefore, according to the series of times, from that first version of the whole Old Instrument [Testament] — falsely called by the name of "the Seventy interpreters" — we shall detect all its faults, if first we admonish our adversaries that this edition was falsely ascribed to the Seventy interpreters, and [that] it was wrongly believed that it was composed by them by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. For Aristeas, the satellite [attendant] of Ptolemy, in the book *On the Seventy Interpreters*, and Philo the Jew in his Chronography, and Josephus in the preface to the Hebrew Antiquities and in the twelfth book of the same work, and the author of the book *Seder Olam* the Lesser, and all the Rabbis of the Hebrews who have made any mention of the Seventy — all these report that the Seventy interpreters, at Ptolemy's exhortation, translated only the five books of Moses, no enumeration being made of the other books of divine scripture. With whom Jerome too agrees in almost innumerable places, but especially in the commentaries on Micah, ch. 2, where he thus says: "The **INTERPRETATION** *(Interpretatio)* of the Seventy — if, however, it be [that] of the Seventy: for Josephus writes, and the Hebrews hand down, that only the five books of the law of Moses were translated by them, and delivered to King Ptolemy." And in the preface to the Hebrew Questions, the same thus writes: "There accedes to this also, that Josephus — who sets forth the history of the Seventy interpreters — relates that only the five books of Moses were translated; which we too confess to consonate [agree] with the Hebrew more than the rest." All which [things] show that this edition, which is had for the whole Old Testament, is not [that] of the Seventy interpreters, but of some other translator of uncertain name and authority. But of whatsoever [translator] it be — even if it were of the Seventy interpreters — Jerome abundantly testifies that the translation which is believed [to be that] of the Seventy was not published through the [Holy] Spirit; and that the Seventy wrote, not as [men] inspired by the divine Spirit, but as men, who in many things could err, and [did] err. And thus Jerome speaks of them, in the preface to the Pentateuch: "I know **NOT** *(Nescio)* who first, by his own lie, built the seventy cells of Alexandria, divided into which they wrote the same [texts] — whereas Aristeas, the ὑπασπιστής *(hyparaspistes* — shield-bearer, bodyguard*)* of the same Ptolemy, and, long after in time, Josephus, related nothing such, but write that, gathered together in a basilica, they conferred [compared], [and did] not prophesy. For it is one thing to be a seer [*vates*], another to be an

interpreter: there the [Holy] Spirit predicts future things; here erudition, and copiousness of words, transfers those [things] which it understands. Unless, perhaps, Tully [Cicero] is to be thought to have translated the *Economics* of Xenophon, and the *Protagoras* of Plato, and the [oration] of Demosthenes *For Ctesiphon*, inspired by a rhetorical spirit." [1]

2. But that this edition is stuffed with many errors, not only the Jews themselves affirm (as Augustine noted in the eighteenth [book] *On the City of God*), but many illustrious [men] of the Christians confirm — and the edition itself most manifestly betrays its own errors. For, since the office of the best interpreter is to take nothing away from the author's meaning, to super-add nothing of his own, to change nothing either into an ambiguous or a contrary sense — in all these [respects] the Seventy are found to have failed. And first, how many places from the Hebrew codices they passed over, Jerome indicates in almost all the prefaces of the sacred books, but especially in the preface to the Pentateuch, in which, enumerating some of those [things] which the Seventy omitted, he says: "We read **MANY** *(Multa)* [things] of the Old Testament which are not had in ours — that is, in the codices of the Seventy interpreters. As that: 'Out of Egypt I called my son'; and, '**Because** *(Quoniam)* he shall be called a Nazarene'; and, 'They shall **SEE** *(Videbunt)* [him] into whom they have transfixed [pierced]'; and, '**Rivers** *(Flumina)* of living water shall flow from his belly'; and, '**Which** *(Quae)* neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it ascended into the heart of man, [the things] which God hath prepared for them that love him'; and many others, which require [their] proper composition [σύνταγμα *(syntagma)*] — of which the first is placed in Osee [Hosea], the second in Isaiah, the third in Zechariah, the fourth in Proverbs, the fifth likewise in Isaiah — of whose error it is not mine to expound the causes." [2] And a little after, accusing them that of set purpose they passed over all [the things] which they had found, in the sacred letters, concerning the holy mysteries of the Trinity, he thus adds: "**FINALLY** *(Denique)*, wherever the scripture testifies anything sacred concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, either they interpreted [it] otherwise, or were altogether silent."

3. But how many [things] they super-added of their own, which are not had in the Hebrew codices, the same Jerome — in the book of Hebrew Questions, and in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela, and in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting* — plucking a few from almost infinite places, noted. As that in the third [chapter] of Genesis, where in the Hebrew it is written, "Upon thy breast shalt thou go," they added, "**AND** [thy] **BELLY** *(Et ventrem)*," which the Hebrew codex has not; and [in] Genesis ch. 13, for that which the Hebrews read, "**that** *(Ut)* the men of Sodom were evil, and sinners exceedingly," they apposed, "**IN the sight** *(In conspectu)* of God" — which, as superfluously added, Jerome damns: because the Sodomites were not only evil in the sight of God, but also in the sight of men. And whereas at the beginning of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22] there is written only אלי אלי למה עזבתני *(Eli, eli, lama azavtani* — printed "hazabathani"*)*, which is interpreted, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" — they interposed two other words, namely, "**LOOK UPON ME** *(Respice in me)*." And for that which is read in Deuteronomy 21, "**Cursed** *(Maledictus)* by God [is he] who hangeth on a tree," they — as Jerome notes in the third [chapter] to the Galatians — added, "**EVERYONE** *(Omnis)* who hangeth on a tree." [And] in Deuteronomy 27, where it is written, "**CURSED** *(Maledictus)* [is he] who shall not have remained in the words which are written in the book of the law," three particles being added, they turned [it]: "**CURSED** *(Maledictus)* [is] EVERY MAN who shall not have remained in ALL the words which are written in the book of the law." And lest any one should esteem additions of this kind to be of light moment, let him know that from these additions — however small — very often the gravest heresies have arisen: as can be shown by the example of the Manichaeans, who, from this last universal particle "**EVERY** *(Omnis)*" — which the Seventy added to the testimony of Moses

[1] ch. 43 (cap. 43).

[2] Hosea 11 and Matthew 2 (Ose. 11 & Mat. 2); Isaiah 2 and Matthew 2 (Esa. 2 & Mat. 2); Zechariah 13 (Zach. 13); John 19 (Ioan. 19); Proverbs 18 (Prou. 18); John 7 (Ioan. 7); Isaiah 64 (Esa. 64); 1 Corinthians 2 (1. Cor. 2).

(printed p. 669 [PDF p. 674] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections of the Heretics continued — 3 (concl.): the Manichaeans abuse the added "Omnis" to blaspheme Moses; 4: the LXX translated things in a contrary sense (Gen 26 the well "saturity" vs "oath"; Ps 18 "for the sun" vs "in the sun he set his tabernacle" — which made the Manichaeans adore the sun); 5: from ignorance of proper speech it rendered things into an alien sense (Gen 30 marked/unmarked flocks; Gen 31 "ten times" -> "ten lambs"; Gen 35 "chibrath" -> "hippodrome"); 6: one argument suffices — Jerome's very labor proves the version's imperfection; 7: the Old Latin, an impure rivulet from an impure fount, is contaminated with all faults (Jerome on Joshua, Job, Esther, Daniel).)

3. [from this last universal particle "Every," which the Seventy added to the testimony of Moses, saying, "**CURSED** *(Maledictus)* [is] EVERYONE who hangeth on a tree,"] took occasion of calumniating and rejecting Moses, calling him (as Augustine writes in the sixteenth book against Faustus) now sacrilegious, now a blasphemer: because he had shut up [included] Christ, the Apostles, and the martyrs hanging on a tree, all under one and the same universal curse.

4. But of those [things] which the Seventy translated in a **contrary sense** *(contrario sensu)*, Jerome too enumerates not a few in the places above mentioned. As in Genesis 26, for that which, according to the Hebrew verity, is read: "**THERE CAME** *(Venerunt)*, in that very day, the servants of Isaac, announcing concerning the well which they had digged, and saying: We have found water: whence its name was called Saturity [Satiety]" — the Seventy turned [it] utterly from the opposite: "**AND** *(Et)* the boys of Isaac came, and announced to him concerning the well which they had digged, and said to him: We have **not** found water; whence its name was called Oath [*iuramentum*]." Which to be falsely translated, Jerome shows from the very etymology of the name: "**FOR what** *(Quae enim)* etymology is [there]," saith he, "that it should for this cause be called 'Oath,' because they had not found water? — whereas the contrary also is done [stated] in the Hebrew, and Aquila and Symmachus in translating have agreed, that they found water, and that for this cause the well was named: [namely,] 'Saturity,' or 'Abundance.'" And in the eighteenth Psalm, for that which is read in the Hebrew, "**For the sun** *(Soli)* he set a tabernacle in them" — that is, that God gave to the Sun in heaven a dwelling and a bridal-chamber, out of which, as a bridegroom, it should proceed in the early morning — the Seventy turned [it] in a contrary sense: [namely,] not that the sun was placed in a tabernacle, but that a tabernacle was placed in the sun, saying, ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ *(en to helio etheto to skenoma autou)*, that is, "**IN** *(In)* the sun he set his tabernacle." Which bred an occasion to the Manichaeans, that they should adore the sun; because from these words they had esteemed that Christ, after he ascended into heaven, had constituted for himself a dwelling in the sun, and thenceforth had dwelt in it as in [his] own tabernacle: for thus Augustine writes of the Manichaeans, in the twentieth book against Faustus.

5. There are **MANY** *(Multa)* [things] also which, from ignorance of the proper speech [idiom], seem to have been translated by the Seventy wrongly, and into an alien and diverse sense. Some examples of which Jerome adduced in the places already said. As in Genesis 30, where concerning the flocks of Jacob and Laban it is had in the Hebrew, "**MADE** *(Facta)* were those [things] which were of the late season Laban's, and those of the first time Jacob's" — the Seventy, the Hebrew words not being understood, turned [it], Ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἄσημα τοῦ Λαβάν, τὰ δὲ ἐπίσημα τοῦ Ἰακώβ *(Egeneto de ta asema tou Laban, ta de episema tou Iakob)*, that is, "**MADE** *(Facta)* were, however, the un-notable [unmarked] Laban's, but the notable [marked] Jacob's": which Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, says pertains nothing to the sense [makes no difference to the meaning]. Likewise in Genesis 31, for that which is in the Hebrew, "**HE CHANGED** *(Mutavit)* my wage ten times [*decem vicibus*]" — the Seventy, deceived by unskillfulness of the proper word, turned [it] τῷ δέκα ἀρνῶν *(... deka arnon)*, that is, "[with] ten lambs [*decem agnis*]": whence Jerome, refuting them in the Hebrew Questions: "I know **NOT** *(Nescio)*," saith he, "by what opinion the Seventy, led [astray], put the Hebrew word מנים *(monim)* [as] 'ten lambs' — whereas it signifies rather a number than lambs: and finally, from the consequents [context] too the sense of number is the more proved.

But Aquila also translated δέκα ἀριθμοὺς *(deka arithmous* — ten in number*)*; Symmachus indeed translated δεκάκις ἀριθμῷ *(dekakis arithmo* — tenfold, in number*)* — each of them consenting with Jerome concerning the number." Likewise in Genesis 35, for that which is read, "**GOING FORTH** *(Egressus)* thence, however, he came [a] כברת *(chibratha)*" — that is, according to Jerome, "in the vernal time [springtime]," or (as others expound) "as it were a stadium [furlong]" — the Seventy, not holding the propriety of the word, turned [it], "**IN** *(In)* the hippodrome"; which Jerome, in the aforesaid book, marvelling at: "I know **NOT** *(Nescio)*," saith he, "meaning what, the Seventy translated 'hippodrome,' since 'chibrath' cannot be a hippodrome." These [things], out of the innumerable errors of this edition, let them be [a] few collected for example's sake.

6. Although for all these [purposes] one single argument might suffice to show the utmost imperfection of this translation — namely, that unless grave and frequent lapses had been in it, in vain would Jerome have expended so much of labor and of vigils [wakeful nights], to publish a new translation from the Hebrew fount, and to furnish it to the Church to be read. Neither would the Church have received the edition of Jerome, so diverse from the interpretation of the Seventy, unless both Jerome and the Church had perceived that the translation of the Seventy departed much from the Hebrew verity, and in very many [places] erred not lightly. Let these [things be said] concerning the first version, of the Seventy interpreters.

7. But concerning the **Latin** *(Latina)* edition of the Old Testament — which they call the Old [Vetus] — it cannot be denied but that it was contaminated with all faults. For if the Greek edition of the Seventy interpreters abounded in so many depravations — whence [as its source] the Old Latin edition, as an impure rivulet from an impure fount, flowed forth — it is necessary that the Latin version too was deformed with much graver blemishes and errors: as also Jerome almost everywhere testifies, now cutting it back as superfluous and redundant, now supplying it as curtailed and amputated, now correcting and emending it as depraved, and in almost all the prefaces of the divine books always indicating its diverse faults. As in the preface of the book of Joshua, concerning the exemplars [copies] of the Old Latin edition, he complains in these words: "**AMONG** *(Apud)* the Latins," saith he, "there are as many exemplars as codices, and each one has added, or subtracted, at his own pleasure, what seemed [good] to him; and assuredly that cannot be true which is dissonant." And in the prefaces of the book of Job he complains that in the Vulgate edition the whole book of Job is torn and truncated, and that there are lacking in it above eight hundred verses; and that truly, among the Latins, that book, gnawed by the worms of errors, lies in the dung. But on the contrary, in the preface of the books of Esther and of Daniel, he damns the Old Vulgate edition, because it handles the sacred histories with ragged [tattered] endings of words, adding those [things] which can be said and heard extempore — as is wont to be done in the schools by those who, with feigned arguments, exercise themselves in writing history, excogitating what could have been said according to place, time, and persons: as was done in the book of Esther, in which six chapters are apposed [added] beyond the Hebrew verity; and in the book of Daniel, in which the judgment of Susanna, and the fables of Bel and of the Dragon, are added, outside the sum of the Hebrew narration.

(printed p. 670 [PDF p. 675] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections continued — 8: the "Old" Latin now in church use is not really Jerome's (it keeps none of his emendations — Gen 4 "he had regard" vs Theodotion's "he kindled"; Gen 4 "let us go forth"; Ps 2 "lay hold" vs "adore purely"; Ps 126 "sons of the shakers" vs "sons of youth"); it is Theodotion's or Aquila's or Symmachus's, sold under Jerome's prefaces — and even Jerome's own version was faulted by Palladius, Augustine, Rufinus, and Lyra, and Jerome confessed his own errors (Isa 19, Jer 6); 9: whosesoever it is, the Vulgate teems with errors in proper names (Gen 2 bdellium, Gen 12 Moreh, Gen 27 "prudently"->"fraudulently," Gen 33 "a hundred coins"->"a hundred lambs"), transmutes place and time (Gen 35 "a stretch of land"->"in springtime"), swaps deeds (Gen 36 "mules"->"hot waters"), and gives contrary, ill-sounding senses (Gen 6 "shall not judge"->"shall not remain").)

8. Concerning the **edition** *(editione)* of the Old Testament which is believed to be Jerome's, this one [thing] first of all is certainly agreed: that it is not Jerome's — Jerome himself being witness; who, in the preface of the book of Kings, speaking of his own edition, says that he changed nothing of the Hebrew verity. Which, assuredly, in the Vulgate edition of the Old Testament — which the Church now uses — we do not see to have been observed: since in it there are so many [things] which dissent from the Hebrew verity. To which this also accedes: that, out of so innumerable places which Jerome commemorates that he either emended, or turned otherwise, or judged ought to be read otherwise than they are now read, there is found in this our edition no place at all which corresponds either to Jerome's castigation or at least to his judgment. Which will clearly appear, if we compare some places of our edition with those concerning which Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, indicated his opinion. And first, in Genesis 3 [4], where our edition has: "**HE HAD REGARD** *(Respexit)*, God, to Abel and to his gifts; but to Cain and to his gifts he had not regard" — Jerome, according to the interpretation of Theodotion, thought it ought to be read: "**AND** *(Et)* the Lord kindled [fire] upon Abel and upon his sacrifice, but upon Cain and upon his sacrifice he did not kindle [it]"; adding that this interpretation is most true, because Cain could not otherwise have known that God had accepted his brother's gifts and repudiated his own, unless he had kindled his brother's sacrifice according to Theodotion — fire being wont to come from heaven for devouring the sacrifice, as is read in the dedication of the temple under Solomon, and when Elijah built an altar on Mount Carmel. Likewise concerning that which our edition has in Genesis 3 [4]: "**LET US GO FORTH** *(Egrediamur)* abroad," or "into the field" — Jerome thus writes: "And Cain said to Abel his brother" — [there] is understood, "those [things] which the Lord had spoken." It is superfluous, therefore, that in the volume of the Samaritans, and in ours, there is read: "**LET US GO FORTH** *(Egrediamur)* abroad," etc. Likewise in the second Psalm, for that which we now read, "**LAY HOLD OF** *(Apprehendite)* discipline" — Jerome, in the Apology against Rufinus, testifies that he turned [it]: "**ADORE** *(Adorate)* purely." And in the exposition of Psalm 126, to Marcella, for that which we now read in that psalm, "**THE SONS** *(Filii)* of the shakers-out [*excussorum*]" — he says that he translated: "**THE SONS** *(Filios)* of youth [*iuventutis*]," as Theodotion had done: because in the Hebrew it is had, כן בני הנעורים *(chen bene hannehurim* — "so [are] the sons of youth"*)*. From which places, and from many others of this kind, it is manifest that this edition is not Jerome's. Which both Paul, bishop of Fossombrone [Forosemproniensis] (not to adduce meanwhile Münster and Luther), and very many others skilled in Hebrew letters affirm — esteeming that this our edition is either Theodotion's, or Aquila's, or Symmachus's, which an interpreter of uncertain name turned into Latin, and — Jerome's prefaces being appended [to it] — hawked [*venditarit*] it for Jerome's edition. And yet neither was Jerome's own edition (whatsoever it may have been) so perfect in every part that it could avoid just reprehension. For — to pass over Palladius the Galatian, who first of all reprehended it in so many places — Augustine, in the first epistle to Jerome, not only does not approve Jerome's edition, but damns Jerome's zeal in translating the Old Testament as superfluous, and exhorts him to desist from translating the Hebrew scriptures as from a rash undertaking. Rufinus too, in the second book against Jerome, thinks Jerome's edition much worse than the Seventy's, and accuses it of many crimes. Nicholas of Lyra likewise shows Jerome reprehensible in his translation — both elsewhere in many places, and especially in the forty-seventh Psalm, where at the close of it he thus says: "**JEROME** *(Hieronimus)*, nevertheless, seems to say less well [rightly], because in all the Hebrew bibles which I have seen, עלמות *(halmuth)* here is one word [*una dictio*] — but why [dwell] on more [instances]?" Jerome himself, in his translation, confesses that he himself erred — in the commentaries upon Isaiah, chapter nineteen, where he thus says: "I think it **BETTER** *(Melius)* to reprehend my own error, than, while I blush to confess unskillfulness, to persist in error — [namely] in that which I translated, 'AND the land of Judah shall be to Egypt for a festivity.'" And in Jeremiah, chapter six, he did not deny that he was ignorant of the signification of certain words.

9. But of whatsoever [authorship] this Vulgate edition be, it is manifest that it stands far from the Hebrew verity, and everywhere teems with innumerable blemishes — the names of places, cities, men, animals, and

plants being frequently varied [altered]. As in Genesis 2, for that which is had, הבדלח *(habbedolach)*, our edition has "bdellium" — whereas that signifies to the Hebrews, not bdellium, but a precious stone, on the testimony of Jerome, and also of Lyra. And for that which is put in our edition, "**UNTO** *(Ad)* the place [of] Shechem, even to the illustrious valley," the Hebrew has אלון מורה *(elon moreh)* — that is, "the plain [*planitiem*] of Moreh"; for according to the Gerundensian [Nachmanides of Gerona] it is a man's name. And [in] Genesis 27, for that which in the Hebrew is במרמה *(bemirmah)* — which according to Lyra signifies "**PRUDENTLY** *(Prudenter)*" — our edition has "**FRAUDULENTLY** *(Fraudulenter)*." And [in] Genesis 33, for קשיטה במאה *(bemeah kesitah)* — that is, "for a hundred coins [*nummis*], or oboli" — our [edition] has "for a hundred **LAMBS** *(agnis)*." Sometimes also it transmutes places into times, and times into places: as in Genesis 35, where these words are written to the letter [literally]: ויסעו מבית אל ויהי עוד כברת הארץ לבוא אפרתה *(va isehu mibeth el, ve iehi hod chibrata ha arez labo ephratha* — with printer's slips for *vayyis'u mibbeth-el vay'hi 'od kibrath ha-arets lavo ephratha*), *that is, "And they set forth from Bethel, and there was yet as it were a stadium [furlong] of land to come to Ephratha" — for which our edition thus reads: "**GOING FORTH*** (Egressus), *however, thence, he came, in the vernal time, to the land which leads to Ephratha." Sometimes it puts other deeds to have been done for others: as when, in Genesis 36, the scripture says that Anah found* הימים (ha iemim) *— that is, a new generation of mules — in the desert, our translation puts "hot waters," which are nowhere found in that desert. Sometimes it puts senses altogether contrary to those which are had in the Hebrew, and ill-sounding in the faith: as in Genesis 6, for that which is read,* לא ינון רוחי באדם לעלם (lo iadon ruchi baadam leolam), *that is, "**MY SPIRIT** shall **NOT*** (Non) *judge in man for ever" — our edition has: "**MY SPIRIT** shall **NOT*** (Non) *remain [*permanebit*] [in man for ever]." Which interpretation Jero-

---

*(printed p. 671 [PDF p. 676] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections concluded — 9 (concl.): Gen 6 "shall not remain" makes God bloodthirsty, whereas the Hebrew "shall not judge" sounds His clemency; 10: the New-Testament editions — the old one Jerome (pref. to Damasus) judged unworthy of trust, the new one (denied to be Jerome's) is riddled with the errors Erasmus catalogued in his seven indices; conclusion: the Church has hitherto had no whole and sincere translation. Then the refutation begins — **DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM** — answer 1: against objection 1, the Seventy did translate the whole Old Testament (Jerome, Eusebius's Evangelical Preparation, Epiphanius, Origen, Philo, and the whole chorus of fathers), and translated by the Holy Spirit's afflatus, though not as prophesying seers; answer 2 begins.)*

9. [Which interpretation ("My spirit shall not remain")] Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, damns as cruel, because it makes God bloodthirsty and truculent: whereas rather that sentence, as it is had in the Hebrew, sounds the clemency of God. For he saith: "**MY SPIRIT** shall **NOT** *(Non)* judge in man for ever, because he is flesh" — that is, "because the condition in man is fragile, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but will here restore to them those [things] which they merit." Therefore [it sounds] not severity, as it is read in our codices (saith Jerome), but the clemency of God — while the sinner is here visited for his own wickedness, lest in another age he be damned for ever. From these, therefore, and from similar places contained in our edition, we gather that the Church, before our times, never had a whole edition of the Old Testament.

10. But what is to be thought concerning the editions of the **New** *(novi)* Testament — and especially concerning that which, in Jerome's time and before, was read in the Church — Jerome indicates in the preface to Damasus, esteeming it altogether unworthy that faith should be given to it: because there were as many exemplars of it as codices, and those [were] either badly edited by faulty interpreters, or perversely emended by unskilled presumers, or, by dozing copyists, either added to or changed — in which very many [things] discrepated from the Greek verity, and even from their own selves. But the new edition, which we now use, and which not only Erasmus alone, but also many other learned men, deny to be Jerome's — it would require a proper work [of its own], if we should wish to comprehend its every error. But let those

seven indices which the most diligent Erasmus prefixed to his edition suffice for explaining all its errors. In the first of which he digested the inexcusable solecisms admitted through [by] the interpreter. In the second he collected nearly all the obscure places, in which interpreters of great name have lapsed. In the third he set in order the manifestly depraved places. In the fourth, the places redundant in our edition. In the fifth he apposed the places deficient in our edition. In the sixth and seventh he subjoined the places changed by the interpreter, and wrongly inverted. From which anyone will easily recognize with how many blemishes, solecisms, barbarisms, amphibologies, hyperbata, and a thousand other errors our edition of the New Testament is stuffed. It remains, therefore, [to conclude] that the Church of the Christians has hitherto had no whole, faithful, true, and sincere translation of sacred scripture — which indeed we assumed from the beginning [as the thing] to be demonstrated.

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Although we know it to be the opinion of almost all the Hebrews that the Seventy interpreters published in Greek only the five books of Moses, we prefer nevertheless to follow the certain and undoubted opinion of all the Christian fathers in this matter, rather than, with the Judaizing heretics, to follow the uncertain opinions of the Jews. But among the fathers, chiefly the divine Jerome affirms that the Seventy translated not only the five books of Moses, but also all the books of the prophets. Which Eusebius had testified long before, in the eighth book of the Evangelical Preparation — in which he also rendered the cause why the books of the prophets ought to have been turned by the Seventy interpreters, thus writing: "**WHEN** *(Cum)* now the times of our Saviour seemed to draw more nearly nigh, and it was most conducive to the salvation of all nations to understand whatsoever had been written by the prophets, He set forth the Judaic scripture to all through the Greek tongue — which almost all nations understood. For either we should not have had it after the times of our Saviour, the Jews from envy concealing [it]; or they would have given us more corrupt [copies]; or, if they could rightly be had, the translators would easily be called into suspicion. Our Saviour, therefore, who as God provided all things, instilled the best disposition into Ptolemy king of the Egyptians, that through the Seventy Hebrew interpreters he might translate the books of the prophets." But Epiphanius, in the little book On Weights and Measures, reports that not only the law and the Prophets, but also the rest of the books of the Old Testament — which he even names by name — were translated by them; and Origen before him thought the same, and, long before both, Philo the Jew: with whom the whole chorus of the Greek and Latin fathers consents. [1] Nor does Jerome discrepate anything from their consent — although (as the heretics object to us) he sometimes seemed to dissent; but rather he doubted out of others' mind than out of his own, whether the Seventy had translated the whole Old Testament. For always, in all his commentaries, he confessed that the Seventy interpreters translated the whole Old Testament. Nay, in the commentaries on the Twelve Prophets, as he testifies of himself against Rufinus, he always, together with his own edition, also discussed the Septuagint interpretation under their name. And at last, what he thought of this matter, he opened in the same commentaries in these words: "**ALTHOUGH** *(Quanquam)* the learned approve that only the five books of Moses were translated by the Seventy — as Josephus, and the Hebrews [do] — yet we, having followed the authority of the ancients, of Irenaeus, Tertullian, [and] Origen, say that the whole Old Testament was translated by the Seventy." But if, for the most part, Jerome contemns those Septuagint cells as published by an uncertain author, and wrote that the Seventy interpreters were not prophets and seers, but only interpreters — not for that reason does he yet deny that they translated with the Holy Spirit illuminating [them]: nay rather, that they, full of the Holy Spirit, and moved by the authority of the Holy Spirit, translated most truly, he constantly affirms in very many places, and especially in the preface of the book of Paralipomenon [Chronicles]. And although he asserted that they neither prophesied in interpreting, nor had the prophetic Spirit, nowhere nevertheless does he deny that they, imbued with the Holy Spirit, approached the translation of scripture. He denied indeed that they had the Spirit by which, foreseeing future things, they might divine and write [them]; but he did not deny that they had, within, the divine Spirit of understanding,

and the afflatus of the interpretation of divine scripture — by the auspice of whose internal light they might convert, from one tongue into another, those [things] which had been written by the prophets. For the spirits of prophecy and of interpretation differ among themselves: this one interprets speeches [words], but that one prophesies things to come.

2. But as for those errors of which the Seventy are accused by the heretics — namely, that they [passed over] many testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ especially *(praesertim)*

[1] ch. 1 (cap. 1).

(printed p. 672 [PDF p. 677] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 2 (concl.): the Seventy omitted messianic and Trinitarian texts for three just causes (the mysteries were not yet perspicuous; not to scandalize Ptolemy into thinking the Jews held two Gods; not to cast pearls before swine); answer 3: their additions concern sense, not words — as Mark added "I say to thee" to "Talitha cumi," and the LXX added "look upon me" to Ps 21 for emphasis, and rendered the double sense of Hebrew "al gachon" (breast and belly) at Gen 3:14; the Deut "Omnis" was in the old Hebrew (Jerome found "cal" in the Samaritan volumes) and the Manichaean scandal was their own malice; answer 4 begins: the places seeming to fight the Hebrew are not truly contrary (Augustine, Jerome).)

2. [that they passed over many testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ, and] especially *(praesertim)* [those] concerning the holy Trinity, in silence — Jerome defends them egregiously in many places, demonstrating that they omitted much concerning the sacraments [mysteries] of Christ, and the mysteries of the holy Trinity, neither negligently nor maliciously, but by a prudent and pious counsel. **First**, because, since they interpreted before the advent of Christ, they could not know many sacraments of the Christ to come, not yet in those ages fully perceived — God so disposing, that all the mysteries of his divinity should be reserved to be unfolded at the rising of the splendor of the evangelical light of Christ. And so, what they were ignorant of, or did not fully know, they either translated in doubtful and ambiguous sentences, or were altogether silent — willing rather to be well silent about the unknown, than, by speaking, to pronounce ill of those [things] which they knew not. **Secondly**, lest they should scandalize Ptolemy king of Alexandria, they concealed much concerning the Son of God and concerning his advent; lest perhaps the king, hearing that God had a Son, should have thought that the Jews, according to the dogma of Plato, held a double divine power [*numen*], and had two Gods — whom he therefore [would have] made much of [reckoned great], because they were said to worship one God. **Thirdly**, they were silent about many other sacraments also besides these, lest they should betray all the mysteries of their faith to the heathen — esteeming it unworthy, according to the sentence of Christ, to give the holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine. For these most just causes, therefore, Jerome hands down that so many [things] were omitted by the Seventy interpreters. [1]

3. But concerning those [things] which were **added** by the same [interpreters], the divine Jerome, in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting*, shows that in those [places] the words are not to be considered, but the sense — to which the Seventy themselves added nothing of their own, although they adjoined certain words which were not in the Hebrew. But since they noticed that certain Hebrew senses could not so significantly pass into the Greek tongue with an equal number of words preserved, for that cause they sometimes added some diction[s], so that what they could not fully express with an equal number of words, they might — other words being added — express more significantly and more efficaciously. Which the apostles and evangelists also sometimes did: as we read in Mark, who, when he had introduced the Lord saying to the dead girl, "**TALITHA CUMI**" *(printed "THABITHA CVMI"; Mark 5:41)*, immediately subjoined: "**WHICH** *(Quod)* is interpreted, Damsel (I say to thee) arise" — in the interpretation of whose sentence, two words, namely, **I SAY TO THEE** *(Tibi dico)*, which are not in the Hebrew saying of Christ, he added of his own; and, that he might make the command of the commanding Christ ἐμφατικώτερον *(emphatikoteron)* — that is, more significant — and might more strongly express the sense of the one calling and commanding. [2]

So too the Seventy, for the sake of emphasis, often added many words of their own: as when, among those words of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22], "**MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME?**", they interposed πρόσχες μοι *(prosches moi* — printed corruptly "πρόσχευσομοι"*)* — that is, "**LOOK UPON ME** *(Respice in me)*" — that they might more powerfully and vividly explain the affection of one supplicating and expostulating. And this is the one cause why the Seventy added some [things] of their own. But the other is the equivocation and multiple signification of words, which is wont to happen among the Hebrews more than in the other tongues of other nations — [namely] that one and the same word often signifies many [things]. Whence the Seventy, wishing for the most part to show the multiple signification of some Hebrew word, and seeing that it could not be done by a single word, by apposing several words, interpret several significations of the same word: as they did in Genesis 3, in the place remembered by the heretics — where, since in the Hebrew is written על גחון *(al gachon)*, which signifies as well "upon the belly" as "upon the breast," the Seventy, desiring to express both significations of the word, translated: ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει σου, καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ πορεύσῃ *(epi to stethei sou, kai te koilia poreuse)*, that is, "**UPON** *(Super)* thy breast, and belly, shalt thou go." Sometimes also it can happen that some [things] in the Hebrew codices — whether by malice, or negligence, or unskillfulness of the scribes — are omitted; which, since afterward they were found in the edition of the Septuagint interpreters (who translated from codices as yet whole), seem to have been apposed by the Seventy above [beyond] the Hebrew verity. As in those two places of Deuteronomy produced by the heretics, Jerome thinks it happened — who speaks thus of these in the commentaries on the Galatians, chapter three: "We hold it **UNCERTAIN** *(Incertum)*, whether the Seventy added '**EVERY MAN** *(Omnis homo)*' and '**IN ALL** *(In omnibus)*'; or whether it was so in the old Hebrew, and afterward was deleted by the Jews. But into this suspicion that thing goads me: that the word 'EVERY,' and 'IN ALL,' as if necessary to his sense for proving that [statement], that whosoever are of the works of the law are under a curse — the apostle Paul, a man of Hebrew skill, and most learned in the law, would never have produced, unless it were had in the Hebrew volumes. For which cause, re-reading the Hebrew volumes of the Samaritans, I found כל *(cal)* — which is interpreted 'every,' or 'in all' — to be written, and to concord with the Seventy interpreters. In vain, therefore, did the Jews take it away, lest they should seem to be under a curse if they could not fulfill all [things] which are written: since more ancient letters of another nation also testify that it was there placed." Thus Jerome. But if the Manichaeans were scandalized by that word — esteeming that Moses blasphemed Christ, because he placed him under the universal curse of those who hang on a tree — this scandal was the heretics' [own], taken not from the occasion of the scripture, but from their own malice: as if the apostle Paul also (whom the Manichaeans venerate) had not said that Christ was not only under a curse, but was even made by God sin, and a curse, for us — made, I say, a curse of his own will, not born as [the] sin which man had committed through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, [and] which he himself, hung [appended] on the tree, might blot out, as Augustine says against Faustus. And let these [things be said] concerning the places super-added by the Septuagint. [3]

4. But concerning the places which among the Septuagint seem to fight with the Hebrew verity, Augustine rightly said, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, chapter forty-four, that there are many [things] among the Septuagint interpreters which — though they be thought to discrepate from the Hebrew verity — if they be well understood, will be found not to be contrary to it; and the divine Jerome [likewise], in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting*: "**They DISCREPATE** *(Discrepant)*," he says, "the [translation] of the Septuagint interpreters, and ours; and yet the variety of the speeches [words] concords in the unity of the spirit. Whence it is **not** *(non)* to be believed"

[1] Jerome in the preface to the Pentateuch (Hier. in praefat. Pentateuchi).

[2] Mark 9 (Mar. 9) — the phrase "Talitha cumi" stands at Mark 5:41.

[3] Galatians 3 (Gal. 3. b).

(printed p. 673 [PDF p. 678] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 4 (concl.): the Gen 26 well is not contrary, only a variant reading (the Seventy's codices had לא "lo" = "not," the later ones לו "lo" = "to him," aleph dropped by scribes), and the "oath" etymology stands; the Ps 18 "for the sun / in the sun" difference is the spiritual sense (Christ's tabernacle in the Church), which the Manichaeans abused into sun-worship; answer 5: the alleged blunders (monim, chibrath) are scribal corruptions, not the interpreters' ignorance — Jerome never charged them with unskillfulness (Reuchlin wrongly says he did), and the Greek church's text is now corrected (Gen 35 reads "Chiphratha," not "hippodrome"); answer 6: Jerome's new version was not aimed against the Seventy (his self-defense to Rufinus and the preface to Chronicles).)

4. [Whence it is **not** to be believed] that the Seventy ever turned anything into a contrary sense. But if they translated that place of Genesis 26 in another sense than the later interpreters did, the cause was that in the codices of their own time they had a diction [reading] contrary to that which Aquila and Symmachus had in their codices. Whereby it came to pass that their interpretation differed from the Septuagint interpretation. For that which the Seventy had in their exemplars — לא *(lo)*, terminating in aleph, which signifies, namely, the negative particle **NOT** *(Non)* — the later interpreters, in their codices, perhaps by the carelessness of the scribes, the aleph being omitted, had לו *(lo)*, which signifies the pronoun "to him," or "to it." Whence both the Seventy and the later [interpreters] most aptly translated what they had in their codices: those [the Seventy], according to the negating particle: "**THE SERVANTS CAME, AND ANNOUNCED TO HIM; AND SAID: WE HAVE NOT FOUND WATER**" *(Venerunt servi, et nuntiaverunt ei; et dixerunt: Non invenimus aquam)*; but these [the later], according to the demonstrative particle: "**THE SERVANTS CAME, AND ANNOUNCED TO HIM, AND SAID TO HIM: WE HAVE FOUND WATER**" *(Venerunt servi, et nuntiaverunt ei, et dixerunt ei: Invenimus aquam)*. But which of these is the true and genuine sense of that scripture, is not to be very anxiously inquired by us — since neither of them is adverse to the dogmas of our faith, and each can equally be fitted to the history. To me, nevertheless, the Septuagint interpretation seems more fitting, lest the pronoun "to him" be superfluously repeated once and again, without any necessity, when it is said, "the servants came, and announced to him, and said to him" — whereas it would have sufficed to have said once, "they announced to him, and said." Nor does anything hinder [the objection] which they oppose concerning the etymology of the well — namely, that the denomination of "oath" cannot be deduced from waters not found: since neither the Seventy, nor Moses himself, said that the surname "oath" was derived from waters not found, but from the oath which, beside that same well, Isaac struck [swore] together with Abimelech and his friends banqueting with him — as appears a little above from the words of the history itself. Similarly, the place of the eighteenth psalm, if it be rightly weighed as to the mystical understanding, does not fight with the Hebrew verity. For that which, according to the dead letter, is read among the Hebrews: לשמש שם אהל בהם *(la scemes sam ohel bahem)*, that is, "**FOR THE SUN** *(Soli)* he set a tabernacle in them" — the Seventy, transferring [it] according to the vivifying spirit, said: ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ *(en to helio etheto to skenoma autou)*, that is, "**IN** *(In)* the sun he set his tabernacle" — thus, the divine Spirit dictating to them, that by those words might be designated the perpetual sacrament of Christ and of the Church, in which, as in a Sun, that divine Bridegroom, the Son of God (as Augustine, in the exposition of that psalm, says), placed his tabernacle and his perpetual habitation. Which spiritual and mystical sense, if the impious Manichaeans had followed [it], they would by no means have fallen into so great impiety as to exhibit that unique worship — which is owed to the immortal God alone — to a mortal and corruptible star [the sun].

5. But concerning the places which they charge to have been badly translated by the Seventy out of ignorance of the proper tongue, we respond that the Seventy are easily vindicated from that calumny out of the almost infinite places of their edition which — since they are far more obscure and more difficult than these which the detractors have indicated — make it perspicuous that the Seventy, being no less skilled in the Hebrew than in the Greek tongue, could not have erred in turning words so open [plain] as are מנים *(monim)* and

כברת *(chibrath)*. Therefore it is rather to be believed that errors of this kind happened by the fault of the copyists, than by the unskillfulness of the most learned interpreters. To assert which, two causes vehemently induce us. One, that Jerome — who detected all the defects of the Septuagint interpreters — nowhere noted them for unskillfulness [ignorance]. Nor do I know how John Reuchlin, in the third book of the Hebrew Institutions, dared to impute [impinge] upon Jerome that he sometimes damned the Septuagint interpreters for unskillfulness — since this is found in none of Jerome's writings; but only this is found, that the Septuagint edition, corrupted by the fault of the scribes, did not remain in its purity. But the other cause is, that many of those [things] which Jerome adduces out of the Septuagint edition — which he read as vitiated — are now had emended in the Septuagint edition which the Greek Church reads. As [in] that [place] where Jerome marvels that the word "hippodrome" was placed by the Septuagint for the word כברת *(chibrath)*: the Greek edition of the Septuagint themselves, of our time, does not so have [it], but, according to the Hebrew verity, thus: ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνίκα ἤγγισεν εἰς χιφραθά *(egeneto de henika engisen eis chiphratha)*, that is, "**IT CAME TO PASS** *(Factum est)* after he had drawn near in Chiphratha." Whence it clearly appears that the Greek codex of Jerome was in many [places] corrupt, and that he himself pronounced [judged] according to that which he had in his codex — not reprehending the Septuagint, but convicting those depravations which had crept into the Septuagint edition by the fault of the corrupters.

6. But that [thing] which they say — that the new labor [version] of Jerome most evidently convicts the Septuagint edition — is an old calumny, formerly also inflicted upon the divine Jerome by his own rivals; which he himself very often refuted throughout the several prefaces of the sacred books, showing that he undertook that labor not against the authority of the Septuagint interpreters, but for many other causes. Whence, against Rufinus (who had objected this same thing to him), he thus says: "**I have** *(Ego)* **neither** spoken anything against the Septuagint interpreters: whom, very many years ago, I gave, most diligently emended, to the studious of my tongue; whom daily I expound in the assembly of the brethren; whose psalms I chant by continual meditation. I should be a fool, to wish, as an old man, to forget what I learned in boyhood. All my treatises are woven with the testimonies of these [the Seventy]; my commentaries on the Twelve Prophets expound both my edition and the Septuagint edition," etc. But the causes which impelled Jerome to this edition [his own] are these. First, that those [things] which in the Septuagint edition had been depraved by the fault of the scribes might be emended out of his interpretation. Which cause he himself indicates, in the preface of Paralipomenon, in these words: "**IF** *(Si)* the edition of the Septuagint interpreters had remained pure, and as it was turned by them into Greek, you would, in vain, O Chromatius — most holy and most learned of bishops — impel me to translate the Hebrew volumes into the Latin speech. For that which had once occupied the ears of men, and had strengthened the faith of the nascent Church, it was just to approve by our silence. But now, since, according to the variety of regions, diverse ex-[emplars are carried about]"

(printed p. 644 [PDF p. 679] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 6 (concl.): Jerome's eight causes for making his new version (to emend scribal corruptions; to restore omitted/obscure passages [Job preface]; to stop Jewish taunts; to curb Greek arrogance [Ezra preface]; to spare the vast cost of buying all the editions; to remove error from the unskilled; to end the discord of the Greek and Latin churches over the divergent recensions of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen; to aid Latin language-study) — none of them against the Seventy's authority; answer 7: the argument that the Old Latin is corrupt because it flowed from a corrupt Greek fount collapses, since the Greek is shown faultless — and though single codices were corrupt in places, the Church always held the whole and incorrupt text in the totality of its codices, God so protecting them.)

6. [since, according to the variety of regions, diverse] exemplars [are carried about], and that ancient and genuine translation is corrupted and violated, you think it [pertains] to our judgment either to indicate, out of many, what is true, or to fashion a new work upon the old work." **Secondly**, that he might restore, supply,

and illustrate the many [things] which had been omitted by the Seventy, or obscurely translated for the causes already said: as he himself, writing in the preface to Job: "**LET** my dogs **HEAR** *(Audiant)*," he says, "that I labored in this volume, not to reprehend the ancient interpretation, but that those [things] which in it are obscure, or omitted, or certainly depraved by the fault of the scribes, I might make more manifest by our interpretation." **Thirdly**, lest the Jews should any longer insult the Church of Christ, reproaching [it] that in the Hebrew it is not so had as the Church of Christ and the Septuagint interpreters read [it]; and lest the Jews should any longer have byways of subterfuge, if ever they should be pressed by the Christians in disputation, and be laid low by their own arms; nor would the Christians any longer have need to consult the Rabbis of the Jews, and implore their help, if ever a suit concerning the Hebrew verity should arise. **Fourthly**, that he might restrain exulting Greece (as he himself says in the preface to Ezra), and repress the proud haughtiness of the Greeks — who so extolled themselves over the Latins as to say that the Latins had nothing of the divine scriptures which they had not received on loan from the Greeks. **Fifthly**, to avoid the huge expenses of those who — wishing to find the truth from the collation of many exemplars — were compelled, at intolerable cost, to buy the exemplars of the Septuagint interpreters, of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Origen, Lucian, [and] Hesychius the presbyter, [and] of the fifth, sixth, and seventh edition, and many others, which could not be procured without great expenditure of money, and by the rich alone. **Sixthly**, that he might take away the occasion of confusion and error from those who handled the diverse exemplars without skill in Hebrew letters — who, since, out of ignorance of the Hebrew speech, they knew not how to discern which among so many interpreters had spoken more truly, erred the more gravely. Which [thing] Jerome, in the preface to Ezra, testifies happened even to a certain most wise man among the Greeks in his times, who, since he knew not Hebrew, often — leaving the sense of scripture — followed the error of each interpreter. **Seventhly**, that he might take away the dissension of both the Greek and the Latin churches concerning the edition of the Septuagint interpreters: which [churches], although they publicly handled the same Septuagint interpretation, yet did not (as Jerome writes in the preface to Paralipomenon) have the same exemplars of the same edition, but plainly diverse and mutually fighting [ones]. For Alexandria and Egypt used the edition of the Septuagint interpreters emended by Hesychius, presbyter of the Church of Jerusalem; but Constantinople, even to Antioch, read the same Septuagint edition, yet in other exemplars emended by Lucian the martyr, once presbyter of the Church of Antioch, and afterward bishop of Nicomedia; but the provinces midway between these read the Palestinian codices, which — elaborated by Origen — Eusebius and Pamphilus published. To take away, therefore, so great a [variety] of exemplars, Jerome undertook a new translation from the Hebrew. **Eighthly**, that he might aid the studies of the Latins in the tongues (as he himself, against Rufinus, is witness), and kindle the minds of his [countrymen] to the love of the holy tongue, and to the handling of the Hebrew exemplars, lest thenceforth we should have need of the help of the unbelieving Hebrews. These causes, therefore, impelled Jerome to the new edition; and the same moved the Latin Church, that, after the old Septuagint edition, they should receive the new interpretation of the divine Jerome. So much hitherto concerning the Septuagint interpreters.

7. From which the argument of those is entirely overturned, who inferred the old translation of the Old Testament among the Latins to be vitiated for this reason, that it had flowed from the vitiated edition of the Septuagint interpreters, as from a vitiated fount. Which [edition], since we have now shown to lack all fault, it cannot be that any fault was derived from it into the old Latin edition. If Jerome detected many errors in it, and corrected [them], not for that reason does it follow that the Latin Church before Jerome had no true and sincere edition of the Old Testament. For although some exemplars were once corrupt, which afterward Jerome corrected, it does not therefore follow that all the codices, however many the Church had, were universally and wholly corrupt. And be it [granted] that all were even corrupt in some [places], yet it cannot come to pass that all at once were depraved in the same places — so that that should remain whole and inviolate in no exemplar which was vitiated in many exemplars. It follows, therefore, that out of several corrupt codices — a collation of them being made with one another, or with the Greek codices — a true and

whole translation of any place whatsoever could easily be had by the learned, who conferred exemplars of this kind into one; and really [indeed] was always had by these. We gather, therefore, against the opinion of the heretics, that, although the Church, in the several separate codices, did not have a sincere and whole translation of the Old Testament, nevertheless it never — in all [the codices] at once, and in the exemplars gathered from everywhere — lacked an exact and absolute translation of the Old Testament; but always, in that general universality of the codices, what was corrupt in one and another codex, that same [thing] remained whole and incorrupt in this or in another codex — God so protecting the codices of the scriptures, lest his Church should for any time be defrauded of the truth of the divine reading, but that it might have it [the truth] at least in the whole simultaneous compass of all the codices [together], which it could not have in the several separate codices. Nor does that which Jerome said weaken this our opinion — [namely] that the old Vulgate edition is deficient in many places (as in the book of Job, in which nearly eight hundred verses were lacking), and in very many other places superfluously redundant (as in the book of Esther, and in the book of Daniel). Because, as much as pertains to those [things] which are lacking, it is possible that in the codices which Jerome had seen — and which certain particular churches then used — those eight hundred verses, and also many other [things], were lacking, which nevertheless in the rest of the [codices] of the other church-

---

(printed p. 645 [PDF p. 680] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 7 (concl.): the "redundant" passages were added extrinsically as apocrypha, marked with obeli and spits, and only later received into the canon; answer 8: the new Vulgate OT, though denied to be Jerome's, is largely his — it keeps his corrections (Gen 13 "in the sight of God" dropped; Gen 35 "springtime" for "hippodrome") and is compounded of his two versions (from the Hebrew, and from the Greek — as the Gallican Psalter shows); his version was praised, not condemned, and Augustine, Rufinus, Palladius faulted only its timing, not its fidelity (Augustine's letter); Jerome's admitted slips (Isa 19 "festivity"->"fear") he himself corrected, and unknown archaic words are no fault, as with Cicero; answer 9 begins: the Vulgate concords with the Hebrew in sense, if not always in words.)

7. [which nevertheless, in the rest of the codices of the other] churches, remained in the exemplars. For both the ancient edition of the book of Job, which Gregory discussed in the Morals, and the Greek edition of the Septuagint interpreters which now is extant, are found to have nothing less than the Hebrew exemplars and Jerome's translation have. But as much as regards those [things] which are superfluous [redundant] in the Vulgate edition, it is manifest that the truth of the translation was never corrupted by these — because they were not put into that common edition as genuine and proper, but were added extrinsically as exoteric and apocryphal, for the supplement of the histories; and — with obeli and spits [*veru*] slaying [them] — were transfixed [marked], both in the Greek and in the Latin codices. Which [things], afterward, because they seemed piously and holily written and added, merited authority by the succession of time, and were received by the Church into the sacred canon.

8. Concerning the new edition of the Old Testament, which they deny to be Jerome's, we respond that, just as it does not seem to be Jerome's (for the causes adduced by the adversaries), so, for the same causes, it does not seem altogether other than [different from] Jerome's interpretation. For just as they, from many places which in our edition are had otherwise than Jerome emended [them], argue that this edition is not that which Jerome translated from the Hebrew verity, so we too, by the same argument, can show that it is not entirely diverse from that interpretation of the divine Jerome — because in it many places are had just as Jerome testified that he had emended [them]. As [in] that [place] which in the Septuagint interpreters was read: "**THE MEN** *(Viri)* of Sodom were evil, and sinners in the sight of God." He himself wished it to be read, as it is now read in our edition, without those two words, "in the sight of God." And [in] Genesis 36 [1], for that which the Seventy had, "**GOING FORTH** *(Egressus)* thence, he came into a hippodrome," he says that he set "into the place of a hippodrome" [as] "in the vernal time," as is read in our edition. And lest I wear away

time in reviewing similar places of our edition corrected by Jerome, let whosoever will, inspect the Commentaries of Jerome on the prophets, in which he discusses two editions — namely the Septuagint's, and his own translated from the Hebrew verity; and he will see that Jerome's edition discrepates almost nothing from our Vulgate edition. Accordingly it is credible that this our Vulgate edition consists of two editions of Jerome: namely, of that which Jerome published according to the Hebrew verity, and of that which he himself translated from the Greek edition of the Septuagint interpreters. For the divine Jerome testifies that he did both — both in the Apology against Rufinus, and in almost all the Prefaces of the Old Testament. Which the Psalter of our edition also indicates: for that very [Psalter] is not the same which he translated for Sophronius according to the Hebrew verity, but another, which he writes (in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela) that he turned from the Septuagint edition. But howsoever it be, this is certainly most true: that Jerome's edition was never damned [condemned] — either for unskillfulness in the tongues, or for falsity, as these [heretics] feign — but was, in a wonderful manner, praised by Augustine, Gregory, Isidore, and other most illustrious men. But if at some time Palladius the Galatian — envious of Jerome's rival glory (whom Epiphanius, writing to John bishop of Jerusalem, admonished was to be shunned as a heretic) — and likewise Augustine, and Rufinus, and certain others, seemed to accuse this translation of Jerome, it is to be known that they disapproved not the form [manner] of interpreting, and the fidelity, but the occasion, the opportuneness, and the counsel of the translator — because they deemed it unlawful [*nefas*] to depart from the now-inveterate authority of the Septuagint interpreters, and esteemed that this new edition of Jerome could not be divulged without the greatest perturbation of the churches, and scandal of the faithful. And that he spoke to this sense, Augustine himself declares, when he wrote to Jerome concerning this matter, in these words: "**I** indeed *(Ego sane)* would rather that you interpret for us the Greek canonical Scriptures, which are reported [to be established] by the authority of the Septuagint interpreters. For it will be very hard, if your interpretation shall have begun to be read more frequently throughout many churches, that the Latin churches should be dissonant from the Greek — chiefly because the gainsayer is easily convicted, the Greek book being produced, that is, [the book] of a most-known tongue. But if anyone, in that which is translated from the Hebrew, shall be moved by anything unusual, and shall charge the crime of falsity — either scarcely, or never, does one come to the Hebrew testimonies by which the objection may be defended. And if even it be come to them, who would bear that so many Latin and Greek authorities be damned?" By which words it appears that Augustine disapproved in Jerome not the form of interpretation, but the untimely office of translating. But as for that [fact], that Jerome sometimes confesses himself to have lapsed, and even not to have understood certain Hebrew words — this derogates nothing from the authority of his edition, since he himself diligently emended those [things] in which he had recognized that he had erred. As he did in the place adduced by the heretics from Isaiah: in which, when he had badly translated "**FESTIVITY** *(Festivitatem)*," afterward, emending the place, he put, for "festivity," "**FEAR** *(Pavorem)*." But concerning those words the significations of which he ingenuously confessed himself to be ignorant, this is not to be turned to his fault, as [though] to an unskilled [man], but is to be imputed to the words [themselves], now obsolete by too great age and antiquity. Just as no one will give it for a fault to the most illustrious orator Marcus Tullius [Cicero], that he confessed himself ignorant of many words antiquated by age, which were read in Varro and Cato: such as "nasciterna," "scutriscum," "urpex," "to make *lessum*," and other dictions of this kind — to which all those words are nothing dissimilar, whose signification Jerome did not deny that he knew not.

9. But to that [charge] in which they accuse [it], saying that our Vulgate edition — of whatsoever [authorship] it be — discrepates utterly from the Hebrew verity, we say that, although in the words it sometimes discords from the Hebrew, yet everywhere it concords in the truth of the sense, and in the unity of the sentence [meaning]. Nor is it a marvel if in the words it sometimes dissents from the Hebrew, since it (as has been said) was not purely and simply deduced from the Hebrew fount, but mixedly and confusedly taken from the two editions of Jerome — of which he himself translated the one from the Hebrew fount, the other

from the Greek verity. Although neither in the words themselves would our edition, if it be diligently considered, [discrepate] from the He-

[1] recte 35

(printed p. 646 [PDF p. 681] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 9 (concl.): the Vulgate departs from the Hebrew only in a few ambiguous words, because the interpreters worked from unpointed codices where one spelling (e.g. שם, read five ways) admits many senses, from archaic names now obscure even to Hebrews, from near-identical points (Zere/Patach), and from letters easily confused (כל "all" vs בל "heart," Dan 6) — hence the "hard words" the heretics cite (habbedolach, alon, bemirma, chibrath, and Gen 6 "lo yadon") are not blunders but genuine ambiguities, and the Vulgate is right in sense though sometimes free in word; answer 10 begins: the New-Testament Latin — Jerome only corrected, not re-translated, it (his own testimony in De viris illustribus and the prefaces to Damasus and Eustochium), and though real faults remain (noted by Pagninus, Cajetan, Forerius, Oleaster) the Church has never lacked a true, whole New Testament, for nothing in it is heretical or hides the faith.)

9. [our edition, if diligently considered, would not] dissent from the Hebrew verity, except in certain dictions, in which the interpreters are necessarily compelled to vary from the exemplars, and to dissent somewhat among themselves — namely, when there occur to them certain ambiguous and uncertain words. But the Hebrew dictions are rendered uncertain to the interpreters for many causes. For sometimes the codices which the interpreters use in translating are destitute of vowel points: such as was the codex which Jerome used, and such as is now the volume of the law which the Jews commonly use in the synagogues. Since, therefore, the letters are not distinguished by their little marks [points], and there occur some dictions written with the same letters, then those [dictions] can be read and translated in many ways. As the word שם *(Sem* [shem]*)*, written without the apices, the points being added, can be read שם *(Scem)* — and then it signifies "name"; or שם *(Sciam* [sham]*)* — and then it denotes "there," or "in that place"; or שם *(sam)* — which signifies "he set"; or שם *(Scam)* — which sounds [means] "desolate." But sometimes, as we have said, there occur certain very ancient names of places, animals, plants, and stones, the significations of which — even among the Hebrews themselves — have perished by the antiquity of the word and the long duration of time. Sometimes there occur dictions written with the same letters, and distinguished by almost similar points: as happens in these two words, שם *(Sciam)* and שם *(Scem)*. In which, if those two points "**Zere**" (..), which are placed under one of those dictions, should — either by a slip of the pen, or by the carelessness of the writer — become a little nearer to one another, they will make the form of the point "**Patach**" (_), which was placed under the other diction; and thus a transition from one signification to another will come about. Sometimes also it happens that dictions are varied by the writers on account of the too great similitude of the letters among themselves: as if anyone, for כל *(cal* — "all"*)*, which signifies "every [all]," should write בל *(bal)*, which in the sixth chapter of Daniel signifies "heart." Since, therefore, by these and other such causes it often happens that the interpreters are impeded, they are not to be damned if sometimes, in a few places, they fall short of the truth of the Hebrew reading. Such certainly are those [places] which these sharp-nosed [captious] heretics object to our interpreter: as הבדלח *(habbedolach)*, which — on the testimony of Josephus, Jerome, and R. Kimchi — signifies both "bdellium" and a stone of sufferings [a gem], a union [pearl], onyx, crystal, and carbuncle; and אלון *(alon)*, which can be translated not only for "valley" and "plain," but also for "oak," as Augustine, bishop of Chisamus, noted; and במרמה *(bemirma)*, which signifies "**WITH GUILE** *(Cum dolo)*" and "with prudence"; and for "Chibrath," which, according to the Septuagint, signifies "a place," and, according to Jerome, "the vernal time [spring]," and, according to David Kimchi, "a certain measure of a journey"; and that [word] likewise which is read in Genesis 6: לא ידון *(Lo Iadon)*, which signifies both "to judge," and "to remain," and, as it were, "to sit as a judge." Whence also the Seventy — whom our interpreter followed — rightly translated οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ *(ou me katameine)*, "**IT SHALL NOT REMAIN** *(Non permanebit)*": so that the sense is, "My spirit shall not remain, or sit as judge, in man" — which is the same as if you should

say, "My spirit shall not judge in man." From which it clearly appears that our edition rarely discrepates from the Hebrew verity in the words, and never in the sentence [meaning].

10. But concerning both Latin editions of the New Testament — and first concerning the new one — we do not much care whether it be of the divine Jerome or not, since that cannot be known clearly enough from his writings; and it rather appears that he emended that old edition of the New Testament, than that he published a new edition into a wholly new Testament. Because he himself, in the catalogue of Illustrious Men, writes that he restored [gave back] the New Testament to the Greek fidelity [verity], but translated the Old according to the Hebrew verity. Which words indeed indicate that he himself set a distinction between "translating according to the Hebrew fidelity," and "rendering to the Greek fidelity"; and that by these [words] he signified that he did not translate the New Testament from the Greek, but only corrected [it]. Which he also intimates in the preface of the Gospels to Damasus, saying: "**THEREFORE** *(Igitur)*, this present little preface promises the four Gospels — a collation of Greek codices, but of old ones, being emended; nor, in those [places] which did not much discrepate from the custom of the Latin reading, have we so tempered the pen [as to change all]; but, those only being corrected which seemed to change the sense, we have suffered the rest to remain as they were." And in the preface of the seven canonical [epistles], to Eustochium: "**THE EVANGELISTS** *(Evangelistas)*," he says, "we lately corrected to the line of the Greek verity." From which it appears that Jerome rather emended the New Testament, previously turned by others, than that he again turned it from the Greek into Latin. And it is likely that this our edition is that which Jerome emended. But concerning the errors which Jerome noted in the old translation, and which more recent [scholars] have likewise noted in this new edition, we too ingenuously confess that many errors were emended by Jerome in the old translation; and that likewise, in this our new edition, there are found some blemishes, solecisms, barbarisms, hyperbata, and many [things] turned little aptly, and less Latinly expressed, obscurely and ambiguously interpreted; and likewise some [things] super-added, some omitted, certain [things] transposed, changed, and depraved by the fault of the scribes — which Sanctes Pagninus, Thomas Cajetan, Franciscus Forerius, and Jerome Oleaster (men most learned, of the Dominican Order) have indicated in their interpretations and explanations. Nevertheless, it does not follow from these [things] that the Church, even to this day, has not had a true, sincere, whole, and faithful edition of the New Testament: because, although errors of this kind are found in it, it is nevertheless certain that neither in the old, nor in the new, edition was anything ever found which

---

(printed p. 647 [PDF p. 682] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution concluded — answer 10 (concl.): the Fathers left the New Testament's minor faults uncorrected on just grounds (no danger to faith or morals; not to unsettle the faithful accustomed from infancy to the old edition; to honor the ancient interpreter's holy simplicity and follow their forebears, who — like the apostles with the imperfect Septuagint — did not despise it but preached it and built the foundations of the faith on it); therefore it is rash and heretical to spurn the Vulgate for its light defects and bring in the heretics' profane versions, especially after the Council of Trent's decree declaring the old Vulgate authentic and forbidding its rejection. Sixtus's closing apology for prolixity. ***Book VIII — and the main body of the Bibliotheca Sancta — ends here.)***

10. [It does not follow that the Church has had no true New-Testament edition — nor is it] because so many most learned and most holy [doctors of the] Church either did not recognize those errors, or approved them, but because they saw themselves impelled, by just causes, to dissimulate [overlook] them. **First**, because they had noticed that no peril in faith and morals threatened from these so light errors. **Then**, lest the faithful should be offended by the importunate and too-exact novelty of correction — [the faithful] whose ears, even from infancy, that old edition had occupied [filled]. **Lastly**, that they might venerate that ancient edition, which had educated [nourished] the faith of the nascent Church, and had strengthened and exalted [the faith] of the growing [Church]; and that they might honor, by their own approbation, that holy and venerable simplicity of the ancient interpreter — who sought not the ornament of speech, but the truth of the history;

and might follow the footsteps of their elders [ancestors], who, led by a certain sacred piety, tolerated those same errors, by the example of the holy apostles — who, although they knew that the edition of the Septuagint interpreters was redundant in many [places], and deficient in many, nevertheless did not contemn it, but everywhere preached it, and from it laid the first foundations of our faith. It is therefore rash — nay, plainly heretical — on account of certain light defects which are found in our Vulgate edition (without any detriment of faith and morals), to spurn it and cast it away, and to introduce in its place new and profane translations of the heretics: especially after the decree of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, whose words, approving the Vulgate edition, thus stand: "**The Most Holy Synod** *(Sacrosancta Synodus)*, considering that no little utility can accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which — out of all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation — is to be held for authentic: establishes and declares, that this very old and Vulgate edition, which by the long use of so many ages has been approved in the Church itself, be held for authentic in public readings, disputations, and expositions; and that no one dare, or presume, to reject it under any pretext whatsoever." And let these [things] concerning the translations of the divine scripture have been said — more prolixly, perhaps, than was fitting.

The End of the Eighth and last book of this [work]. **(Octavi & ultimi huius libri Finis.)**

(PDF p. 732 — the theologians' approbation [imprimatur] of the whole work. The in-book indexes that follow the text of Book VIII — PDF 683–731 — were passed over as out of scope; this leaf, a single full-width block bearing no running-head folio number, is the closing endorsement of the entire eight-book Bibliotheca Sancta, here appended as the final page of Book VIII.)

The written attestation [Syngrapha] of the theologians whom — according to the pious ordinances of the Order of Preachers — the Reverend Father John Mary of Lignasco [Lignascensis], Provincial, superior [Antistes] of both Lombardies, chose for the examination [recognition] of this work.

HAVING BEEN ordered *(Libros… iussi)* by our Reverend Father Provincial of both Lombardies, Father Friar John Mary of Lignasco, of the Order of Preachers, to examine the eight books of the *Bibliotheca Sancta* of the Reverend Father Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers, a most excellent preacher — so that they might, as soon as possible, be sent forth into the light [published] — we took care to accomplish this not undiligently [i.e. with all diligence]. Those [books], therefore, having been read through by us, we give assurance [certify] that nothing is asserted in them by the author himself — so far as we ourselves are able to judge — which is adverse to good morals, or to the catholic doctrine of the sacrosanct Roman Church. For the rest, we judge that the labors of so learned a father, so great [as they are], if they be publicly printed, will be exceedingly welcome, and useful, to pious and learned men.

At Genoa, the 29th day of January, 1566.

Brother Stephen of Finario [Finale], lecturer in Theology, by his own hand.

Brother Paul of Ferraria [Ferrara], of the Order of Preachers, lecturer in Theology.

Brother Jerome of Genoa, Inquisitor of all Liguria, as he affirms above, by his own hand.