

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 hæresis 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 Matthæi hæresis 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 hæresis 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 hæresis IIII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 32
The Confutation — p. 36

Page 39: OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN — Heresy V (*De Evangelio Ioannis hæresis 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 hæresis VI*)

Page 46: OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE IN GENERAL — Heresy VII (*De epistolis Pauli Apostoli in universali. Hæresis 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

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 contraries 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 History¹ 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 treasures (*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: '**Amen** 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 contra 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 אוןי *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 Pharaoh'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 Retractions, 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 condemn 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 condemning 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 contra 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 contra Faust. cap. 8 & 9 & lib. 2 de cons. eua. cap. 1).

¹² Matth. 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 (Jer. 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 principedom, destroyed the Sanhedrin out of the house of David, and substituted a certain Annalaus [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 contra 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 contra 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 ordinally 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 *Esaia 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 Esaia but by the prophet Malachias. Nor does that solution avail — namely, that Mark attributed to Esaia what was Malachias's because, if not the words, yet the sense may be found in Esaia; 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 Esaia 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 Esaia 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 Ἡσαΐα 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 ἡλειμμένον [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 (Joel. 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 Galileans, 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 condemn the codices of the catholic church with the same facility with which they condemn 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.

CONFUTATIO [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 III: 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 he⁴

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 Christ⁴ — 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 Pharaoh, 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 Aristaeas, 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 σπουδαστήν [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. hæ. 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 Arians 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 condemn 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 Arians 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 Arians, 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 — whosoever 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, whosoever 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's¹⁰

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. hæ. 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. hæ. 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, "**Whosoever** 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 whosoever 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, πατήρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἓν 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 ἑσμέν — 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 ἥθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί — that is, "Evil colloquies corrupt good manners"; and that, writing to Titus about the Cretans: Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, 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. hæc. 51. cap. 2.

⁷ Eus. lib. hist. cap. 38.

⁸ Lib. hist. 7. cap. 23.

⁹ Apoc. 1. b.

¹⁰ Lib. 2. lib. 1. hæc. (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. hæ. 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).