

Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VIII

On those who have assailed the volumes of the Old Testament

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, BOOK VIII

TABLE OF HERESIES

The 13 heresies confuted in this book, in order, with the parts of each. The page number is the page of this English translation.

Page 4: OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy I (*De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis I*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 4
The Refutation — p. 5
Objections of the Heretics — p. 10
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 13

Page 18: OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy II (*De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis II*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 18
The Refutation — p. 18
Objections of the Heretics — p. 20
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 23

Page 25: OF THE BOOKS OF THE MOSAIC LAW — Heresy III (*De Libris Mosaicae legis. Haeresis III*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 26
The Refutation — p. 26
Objections of the Heretics — p. 26
The Diluting of the Objections — p. 28

Page 32: OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS — Heresy IV (*De Libris Propheticis. Haeresis IIII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 32
Objections of the Heretics — p. 33
The Diluting of the Objections — p. 34

Page 36: OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS — Heresy V (*De Libro Psalmorum. Haeresis V*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 36
The Refutation — p. 36
Objections of the Heretics — p. 38
The Objections Are Dissolved — p. 40

Page 42: OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL — Heresy VI (*De Libro Danielis. Haeresis VI*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 42
The Refutation — p. 43
Objections of the Heretics — p. 44
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 46

Page 49: OF THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES — Heresy VII (*De Libro Ecclesiastis. Haeresis VII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 49
The Confutation — p. 50

Page 51: OF THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES — Heresy VIII (*De Cantico Canticorum. Haeresis VIII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 51
The Confutation — p. 52

Page 53: OF THE BOOKS OF WISDOM AND OF ECCLESIASTICUS — Heresy IX (*De Libris Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici. Haeresis IX*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 53
The Refutation — p. 53
The Objections of the Heretics — p. 56
The Solution — p. 57

Page 57: OF THE BOOK OF JOB — Heresy X (*De Libro Iob. Haeresis X*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 57
The Refutation — p. 58
The Objections of the Heretics — p. 58
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 60

Page 64: OF THE BOOKS OF ESDRAS, TOBIT, JUDITH, AND ESTHER — Heresy XI (*De Libris Esdrae, Tobiae, Iudith, et Esther. Haeresis XI*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 64
The Refutation — p. 64
The Objections of the Heretics — p. 65
The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 67

Page 71: OF THE BOOKS OF MACCABEES — Heresy XII (*De Libris Maccabaeorum. Haeresis XII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 71
The Refutation — p. 72
The Objections of the Heretics — p. 73

The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 76

Page 81: OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF SACRED SCRIPTURE — Heresy XIII (*De Translationibus Sacrae Scripturae. Haeresis XIII*)

The Assertors of this Heresy — p. 81

The Refutation — p. 81

The Objections of the Heretics — p. 90

The Dissolution of the Objections — p. 96

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VIII

Of Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On those who have assailed the volumes of the Old Testament, or, Against the destroyers of the old Scripture (*De his qui veteris testamenti volumina oppugnarunt, sive adversus veteris scripturae destructores*) — the Eighth Book of the *Bibliotheca Sancta*

PRAEFATIO [Preface]

We demolished (*Destruximus*) in the preceding, seventh volume all the heresies which, from these times down [to our own], have arisen against the evangelical and apostolic scriptures of the New Testament: now, the order of disputation leading on, we subjoin to this work the Eighth and last book, pursuing in it the exposition and confutation of those heresies which, at various times, divers heretics stirred up against the Mosaic, the Prophetic, the Parenetic [hortatory], and the Historical books of the Old Instrument. Which being completed — the divine power favoring [us] — our labor will find the wished-for end of our whole work.

CATALOGUE OF THE HERESIES which are confuted in this eighth Book
(*Haereseon quae in hoc octavo Libro confutantur catalogus*)

Of the Old Testament in general	Heresy 1
Of the Old Testament	Heresy 2
Of the books of the Mosaic law	Heresy 3
Of the Prophetic books	Heresy 4
Of the book of Psalms	Heresy 5
Of the book of Daniel	Heresy 6
Of Ecclesiastes	Heresy 7
Of the Canticle of Canticles	Heresy 8
Of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus	Heresy 9
Of the book of Job	Heresy 10
Of the books of Esdras, Tobias, Judith, and Esther	Heresy 11
Of the books of the Maccabees	Heresy 12
Of the Translations of divine Scripture	Heresy 13

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy I (*De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis I*)

To cast away the whole Old Testament — [as] made for the Jews alone, founded by the evil God of the Jews, and augmented by his followers with fabricated narrations; of no profit in any part to the Christian faith; noxious moreover to good morals; and contrary to the evangelical doctrine.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The first authors of this prodigious and abominable heresy were those, whosoever they were, that introduced two Gods: one, namely, of the Hebrews, evil and false; the other, of the Christians, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, good and true. Of whom the chief (Epiphanius being witness) was Simon Magus the Samaritan, the first heretic after the ascension of Christ, who taught that the old testament — namely the law and the prophets — was put forth by a sinister power (*virtus*) and by evil angels.¹ To whom, in the same error, there succeeded Basilides, Carpocras, the Valentinians (*so printed "Valerini"*), who are also [called] Gnostics, the Ptolemaeans, the Heracleonites, the Cainites (*Caiani*), the Archontics, the Cerdonians, the Marcionists, the Apelleians, and the Severians — who by the same assent cast away the old testament, either wholly (*ex integro*) or in part.² After [these] others, in the times of the Emperor Aurelian, a certain Persian named Cubricus, surnamed Manes, so exalted this heresy — [which had] somewhat subsided — that his name has almost remained upon it.³ Then his disciples, who for honor's sake called their teacher MANICHAEVS — that is, the pourer-out of manna (*mannae effusor*) — having sent forth the pernicious books of the same error, spread the now-famous heresy more widely over the whole world. Of their number the more eminent were a certain Addas, surnamed Adimantus, a disciple of Manichaeus while he was yet living; and, many years after him, Faustus the African, a Milevitan by fatherland; and a certain unnamed disciple of Fabritius, far worse than the Manichaeans of old — fragments of whose volumes are still preserved in the books of Augustine among the confutations of the Manichaeans.⁴ There were also, as Augustine relates, certain Patrician heretics, named from a certain Patricius, who subscribed to the same heresy. After whom, through many ages of years, the Bogomil heretics of the Bulgarian nation, and at last the Albanenses [the Albanensian Cathars], called this same error — buried [as it had been] through so long a length of times — back again into the light.⁵ And these are they who thought that the whole old testament was to be rejected wholly.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

The present assertion of the heretics comprises five detestable and blasphemous propositions, which we shall endeavor to destroy in order, with as much brevity as may be.

Proposition the first. The first proposition is: THAT THE WHOLE OLD TESTAMENT IS FROM THE EVIL GOD OF THE HEBREWS, WHO IS THE DEVIL. And it is destroyed

¹ Epiphanius, in the Anacephaleosis (Epip. in Anacephaleosi); Jerome, in the preface to Titus (Hier. in praefat. ad Titum).

² Augustine, in the catalogue of heresies [De haeresibus], and book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 12 (Aug. in catalogo haere. & li. 2. co. adu. leg. cap. 12).

³ Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66).

⁴ Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law and the prophets, ch. 12 (Aug. lib. 2. co. adu. legis & pro. cap. 12).

⁵ Euthymius [Zigabenus], book 2, Panoplia [Dogmatica], title 23 (Euthy. li. 2. panoplia tit. 23).

(printed p. 620 [PDF p. 625] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 1 (one God of both testaments); Proposition 2 and Proposition 3.)

And **moreover** this execrable opinion is destroyed by the testimonies of the new testament, which make one and the same God the author of each testament. For Paul, saying that Abraham had two sons — one of the handmaid, and the other of the free woman, which by allegory signify the two testaments — shows that, just as there are two women and one man, so also there are two testaments, and one God, who bequeathed both.¹ And the same Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, making a mutual comparison of the two testaments, calls the one new and the other old; and says that the new was confirmed by its own testator, unto the imitation and completion of the old, in blood, through the death of Christ — so that, his death intervening for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the old testament, we might receive the promises (*repromissiones*) which were signified in it.² Therefore, unless Christ, the mediator of the new testament, had seen that the old testament was from the good God, he would by no means have completed it by

imitating it. But he imitated it for this reason: because, as he himself says in the Gospel: "**Whatsoever** the son seeth the father do, this the son also doeth in like manner." ³ And that the same God spoke in each testament, the same Paul everywhere openly teaches, saying: "**Paul**, an Apostle, set apart unto the Gospel of God, which he had before promised by his prophets in the holy scriptures concerning his son." ⁴ And again: "**In many ways** (*multifarie*) and in many manners God, of old speaking to the fathers in the prophets, hath last of all spoken to us in [his] son." ⁵ And elsewhere: "**Having** the same spirit of faith, as it is written: I believed, for which cause I have spoken" — intimating by this that both testaments were inspired by the same spirit. ⁶ And Zacharias testifies that he is the same God of Israel who spoke in the old testament by the mouth of the holy prophets, and who in the new testament visited and wrought the redemption of his people; ⁷ with whom Mary, consenting in her Canticle, sings: "**He hath received** [taken up] Israel his servant, being mindful of his mercy: as he spoke to our fathers, Abraham, and to his seed for ever." ⁸ And lest we should perchance believe that there had been some prophet in whom God did not speak, therefore Peter added: "**God**, who by the mouth of all the prophets foretold that his Christ should suffer, hath so fulfilled it." ⁹ To which testimonies this demonstration also is joined: since the Mosaic law — on which the whole old testament depends — was founded by its author for this reason, that it might lead its cultivators to Christ as to the end of the law, Paul saying: "**The end** of the law is Christ"; ¹⁰ and, "**The law** was our pedagogue in Christ." ¹¹ How can it be that that evil God of the Manichaeans, the perpetual enemy of our Lord Jesus Christ, should have promulgated the law and the testament by whose leading his followers were led to the worship of Christ — by whom he himself was to be cast out of [his] kingdom, Christ saying: "**The prince** of this world shall be cast forth"? ¹² The one and only author, therefore, of both testaments is God, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ. ¹³

Proposition the second. The second proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT PERTAINS NOT TO CHRISTIANS, BUT TO THE JEWS ALONE ONLY. The absurdity of this is caught from this: that a testament pertains to those to whom the gifts and promises of the testament pertain, and who fulfill the conditions of the testament. But it is certain both that the conditions of the old testament are not kept by those who are Jews according to the flesh only, and that the promises of that same testament were not made on account of such [men]; but on account of the true Israelites, content with the promise of the seed of Abraham — that is, on account of those who believe in Christ, who is the sum and end of all the promises of the old testament, Paul saying: "**For however many** are the promises of God, in him they are [yea]." ¹⁴ And again: "**I say** that Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the confirming of the promises of the fathers" — which promises, indeed, pertain not to those who are only of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, ¹⁵ but to those, as Paul says, who are the sons of the promise of Abraham, and are reckoned in the seed of Isaac, of whom it was said: "**In Isaac** shall thy seed be called" — who is Christ. ¹⁶ For to **Abraham**, as the same Apostle writes to the Galatians, were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not, "and to seeds," as of many, but as of one, "and to thy seed," which is Christ. ¹⁷ Concerning whose salvation, as Peter says, all the prophets searched and inquired, who prophesied of the grace to come upon us. ¹⁸ And that not only the promises of the old testament, but also all its other mysteries, were made on account of us, the heirs of these promises — that we might be rendered fit for obtaining them — Paul, to the Corinthians, openly expressed in these words: "**I would not** have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized in Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink: for they drank of the spiritual [rock] that followed them, and the rock was Christ. Now these things were done in a figure of us." ¹⁹ And a little after: "**All** these things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our sake, upon whom the ends of the world are come." And to the Romans again: "**Whatsoever** things were written, were written for our instruction, that through patience and consolation we might have hope." ²⁰ And that the true understanding of the old testament, taken away from the Jews, has passed over to us, the same Apostle testifies, saying: "**Even unto** this present day the selfsame veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away, which in Christ is made

void; but even unto this present day, when Moses is read, the veil is laid upon their heart." ²¹ Wherefore, since they themselves neither understand nor keep the will of the testator and the conditions handed down in the testament, it is manifest that that testament pertains to us, who hold Christ, the end of its promises, know the will of the testator, and keep the conditions of the commandments set forth by him.

Proposition the third. The third proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT HAS BEEN CONTAMINATED BY THE JEWS WITH FABRICATED NARRATIONS. Against a proposition so wicked and impious all the evangelical and Apostolic scriptures cry out — taking from the old books innumerable testimonies and examples for the confirmation of doctrine, for exhortation, correction, and consola-

¹ Gal. 4; Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Gal. 4; Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66).

² Heb. ch. 9 (Heb. cap. 9).

³ John 5. a (Ioan. 5. a).

⁴ Rom. 1. a (Rom. 1. a).

⁵ Heb. 1. a (Heb. 1. a).

⁶ 2 Cor. 4; Psalm 115 (2. Cor. 4; Psal. 115).

⁷ Luke 1 (Luc. 1).

⁸ Luke 1 (Luc. 1).

⁹ Acts 3 (Act. 3).

¹⁰ Rom. 10 (Rom. 10).

¹¹ Gal. 3 (Gal. 3).

¹² John 12 (Ioan. 12).

¹³ Augustine, book 19 against Faustus (Aug. lib. 19. contra Faust.).

¹⁴ 2 Cor. 1 (2. Cor. 1).

¹⁵ Rom. 15 (Rom. 15).

¹⁶ Rom. 9 (Rom. 9).

¹⁷ Gal. 3 (Gala. 3).

¹⁸ 1 Pet. 1 (1. Pet. 1).

¹⁹ 1 Cor. 10 (1. Cor. 10).

²⁰ Rom. 15 (Rom. 15).

²¹ 2 Cor. 3 (2. Cor. 3).

(printed p. 621 [PDF p. 626] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 3 concluded; Proposition 4 (that the OT is useless for faith and adverse to morals) refuted.)

[for the confirmation of doctrine, for exhortation, correction, and] consolation of the faithful — not as [drawn] from fabulous [writings], but as from most truthful scriptures, composed at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. To these, as to an uncontaminated fountain of truth, Christ sent those skilled in the law, saying: "**Search** the scriptures; for they give testimony of me." ¹ To these, as to intact letters of incorrupt faith, he called back his disciples, when — beginning from Moses, and running through the psalms and the prophets — he expounded all the things that were written of him in the old books, and demonstrated them fulfilled in his very self with a most certain outcome. ² Out of these [scriptures], as out of sincere and inviolate writings, the two evangelists Matthew and Luke briefly gathered the two genealogies of our Lord — the one beginning from Abraham and descending, through the successions of the patriarchs and kings, down to Christ; the other ascending, through the several generations and times of the old testament, up to Adam: to wit, that from a compendium of the histories of the whole old testament, which each genealogy had touched upon, they might signify that the whole sum of the entire ancient scripture is to be received with undoubted certitude. Paul likewise — who gloried that at the feet of Gamaliel he had learned not the fables but the truth of the old testament — confirmed by his own authority very many sayings and deeds of the old instrument, and especially those histories which the Manichaeans deride, in that most brief compendium of the old scripture which he most artfully drew together in the epistle to the Hebrews; ³ where, summarily enumerating almost all the histories of the ancient testament, from the beginning of Genesis down to the last volume of the

Maccabees, he says: "By **faith** we understand that the ages were framed" — and the rest, which throughout that whole chapter he so commemorates that he seems purposely to wish to point out with his finger the deeds of the old testament.⁴ I pass over now the innumerable testimonies of the same Apostle, and of the other apostles, upon this matter, lest I heap loathing upon the reader in a thing most well-known, and to which all the letters of the new testament, and the stable and perpetual consensus of the Catholic Church, bear witness. But if anyone desires more for the confirmation of this proposition, let him read what is said by us below, in the confutation of the second heresy.

Proposition the fourth. The fourth proposition asserts: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT IS USELESS FOR THE CONFIRMATION OF OUR FAITH, AND ADVERSE TO THE ATTAINING OF GOOD MORALS. Which impiety all the letters of the new testament most openly confute. And first of all Paul professes that the old testament is necessary both for faith and for morals, writing to Timothy in these words: "But **thou**, continue in the things which thou hast learned and which have been committed to thee — knowing of whom thou hast learned [them], and because from infancy thou hast known the sacred letters, which can instruct thee unto salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. For all scripture, divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice: that the man of God may be perfect, furnished unto every good work."⁵ By which words the Apostle shows the old scriptures to be most necessary in two things especially, namely for instructing faith and for forming good morals. For since the whole Christian profession is placed in two things — namely in contemplation, which insinuates faith, and in action, which teaches morals — the Apostle accommodates the scriptures of the old testament to each business. To contemplation, indeed: since, whereas there are two offices of Christian contemplation — that is, to teach truth and to refute falsehood — Paul embraced both, saying: "**All** scripture is profitable to teach" — namely truth — "and to reprove" — namely falsehood.⁶ But to action the old scripture is profitable, because — since two parts complete the whole of action, namely that each one, according to the prophet's saying, should decline from evil and do good — therefore Paul says that those scriptures are profitable "to correct," that is, to snatch men away from sins, and "to instruct in justice," that is, to instruct men in justice and goodness.⁷ Accordingly Christ, seeing how necessary the old scriptures are for the confirmation of faith, when he spoke of himself to those skilled in the law, brought in to them the books of Moses, saying: "**If** you believed Moses, you would believe me also; for he wrote of me."⁸ And when he spoke to his disciples of his passion, he confirmed it from the prophets, saying: "**All things shall be accomplished** (*Consummabuntur*) that were spoken by the prophets concerning the son of man."⁹ And when he had risen from the dead, he established almost all the Evangelical truths from the authority of the old books. For when he had given himself as companion to the two disciples going to Emmaus: "**Beginning**," says Luke, "from Moses, and running throughout by the prophets, he interpreted to them all the things which were foretold of himself in the old testament."¹⁰ And again, when — the doors being shut — he had stood in the midst of the disciples, and had offered himself not only to be beheld by the eyes of the disciples but also to be handled by [their] hands: yet, lest they should think that anything was being done deceitfully with their mortal eyes and carnal senses, he strengthened them the more from the testification of the old books, saying: "**These** are the words which I spoke to you when I was yet with you: for it is necessary that all things be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." Then he opened to them the understanding of the scriptures, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said to them: "Because thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations."¹¹

With these testimonies, therefore, just as Christ showed that the old testament is necessary for the firmness and certitude of our faith, so he demonstrated it to be most useful for the institution of the moral life — since from it he received so many examples for the shaping of an honest life: such as they are, when he rouses the sloth of his hearers to vigilance by the example of those who in the days of Noe were drowned by the unforeseen inundation of the deluge;¹² or when he admonishes those relapsing into sins by the example of

the wife of Loth, saying: "**Remember** Loth's wife"; ¹³ or when he deters the obstinate minds of the Jews by the recollection of the Sodomites and the Ninivites and the queen of the South; ¹⁴ or when he reproaches the Pharisees that they do not the works of Abraham, whose sons they boast themselves; ¹⁵ or when, out of the words of Abraham, he calls back to penance the imitators of that rich man buried in hell, saying: "They **have** Moy-

¹ John 5 (Ioan. 5).

² Luke 20 (Luc. 20 — so printed; the passage is Luke 24:27, 44).

³ Acts 22 (Act. 22).

⁴ Heb. 11 (Heb. 11).

⁵ 2 Tim. 3 (2. Tim. 3).

⁶ Augustine, book against Faustus (Aug. lib. co. Faust.).

⁷ Psalm 33 (Psal. 33).

⁸ John 5 (Ioan. 5).

⁹ Matt. 20 (Matt. 20 — so printed; the passage is Luke 18:31).

¹⁰ Luke 24; Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Luc. 24; Aug. lib. 4. cont. Faust. cap. 2).

¹¹ Luke 24 (Luc. 24).

¹² Matt. 24 (Matth. 24).

¹³ Luke 17 (Luc. 17).

¹⁴ Matt. 11 (Matt. 11).

¹⁵ John 8 (Ioan. 8).

(printed p. 622 [PDF p. 627] — Heresy I: refutation of Proposition 4 concluded; Proposition 5 (that the OT fights point-by-point against the NT) refuted; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS begin.)

"They have **Moses** and the prophets; let them hear them." Paul likewise, drawing the whole old testament to the instruction of morals, says that all the things which are written in it "happened in figure for our sake, that we should not be desirers of evil things, nor idolaters, nor fornicators, nor gluttons, nor murmurers, nor tempters of God — lest we perish as they did, who in the old testament perished for such misdeeds, whose scourgings (*flagella*) are written," says the Apostle, "for our correction, upon whom the ends of the ages are come." ¹ Which things, and innumerable others which could be produced for this sentence, I pass over: they most efficaciously convince [us] that the old scriptures are greatly necessary both for faith and for morals.

Proposition the fifth. The fifth proposition is: THAT THE OLD TESTAMENT FIGHTS, POINT BY POINT, AGAINST THE NEW TESTAMENT. And this above all Adimantus the Manichaeian strove to establish, having published a book in which, to the several sentences of the old instrument, he opposed the several contrary sentences of the new testament. But that in the divine scriptures nothing can be contrary or repugnant is manifestly convinced from the things said above. For since the old scriptures were written by God inspiring [them] — Peter saying, "**Not** by human will was prophecy brought at any time, but the holy [men] of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Spirit" — ² and God is the highest truth, from which proceeds the spirit of union and not of dissension, it is necessary that in the scriptures composed by his afflatus nothing adverse or dissonant be found. For as from the highest truth nothing but the true can possibly proceed, so it is impossible that the true, which proceeds from it, should fight with itself. Moreover, as Augustine rightly infers, if the divine scriptures had been fighting among themselves and discordant, how could it ever have come to pass that so many and so great peoples should have believed scriptures so dissonant among themselves and conflicting — not the unlearned only, and those accustomed to the fields, but [men] worn [in study] in the cities, in the schools, and in the gymnasia amid contentious disputations? ³ who, whereas the garrulous [philosophers] ever dissented about the dogmas of philosophy — disciples from [their] masters, and fellow-disciples among themselves — at last, unanimous, came together under the concord of these scriptures: which is read never, either before or after, to have befallen any writings of the philosophers. For Plato dissents from Pythagoras in most things, Aristotle opposes Plato, and even his own disciples contradict Aristotle. But our writers are always concordant among themselves, nor do the apostles preach anything else

than what the prophets pronounce. Who, although they be not so many as the writers of the gentiles — lest, like those, they should grow cheap by multitude — yet are not so few that their consensus is not to be wondered at. Yet we confess that many things are found in the sacred letters of which, although the meaning is the same, the words nevertheless apparently disagree: divine wisdom so disposing, unto the exercise of our faith, that while we know not how to reduce them to concord, we may pray to him who made both one, that he may open to us the reconciliation of the apparent contradiction.⁴ And let these things, said against the five propositions of the heretics, suffice.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. No cause presents itself to us why we should receive the Old Testament. For if we consider the person of the testator — which is first sought in every testament — deservedly, on account of it, do we execrate the old testament. For the founder of this testament is that evil God of the Hebrews, the perpetual enemy of the good God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ; from whom [come] all evils, slaughters, thefts, and concupiscences; who kills, blinds, hardens, and injects evil concupiscences into the minds of men and of women; who gives evil laws — as he himself testifies through his own prophets — and precepts not good, in which the cultivators of the law cannot live.⁵

2. Then also the inheritance left in that testament is so wretched, and corporeal, and far from the goods of the soul, that after that blessed promise of the new testament — which promises us the kingdom of the heavens and perpetual life — even if his own testator should thrust it upon me gratis, I would of my own accord loathe [it]. For since so many immortal goods have been left me in the new testament, the carnal goods which the old promises to its own — namely riches, and fullness of the belly, sons and grandsons, and long life — I willingly and gladly permit to the Jews as their own, content, forsooth, with the splendid inheritance of the new testament alone, and of the kingdom of the heavens.⁶

3. Moreover, the testament is to be accepted [only] by those to whom, together with the testament, an inheritance is consigned. But since the old testament not only does not constitute us heirs, but rather even disinherits [us], what impropriety it is to usurp for ourselves the tablets of the old testament, which — the inheritance being transmitted to others — testify us to be disinherited! For who is ignorant that the old Testament promises the land of the Canaanites, and that to the Jews alone — that is, to the circumcised, and to those sacrificing, and abstaining from swine's [flesh] and the rest of the meats which Moses calls unclean, observing the sabbaths, and the solemnity of the unleavened bread, and the rest of this kind, which the testator himself commanded them to observe? which, because they have pleased none of the Christians (for neither does any one of us keep them), it is fitting that, the inheritance being refused, we should give back the tablets also.

4. In vain, also, is a testament accepted by those who will not keep the will of the testator and the conditions of the testament. But since the conditions of the testament are that the heirs of the testament be circumcised, sacrifice, and abstain from unlawful foods, etc., and we keep not those things — I fear lest a Jew, rightly upbraiding me, should say: Why, wicked one, dost thou usurp for thyself the old testament, whose precepts thou keepest not? and what hast thou to do with the old testament, whose commands thou despisest?⁷

5. Furthermore, if there be any cause on account of which the old testament is to be received, this surely will be it: on account of the testimonies which are had of Christ in the law and the prophets. But since none such are found in them, by right their scriptures are seen to be worthy of contempt. And that there are in them no prophecies of Christ appears from those very testimonies which are wont to be brought forward, out of the old testament, for the confirmation of the faith concerning Christ. Out of which⁸

¹ Luke 16 (Luc. 16); 1 Cor. 10 (so printed "2. Cor. 19"; the passage is 1 Cor. 10:6, 11).

² 2 Pet. 1 (2. Pet. 1).

³ Augustine, book 18 of the City of God, ch. 41 (Lib. 18. de ci. Dei. cap. 41).

⁴ Augustine, in the same [work], ch. 7 (Aug. ibi. c. 7).

⁵ Manes, in Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Manes apud Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66); Judges 9; 1 Kings [Samuel] 18; 2 Chron. 18; Isaiah 6; Isaiah 4 (Esa. 4, so printed); Exodus 14; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 22; Ezekiel 10 (Iud. 9; 1. Reg. 18; 2. Par. 18; Esai. 6; Esa. 4; Exod. 14; 3. Reg. 22; Ezech. 10); Faustus, in Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 1, and book 10, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 4. cont. Faust. cap. 1. & lib. 10. cap. 1).

⁶ In the same place (Ibidem).

⁷ Faustus, in Augustine, book 10, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 10. cap. 1).

⁸ Faustus, in Augustine, book 16, ch. 41 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 16. cap. 41).

(printed p. 623 [PDF p. 628] — Heresy I: the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS continue (objections 5 concluded through 10).)

together with that most common testimony brought out of Deuteronomy — "**A PROPHET**, namely, like unto thee will I raise up for them," etc. — [this] in no way looks to Christ. What, I ask, is to be thought of the other testimonies which are subjoined to this testimony by a like example? which certainly cannot be understood of Christ: for Christ is not a prophet, nor like to Moses — since that one [Moses] was a man, this one [Christ] God; that one a sinner, this one holy; that one born of coition, this one (according to you) born of a virgin; that one, his God being offended, is slain upon the mountain, this one, well-pleasing to his father, suffers by his own will. How therefore will he be a prophet like to Moses? But if there is no testimony of Christ in the old testament, then it is useless for the confirmation of our faith. ¹

6. But if it confers nothing to the certitude of our faith, much less will it help toward morals. For how can those most wicked examples — worthy of all hatred and loathing — which the old testament everywhere sets before us in the lives of the patriarchs and prophets, profit us for the instruction of living well? namely, that fathers-in-law sleep with their daughters-in-law, like Judas; fathers with [their] daughters, like Loth; prophets with harlots, like Osee; the Nazarites of God with whores, like Samson; husbands to behold the nights of their own wives [given over] to lovers, like Abraham; a married man to be mingled with two german sisters [full sisters], like Jacob; rulers of the peoples, and those most inspired (*entheos*) voices, like David and Salomon, to wallow with harlots by thousands and by hundreds: and many other examples of like foulness, which it would be long to enumerate. ²

7. The old testament also narrates many fabulous and fabricated things, which shall be told by us in their own place; on account of which Paul, not unjustly, calls the old scriptures profane, and old-wives' fables, and foolish genealogies. For concerning these he said to Timothy: "Avoid **PROFANE** (*Prophanas*) and old-wives' fables." And again: "**Attend NOT** (*Ne intendas*) to Jewish fables, and interminable genealogies, which furnish questions rather than the edification which is in faith; as certain [men], wishing to be doctors of the law." And again: "Avoid **FOOLISH** (*Stultas*) and undisciplined questions, knowing that they beget strifes." And, writing the same things to Titus, he says: "Avoid **QUESTIONS** (*Quaestiones*) and genealogies and contentions: for they are useless and vain." All which things are said by Paul concerning the utterances of the law and the prophets. ³

8. To these is added, that the old testament is so hostile and repugnant to the new testament that the two cannot come together into one. And indeed, first, in Genesis it is written that God by himself made heaven and earth; but in John it is written that the world was made through our Lord Jesus Christ, where it is said: "**And** the world was made through him." In Genesis it is read: "The Lord **rested** (*Quievit*) on the seventh day from every work which he had wrought"; but in the gospel, on the contrary, Christ says: "**My Father** (*Pater meus*) worketh until now." In Genesis it is written: "**Let us make** (*Faciamus*) man to our image and likeness"; but Christ says to the Jews: "**You** (*Vos*) are of your father the devil" — yet they cannot be sons of the devil [and] made to the image and likeness of God. The old testament forbids separation from a wife, saying: "**Therefore** (*Ideo*) shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh"; the contrary of which Christ persuades, saying: "**There is no one** (*Nemo est*) who

leaveth wife and children for the kingdom of the heavens, who shall not receive much more in this time, and in the world to come life eternal." In Exodus it is said: "**Honor** (*Honora*) thy father and thy mother"; but Christ, to him who wished to perform the office of burial for his father, commands the contrary, saying: "**Let** the dead (*Sine mortuos*) bury their own dead." In the old testament it is said that God was seen by Jacob, by Moses, and by many others, face to face; but on the contrary in the gospel it is said: "**God** no man hath seen (*Deum nemo vidit*) at any time." The old testament describes God as hating the evil and avenging sins, when it says: "**I God** (*Ego Deus*), a Zealot, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the sons unto the third and fourth generation, upon those who hate me"; but Christ asserts him to be benign upon the evil, when he says: "**Who** (*Qui*) is benign upon the good and the evil." And he himself commands that we forgive a sinning brother, not only seven times, but seventy times seven. The old testament commands vengeance, saying: "**An eye** for an eye (*Oculum pro oculo*), a tooth for a tooth"; but Christ, in the gospel, destroying this precept, says: "**You have heard** (*Audistis*) that it was said to the ancients, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you, resist not evil; and if any one strike thee on one cheek, offer him also the other." Out of which, and other things like to these, in which the old scriptures fight with the new, it becomes manifest that not unjustly is the old testament disdained by us as contrary to the new testament.⁴

9. They exhort us moreover to the reprobation of the old testament, no less the Evangelical and Apostolic exhortations than [their] examples — but especially the example of the Apostles; who, lest they should be pressed any longer by the intolerable servitude of the old testament, although they were Jews and born under the old testament, nevertheless shook off its yoke. But we, on the contrary, having obtained by the benefit of nature that we should not be born under the law of servitude — Christ forthwith meeting us with the full gift of liberty — how wretched and foolish shall we be, and moreover ungrateful, if of our own accord we addict ourselves to servitude? Indeed Paul thereupon rebukes the Galatians, that, relapsing into circumcision, they went back to the weak and needy elements, which they wished to serve anew. How therefore shall we admit in ourselves that for which we see others reprehended? It is base, certainly, to go into servitude; but baser to return.⁵

10. Frequent, finally, are the admonitions of Christ and of his Apostles that admonish us of the same. "**No one**," says Christ, "seweth a new patch to an old garment, otherwise a greater rent is made; neither doth he entrust new wine to old, musty (*veternosis*) wineskins" — intimating that Christian newness is not to be mixed with Hebrew oldness. For since it is sordid, when one is clad in new garments, not to give the old garments to inferiors, therefore he admonished us to leave the old vestment — that is, the old testament — to the Jews as to the lowest servants, and likewise the law; and he compared the prophets to dried-up and inveterate trees, saying: "**The Law and the Prophets** [were] until John" — namely, that, according to Paul, he might show us that everything which grows old and ages is nigh to destruction⁶

¹ Deut. 18 (Deut. 18).

² Faustus, in Augustine, book 32, ch. 4 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 32. cap. 4); Gen. 38; Gen. 19; Osee 1; Judges 14; Gen. 12; Gen. 20; 2 Kings [Samuel] 11; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (Gen. 38; Gen. 19; Ose. 1; Iud. 14; Gen. 12; Gen. 20; 2. Reg. 11; 3. Reg. 11).

³ Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 1 (Lib. 2. co. adu. legis c. 1); 1 Tim. 4; 1 Tim. 1; 2 Tim. 2; Titus 3 (1. Tim. 4; 1. Tim. 1; 2. Tim. 2; Tit. 3).

⁴ From Augustine against Adimantus (Ex Aug. co. Adimantum); Gen. 1; John 1; Gen. 2; John 5; Gen. 1; John 8; Gen. 2; Luke 18; Exod. 20; John 1; Gen. 32; John 1; Exod. 20; Luke 6; Matt. 18; Exod. 21; Matt. 5.

⁵ Faustus, in Augustine, book 9, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 9. c. 1); Acts 1 (Act. 1); Faustus, in Augustine, book 8, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 8. c. 1); Gal. 4 (Gal. 4).

⁶ Faustus, in Augustine, book 8, ch. 1 (Faustus apud Aug. li. 8. c. 1); Marcion, in Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 4 (Marcio apud Epiph. lib. 1. her. 4); Matt. 9 (Matth. 9); Manes, in Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Manes apud Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66); Luke 16 (Luc. 16); Heb. 8 (Heb. 8); 2 Cor. 3 (2. Cor. 3).

(printed p. 624 [PDF p. 629] — Heresy I: objection 10 concluded; then the DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS begins (refutations 1–4).)

to be [nigh to destruction]. And Paul, for this cause, called the old testament the "ministration of death," when he said: "The **MINISTRATION** (*Ministratio*) of death, or the testament of death, formed in letters upon stones" — so that we should shun that [testament] no otherwise than [as a thing] put forth by the author of death; knowing that that law (as the same [Paul] says in another place) is not set for the just, but for parricides, matricides, and perjurers — but not for those who live justly in Christ.¹

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS (*Dissolutio Obiectionum*)

1. If the rash heretics had commemorated, particularly and expressly, in those things which with unbridled tongue they utter against the good God, when, how, and in what place these things were done by God himself, we should indeed refute [them] likewise particularly and member by member, responding to the several [points]. But now, since they themselves touch upon certain things universally, as it were fleeing [glancingly], we too respond generally and universally. We say that the evil concupiscences are not from the God of the old testament. For how should he inject concupiscence who says: "Thou shalt **NOT covet** (*Non concupisces*) the things which are thy neighbor's, nor his wife, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor whatsoever are thy neighbor's"? If therefore he takes away concupiscence, he is not a supplier of concupiscence. But if he hardens and blinds the minds of some, he is not therefore to be called evil; otherwise Christ also would be evil, who says: "**For judgment** (*In iudicium*) I came into this world, that they who see not may see, and they who see may become blind." He therefore, who — according to the apostolic sentence — has mercy on whom he will, and hardens whom he will, without doubt illuminates whom he will, and blinds whom he will. But there is no iniquity with God, to whom the Church says: "**Mercy** (*Misericordiam*) and judgment I will sing to thee, O Lord." He illuminates, therefore, by mercy; he blinds by judgment — most equitable, though most hidden; for inscrutable are his judgments; to whom nevertheless it is said: "**Thou hast sat** (*Sedisti*) upon the throne, who judgest justice." But when those wretched [men] say, "How is the God of the Hebrews good, who commands thefts?" — the vain men know not that with God nothing perishes, and that his judgment is just, and that God "is not led by the nose" (*naso non suspenditur*), as the Egyptians thought, who wished the Jews to have labored without wages — and that indeed not for a few years, but for two hundred and fifteen years. It was equitable, therefore, before God and men, that a reward should at the last be rendered to them. And for this cause the just God commanded his own [people] to plunder the Egyptians, and to go out thence with the spoils; and for the same cause [he ordained] most just slaughters, and havoc as great among his own as among strangers, so that no crime of any sinner of his own should remain unavenged. But, they say, "How is the God of the law good, who glories that he gave to his own precepts not good?" — and the most unskilled scoundrels (*nebulones*) do not perceive those vital and holy precepts of the old law, of which Paul said: "The **LAW** indeed [is] holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good" — [and that they are] for this reason called "not good," not because in themselves they are evil, but because, a comparison being made of them with evangelical perfection, they are less good, and in a certain manner evil: by the usual mode of speech of divine scripture, namely, which frequently is wont to call those things which are less good, not only "not good," but even "evil"; just as Christ [called] so many good men, who were in the world, — by intuition of the divine goodness — [and] denies them to be good, saying: "**No one** (*Nemo*) is good, but God alone"; and just as the apostles, who by the merit of election excelled the goodness of the human race in many ways, [yet] compared to the goodness of God are called evil — the Lord saying to them: "**If you** (*Si vos*), being evil, know how to give good things to your sons, how much more shall your father from heaven give the good spirit to those asking him?" The Apostle also thus affirms that the glory of the law was blunted by the light of the new testament, so that — by comparison with the evangelical splendor — he pronounces it not to have been glorified, saying: "For **neither** (*Nam nec*) is that glorious which was glorified, by reason of the excelling glory." Good, therefore, and holy, and just is the God, the testator of the old testament.²

2. Whose testament, indeed, we do not receive for this reason — that our hope should be fixed in the promise of temporal things — since we do not even believe those saints of that time, and spiritual men, the patriarchs

and prophets, to have been given over to these earthly things. For we have heard a prophet casting away such felicity, and singing that one must flee for refuge to the one Lord: "**Deliver** (*Erue*) me from the hand of the sons of strangers, whose sons are as new plantings established in their youth; their daughters set round about, and adorned as the likeness of a temple; their storehouses full, bursting out from this into that; their sheep fruitful, their oxen fat; there is no ruin of the wall, nor passage, nor cry in their streets. They have called the people blessed to whom these things are." Which felicity David, deriding, forthwith on the contrary added: "**Blessed** (*Beatus*) is the people whose Lord is its God." But just as those old fathers understood, in these promises — the Spirit revealing [it] — the future things which were being foretold through those very [temporal goods], and on this account were kindled to the desire of the new testament: so we also, knowing that the things which were signified through them have been completed in us, for this cause venerate and receive the memory of the old testament as [it were] the promise of our present felicity.³

3. Not, therefore, do we hold his scriptures for obtaining that earthly inheritance, but we receive [them] for understanding in them the promises of the new testament; for the testification of the old reconciles faith to the new. For we know that the promises of temporal things are contained in the old testament, and that for this reason it is called the "old testament"; and [we know] that the promise of eternal life, and the kingdom of the heavens, pertains to the new testament — but that in those temporal [things] there were figures of things to come. In which manner, indeed, Paul taught that the old testament is to be received by us, when he says: "**All** (*Omnia*) things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our sake, upon whom the ends of the ages are come."⁴

4. Neither is there danger that a Jew should rightly upbraid me. For to him saying, "Why holdest thou the old testament, whose precepts thou keepest not?" I will answer, that in those books there are two kinds of precepts: precepts, namely, for signifying life [the life to come], and precepts for acting out life [the moral life to be lived]; of which the latter are now observed by Christians, but the former were then rightly observed by the Jews, when they foretold those things which now have been revealed. But now, after the Light — Christ — has come, [it is] superfluous [that they should be observed] by us⁵

¹ 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1).

² Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. haer. 66); Exod. 20; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law and the prophets, ch. 8 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. leg. & proph. cap. 8); John 9; Rom. 9; Psalm 100; Rom. 11; Psalm 9; Epiphanius, in the book Anchoratus (Epiph. in lib. Anchorato); Exod. 21; Ezek. 20; John Cassian, Conference 23, ch. 4 (Ioan. Cassia. col. 23. cap. 4); Rom. 7; Luke 18; Matt. 7; 2 Cor. 3.

³ Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2, and against Adimantus, ch. 18 and 20 (Aug. lib. 4. con. Faust. c. 2. & con. Adiman. cap. 18. & 20); Psalm 143.

⁴ Augustine, book 4 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Aug. li. 4. co. Faustus c. 2); 1 Cor. 10 (1. Cor. 10).

⁵ Augustine against Faustus, book 10, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 10. cap. 2).

(printed p. 625 [PDF p. 630] — *Heresy I: Dissolution of the Objections continues (refutations 4 concluded through 8 begun).*)

[it would be superfluous] that those shadows should be observed by us. Nevertheless we hold them — not for religion, but for testification; just as we also hold the carnal promises which are contained in them, since through them the spiritual things to be hoped-for by us have been revealed.

5. But they say: what need is there of the old testament for the certitude of our faith, in which there is no testimony of Christ? For what is written in Deuteronomy pertains not to Christ, because Christ is not like to Moses. To these [objections] we thus meet [them]: that which is called "like" is not understood [to be] like in every part and manner. For not only those things which are of one and the same nature are said to be like among themselves — as olive to olive — but also those which are of disparate nature, as olive to wild-olive (*oleaster*), and spelt (*far*) to wheat. So also the Son of God, who is so far distant from mortal things, is called in the scriptures "Lamb" and "Lion"; as in John it is read, "**Behold** (*Ecce*) the lamb of God," and in Paul, "The **rock** (*Petra*) was Christ" — which [names] they by no means would have spoken, unless Christ took

upon himself some likeness with those [things]. Since therefore Christ was made like to a sheep, what wonder if he disdained not to be made like to Moses, who was unlike to Moses? Like, indeed, because man; unlike, because God: like, because made in the likeness of the flesh of sin; unlike, because holy and without sin: like, because born of a woman; unlike, because born of the Holy Spirit: like, because by true death he died upon the mountain; unlike, because he died not on account of his own sins, but by his own power: like, because — his God being offended on account of the crimes of men — he bore the offenses of the human race, dying in his own body; unlike, because it was not — [his] God being offended — on account of his own fault that he died.¹

6. To those things which the most impure heretics vituperate in the lives of the patriarchs and prophets, we respond, that although — out of those vices which are narrated concerning the fathers in the old testament — it be conceded that certain [of them] were grave crimes, not on that account is the authority of scripture diminished; nay rather, it is the more commended to us, that it not rashly, but for most just causes, wisely narrates such vices — namely, that by the consideration of them we may obtain these four [things]: to wit, the instruction of faith, fear, and hope. First, faith: that we should doubt nothing of the truth of that history, seeing that it — as the brightness of a faithful mirror [reflecting] the persons brought before it — indicates not only those which are fair and whole, but also those which are deformed and vicious; and it excepts no person to be flattered, but the deeds of men, as much to be praised as to be blamed, it either itself judges, or proposes to be judged by the readers; nor only intimating the men themselves as either laudable or blameworthy, but also not keeping silent certain things praiseworthy in the blameworthy, and certain things blameworthy in the praiseworthy. Secondly, it refers the vices of the fathers to our instruction — not indeed that we should imitate and follow them, but that we may know those things to be shunned and fled which the scripture blames. Thirdly, to fear: that the fall of the greater should be the fear of the lesser. For if those so holy men the pernicious blandishments of this world overcame, how much more is it to be feared by us, [who are] weaker? Fourthly, to the consolation of hope: that we may learn, in such lapses, that salvation is not to be despaired of; for certain [persons], having fallen into sins, sin the more by desperation, and not only neglect the medicine of repenting, but, for the fulfilling of dishonest and nefarious desires, become slaves of lusts and of wicked cupidities, as if they would lose [their labor] if they did not do what lust tracks out — whereas already a certain damnation awaits them. Against this exceedingly perilous and destructive manner [of sinning], the commemoration of the sins into which the just and holy [men] fell is of avail.²

7. But as to what pertains to the fables which the impious confirm from the testimony of Paul — who, [understanding it] thus, unless a much-blinded heretic, would err? Why did the Apostle himself not do this, if he judged these to be old-wives' fables? Why, writing to the same Timothy, does he say: "**We know** (*Scimus*) that the law is good, if any one use it lawfully"? And why does he command the same [Timothy] to remain in the sacred letters which he had learned from infancy, [they] instructing unto salvation through faith? But let those insane [men] know that the Jews have, besides scripture, certain traditions called *δευτέρωσιν* (*deuterosin*) [the "repetition," the Mishnah], in which they hand down that God at first created two women for the [first] man, out of whom they weave various genealogies, contending that some descended from the one, others from the other woman. Concerning which traditions, when once the Pharisees interrogated Christ, saying, "**Why** (*Quare*) do thy disciples not walk according to the traditions of the elders?" they were refuted by him, saying: "Why do you also transgress the commandment of God for your traditions?" Which words the divine Epiphanius, expounding, said that those traditions are four kinds of expositions which are among the Jews: of which one is borne under the name of Moses; the second is [that of] Rabbi Aciba; the third [that of] Adda, or Juda; the fourth [that] of the sons of Asamoneus [the Hasmoneans]. Concerning which — and also concerning the genealogies of the Jews and the Talmudic questions condemned by Paul — Annius, most skilled in antiquities, wrote some things worthy to be known, in the commentaries on the Chronography of Philo; to whom, for brevity's sake, we send the reader eager for this knowledge, passing on to those places which the Manichaeans adduce out of both testaments as [things] fighting among themselves.³

8. Whose contradiction — because it is placed in words alone — is dissolved with easy effort. The **first** opposition, therefore, which looks to the exordium of Genesis, is removed in three ways. First, when it is said, "**In the beginning** (*In principio*) God created heaven and earth," by "God" is signified the Trinity, in which not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit, are understood. Secondly, when in the same place it is written, "God said, Let there be light; and light was made," it is necessary that we understand God to have made, through the Word, that which he made; but the Word of the Father is the Son. Thirdly, if for this reason the Son is not there understood — because it is not said that God made the world through the Son — neither in the gospel does God through the Son feed the birds and clothe the lilies, and the other innumerable things which Christ says the Father does, although he does not say that he does them through the Son. The **second** contradiction is removed, because it is not written that God rested from all his works so that thereafter he should work nothing whatsoever, but that he rested from all the works which he had then made — that is, from instituting the natures of things — so that he should no longer make the world [anew]; from which work, after [its] perfection, he had ceased: but in administering [governing] the world [he works] many [things] ⁴

¹ Augustine against Faustus, book 16, ch. 15 (Aug. co. Faust. li. 16. cap. 15); Deut. 18; John 1; 1 Cor. 10.

² Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 60 (Aug. li. 22. co. Faust. c. 60); Augustine against Faustus, book 22, ch. 65 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 22. c. 65); Augustine, book of 50 homilies, homily 21 (Aug. lib. 50. hom. 21); Augustine, book On Nature and Grace, ch. 35 (Aug. lib. de nat. & grat. cap. 35).

³ Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 1 (Aug. lib. 1. con. adu. leg. cap. 1); 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1); 2 Tim. 3 (2. Tim. 3); Mark 7 (Mar. 7); Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66).

⁴ Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 1 (Aug. con. Adiman. ca. 1); Gen. 1; Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 2 (Aug. cot. Adiman. cap. 2).

(printed p. 626 [PDF p. 631] — *Heresy I concluded: Dissolution of the Objections, the resolution of the scriptural "contradictions" (third through eighth) and refutations 9 and 10.*)

[in administering the world he works] many things, always. And in this work Christ intimated him to be, when he said: "**My Father** (*Pater meus*) worketh until now." ¹

The **third** contradiction also is thus loosed. In three ways, in the scriptures, the name of "sons" is taken: according to nature, as Isaac [is] son of Abraham; according to doctrine, as the Apostle calls "his sons" those who learned the gospel from him; thirdly, according to imitation, as the Apostle calls us "sons of Abraham," because we imitate his faith. The Jews, therefore, by discipline and by imitation are sons of the devil, but by nature sons of God. ²

The **fourth** is thus removed. When the cause of obtaining the kingdom of the heavens is not present, if any one leave [his] wife, it is disapproved by the Lord; but when the wife impedes the man from the possession of the kingdom of the heavens, then the wife is commanded to be left: because the wife is joined to the man, that together they may merit the kingdom of the heavens. ³

The **fifth** is settled in the same manner: that on account of the kingdom of the heavens we should honor [our] parents, and the same [parents] — when it shall be needful, on account of the announcing of the kingdom of God — we should condemn. For the love of parents is a certain step to the love of God; whereby it is manifest that the honor of parents in its own degree is to be kept, and yet that they, in comparison with the divine love — especially if they are an impediment — are with no doubt to be condemned. ⁴

The **sixth** is thus loosed. When it is said, "**God** (*Deum*) no one hath seen at any time," it is understood of God according to the immutable essence of his divinity, which cannot be seen except by a most purified and most simple heart; but when we read that he was seen, and heard, and spoke to many, we understand this to have been done by him through some visible creature: as in certain places scripture testifies that an angel was seen, where it says that God was seen — as in that wrestling of Jacob, scripture calls him an angel whom Jacob calls God, saying, "**I saw** (*Vidi*) the Lord face to face." And that God, whom Moses said had appeared

to himself in the bush, and on Sinai with the law, Stephen — in the Acts of the Apostles — testifies to have been this same angel.⁵

The **seventh** is settled in this manner. God is a Zealot and benign: benign indeed, as Paul says, when by his benignity and patience he invites the evil to penance; a Zealot, and punishing unto the third and fourth generation, when by his justice he punishes those who — correction being despised — wished to persevere in the same perversity of [their] parents; but indulgent and pardoning he is, not only seven times, but seventy times seven, toward those who — the correction of God being accepted — are reconciled through penance.⁶

The **eighth** is thus reduced to concord. In these two sentences [the "eye for an eye" and "turn the other cheek"] not a contrariety of the testaments is shown, but a diversity of them in perfection. For since there are two degrees of leniency — the first, that the measure of the received injury should in no way exceed the sorrow of the avenger; the second, that one should forgive the whole injury with placated mind — the old testament, as [being] less perfect, constituted carnal men at the first degree, of measuring vengeance; but the new testament, as [being] more perfect, led spiritual men even to the second degree, of complete remission.⁷

9. But concerning the example of the apostles renouncing the legal precepts, we say that they did not fall away from those precepts for signifying the life [to come] according to faith — as though they did not believe them to have been figures of things to come — but that they desisted only from the observation of those [precepts] whose shadows had fled away, the evangelical light already coruscating. Neither do we, believing those things, relapse again into servitude: because we do not observe the things which once were commanded to the fathers for the foretelling of us, but in liberty we read the things which were written for the confirming of us. But Paul rebukes the Galatians, not as [men] reading the scripture of circumcision religiously, but as [men] wishing to be circumcised superstitiously.⁸

10. Neither do those testimonies of Christ and of Paul have any weight. For the new patch, and the old garment, and the new wine, and the old wineskins, do not signify two testaments, but two lives and two hopes. For if any one should think that two hopes are to be had — that he should serve God both on account of earthly felicity and on account of the kingdom of the heavens — this [hope] does not contain that [other]; for when this [earthly hope] shall have been disturbed by some tribulation, the failing man will lose that [heavenly] one also. Thence is that [saying]: "**No one** (*Nemo*) can serve two masters," which Christ expounded, saying: "You **cannot** (*Non potestis*) serve God and mammon." He mixes, therefore, the new patch with the old garment — not [he] who mixes the old testament with the new, but [he] who wishes to have spiritual continence, and has not yet laid aside the carnal hope. But as to what they add — that "the **Law** (*Lex*) and the prophets endured until John" — it is not so to be understood, that after John both are altogether to be cast away; but that the law and the prophets were until John as preparers and fore-announcers of the advent of Christ, which [advent] coming, their preparation and fore-announcing ceases. Yet both remain for the confirmation of the fore-announced things, that we may know the advent of Christ to have been foretold by them, by divine disposition, long before it came to pass. They remain also for the conserving of the gratitude of our mind, that we may render thanks to those who foretold to us so happy an advent of Christ. For just as, if any one should have a pedagogue (as also the Apostle says that the law was a pedagogue to us unto the advent of Christ), when he shall have come to [full] age and shall have received a teacher, he does not altogether reject the pedagogue as an enemy: so we also, since we were led [as children] in the law and the prophets until the advent of the teacher Christ, the teacher being found, do not reprobate the pedagogue, but confess gratitude to him, that he led our childhood [along], and dismissed [us] to more perfect disciplines. There remains, therefore, the law — which Paul for this reason says is not set for the just: because it is not against the just, inasmuch as the just [man] has already anticipated to fulfill the things which are of the law; but it is set for the unjust, that is, against the unjust, unto condemnation; and on this account [it is] called "the testament of death" — not because it was given by the author of death, but because it commands death to be given to homicides, adulterers, and the transgressors of its precepts. For thus it was fitting that the testament

of death should go before, so that, first being dead to sins, we might live to justice.⁹

¹ John 5 (Ioan. 5).

² Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 5 (Aug. cot. Adiman. cap. 5).

³ Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 3 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 3).

⁴ Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 6 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 6).

⁵ Against Adimantus, ch. 9 (Con. Adim. cap. 9); Gen. 32; Exod. 3; Acts 7 (Act. 7).

⁶ Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 7 (Aug. co. Ad. cap. 7); Rom. 2.

⁷ Augustine against Adimantus, ch. 8 (Aug. co. Adi. cap. 8).

⁸ Augustine against Faustus, book 9, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 9. c. 2).

⁹ Augustine against Faustus, book 12, ch. 2 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 12. cap. 2); Mark 9 (Mar. 9); Matt. 6; Epiphanius, book 2, heresy 66 (Epiph. lib. 2. her. 66); Luke 16; 1 Tim. 1 (1. Tim. 1).

(printed p. 627 [PDF p. 632] — *Heresy II opens: title, heresy statement, Assertores, and the beginning of the Impugnatio.*)

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT in general — Heresy II (*De Veteri Testamento in universali. Haeresis II*)

That in the Old scriptures, which the Church now holds, many things have been falsified — as much by the Jews as by the Christians — and that many things also have partly been super-added, and partly been subtracted.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This most pestilent error the more recent Anabaptists profess in our age; with whom, in the same error, consent the Servetans — so called from a certain impious Michael Servetus, a Spaniard, whom, in the year 1554 (*so printed "M.D.LIIII"; Servetus was in fact burned in 1553*), on account of his execrable heresies, those same Lutherans burned by public fire in the city of the Allobroges, Geneva — [those Lutherans] who [nonetheless] contend that heretics, however pertinacious, are by no reason to be killed. These Servetans, therefore, since they know that many testimonies concerning the divinity of CHRIST and the holy Trinity (which they themselves deny) are written in the old testament, and those [testimonies] so open that they cannot be eluded, say that those testimonies were vitiated [corrupted] by the "Trinitarians" — for so those impious [men], by way of contempt, call the Catholic assertors of the Trinity.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

It cannot be said that the divine scriptures of the Old instrument were falsified by the malignity either of the Jews or of the Christians. For if we should say that they were corrupted by the Jews, then it is deservedly asked (says Origen) whether the Jews corrupted them before the advent of Christ, or after his advent. If before, then surely Christ and the Apostles — who accuse the scribes and Pharisees of the other crimes — would never have kept silent about this crime, which was the greatest; nor would Christ have sent his hearers to them, saying, "**Upon** (*Super*) the chair of Moses have sat the Scribes and Pharisees: whatsoever they shall say to you, do" — if he had known them to bring forth falsehoods from the chair of the Mosaic reading. But if any one should say that, after the advent of the Lord Savior and the preaching of the apostles, those books were falsified by the Hebrews, I shall not be able to hold my laughter (*cachinnum*): that the Savior, and the Evangelists, and the Apostles brought forth [their] testimonies just as the Jews were afterward going to falsify [them]! ¹ And if any one should say that those books were depraved by the Christians after Christ, Augustine responds that it was done by divine providence that not all the Jews were killed, but dispersed through the world by the power of God, so that from their intact volumes we might be able to recognize that ours are not falsified. And lest the Jews themselves should be able to hide those books from us, or to show [them as if] corrupted, God — two hundred and fifty years before the advent of Christ — inspired Ptolemy

Philadelphus, king of Alexandria, to take care that those scriptures should be translated by the seventy renowned interpreters of the Hebrews; and, through Demetrius, the prefect of the Library, [inspired] that [the volumes], together with the Hebrew exemplars, should be placed in his Library and diligently kept: which volumes, together with the Hebrew ² exemplars, Tertullian in the Apologetic testifies to have been, down to his own times, in the same Library, and frequently read by the Jews, and by them judged most faithful. Neither can any prudent [man] believe that the Jews — dispersed in codices so many, and so far and wide — should have come together into one [conspiracy] out of whatsoever perversity and malice, and, by hatred of the Christians, should have conspired in the corruption of their own volumes; namely, so that, while they envied to others the truth of scripture, they should deprive themselves of the truth. Who, even if they had wished to do this by unanimous consent, [it] can be persuaded to no one that Christ our Savior would have permitted so grave a crime by the hands of the enemies of his Church — lest the Church, founded in the truth of his word, should receive so great a detriment of the truth from her own enemies, and be held in the perpetual error of deception, embracing false things for true. Nor even is it credible that God would have wished to deny to the Church of his beloved Son, after the advent of Christ, that which — before his advent — he had conceded to the Synagogue of the Hebrews: namely, that no one should dare to add to, or take away from, his scriptures — evident miracles being also applied against those who presumed to attempt it. ³ For we read, in Aristeas and Josephus, that certain illustrious men, for this cause, were long afflicted with an adverse state of mind and a languor of body — as Theodorus [Theodectes] and Theopompus: of whom that one, the writer of tragedies, when he wished to refer some things out of the Jewish scripture, in [his own] words, into a certain fable, was deprived of the [light of his] eyes; but this other [Theopompus], when he had begun to translate something out of the divine law into the Greek tongue, was struck by a certain disturbance of mind and soul: whence afterwards, greatly praying to God [to know] why this had befallen him, he received answer through a dream, that he had defiled the divine scriptures. ⁴

To these are added so many labors and vigils of the most ancient fathers of the Church, who by unwearied studies applied themselves that they might leave to us the Hebrew scriptures free from all falsification and from the suspicion of vice — having for this cause bought, at great expense, the most ancient and most emended codices, with which they might compare our exemplars, and, having collated them, might translate [them], emend [them], and expound [them]; lest thereafter the infidels and heretics should be able to reprehend us concerning the falsity of the old scriptures. For "God knows" (says Jerome) "that I have sweated in the erudition of a foreign tongue, lest the Jews should any longer insult his churches concerning the falsity of the scriptures." But if any one should again insist that the old books, which we now use, were falsified after the age of those fathers, we shall respond that this would have been to be feared, were it not that the people of the Jews is widely scattered and widely known — among whom their own codices have always been kept with such great diligence that they could not be vitiated by the Christians. For the Jews are our porters (*geruli*), who carry the books for themselves as a burden, but for us for erudition and faith: so that when a doubt shall arise concerning the sincerity of our codices, it may be removed by the incorrupt faith of the Hebrew volumes. Finally, the irrefragable and perpetual consensus of all the fathers in the reading of the Old Testament takes away every scruple of falsification: for thus, through all the successions of times, the writers and doctors succeeding one another in turn, the old ⁵

¹ Origen, book 8 of the commentary on Isaiah (Orig. lib. 8. com. in Esa); Jerome, book 3 of the commentary on Isaiah (Hier. lib. 3. com. in Esai); Matt. 23.

² Augustine on Psalm 58 (Aug. in Psal. 58); Eusebius, book 8 of the Evangelical Preparation (Eus. li. 8. Ev. praep.).

³ Tertullian in the Apologetic, ch. 18 and 19 (Tertul. in Apolog. cap. 18. & 19); Augustine, book 15 of the City of God, ch. 13 (Aug. lib. 15. de ci. Dei ca. 13); Augustine, book 33 against Faustus, ch. 6 (Aug. li. 33. co. Faustus c. 6).

⁴ Augustine, book 2 of On Christian Doctrine, ch. 14 (Aug. li. 2. de doct. Christ. c. 14); Aristeas, in the book on the Seventy interpreters (Aristeas in libr. de LXX interp.); Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 1 (Iosephus l. 11. ant. cap. 1).

⁵ Jerome in the preface to Isaiah (Hie. in praef. Esaiiae); Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 10 and ch. 14 (Augu. lib. 13. co. Fau. c. 10. & cap. 14).

(printed p. 628 [PDF p. 633] — *Heresy II: the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS* (1–3, objection 3 running on to the next page).)

[the writers and doctors, succeeding one another in turn,] read the old books just as we now read [them], and always cited the same sentences, and with the same words, which we now use in our codices — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. From these, therefore, and from very many other [things] which, on this argument, we set down in the preceding volume [Book VII], in the confutation of the first heresy, the scriptures of the Old instrument are freed from all suspicion of falsification.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. That for many ages now — as much among the Christians as among the Hebrews — the scriptures of the old instrument have been corrupted, and on that account [are] various, and even dissonant among themselves, is convinced from the multitude of the mutually discrepant translations of the old testament. For there are the translations of the Seventy interpreters, and of Aquila, and of Symmachus, and of Theodotion; and, besides these, three others, which are called the Fifth, the Sixth, and the Seventh; and after these also an Eighth, which is believed [to be] of Jerome — so various among themselves, and conflicting, that one of these contains more [things], another fewer, another diverse [things] and perversely transposed, another things contrary not only in words but also in the senses pertaining to faith, and things repugnant to the other editions: which indeed is by no means to be believed to have happened by the fault of so many most erudite interpreters, but rather to have befallen out of the diverse variety of the Hebrew exemplars. But since a dissonant variety never subsists without falsity, it is consequent that the Hebrew codices — whence so manifold a discord of the interpreters arose — were not only various, but even vitiated and falsified.

2. This also argues that the context of the old testament was, by the succession of times, changed from its ancient sincerity: that in the Hebrew codices of our age all the narration of scripture, from beginning even to end, is extended in prose alone; nor in them does there scarcely remain even one of the so many songs (*carmina*) with which many old books are handed down to have been written. For Jerome testifies — in the preface to the Chronicle of Eusebius, in the preface to the book of Kings, and in the preface to Isaiah — that very many Psalms, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and many other [things] of diverse kind of meter, are contained in them. And in the preface to the book of Job he writes that the same book is composed in hexameter verses, running by dactyl and spondee, intermingled sometimes with certain ringing and sweet rhythms; and that there are, in the sacred volumes, various kinds of songs, such as are in the poems of our Virgil and Horace, and of the Greek Pindar and Alcaeus — of which [kinds] the Psalter, and the Lamentations, and almost all the canticles of the scriptures consist. The same [Jerome], writing to Paula of the City [Paula Urbica], adds that the last part of the book of Proverbs is closed with an alphabet [acrostic], which is reckoned by iambic tetrameter; but the Lamentations, with a fourfold alphabet, of which the second, third, and fourth are written in Sapphic meter, out of three little verses, always with a heroic comma [clausula], or concluded by an Adonic [colon]. Eusebius likewise, of Caesarea, in book 10 of the Evangelical Preparation, affirms that there are found in the old testament most artful songs — as the great Cantic of Moses, and David's hundred-and-eighteenth Psalm, composed in heroic verse, and many other songs, trimeter and tetrameter, most elegantly ¹ composed, as far as pertains to diction. Josephus also, in the second book of the Hebrew Antiquities, writes that Moses, after the passage of the Erythraean [Red] Sea, sang that cantic which now exists, in hexameter verse. But now, in the Hebrew volumes, not even any vestige of this kind appears — whether of heroic or of lyric verses. And, to be silent about the other songs, in the whole old testament you will not find one hexameter woven together after the manner of the Latins or the Greeks, by dactyl and spondee; nor will you find two cola similarly [arranged], which are closed according to the custom of rhythm, either by an equal number of syllables, or by the same termination of the final syllable. Which, since they are none [such] in our exemplars, it remains that we say that the context of the old books, and the

face of the whole narration, was changed, and that ancient sublimity of songs brought down into this humility of prose.

3. It makes to this [argument] also the testimony of some of the Latins, of the Greeks, and of illustrious Hebrew authors, who affirm that the Hebrew codices were of old depraved by the Hebrews themselves. Of whose number Justin the Philosopher and Martyr — a thousand four hundred years ago — writing against Trypho, shows that the Jews, in hatred of Christ, cut away and took away many prophetic testimonies from the holy scriptures. Origen, in Homily 12 on Jeremiah, writes that the Jews falsified their own exemplars, especially in the book of Jeremiah, where, for that which was read, "The **sin** (*Peccatum*) of Juda is written," etc., they themselves — unwilling to confess themselves sinners — put, for "the sin of Juda," "their sin."² Jerome also, in the commentaries on the third chapter to the Galatians, expounding that saying, "**Cursed** (*Maledictus*) [is] every one who shall not have remained in all the things which are written in the book of the law," says that in the exemplars of the Hebrews of his time those two words, "ALL" (*Omnis*) and "ALL [things]" (*Omnibus*), were lacking; and that he held it uncertain whether the Seventy interpreters had added them, or whether in the old Hebrew they were so [present] and afterward were deleted by the Jews; but that he was led into the suspicion of believing those particles to have been removed by the Jews — partly, lest the Hebrews should seem to be under the curse, [as being] not able to keep the things which are written; partly because Paul, a man of Hebrew skill and most learned in the law of the Lord, would never have brought them forth unless they were had in the Hebrew volumes; partly because, in his time, in the Hebrew, in the volumes of the Samaritans, there was found written *chal* [Hebrew כָּל], which is to be interpreted "ALL" (*Omnes*), or "ALL [things]" (*Omnibus*).³ Similarly, that which is read in Deuteronomy, "**Cursed** (*Maledictus*) by God [is] every one who hangeth upon a tree," Jerome judges to have been falsified in the same place by the Hebrews — unto the ignominy of Christ, as much in the Hebrew as in our codices — two particles being interposed, "BY GOD" (*A Deo*) and "EVERY ONE" (*Omnis*): namely, that they might brand infamy upon the Christians, who would believe in Christ [as] cursed by God. Of which thing Jerome brought no slight indication: that in the old testament in no place is it written that any one is cursed by God; and wherever a curse (*maledictio*) is placed, never is the name of God found joined [to it]. Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, likewise, bishop, in the preface of his enarrations on the psalms, writes that the Hebrews, Arabs, and Chaldees did not of old have either vowels or points in their letters⁴

¹ ch. 8 (Cap. 8); Deut. 32.

² Book 4, ch. 12 (Lib. 4. c. 12).

³ Gal. 3.

⁴ Deut. 27 (Deut. 27 — so printed; the "cursed is he that hangeth on a tree" is Deut. 21:23).

(printed p. 629 [PDF p. 634] — *Heresy II: objections 3 concluded and 4 (the "Tikkun Sopherim" argument, with Hebrew examples); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins.*)

[the Hebrews, Arabs, and Chaldees did not of old have vowels or points in their letters,] but [that] all sacred scripture was written by Esdras [Ezra] without vowels and without points; but that the Rabbis of the Jews, after the conversion of Constantine the Great, in place of the vowels invented points, and, according to their own human senses, perverted sacred scripture — and this especially in those places where manifest mysteries lay hidden, either concerning Christ or concerning the Church. Whence he also concludes that no faith is to be given to the scriptures of the Hebrews [as] thus written by points, and interpreted.

4. But what need is there of external testimonies, when the Hebrews themselves spontaneously confess that their volumes have now, for many ages, been corrupted? — that is, from the very destruction of the city of Jerusalem, but especially when Nabuzardan [Nebuzaradan], prefect of the king of the Assyrians (as is had in the fourth [book] of the volume of Kings), set fire to the house of the Lord, and the house of the king, and burned all the houses of Jerusalem: then those sacred and authentic volumes, which were kept in public

places, were all consumed by the fire, nor could they ever afterward be restored to their pristine sincerity — although many endeavored to do this, certain particular codices, which had remained among some of uncertain authority, being collated together with one another.¹ Witnesses of this thing are very many of the Rabbis, and among others David Kimhi (*Kimki*), whose opinion a great number of the Rabbis follows. He, in the exposition of the third book of Kings, and in the preface to the Prophets, thus speaks: "In the first captivity the exemplars were corrupted, and they drew out [readings] from one exemplar thus, and from another otherwise. And where they could not clearly have the [right] sense, they wrote one word (*dictionem*) within the context, and another at the margin. The exemplars also perished, and were pulled apart; and, the wise men dying who held the sense of scripture, these who were of the great synagogue endeavored to restore the law to its own antiquity; and, finding dissensions in the exemplars, they gave faith to the more numerous exemplars agreeing [together]. But where they could not have clear cognition, they wrote one word without points, or wrote [it] in the margin and not within the context."² These [things] R. David [Kimhi]. But the Thalmudists, almost all, in the Thalmudic books frequently make mention of a certain correction of the old testament, which of old their Rabbis used in emending the text of holy scripture — which תיקון סופרים (*Tikun sophrim*), that is, "the Correction of the wise scribes," they call [it]; according to which the scribes, even before Christ was born, changed certain things in the books of the law and the prophets — now distinguishing the scripture by certain points, now placing other [words] in the margins, which, in place of those that were written in the context, might, for the sake of urbanity and modesty, be read more honestly and more decently: as, for *coire cum concubina* [to lie with a concubine], "*iacere cum illa*" [to lie with her]; and, for "human dung" (*humano stercore*), "evacuation" (*egestionem*). For the sake of which thing, sometimes also that which was written by the prophet they, erasing, put in its place that which they themselves judged more decorous for scripture. Whence it came to pass that a sense far diverse from the Prophet's meaning emerged. Of which thing the witness is Prochetus [Porchetus], a most diligent observer of the Hebrew volumes, in the first book of the *Victory against the Hebrews*, indicating that of old, at the foot (*in calce*) of the first chapter of Malachi, was written אותי (*'othi*), that is, "me"; in whose place the scribes substituted אותו (*'otho*), that is, "him," or "that one" — from which it follows that where we now read, according to the correction of the scribes, "**Behold**, [ye have brought] of your labor, and you have blown *it* away" (*Ecce de labore vestro, & exufflastis illum*), there it was once said by the prophet, "**Behold**, of your labor, and you have blown *me* away, saith the Lord" (*Ecce de labore vestro, & exufflastis me, dicit dominus*) — or "you have afflicted, vexed, or made *me* to expire, saith the Lord."³ Similarly, that which we now read in Micah, first chapter, "**In** the house of dust, sprinkle yourselves with dust" (*In domo pulveris, pulvere aspergite vos*), "roll thyself" (*involve te*) — according to another translation, this (says R. Scelomo [Shelomo]) is a correction of the scribes, who, making the points, corrected [it], and said חתפלשתי (*chit palascithi*), that is, "**ROLL YOURSELVES**" (*Involve*), where by Micah it had been written התפלשׁ (*hith palasci*), that is, "**ROLL ME**" (*Involve me*); for thus in the Prophet it was written: "In the house of dust, sprinkle *me* [with] dust."⁴ Likewise, that which we now read in Osee [Hosea], the ninth [chapter], "**In my departure** [from them]" (*In recessu meo*), or "my departure," or "When I shall have departed from them" — R. Scelomo and R. Kimhi say that it is read [thus] according to the correction of the scribes, namely בשורי מהם (*bessuri mechem*), that is, "**IN MY DEPARTURE FROM THEM**" (*In recessu meo*) — whereas the true text of the Prophet once had בשורי מהם (*besuri mechem*) [pointed otherwise], that is, "**MY INCARNATION [is] to them**" (*Incarnatio mea eis*). The sense of which sentences, as we now have [it] according to the text corrected by the scribes, differs greatly from the sense of those sentences which the first [original] scripture once had — in which the Son of God, speaking through those prophets, designated the mystery ("according to you") of [his] future incarnation: [he] whom you now say to have, in the house of dust, sprinkled himself with dust, when he put on the dust of our flesh — [he] whom the Jews afflicted and made to expire. These, and very many other [things], Rabbi Scelomo, R. Kimhi, R. Simon, and R. Iohannam [Yohanan] testify to have been of old corrected by the scribes; whose example of scribes the later Rabbis, imitating, did the same, and persuaded their disciples to do the same — as R. Iohannam, out of the opinion of

R. Simeon, said in the book Ievamoth [the tractate Yevamot]: "It is good that thou pluck out one letter from the law, and [that] ן [*Chet*] be pronounced in public." These [things] Prochetus. From all these [things], therefore, it is manifest that the old books were falsified by the correction — or rather the corruption — of the scribes.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS (*Dissolutio Obiectionum*)

1. So foolish is the hypothesis on which the argument of the Anabaptists leans, that nothing [is] more foolish. For the diversity of translations can arise not from that sole cause which they themselves adduce, but from many others — as from the varied talent (*ingenium*) and judgment of the interpreters, or sometimes [their] inexperience, or negligence, or even malice: by all of which it happens that interpretations of the same scripture frequently differ among themselves, and in many [places]. It can also happen that editions of diverse interpreters, which before agreed among themselves, afterward differ among themselves as much as possible — whether by the carelessness, or ignorance, or fraud of the writers and copyists (*librarii*), who copied them perversely from emended and sincere exemplars: as, in all the editions of the old testament put forth before the times of Jerome, it came to pass that individual [copies] differed from individual [copies], as much on account of the writers as on account of the variety of the interpreters — from which

¹ ch. 25 [4 (2) Kings 25] (Cap. 25).

² ch. 13 (Cap. 13).

³ ch. 15 (Cap. 15); Mal. 1.

⁴ Mal. 1; Micah 1 (Mich. 1).

(printed p. 630 [PDF p. 635] — *Heresy II: Dissolution of the Objections, refutations 1 (concluded), 2 (the Hebrew poetic meters), and 3 (begun).*)

some prudently, some malignly, some through ignorance, changed many things, or kept silent, or added. Prudently, indeed, the Seventy interpreters kept silent about many things — both lest they should betray the secrets of the faith to the heathen, and give what is holy to dogs; and because they did not fully understand many things, being interpreters before the advent of Christ: and the things which they did not understand, or omitted, or brought forth with doubtful sentences, [they did] so, the divine Spirit working in them, who — for [reason of] time and place — willed the forms of the mysteries to be covered over (*obtectas*) in the scriptures, so that the manifestation of them might be reserved to the Evangelists and apostles, Christ being manifested. But maliciously, indeed, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and very many other Judaizing and heretical translators, permuted, subtracted, and added many things — whose editions the Church of Christ cast away, content with the sole edition of the Seventy interpreters down to the times of Jerome. Many things also, through inexperience and negligence, the drowsy copyists (*librarii*), copying perversely the things which had been well edited, perverted. Whence, all these causes concurring into one, it came to pass that, from one and the same fountain of Hebrew truth, so great a variety of editions and of codices emanated. Concerning the diversity of these editions — and how and when the Church used them — we shall speak more fully at the end of this work, when we shall treat of the editions of holy scripture.¹

2. But concerning the diverse kinds of songs (*carmina*), with which the Anabaptists say that of old very many books of the old instrument were composed — which now among us are read in loosed [prose] speech — either they lie most impudently, or they are most imprudently deceived out of ignorance of Hebrew poesy: just as of old, for a like cause, Julian the apostate deceived himself, accusing Eusebius of Caesarea, [saying] that he had falsely persuaded [men] that many species of songs are found in the holy scriptures. Yet it is nearer the truth that the unskilled heretics are deceived from ignorance. For since they have neither skill of the Hebrew arts, nor have considered the words of Jerome, they think that those hexameters, and trimeters, and tetrameters, which Jerome, Eusebius, and Josephus commemorate, are of the same kind with the songs of

our poets, and consist of the same quality of feet, quantity, and disposition — because Jerome said that among the Hebrews there are verses running by spondee and dactyl: which words the unlearned Anabaptists do not understand.² For neither is Jerome's similitude to be understood thus — that the verses of the Hebrews are in all respects like to the songs of the Greeks and Latins — but in this part only: that that very ancient poesy of the Hebrews has, just as ours [does], not only many feet like to ours, apt for making songs (namely dactyls, spondees, iambs, and many others), but also several kinds of songs — hexameter, trimeter, tetrameter, and others of this sort — which proceed with an equal number of feet as our hexameters and trimeters, but differ from ours by the varied quality, position, and order of the feet: because the hexameters of the Hebrews often receive, among the dactyls and spondees, also other feet, the order of the feet in which among us they are wont to be placed being also varied. For frequently (as Jerome says) the hexameters of the Hebrews,³ on account of the property of the tongue, receive other feet besides the dactyl and the spondee — not of the same syllables, but of the same times [durations]. The Hebrews also, against the custom of our poets, interpose in their songs certain unusual rhythms, which (as Jerome says) the simple reader cannot understand, but only one most skilled in the metric art. Wherefore let not the Anabaptists wonder if in the old testament they have not found rhythms like to ours, and having an equal number of syllables, and recurring [each] into the same final syllable after a certain compass of verses — since not even among us do the several kinds of rhythms retain the same number of syllables and the same endings of songs: but some (as is in use among the Etruscans [the Tuscans]) consist of eleven syllables, accommodated to chanting heroic [verse]; others of seven syllables, most apt for odes to be modulated to the lyre, and most delightful; others of twelve syllables, always ending in a dactyl, hurried and slippery, wonderfully serving the stage; and out of all these rhythms, again, others⁴ — among the Etruscan poets — always keep the law of rhythm, closed by the similitude of the final syllables; but others, loosed from that law, and the similitude of the final syllables being neglected, are moved [along] — whence they are called "loosed" rhythms. So, therefore, in the Hebrew divine scriptures there are many kinds of such rhythms and verses, whose canons and measures to narrate now would be long and superfluous. But if any one is held by desire of them, let him read the Hebrew poets, and among others Rabbi Scelomo, surnamed Gabirol [Ibn Gabirol], an eminent poet among his own, and the poem of Rabbi Iosephi Hyssopaeus, written in iambic song, which is inscribed "The Silver Dish" (*Scutella argentea*): among which two [poets] he will find almost all the aforesaid songs. But why the sacred interpreters, in translating the divine letters, did not keep the laws of the Hebrew songs, Augustine, in the epistle to Memorius the bishop, assigns the cause in these words: "For neither did the interpreter wish to express the [metrical] numbers out of the Hebrew tongue, lest he should be compelled, by the necessity of meter, to digress from the truth of interpreting further than the reason of the sentences [meaning] allowed: yet I believe the Davidic Psalms consist of certain measures. For that holy man loved pious music, and himself kindled us to those studies more than any other author."

3. But as much as pertains to the testimonies of the fathers which indicate that the old books were of old falsified, we freely confess that they were, in some places, depraved by certain Jews; but we do not believe such a depravation to have been of such moment but that it could easily be emended by Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and the other fathers skilled in the Hebrew tongue — a collation being made with the other most ancient exemplars of the Hebrews: both because very few were those places corrupted by the Jews, and because the corruption of those same places was not so universal that, in all the exemplars of the Hebrews at once — dispersed over the whole globe of lands — the selfsame places and the selfsame words should be corrupted (divine providence of Christ not permitting this, lest the Church, his spouse, should be defrauded of the truth of the divine scripture). Wherefore, since the corruption of the old scripture was neither universal nor great, easily, out of the more numerous codices in which the integral

¹ Jerome in the preface to the Pentateuch and to Isaiah, and in the Apology against Rufinus (Hier. in praefat. Pentat. & Esaiae, & in Apol. contra Ruff.); Jerome in the preface to Job (Hier. in praefac. Iob); Irenaeus, book 3, ch. 24 (Irenaeus lib. 3 cap. 24); Jerome in the prologue to Paralipomenon [Chronicles] and in the prologue to the four Gospels (Hier. in prol. Paral. & in prol. 4. eua.).

² Book 1, heresy 4 (Lib. 1. haer. 4); Cyril, book 7 against Julian (Cyrill. lib. 7. advers. Iulia.).

³ Jerome in the preface to Job (Hier. in praefac. Iob).

⁴ The variety of Etruscan song (Hetrusci carminis varietas).

(printed p. 631 [PDF p. 636] — *Heresy II concluded (refutation 4, with Jacob ben Chayyim's rebuttal)*; then *Heresy III opens: Of the books of the Mosaic law.*)

[out of the more numerous codices in which the] integral [text] had remained — [those] which in others had been vitiated — the Hebrew reading could be restored to its pristine sincerity; and in very fact it was restored by Jerome and other erudite fathers. Whence it is foolish, and without reason, to wish now to assert that the Hebrew codices were of old falsified in those places in which all the codices of all the Hebrews — as much the recent as the ancient — agree. Neither does the addition of vowel-points, made by the Jews, derogate anything from the perpetual sincerity of the divine volumes. For although now the Hebrews, points being added beneath the consonants, may interpret otherwise, and understand the scripture otherwise than they ought, yet they cannot, by this addition of points, so universally deprave and contaminate that [scripture] that it does not always retain its old integrity; for, the points of the Rabbis being removed, it is necessary that the old scripture always remain, with its radical and servile letters, in its purity, integral and incorrupt. Although (that I may confess the truth) it has never befallen me to see any volume of the Hebrews in which the points added to the consonants so rendered the signification of the words diverse from that ancient signification and sense which they had in the time of Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, that from that diversity anything absurd should follow in those [things] which pertain to the dogmas of our faith.

4. To the last [argument], which they adduce concerning the תיקון סופרים (*Tikun sophrim*), it pleases [me] to respond nothing else, except that we do not receive the portentous testimonies of the Thalmudic volumes — inasmuch as [they are the testimonies] of those books which are full of every lie, contumely, and blasphemy, not only against Christ, whom they themselves hold for an enemy, but also against God the creator of heaven and earth, whom the Jews alone confess themselves to worship: which [books] also have been damned by the public decree of the whole Church, and, through all the cities of the Christians, in recent years have been burned in the midst of the marketplace. Whose testimony even if we should receive, nevertheless the Anabaptists would obtain nothing thence for the defense of their cause. For the individual [things] which the *Sophrim* — that is, the scribes — are said to have erased are, in many and authentic Hebrew commentaries, annotated, and diligently handed down to memory. Out of which annotations (as has already often been seen, and can still be seen) all the things which were erased by the scribes in the Hebrew exemplars, which now exist in the whole world, have been restored down to the least jot or apex; and the Jews themselves damn the opinion of those who dared, among them, to say that the sacred books were at some time corrupted. Whence Jacob Benhaym [ben Chayyim], of the kingdom of Thunetum [Tunis], reproving the aforesaid opinion of R. Kimhi introduced by the heretics, writes against it in this manner: "The opinion of those is far from me; for I cannot be led to believe, and confess with [my] lips, that Ezra the scribe found the book of the divine law, and the books of the prophets, doubtful, corrupted, and confused. Nay rather, this is my opinion: that Ezra and his colleagues found the sacred Bible integral and unharmed; and that Ezra, by his own judgment, recognized which books were written by that excellent wisdom [inspiration], and why certain letters should be written, but certain [others] not — why also certain extraneous words (*dictiones*) were written; and he left them in the very text as they were written, adding in the margin, as it were, a gloss which might explain the nature of the extraneous word." These [things] R. Jacob [ben Chayyim]. From which the delirious trifles of the Anabaptists are exploded.

OF THE BOOKS OF THE MOSAIC LAW — Heresy III (*De Libris Mosaicae legis. Haeresis III*)

Whosoever [would] repudiate the books of the Mosaic law.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The **Ptolemaeite** heretics, who descend from Ptolemaeus the Gnostic, of the sect of the Valentinians (as Epiphanius writes), damned these books, because they believed that the things which are contained in them are not from the good God, but composed by three diverse authors: namely, one part of them by God the maker of this world, who was middle between the good God and the devil; another part by Moses, according to his own mind, and not according to the will of God; a third by the elders of the Jews, devised according to their own talent. But the Manichaeans, far more iniquitous, affirm that they reject those books for this reason: that from the beginning even to the end they were dictated by the evil God of the Hebrews, and were stuffed by his sons, the Jews, with every turpitude and foulness — [the Jews] who, in order to cover those foulnesses, inserted into them a few certain words of that natural law which the good God impressed upon human minds, so that — as if by a veil and a mist of divine words superinduced — they might conciliate faith and authority to their own books. And Faustus, and the Anonymous disciple of Fabritius, collected, for the subversion of these books, whatsoever Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, and the other enemies of the sacred volumes barked out against the divine law.¹

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Already, in those things which were said above at the beginning of this book, we have sufficiently confuted the present insanity of the heretics, showing that the whole scripture of the old testament emanated from the good God, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ — by whom its writers, inspired, committed to those letters only those things which the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, suggested. Wherefore there is no need that we repeat here again the same things, or things like to the same.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. "We," say the Ptolemaeites, "do not receive the books of Moses as divine: because we know that they were written not according to the mind of the good and perfect God, but partly according to [the will] of men, partly according to the will of the middle God. And first, that that law which is called the Decalogue, engraved on the twin tablets, is not from the good and perfect God, appears [thus]: because the works of the perfect God are perfect; but this [law] is imperfect, and needing completion — for the fulfilling and consummating of whose perfection our Savior testified that he had come. It appears also that there is in these books a certain other legislation, brought not by God, but by Moses, which he dictated following not the will of God but his own understanding, the perfect law of God"²

¹ Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Augustine, book 23 against Faustus, ch. 2 (Aug. lib. 23. co. Faust. c. 2).

² Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Deut. 31; Matt. 5 (Matth. 5).

(printed p. 632 [PDF p. 637] — Heresy III: the objections continue — the Ptolemaeite objection concluded, then the Manichaean catalogue of alleged unworthy things in Genesis and the Law (objections 2–14); then the Diluting of the Objections begins.)

[dictating] the perfect law of God [otherwise], permuting [it] according to the debility and necessity of those who were pressed by the grave burden of the divine law: lest, while they could not keep it, being driven by desperation, they should precipitate themselves into every injustice. As when, from himself, he gave a law of repudiation [divorce] contrary to the divine law, on account of the hardness of the people; so that, if they could not keep the divine [law] which says, "**What** God hath joined, let not man separate," they might not forthwith be turned to raging unto the slaughter of the wife, but might have a refuge to repudiation as to a lighter fault: which Christ testifies, saying, "**Moses**, on account of the hardness of your heart, permitted [you] to dismiss the wife; but from the beginning it was not so. For God said: **They** shall be two in one flesh; what therefore God hath joined, let not man separate." Again, certain other laws and traditions of the elders are

found wrapped up in these books, against which our Savior is carried [inveighs], the testimony of Isaiah being applied, saying: "**God** says, Honor thy father and thy mother; but you have said (he says, speaking to the elders), whatsoever gift is from me [shall be] turned to thy profit — hypocrites! rightly did Isaiah [prophecy] of you: In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men; for you have made void the commandment of God for your traditions." These [things] Ptolemaeus, in the epistle to Flora. ¹

2. But the **Manichaeans** — among whom Faustus and the anonymous disciple of Fabritius — add that they do not receive the books of Moses, because in them, from the beginning even to the end, are read [things] unworthy of the good God and of his son Christ, [things] destroying piety and morals. And first of all, in the very vestibule of Genesis, Moses describes a certain God turned [busied] in darkness from eternity, saying that darkness was before light was created, and that God walked over the waters beset with darkness through the night, before he made light. ²

3. He describes also God wondering at the aspect of the unwonted light, and stupefied — and so much [so that], not knowing before what light was, when he first had seen it, then he judged it best. ³

4. He shows [him] also **malevolent**, who prohibited man from taking the food of the knowledge of good and evil — that is, prudence, by which alone human life seems able to be sustained: as if he had wished him to be equal to the cattle that know not these things; whereas he [the serpent], whom he had made superior to the beasts, had denied this [to man], by which alone man surpasses the beasts. ⁴

5. But he makes the **serpent** better, or stronger, than God himself: better, indeed, because, by alluring man to the food of prudence, he made [him] like to God — as God himself is witness, saying, "**Behold**, Adam is made as one of us, knowing good and evil"; but stronger, because he was able to deceive and conquer man, whom God had made. ⁵

6. He makes God also either **ignorant** of the future, when he commanded that precept [to Adam] which he did not know whether Adam would keep; or **imprudent**, when he commanded that which he knew Adam would not keep. ⁶

7. **Improvident** likewise, when — man lying hidden in a corner of paradise after his nakedness was recognized — as though he could not see him, he sought [him] with clamors, saying, "**Adam**, where art thou?"

8. Nor less **envious** than fearful, when he armed an angel with a fiery lance (*framea*) for the guarding of paradise, fearing lest perhaps our first parents — who, by the benefit of the serpent, had already been made participants of prudence — should again return into paradise, and taste of the tree of life, whence in future they might enjoy immortality, even himself [God] being unwilling. ⁷

9. He describes also God as **desirous of blood and fat**, when — out of every kind of sacrifices, as if greedy of flesh and entrails — he commands [them] to be offered to himself. ⁸

10. Likewise **jealous** (*zelantem*), bearing [it] ill and laboring with jealousy, while to other gods, of whom he is jealous, [are offered] the same things which he forbids to be offered to himself.

11. **Wrathful**, moreover, threatening, and truculent, and unjust; since so often he is angry, now against his own, now against strangers, destroying so many thousands of men on account of certain slight [things], or no crime committed — threatening that he will come with a devouring sword, and will spare no one, neither the just nor the unjust.

12. Nor only with contumelies of this kind did Moses treat his own God, but — what is more execrable — Christ the son of God, who for the cause of our salvation hung upon the wood, he lacerated with a dire reproach of [religious] devotion [i.e. a curse], pronouncing that every one is cursed who hung upon the wood; who — whether willing, or by chance, he did it — is in neither [case] to be excused. For if unwilling he

cursed Christ, it is agreed that he was not divine, nor a prophet; but if willing, and not ignorant of these future things, he was certainly envious of our salvation, which was to be from the wood, in whose author [Christ] he drew forth the poison of his maledicent mouth. Which reproach touches also all the just and the martyrs, as many as died by a like exit of passion — as Peter and Andrew, and the rest of the same lot: for neither does he say that they are cursed among the common [people] only, that is, among men only, but cursed by God.⁹

13. For so also he pursues all the boys [children] of God, and the virgins, with a like [religious] devotion [curse], saying that every one is cursed who has not raised up seed in Israel. Which reproach principally touches Christ, who, sprung (as is said) from the Jews, nevertheless raised up no offspring for the sake of a posterity to be preserved among them. Then also his disciples, some of whom he [Christ] separated from wives, whom he had found joined [married], and some he forbade to be joined, whom he apprehended untouched [chaste].¹⁰

14. Besides these things, Moses also extinguished all hope of the future resurrection in men, who pronounced the soul to be mortal, and said it to be blood, when he wrote: "The **soul** of all flesh is the blood."¹¹

THE DILUTING OF THE OBJECTIONS (*Dilutio Obiectorum*)

1. The rash Ptolemaeus contentiously asserted that the books of the law have something from the middle God, something from Moses, something from the elders; yet he cannot anywhere show, from the holy scriptures which he is ignorant of, that the whole law of Moses is not from the best and most perfect God. Which [law], although it was not perfect in every part, and needed a fulfilling made through Christ, nevertheless — according to the distribution of those times and the disposition of persons, as much as its office befitted — was perfect, suiting the rude and carnal people, whom it, as it were a pedagogue, led [down] to Christ the teacher of perfection, for whose sake that law was given to Moses: [Moses] who never commanded or wrote anything in his books outside the will of God. Neither [did he ordain] an inseparable [bond] of marriage¹²

¹ Deut. 24; Matt. 19; Matt. 15; Exod. 20; Mark 7 (Mar. 7); Isaiah 29 (Esa. 29).

² From Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. lib. 22. con. Faust. cap. 14).

³ In the same place (Ibidem); Gen. 1.

⁴ Gen. 3; from Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. con. adu. leg. lib. 1. cap. 14); Julian the apostate, in Cyril, book 3 against Julian (Iulian. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 3. co. Iul.).

⁵ From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 15 (Ex Aug. co. adu. leg. li. 1. cap. 15); Gen. 3.

⁶ From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 1, ch. 14 (Ex Aug. con. adu. leg. li. 1. cap. 14); Gen. 2; book 22 against Faustus, ch. 4 (lib. 22. con. Faust. cap. 4); Gen. 3.

⁷ In the same place, ch. 4, and Julian the apostate in Cyril, book 3 against Julian (Ibid. c. 4. & Iulian. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 3. co. Iul.); Gen. 3.

⁸ In the same place (Ibidem); Exod. 20; in the same place, and Julian the apostate in Cyril, book 4 (Ibid. & Iul. apost. apud Cyrill. lib. 4); Ezek. 21.

⁹ From Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. lib. 14. con. Faust. cap. 1); Deut. 27.

¹⁰ In the same place, ch. 1 (Ibidem cap. 1); Exod. 23; Deut. 7; Deut. 28.

¹¹ From Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 6 (Ex Aug. co. adu. leg. li. 2. cap. 6); Lev. 17.

¹² Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Gal. 4; Augustine against Faustus, book 9, ch. 26 (Aug. contra Faust. lib. 9. cap. 26).

(printed p. 633 [PDF p. 638] — *Heresy III: the Diluting of the Objections (refutations 1 concluded, through 8 begun).*)

[nor did he command that] the union of marriage, instituted by God, be dissolved — although he brought [made] a law about giving a bill of repudiation. For *repudium* (divorce) is one thing, and a bill of repudiation another: repudiation is a permission; to give a bill [of divorce] is a precept. Moses did not say, "**Whoever** shall wish, let him dismiss the wife" — which would be contrary to the law of God — but, "**If anyone** shall dismiss [her], let him not dismiss [her] unless a bill of repudiation be first given": so that, namely, by the interposed delay, the mind — [being] headlong into dissension — might, broken by the writing-out of the

bill, desist, and might think what evil it is to dismiss a wife; and, by the wisdom and piety of the judges (*praesides*), before whom he was bound to read the bill, [the husband] might be recalled to conjugal concord. But if so much hatred intervened that it could not be extinguished and emended, then he permitted a divorce to be made — knowing that a man would not, without cause, dismiss a wife whom he so hated. All the legislation of Moses, therefore, is from God, nor are there in it any traditions of the elders mixed in. For the traditions of which the Savior spoke are altogether outside the law, and are (as we have already said) the fourfold expositions of the Jews — namely of R. Moses, R. Akiba, R. Juda, and of the sons of Asomonaeus [the Hasmoneans]. And that Christ understood these [traditions], his speech openly shows, when he says: "**If anyone** shall say to his father, Korban [Corban], that is, [it is] a gift, etc." — which words, since they are found nowhere in the books of Moses, it is consequent that Christ spoke of the traditions of the elders, which are outside the law.¹

2. But as much as pertains to the calumnies of the Manichaeans, we respond: first, that although light was not upon the face of the abyss before God created light, God was nevertheless not busied (*versabatur*) in darkness before he made light. For there was not lacking, before this temporal and visible light, another eternal and inaccessible light in which God dwelt — namely God himself, in whom there are no darknesses. This light God inhabited from eternity, alone sufficient to himself for perpetual light. Accordingly, when the Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters still beset with darkness, and cherished them by his own power, he did not lie hidden in the darkness as [one] destitute of light, but in the most clear light — namely, in his very self — he remained.²

3. But as to what they calumniate — that God wondered [was astonished] — that is neither written, nor does it follow from the things which are written. For it is read: "**And** God saw the light, that it was good" — which words show God rather [as] the approver of the light created by himself, than the admirer of an unexpected light. But even if the old scripture had said that God wondered, nothing absurd would thence be suffered [i.e. follow], since also in the new testament we read that Christ — whom the Manichaeans confess to be God — the faith of the centurion having been heard, wondered [marveled]: not because he saw anything beyond expectation when he first saw [it] in the centurion, but as [one who] approved that that which he had already before foreknown as future ought so to be done.³

4. Now, indeed, to that calumny of malevolence we respond, that the discernment of good and evil is twofold: one through science [knowledge], which is of the blessed man; the other through experience, which is of the miserable man, and is unhappily learned, and happily not known. For diseases and pains — how much more happily should I not know them? Therefore God, who prohibited man from this unhappy discernment, is to be called not malevolent, but benevolent — just as we would call a physician benevolent who would forbid us⁴ from some food, by which he foreknew that we, having received [it], would sicken; and on that account, from the very event, would call the same food [the food] "of the knowledge of health and of weakness," because through it man, when he had begun to sicken, would recognize by experience what difference there was between contracted ill-health and lost good health — which he certainly would better have been ignorant of, if he had remained in that health which he lost, believing the physician through obedience, not the disease through experience.

5. If, therefore, that knowledge which God forbade to man is miserable, it sufficiently appears that the serpent was not better than God, as the impious triflers blaspheme, but — beyond what can be said — evil and worst, who showed to man so unhappy a knowledge of all evils. Nor are those words, "**Behold**, Adam is made as one of us," words of God affirming [it], but rather of [God] reproaching: just as that [saying] of the Apostle when he says, "**Forgive** (*Donate*) me this injury" — [which] certainly he wishes to be understood from the contrary, if there be present a learned expounder, not an unlearned calumniator. Nor is the serpent therefore stronger than God, because he deceived the man whom God made:⁵ for God would by no means be deceived, if he [man] had not receded from God in [his] heart. Because, therefore, he receded from God,

therefore he was deserted by God, and was conquered by the serpent. But neither did the serpent conquer, since by his very self he is himself deceived and conquered. For as much [as] he who deceived, as he whom he deceived, both are deceived, receding from him who cannot be deceived; and both are conquered, receding from him who cannot be conquered — by whom certainly, whoever recedes more, is conquered more, because he becomes so much the worse, [by] how much the more remote [he is]. And therefore it is necessary that he who seems to conquer by first inflicting evil on another, should himself the more be conquered by losing good; nor can it come to pass that a place should be better for him for whom the cause is worse. And when for a time the devil seemed to have prevailed, man being overcome, even so he is conquered for eternity, man being repaired [restored].

6. But as to that which they proudly deride — that God [was] ignorant of the future — we say that God was not ignorant that man would sin, but at the same time also foreknew, by [his] highest divinity, what of just and good he was going to do concerning the sinner: nor did he institute [that precept] which would be harmful, if man had not wished to harm himself, but rather he instituted that which would profit. Because man would not, without a good reward, have kept obedience, and not without a useful example — that his holy posterity might keep it — [and not without] having paid the penalties of disobedience.⁶ Nor did he will [command] that which [man] could not [do]; for he willed this: that man should be either obedient, or, [if] disobedient, not unpunished. Nor did he will fruitlessly that which man was not going to keep — because the penalty of the contemner taught others to obey.

7. Neither was God improvident, because he asked Adam, lying hidden, where he was: for he therefore asked, that he might convince the man by his own response; although he knew not only where he was, but also what he was going to answer to himself, and willed that these things be answered to himself, so that — the confession of the crime being extorted — he might seem not unjustly to punish him.⁷

8. Similarly, neither is God to be argued of envy, because he did not permit the sinners to enter beyond the gates of paradise to the eating of the vital [life-giving] tree; but [he is] as [one] justly to be praised by merit, who from eternity — [+ knew what] justly

¹ Deut. 24; Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33 (Epiph. lib. 1. haer. 33); Mark 7 (Mar. 7).

² Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, ch. 8 (Aug. lib. 22. co. Faust. cap. 8).

³ Augustine against Faustus, book 22, ch. 13 (Aug. co. Faust. lib. 22. cap. 13); Gen. 1; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. c. 15).

⁴ Gen. 1; Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. c. 15).

⁵ Augustine, book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 15 (Aug. li. 1. co. adu. le. ca. 15); 2 Cor. 12.

⁶ Book 1 against the adversary of the law, ch. 14 (lib. 1. co. adu. leg. cap. 14).

⁷ In the same place, ch. 14 (Ibid. cap. 14).

(printed p. 634 [PDF p. 639] — *Heresy III concluded: the Diluting of the Objections (refutations 8 concluded through 14). It closes: "Thus far concerning the books of the law; now let us pass to the prophetic books."*)

[who from eternity, what] justly had been given to the obedient, justly prohibited to the prevaricators [transgressors]. Just as neither would the Manichaeans say that Christ [is] envious, or fearful, because he did not permit the foolish virgins to enter into his kingdom, the door being shut; but [that he is] just, who did not admit sinners to eternal life.

9. But to think that God is desirous of blood and fat, because he commands the fat and entrails of animals to be offered to himself, is [the mark] of a man ignorant of the divine sacraments [mysteries]. For God did not command these things as [though] he were delighted by the slaughter of animals and the effusion of blood, or fed by their odor, or desired to be satiated with the blood of victims and the vapors of holocausts; but that, by those sacrifices, he might fore-announce to us that true sacrifice which the one true God-priest — the

mediator of God and men — offered to the one true God, whose promissory figures it behooved to be celebrated in the victims of animals, on account of the commendation of the future flesh [of Christ], through which one victim there would be made the remission of the sins contracted from the flesh.¹

10. Nothing, moreover, unworthy of God do [the scriptures] attribute, naming him a "Zealot" — since even in the new testament Christ, the money-changers being cast out of the temple, says of himself: "The **zeal** (*Zelus*) of thy house hath eaten me up." For the zeal of God is not that perturbation of mind by which a husband, troubled by the adultery of a spouse, pines away, but the loving care of conjugal chastity to be conserved, which God is wont to apply, when he admonishes his people as a spouse, lest through many false gods she fornicate; or when he exhorts each one that the chastity which the soul owes to the one God be not, through the false enticements of this world, corrupted and prostituted and defiled. Zeal, therefore, is attributed to God, not according to the anxiety of a livid [envious] perturbation, but according to the most tranquil goodness of [his] benevolence toward us; or according to the property of the Hebrew tongue; or according to the abuse [catachresis] of the word, by which virtues are frequently wont to be called, among all nations, by the word of vices.²

11. The like also is to be thought concerning the anger and fury of God — who, although he can be troubled by no human passions, is nevertheless said to be angry, when he inflicts on our crimes the penalties of due vengeance. His anger also signifies [his] vengeance, whether by some property of the Hebrew tongue, or by the abuse of the word — which is widely applicable in all tongues, when, by the names by which vices are properly denoted, virtues also are named: [as when] they say cunning for prudence, and cupidity for will.³ God, therefore, did not — turbidly, like a human [being] — rage by anger, but retributed [something] just, a divine anger, which is named "anger" not on account of the lust of avenging, but on account of the rigor of vindicating [justice], by a certain use of speech. But as to the thousands of men destroyed on account of certain slight [things], or nothing: if those stolid [men] would expressly commemorate them, we would show [these] to be neither slight nor nothing, but most grave. For what greater impiety can there be, than to oppose the creatures to the creator? or to tempt God? or to murmur against him? or to defect from his worship? or to despair of his providence and aid? — all which things those [people] perpetrated, of whom many thousands are read [to have been] slain in the desert.⁴ Whence God, who threatens that he will spare no one, neither just nor unjust, is neither truculent nor unjust: because — as we [read] — that vine-dresser [God] otherwise prepares the pruning-hook for the branches in the unfruitful [vines], otherwise in the fruitful; the [fruitful] ones, indeed, to be purged,⁵ but those [unfruitful] ones to be cut away — the impious, as branches cut off for burning; but the just he does not spare, for the perfecting of [their] purgation: he spares not the just, nor the sinner — [flogging] that one as a son, [punishing] this one as impious. So, therefore, applying to the just a salutary correction, he is merciful and clement, not truculent and wrathful; but to sinners, retributing due severity on account of [their] sins, he is not unjust, but most just.

12. But now let us see what understanding that [saying] has which the execrable heretics vituperate — [the saying] concerning the curse of [one] hanging on the wood, brought forth by Moses. It is to be known that, just as the tongue and the hand in some manner signify those very parts and members of the body, but in some manner [signify] the works which follow from them — as the speech of men is called "tongue," because it is made through the tongue; and a man's writing is called "hand," because it is made by the hand — so "sin," or "curse" (which is the same), signifies not only that evil work itself, but also, in the holy scriptures, [signifies] death itself: because death is from sin, which is called a "cursed thing."⁶ In which sense Moses called Christ "cursed," because Christ, without guilt, took up death, the punishment of us [who are] cursed. In which sense also Paul called Christ "sin" and "a cursed thing," when he said: "**Him** (*Eum*) who knew not sin, he made sin for us" — that is, the punishment of our sin; and, "He was **made** (*Factus*) a curse for us" — that is, dead for us: for it is the same thing, dead, [as] cursed; because death itself is from the curse, and cursed is every sin.⁷

13. But as to [the claim] that Moses is hostile to continence or virginity because he said, "**Cursed** (*Maledictus*) [is] every one who has not raised up seed in Israel" — let him read Isaiah, crying out in the same spirit: "**Thus** (*Haec*) saith the Lord to all the eunuchs (*spadonibus*) who shall have observed my precepts: I will give to them in my house a place named better than [that] of sons and of daughters; an eternal name will I give to them, and it shall not fail them." Or, if they think Isaiah contrary to Moses, let Moses please them, if Isaiah displeases. This is not of little [weight] against those [heretics]: for it suffices us to know that the one God spoke, both through Moses and through Isaiah; and that, according to the spiritual understanding, cursed is every one who has not left seed in Israel — that is, every one who, according to the measure of his own virtue, has not increased [invested] with the dominical gains [talents], and has not left seed which may see God: that is, who has not had either a son, or a servant, or a neighbor, whom he may teach the fear of God upon the earth. Spiritually, therefore, Moses is to be understood.⁸

14. [Moses] who, indeed, if he had believed the soul to be mortal, would not in another place say: "**Every one** (*Omnis*) who shall have touched the dead — and there shall have been a dead [person in his tent] — and he shall not have been purified, his soul shall be cut off from Israel, because he is still unclean." "**Still**" (*Adhuc*), certainly, he said, even after death, because he is not purified. But he called the soul "blood" not [in respect] of substance, but for the cause of signification — in the manner in which it is said, "The **Rock** (*Petra*) was Christ": not because it was this [literally], but because hence it was signified. Nor did he in vain wish to signify the soul by blood: because, just as blood in our body has the principate [rules] more than the other humors, so the soul invisibly prevails over all the [parts] of which we consist. Thus far concerning the books of the law; now let us pass on to the prophetic books.⁹

¹ In the same place, ch. 17 (Ibid. cap. 17).

² Book 22 against Faustus, ch. 18 (lib. 22. co. Faust. ca. 18); Psalm 68 (Psal. 68).

³ In the same place, ch. 18 (Ibid. cap. 18).

⁴ In the same place, ch. 19 (Ibid. cap. 19).

⁵ In the same place, ch. 20 (Ibid. cap. 20); Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 3 and 4 (Aug. lib. 14. co. Faust. c. 3 & 4).

⁶ Deut. 27.

⁷ 2 Cor. 5 (2. Cor. 5); Gal. 3.

⁸ Augustine, book 14 against Faustus, ch. 13, and in the Questions on the Old and New Testament, question 17 (Aug. lib. 14. con. Faust. ca. 13, et in quaest. vet. & nov. test. quae. 17); Isaiah 56 (Esa. 56).

⁹ Augustine against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 6 (Aug. co. adu. le. li. 2. c. 6); Num. 19; Lev. 17; 1 Cor. 10.

(printed p. 635 [PDF p. 640] — *Heresy III opens: Of the prophetic books. Title, Assertores, objections 1–4, and the Diluting of the Objections (1–2 begun).*)

OF THE PROPHETIC BOOKS — Heresy III (*De Libris Prophetis. Haeresis III*)

That the books of the Prophets have nothing in themselves for the sake of which they ought to be received.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

And this also is a heresy of the Manichaeans, which before the rest Faustus, and the Anonymous disciple of Fabritius, defended. With these a certain Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Theodorus Mopsuestites*) seems to consent, who — as is read in the Acts of the Fifth Synod — asserted that nothing is contained in the prophets which is evidently pronounced concerning Christ, but that our elders drew, out of their own will, to Christ those things which had been said of other matters; for which heresy he was deservedly condemned in the Fifth Synod. But that in all the prophets there are innumerable prophecies, presages, and oracles concerning Christ — to whom, as Peter says, all the prophets give testimony — and moreover many examples of honest life; and that, for this cause, their books are exceedingly necessary to us, as much for the truth and firmness of faith as for living well and justly: [all this] we have abundantly proved above from the authority of the

new testament. It remains, therefore, that we see how slight are those things which the Manichaeans object against the books of the prophets.¹

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. If the books of the prophets are to be received, they are to be received chiefly on account of two [reasons]: either that they confer to the testification of faith, or that they confer to the information [instruction] of life; of which, since the books of the prophets furnish neither, no cause offers itself which might make them commended to us. For what need have we of their writings on account of testimonies concerning Christ the Savior, which are none in them? Or, if perchance there be any, we nevertheless neither need them for the confirmation of faith, nor ought to use them. For it is [the mark] of an inert faith not to believe in Christ without witness and argument. For since you yourselves are wont to say that nothing is to be curiously sought out, because Christian credulity is simple and absolute, how is the simplicity of faith not destroyed by propping it up with indications and witnesses — and especially with the Jews?²

2. Whose testimonies certainly are so useless to us for faith that they profit nothing, neither after faith nor before faith concerning Christ received. For if to a Gentile, before faith received, it is to be believed in Christ on account of the testimonies of the Hebrew prophets, which you think to be found in their books, then those [Gentiles] will have to believe the prophets before Christ. But say, I ask: if you think that Christ is to be received by me through the prophets, the prophets themselves — through whom shall I receive [them]? and who will make faith for me on their behalf? Certainly not other prophets — because then the question would go off into infinity, we asking again and again who should render testimony on behalf of those prophets [just] recently brought in. But if you say that they are to be received from the testimony of Christ, so that mutually — that is, those prophets commend Christ, and Christ [commends] those [prophets] — the Gentile, certainly, free by [being bound to] the condition of each, would believe neither the scriptures of the Hebrew prophets speaking of Christ, nor Christ testifying about their scriptures. Wherefore it sufficiently appears that the testimonies of the Jewish prophets are useless before faith in Christ; because before faith, when we were Gentiles,³ we could not believe them, as [being] Hebrews; but after faith, since now we believe in Christ, the testimonies are superfluous, since we no longer need them, that we should believe those things which we have already believed.

3. But if any one should say to us that testimonies are needed, after faith received, for the stabilizing of the undertaken firmness of belief — I ask, what necessity compels that from external, obscure, and uncertain Hebrew witnesses we should beg superfluous testimonies? — as if there were not enough for us the most abundant and most faithful witnesses whom we have. For who can be a more faithful witness to us than God himself concerning his own son? — who, not through a seer, nor through an interpreter, but of his own accord, by a voice bursting forth from heaven, when he sent him upon earth, said: "**This** is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." And Christ himself also says of himself: "**I went out** (*Exivi*) from the Father, and I came into the world"; and many things of this kind. To which [words], when the Jews said, "Thou givest testimony of thyself; thy testimony is not true," he himself responded: "**And** if I testify of myself, my testimony is true, because I am not alone. For also in your law it is written, The testimony of two men is true. I am [he] who testify of myself, and [the Father] testifies of me who sent me." He did not, moreover, say "the prophets," but "the Father." To these things he also calls his own works to himself for a testimony: "**If** you believe not me (*Si mihi non creditis*) (saying), believe the works." He did not say, "If you believe not me, believe the prophets." Wherefore, since we have as witness the Father and the Son, we do not need external testimonies for faith.⁴

4. Then, how can we read them for an exemplar of honest life, whose flagitious deeds we know to have been so openly damned by Christ? For the Savior himself, striking at the life and morals of all the prophets at once by a single sentence, called them robbers and thieves, saying: "**All** (*Omnes*), as many as came before me, are

thieves and robbers." ⁵

THE DILUTING OF THE OBJECTIONS (*Dilutio Obiectorum*)

1. It is [the mark] of a most demented man to say that it is [the mark] of an inert faith not to believe without a witness. For how can the knowledge of Christ come to us without a human witness? How, indeed, will they believe him whom they have not heard? and how will they hear without a preacher? Wherefore, when we say that a simple faith is necessary to the Christian, we do not persuade [men] that the testimonies of the old testament are not to be believed, but we admonish that the Christian mind ought first to be nourished by a simple faith, so that it may be rendered capable of understanding the supernal [things]. For thus says the prophet: "**Unless** (*Nisi*) you shall have believed, you shall not understand." This is that simple faith, by which we believe ⁶ before we know the super-eminent knowledge of the charity of Christ, in whom are all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God hidden away — which are opened to none, if he shall have condemned, for himself, the food conveyed through the maternal flesh (that is, [the food] through the apostolic and prophetic udders of milk-nourishments), and, as [one] disdain[ing] infantile victus, as if by reason of his over-great age fastidious [squeamish], shall have rushed sooner into the poisons of the heretics than into the wisdom for which he judges himself fit.

2. But as to what they contend — that the prophets of the Hebrews profit neither before nor after faith — asking who indeed [would make], for a Gentile (who believes neither Christ nor the prophets), faith of the prophets out of the scriptures: we easily refute [them], saying that the very scripture of the prophets conciliates [wins] faith for itself, and its own [faith], among all ⁷

¹ Faustus, in Augustine, book 12 (Faustus apud Aug. lib. 12); Acts 10 (Act. 10).

² From Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 4, and book 12, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 16. con. Faust. c. 4. & lib. 12. ca. 1).

³ From Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 13. co. Faust. ca. 1).

⁴ From Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 1 (Ex Aug. li. 12. con. Faust. c. 1); Matt. 17; John 16 (Ioan. 16); John 8 (Ioan. 8); Deut. 19; John 5 (Ioan. 5).

⁵ From Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 2, and against the adversary of the law, book 2, ch. 4 (Ex Aug. lib. 16 co. Faust. c. 2. & co. adu. leg. lib. 2. cap. 4); John 10 (Ioan. 10).

⁶ Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 45 and 46 (Aug. lib. 12. cot. Faust. cap. 45. & 46); Rom. 10; Isaiah 7 (Esa. 7); Eph. 3.

⁷ Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 14 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 14).

(printed p. 636 [PDF p. 641] — *Heresy IIII concluded (Dilutio 2–4); then Heresy V opens: Of the book of Psalms.*)

[the very scripture of the prophets conciliates faith for itself, and its own faith, among all peoples,] to commend [its] authority to all nations, while it fore-announces all those things which, through the successions of times, came to pass — so long before they were done, as [things] to be done: and those especially which, in these most recent days, the Gentiles themselves both know and confess to have been completed. As concerning the propagation of the Christian religion, which they themselves see; and concerning the persecutions stirred up against it by kings, of which frequent memory exists in the histories of the Gentiles, and the laws of the emperors, committed to their letters, testify; likewise concerning the faith of the emperors, and the most salubrious servitude under Christ, and concerning the name of Christ diffused far and wide into all nations, concerning the abolition of idols, and the blindness and captivity of the Jews. All which things, if I were to press upon a Gentile out of the scriptures of the prophets before those things had been done — so that he might believe those things which he had not yet seen done — he might perhaps deservedly say: "What [have I to do] with these scriptures, from which [source] you [claim to] prove [them] truthful is not shown to me?" But when so great and so many things which they said have now been brought to fulfillment, plainly that [Gentile], if he were perverse, would be unwilling, nor would he in any way condemn those [scriptures] which, by foreseeing so long before, and by fore-announcing with so great an apparatus, deserved to be commended. For we believe nothing more prudently — whether concerning things

past, which were done of old, or concerning future things, which are not yet done — than [those things which] they [the prophets], to us who [take] from them faith of their words in so many and great [matters] (which, foretold by them, are now done), have proved. There are, therefore, the prophetic scriptures, before faith, useful to the Gentiles in [believing] Christ. But neither, after faith, are they on that account superfluous, because we now believe. Otherwise it would behoove those who believe to cast away all the books through which it came to pass that they should believe. For if this were true, I do not see why even the gospel itself should be read by the faithful of Christ: before faith, indeed, it is useless, because that Gentile whom the Manichaeans bring in does not believe in Christ; but after faith, [it would be] superfluous, if even by true preachings concerning Christ it is now superfluously believed, when it has [already] been believed in him. Here perhaps they will say: But the gospel ought to be read [by one] already faithful, lest he forget what he believed. So, therefore, O insane [men], he ought also to read the true testimonies of the prophets, lest he forget why he believed. But if he shall have forgotten [it], that which he believed will not be able to be firm with him.¹

3. But now, when they ask why, after the testimony of the Father and the Son, we follow the external testimonies of the Jews, we respond: not that this is done by us because we do not believe the testimony of Christ without another witness, or because we prefer the testimonies of others to the testimony of Christ, but because a twofold cause impels us to this. **THE FIRST**, indeed, [is] that I may know why we have believed these things which they handed down to us, [things] which we now believe; and, knowing this, [that] we may be more stably confirmed in the faith of those things which they handed down to us. For since we neither heard that voice of the Father brought from heaven, nor saw the works of Christ, we needed the testimony of those who had seen and heard those things — so that, from their preaching, we might hear that Christ had done such things; and, hearing, might believe in Christ, before unknown to us. And for this cause the preaching of the apostles was made to [reach] all; which — lest it should be contemned by men, and thought fabulous — the vaticinations and testimonies of the prophets were necessary to the apostles, by which they might demonstrate those things which they themselves preached to have been fore-predicted² long before by the prophets. For although the miracles put forth by them attested the preaching of the Apostles, nevertheless there would not have been lacking certain [men] (as even now still certain [people] mutter) who would attribute all those things to magic power, unless such a thought of theirs were overcome by the prophetic contestation. For that they [the Apostles] had, by magic arts, constituted prophets for themselves long before they were born, by whom their preaching should be fore-announced, no one indeed would say. This, therefore, is one cause. But **THE OTHER** is, that by the authority of the old testimonies we may sweetly invite all infidels — as much Hebrews as Gentiles — [if] not resisting, to embrace the faith of Christ; or, [if] resisting and contradicting, may strongly repel [them]: the Hebrews, indeed, while we show to them that those [scriptures] which we believe were not written by us as [if] after the event, as [being] afterward warned, but by their own codices we prove that they were most openly proved by their own prophets; but the Gentiles, while — out of the books of our enemies, kept by them with such diligence that they could not be vitiated by us — we show fore-announced, so long a time before, [those things] which the Gentiles themselves now see completed: namely, concerning the vocation of the nations to Christ, concerning the overthrow of idols, concerning the persecutions of the Church (which the histories of the Gentiles describe), and concerning³ the excellence of our Church, and the rest of this kind — which they have before [their] eyes, and, even if they wish, cannot deny.

4. That also they malignly add — that the Lord said, "**All** (*Omnes*) who came before me are thieves and robbers" — for it is not so written, but thus: "**All** (*Omnes*), as many as came, are thieves and robbers." For in this place he willed those to be understood who had not been sent — whom Jeremiah also rebukes, saying: "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets who prophesy in my name, and I sent them not." But those [true prophets] whom these insane [men] blaspheme were sent by the Lord, [and] came not of their own accord. Or, if it be written, "All, as many as came before me, are thieves and robbers" — as the Greek now

has, πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον (*pantes hosoi pro emou elthon*) — he wishes those to be understood [as coming] "before" who came not with him, but wished by pride to precede him, and were unwilling to come with Christ (that is, with the Word of God), but, since God did not send them, brought their own lies to men; but the holy prophets came not before Christ, but with Christ, because they did not wish by pride to precede him, but bore him humbly, [him] speaking through them.⁴

OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS — Heresy V (*De Libro Psalmorum. Haeresis V*)

That the book of Psalms is falsely inscribed with the name of David, and composed without any prophetic spirit; and that, besides certain human ditties (cantilenae) of secular poets, it contains nothing else.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Philastrius, in the catalogue of heresies, attributes this heresy to the Nicolaites, the Gnostics, and the Manichaeans, who also said that David was not a prophet of Christ, and a writer of the divine scriptures, but a composer of human and secular song. But in the epistle of the Council of Antioch, which is had in book 7 of the Ecclesiastical History [of Eusebius], the same error is ascribed to Paul of Samosata, in these words: "Paul of Samosata [suppressed] the psalms which were sung (*dicebantur*) unto our Lord Jesus Christ"⁵

¹ Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 18 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 18).

² From Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 45 (Ex Aug. li. 12. co. Faust. c. 45).

³ Augustine, book 13 against Faustus, ch. 10 and 16 (Aug. lib. 13. co. Faust. c. 10 & 16).

⁴ John 10 (Ioan. 10 — so the passage, John 10:8; digit blotted); Augustine, book 2 against the adversary of the law, ch. 4 (Aug. li. 2. co. adu. leg. c. 4); Jer. 14; Augustine, book 16 against Faustus, ch. 12 (Aug. lib. 16. con. Faust. c. 12).

⁵ ch. 127 (Cap. 127); Eusebius, book 7 of the Ecclesiastical History (Euseb. lib. 7 hist. eccl.).

(printed p. 637 [PDF p. 642] — Heresy V: Assertores concluded; then the Impugnatio (the first heretical claim — that the Psalter is falsely ascribed to David — refuted from Scripture).)

[the psalms which were sung unto our Lord Jesus Christ, Paul of Samosata caused to] cease, as [being] modern and recently invented; but those composed by himself he commanded women to sing, in the days of Pascha [Easter], in the midst of the church — especially [those women] whom he himself had before instituted for singing — so that one would shudder if he heard [it]. Theodore of Mopsuestia also (as is noted in the acts of the Fifth Synod) affirmed that nothing about Christ is written in the psalms. Lastly, the Anabaptists of our own times raised up this heresy again, asserting that the psalms were composed neither by David, nor by any holy man divinely, but by certain more recent masters of the Jews after the advent of Christ; and [that they are] filled with many dire [things] and imprecations against Christ, and against the [Christian] people — so that the Hebrews might have, for the solace of [their] captivity, some ditties by which, gathering publicly in their synagogues, by praying and singing, they might imprecate calamities and destruction upon their enemies.¹

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

Two [things] are said by the heretics, of which the first is: that the book of Psalms is falsely entitled with the name of David the prophet. The vanity of which most slight opinion the most weighty testimonies of divine scripture crush. For we read, first of all, that David was an admirable psalmist, and for this cause was summoned by King Saul, that he might soothe his sick mind by songs modulated to the cithara; and when the ark was carried up into Jerusalem, we read that he sang hymns before the Lord upon instruments. Whence in the books of Kings it is written of him: "**The man said** (*Dixit vir*), to whom it was appointed concerning the Christ of the God of Jacob, the excellent psalmist of Israel."² But that he put forth psalms, and gave [them] to be sung in the temple of the Lord, the first book of Annals [Chronicles] testifies, commemorating that

David placed in the temple four thousand psalmists, singing to the Lord upon instruments, and that he chose out of them especially the sons of Asaph, and Heman, and Idithun, who beside him should sing canticles in the temple upon citharas, psalteries, and cymbals.³ There are found also, here and there, in many books of holy scripture, very many psalms out of this book of psalms particularly cited under the name of David: so that it cannot be denied that the book is his, by whose name it is inscribed. In the second volume of Kings [2 Samuel], there is recited an entire psalm from the mouth of David, which in the book of psalms is numbered the seventeenth [Ps 18]. And in the first [book] of Annals is similarly related the whole hundred-and-fourth psalm [Ps 105], which David, when the ark was being brought back, gave to Asaph the chief of the singers to be sung.⁴ And in the 1st book of Esdras it is written that, after the restoration of the temple, the Levites, the sons of Asaph, praised God upon cymbals, "by the hands of David the king" — that is, by the psalms composed by David; and that out of these they sang by name those which have the beginning, "**Give thanks** (*Confitemini*) to the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy [endureth] unto the age" — that is, the hundred-and-fifth [Ps 106], the hundred-and-sixth⁵, the 117th, and the 135th — all beginning from this one song.⁶ And in the new testament Christ, out of this book, under the name of David, brought forth the 109th psalm [Ps 110] against the Pharisees, saying: "**How** (*Quomodo*) then does David, in [the] Spirit, call him lord, saying: The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand?" — which words, lest anyone should suspect [them] to be cited by our Savior rather from another book of David than from this one, Luke in the Acts [added]:⁷ "David himself says in the book of Psalms: The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, etc." And Peter, in the Acts, ascribed the fifteenth psalm of this book [Ps 16] to David, saying: "**David** says in the book of psalms: I foresaw the Lord in my sight always." Of which [David] also the Apostles testified the second psalm to be, saying: "**O Lord** (*Domine*), who by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of our father David thy servant, hast said: Why have the nations raged?" — which psalm Paul by name called "the second," saying: "**As** (*Sicut*) it is written in the second psalm: My son art thou; I this day have begotten thee."⁸ And elsewhere the same Apostle testified the thirty-first psalm [Ps 32] to be David's, and likewise the sixty-eighth psalm [Ps 69]. It is manifest also, from some inscriptions by which certain psalms of this book are prefixed, that David — besides the psalms already mentioned — sang with his own mouth also many others: namely those whose arguments and histories are read in the books of Kings; as are the third psalm, to which is prefixed the title, "**A psalm** (*Psalmus*) of David, when he fled from the face of Absalom his son," whose history is written in the second [book] of Kings;⁹ and the psalm of like argument to which is titled, "A psalm of David, when, fleeing from the face of Absalom, he was ascending the Mount of Olives with bare feet and covered head"; and the 32nd psalm [Ps 34], having for [its] title, "A psalm of David, when he changed his countenance before Abimelech, and cast him out, and, being dismissed, went away," whose argument is had in the first volume of Kings; likewise the fiftieth psalm [Ps 51], and the 51st [Ps 52]; and many others, whose occasions are related in the books of Kings and of Annals.¹⁰

The **second** [thing] asserted by the heretics is: that this whole book, composed without any prophetic spirit, contains nothing divine in itself. Whose stolidity the other books of divine scripture refute — but especially the books of Kings, in which David himself, with open voice, proclaims that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit, that he might fore-sing the Christ to come, saying: "**The man said** (*Dixit vir*), to whom it was appointed concerning Christ, the excellent psalmist of Israel: The Spirit of the Lord hath spoken through me, and his speech through my tongue. The strong [one] of Israel said to me, [that there should come] the ruler of men, the just [one], the ruler in the fear of God" — which our Savior confirmed, when he said to the Jews: "**How** (*Quomodo*) then does David call him, in [the] Spirit, lord, saying: The Lord said, etc.?"¹¹ And after his resurrection, when he opened the sense of the scriptures to his disciples, he testified that the Holy Spirit had spoken, in the book of psalms, concerning [his] life, passion, death, and resurrection, and the preaching of the gospel.¹² And the apostles call David, the author of this book, a prophet, and everywhere bring forth his vaticinations as [those] of a truthful prophet. "**A prophet** (*Propheta*)," says Peter, "since he was, and knew, because God had sworn to him with an oath, etc." And the apostles, in the Acts: "**O Lord** (*Domine*),

who by the Holy Spirit, through the mouth of thy servant David, hast spoken." And Paul: "**I will give** (*Dabo*) you the holy faithful [things] of David" — that is, I will give you to recognize that the vaticinations of David were faithful.¹³ But, although it may have been doubtful among the Catholic fathers (as Augustine writes in the seventeenth book of the City of God) whether all the psalms of this book were put forth by David, or whether per-[haps some by others]¹⁴

¹ Thomas Aquinas in the preface to the Psalms (Tho. Aquin. in praef. Psal.).

² 1 Kings [Samuel] 16 (1. Reg. 16); 2 Kings [Samuel] 23 (2. Reg. 23).

³ 1 Chron. 6, 15, 16, 23, 25 (1. Par. 6; 1. Par. 15; 1. Par. 16; 1. Par. 23; 1. Par. 25).

⁴ 2 Kings [Samuel] 22 (2. Reg. 22); 1 Chron. 16 (1. Par. 16); Esdras 1 (Esd. 1).

⁵ so printed "306," a slip for 106

⁶ Psalm 105 (Psal. 105).

⁷ Matt. 22 (Matt. 20, so printed); Luke 20; Psalm 109; Acts (Act. 20, so printed); Acts 2; Psalm 15.

⁸ Acts 4; Acts 13; Psalm 2; Psalm 13; Rom. 4; Rom. 11; Psalm 68.

⁹ ch. 116 (Cap. 116).

¹⁰ 1 Kings [Samuel] (1. Reg.).

¹¹ 2 Kings [Samuel] 23 (2. Reg. 23); Matt. 22 (Matth. 22).

¹² Luke 24 (Luc. 24).

¹³ Acts 2; Acts 4; Acts 13 (Act. 2; Act. 4; Act. 13).

¹⁴ ch. 14 (Cap. 14).

(printed p. 638 [PDF p. 643] — Heresy V: the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (1–4) that the Psalter is not David's and not prophetic.)

[whether] several of these were composed by certain [other] holy men, whom David had ordained [as] psalmists in the temple of God — namely by Asaph, Heman, Idithun, Chore [Korah], and their sons (because many of their psalms are prefixed with their names): nevertheless it behooves to believe that those too, by whomsoever they were [composed], were dictated by the Holy Spirit. For it is written in the first book of Annals [Chronicles] that all those singers — namely Asaph, Heman, Idithun, Chore, Moses — and their sons, were prophets, and holy doctors, in the temple of God. Whence Christ and the apostles approved their psalms as [things] put forth by the prophetic spirit, and confirmed their own preaching by the authority of them.¹ Of the psalms inscribed [to] Asaph, we find that our Savior cited that [saying] of the eighty-first psalm [Ps 82]: "**I said** (*Ego dixi*), you are gods"; and [we find] that Matthew similarly called Asaph himself a prophet, when — a versicle of his psalm being produced — he said: "**All** these things (*Haec omnia*) Jesus spoke in parables, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables."² Of the psalms inscribed [to] Moses, Paul took a testimony, saying: "**As** (*Sicut*) the Holy Spirit says: Today, if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts." And of the psalms attributed to Chore [Korah], the same Apostle received that testimony: "Thy **throne** (*Thronus tuus*), O God, [is] unto the age of the age."³ From all which it evidently appears that all the psalms were composed by the Holy Spirit, and sung through the mouth of David and of his singers. But the present Book of Psalms is inscribed with the name of David the prophet, either because the first and nobler part of the book was composed by David through his very self, or because — David suggesting the matter of the psalms to his singers — the greater part of the book was written and sung by them.

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. Those who affirm the book of psalms to be David's are led (say the Anabaptists) by no certain conjecture. For neither does the inscription of the book show this, in which the name of David is not [always] placed; nor in the whole of holy scripture is there ever mention of the author of this volume; nor is it ever read that any psalm was composed by David, except one only — when God had freed him from the hand of Saul — whose beginning is: "The **Lord** [is] my **rock** (*Dominus petra mea*)," which is written in the 2nd book of Kings [2 Sam 22]. And concerning this one psalm, whether it truly be his, it scarcely is agreed: because the Book of

Psalms judges otherwise about it, and the second [book] of Kings otherwise; in which it is written that this psalm was the very last of all ⁴ the words which David spoke; but in the book of psalms it is written that the last of all the psalms of David was that one which is placed in the seventy-second number [Ps 72], at whose foot it is written: "**Finished** (*Finitae*) are the prayers of David, son of Isai [Jesse]." ⁵

2. There are, moreover, in this book very many psalms which are ascertained to have been composed neither by David nor in David's time — both from their inscriptions containing the names of men who were long after David's time, and from those things which are related in them [as] done many years after David: as the destruction of Jerusalem, of which the seventy-third psalm [Ps 74] speaks as of a thing already past; and the mourning of the captives at the rivers of Babylon, which is commemorated in the 136th psalm [Ps 137]; and the return from the captivity of Babylon into Jerusalem, of which [is] the 125th psalm [Ps 126], as [the psalter] speaks of it as already completed. Which [things] also seven-and-forty psalms more openly indicate — namely, from the hundred-and-eleventh even to the end of the book of psalms — which are inscribed "**Reversions** (*Reversiones*)" of Aggaeus [Haggai] and Zacharias [Zechariah], because through these two prophets they were sung for the return of the sons of Israel from Babylon into Jerusalem.

3. To this it accedes [is added], that almost all authors, as much Jews as Christians, affirm that the greater part of this volume is not David's. R. David Kimhi thinks those only to be psalms of David to which is prefixed the title לְדָוִד (*le David*), that is, "of David himself" (*Ipsi David*); but the others to be [the psalms] of those by whose name they are entitled — whom Aben Ezra [Ibn Ezra], calling into doubt, says that it is uncertain whether every psalm to which is prefixed the name לְדָוִד (*le David*), that is, "of David himself," be his, or rather of some singer who composed it concerning David. Jerome also, in the epistle to Cyprian, says: "They **err** (*Errant*) who think all the psalms to be David's, and not [the psalms] of those by whose names they are inscribed — as David, Asaph, Idithun, the sons of Core [Korah], Heman, [Ethan] the Ezrahite, Moses, and Solomon, and the rest, whom Esdras comprehended in the first volume." But Augustine, in the preface to the 2nd psalm, judges that David sang only nine psalms, but that the others, to which his name is prefixed, were sung by his singers. John Chrysostom, in the preface to the psalms, asserts [the same]. The inscriptions which are now prefixed to the psalms, he asserts to be for the greater part false. Which consensus of opinions makes faith [gives assurance] that this book is not David's.

4. But as to [the claim] that nothing prophetic is in this book, the Hebrews themselves testify, who exclude it from the prophetic scriptures. And you [Christians] also confirm the same, when you make David the author of the book — [David] who was not a prophet, but a king assumed for the governance of the kingdom. For those are called prophets in the scriptures who are divinely called to the office of prophesying, or are sent to a king, or to some people, with the public dignity of an office, that they may announce future things to them — as Moses to Pharaoh, and Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets to the people of Israel: but David we nowhere read to have been called to this dignity of prophesying. But also the psalms of this book themselves most clearly show that nothing is found in this book which pertains to prophecy. For those testimonies which are wont to be brought forth from the psalms as presages of Christ agree to none less than to Christ. For how do those words pertain to the crucifixion of Christ: "They have **dug** (*Foderunt*) my hands, and they **divided** (*Diviserunt*) my garments" — which can in no way be adapted to Christ? ⁶ For, besides that the Hebrews read those words otherwise, saying, "**Like** (*Sicut*) a lion my hands and my feet they have observed [watched]," it is also evident that Christ was not crucified with nails driven through hands and feet — because it was not the custom in Israel that those who were hanged on wood should be fastened to the cross with hands and feet transfixed by a nail, but the law so prescribing, that [men], suspended and transfixed, should hang on the cross. Likewise, that which is taken from the eighteenth psalm [Ps 19]: "**Into** (*In*) all the earth their sound went out" — how can it be twisted to the preaching of the apostles, when ⁷

¹ 1 Chron. 25 (1. Par. 25).

² John 10 (Ioan. 10); Psalm 81 [Vulgate], "I said, you are gods" (printed "Psal. 18," apparently transposed); Matt. 13 (Matth. 13); Psalm 77 [= Ps 78] (Psal. 77).

³ Heb. 3 (printed "Heb. 13"); Psalm 94 [= Ps 95] (printed "Psal. 64"); Psalm 44 [= Ps 45] (Psal. 44); Heb. 1 (Hebr. 1).

⁴ 2 Kings [Samuel] 22 (2. Reg. 22); Psalm 17 [= Ps 18] (Psal. 17); ch. 23 (Cap. 23).

⁵ Psalm 72 (printed "Psal. 27," a slip).

⁶ Psalm 21 [= Ps 22] (Psal. 21).

⁷ Psalm 18 [= Ps 19] (Psal. 18).

(printed p. 639 [PDF p. 644] — *Heresy V: objection 4 concluded, objection 5 (the "imprecation" psalms); then the Objections are Dissolved (responses 1–3 begun).*)

[how can "Into all the earth their sound went out" be twisted to the preaching of the apostles,] when it [the psalm] speaks expressly of the heavens themselves, according to a certain poetic prosopopoeia? By which two testimonies, if the matter be more attentively inspected, there are found also other testimonies like [these], which our elders referred to the vaticinations of Christ.

5. The sentences, moreover, and words of this book so abhor from the mind of every pious man that it appears its author was not divine, but a certain barbarous, inhuman [man], greedy of slaughter, of vengeance, and of blood, who everywhere sends against his enemies dire [things], imprecations, execrations: "**Judge** (*Iudica*)," he says, "O Lord, those who harm me; overthrow those who impugn me; pour out the lance (*framea*), and shut up [the way] against those who persecute me. Let them become as dust before the face of the wind, and let the angel of the Lord straiten them. Let their ways become darkness and slipperiness, and let the angel of the Lord persecute them." ¹ And, "Let **death** (*Veniat mors*) come upon them, and let them descend into hell living." And again, "**Make** (*Fac*) them as Madian [Midian], and Sysara [Sisera], and as Iabin [Jabin], in the torrent of Cyson [Kishon]; let them perish, and become as the dung of the earth. Make their princes as Oreb, and Zeb, and Zebec [Zebah], and Salmana [Zalmunna]. My God, make them as a wheel, and as stubble before the face of the wind; as fire which burneth the wood, and as a flame burning the mountains, so shalt thou persecute them in thy tempest, and in thy wrath shalt thou trouble them." ² With which indignations and maledictions almost all the psalms are so full, that they bear a similitude of those imprecations with which Callimachus devoted [cursed] Apollonius of Rhodes, and Ovid [devoted] his *Ibis*.

THE OBJECTIONS ARE DISSOLVED (*Diluuntur Obiecta*)

1. So inept are the objections of the Anabaptists that a response seems in some manner superfluous. For if the book is on this account denied to be David's — because it does not bear his inscription — then neither will Moses be the author of the five books of the law, because they are not titled with the name of Moses. The opposite of which thing Christ teaches, saying: "**Moses** wrote of me"; and all authors, as much Hebrew as Christian, confirm it. ³ And lest most unskilled men wonder that the name of David is not prefixed to this book, let them know that among the Hebrews the divine volumes are inscribed in various ways: either from the name of the author, as the book of Joshua; or from the first word of the book, as the book of Genesis, which from its first word is entitled בראשית ברה (*Berescith barah*) [that is, בראשית ברה, "In the beginning [God] created"]; or from the matter contained in the book, as the book of Kings, and the present volume of Psalms — which, from the hymns and odes contained in it, the name of the author being omitted, is called ספר תהלים (*Sepher theillim*), that is, "the book of psalms, or of hymns, or of prayers": which book, nevertheless, our Savior testified to be David's, when he said to the scribes, "**David** himself says in the book of Psalms: The Lord said to my lord." And we have already shown that the author of all the psalms which are in it was David, who — besides those psalms which he sang with his own mouth — supplied (as Augustine and Chrysostom say) all the subjects of the other psalms to those singers, who sang them, and inscribed them with their own names, and, the subjects being received from him, explained [them] in songs. ⁴ But those are confuted who say that David put forth one [psalm] only, through the very same words which they bring against us. For if that psalm which is read in the second volume of Kings [2 Sam 22] was the last of the

psalms, then it behooved that before it more other psalms were composed by David; for neither would it be called the last, unless others had preceded it. But as to [the fact] that after the end of the seventy-first psalm it is written, "**Finished** (*Finitae*) are the prayers of David," it is not so to be understood, that I should believe the psalms of David to be there finished, and that [psalm] to be the last of all the psalms; but that we may know those prayers to be finished in that place, by which he besought God for the safety and the kingdom of his son Solomon. Similarly concerning the psalm of the book of Kings it is to be thought, that it was not the last of all David's psalms, but only of those which he composed during the persecution of his enemies.

2. To the **second** objection of the Anabaptists — concerning the psalms which seem to have been composed after David's time — Augustine, in the seventeenth [book] of the City of God, responds in these words: "It seems to **me** (*Mihi*) more credible to esteem that those [men] who attribute all these psalms to the work of David — and [say] that he prefixed some [of them] also with the names of others, prefiguring something which pertains to the matter [thereby dealt with] — [judge rightly]. Nor ought it to move [anyone] to this disbelief,⁵ that some names of prophets who were after the times of King David are read inscribed on certain psalms in that book, and [that] the things which are there said seem, as it were, to be said by them: for the prophetic Spirit was able to reveal to David these names also of future prophets — as King Josias [Josiah], who was to reign after more than three hundred years, was revealed by [his] own name to a certain prophet." These [things] Augustine. But the Anabaptists say that those things which are contained in the psalms are not fore-announced as future, but narrated as past. Whom the divine Jerome meets, saying that this is set among the prophets as a custom: that, on account of the certitude of the prophecy, they should pronounce future things as if already past.⁶

3. To the **third** objection we respond, [that] three [things] are to be considered in the psalms: the invention, the disposition, and the pronunciation. If we inspect the invention, it is certain that David found out [devised] the matter and subject of all the psalms, and, [it] being found, supplied it to his singers — as the books of Kings and Paralipomenon [Chronicles] testify, and Aben Ezra [Ibn Ezra] in the preface to the psalms, and Augustine in the 17th [book] of the City of God, and Jerome, and Chrysostom in the preface to the psalms, confirm. If the discourse is about the disposition of the psalms, the aforesaid authors rightly judge that not all the Psalms were disposed by David through songs and modulations, but by Asaph, Chore [Korah], Idithun, Moses, and Samuel his son, and other singers accommodated to the meters, and fitted to the songs, and adapted to diverse musical instruments. But if the discourse is about the pronunciation of the living voice, Augustine, in the second preface to the psalms, best said that David alone sang nine psalms with his own mouth. But concerning the titles of the psalms, which Chrysostom said to be false, it is not to be believed that he himself thought the true titles to have been erased, and in their place other false titles substituted; but that he rather esteemed those titles to have been transposed, and — the order of the history being confused — permuted [rearranged], as his following words indicate, when he says that Esdras, after the Babylonian

¹ Psalm 34 [= Ps 35] (Psal. 34).

² Psalm 54 [= Ps 55], "let death come" (Psal.; printed digit unclear); Psalm 82 [= Ps 83] (Psal. 82).

³ John 5 (Ioan. 5).

⁴ Luke 20 (printed "Luc. 12"); Augustine, book 17 of the City of God, ch. 14 (Aug. li. 17. de ciu. Dei c. 14); Chrysostom, in the second preface to the psalms (Chrysost. secund. praef. in psalmos).

⁵ Augustine, book 17 of the City of God, ch. 14 (Aug. lib. 17. de ciu. Dei ca. 14).

⁶ 3 Kings [1 Kings] 13 (3. Reg. 13); Jerome on Psalm 21 (Hier. in Psal. 21).

(printed p. 640 [PDF p. 645] — *Heresy V concluded (refutations 3–5); then Heresy VI opens: Of the book of Daniel.*)

[that Esdras, after the Babyloni-Jan [captivity], collected these psalms — dispersed here and there — into one volume, the order of the history being omitted. Which the very series of the book of psalms betrays: in which the third psalm, put forth by David when he fled from the face of Absalom, precedes the thirty-third

psalm [Ps 34], which David had made many years before, when — his madness being feigned — he fled from the hands of Abimelech.

4. But when they add that David was neither a prophet, nor [that] the psalms inscribed to him are divine, they show themselves much worse than the Jews: who, although they do not believe that the psalms fore-announced anything about our Savior, nevertheless believe that the Holy Spirit was the author of this book. And although they do not place it [David/the book] among the prophets, but in the beginning of the books which they call כתובים (*Chetubim* [Ketuvim], so printed "*cherubim*") — that is, ἁγιογرافα (*hagiographa*), or "holy writings" — nevertheless they do not deny that many things in it are written by the prophetic spirit: as the second psalm, and the forty-fourth psalm [Ps 45], and the hundred-and-tenth [Ps 110], which they expound of their [own] Messiah. Therefore, to those vaticinations which — as if by us violently distorted — the heretics, together with the author of the book Nizaon [the Jewish *Nizzahon*], calumniate, we respond: [as to] those words of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22], "They have **observed** (*Observaverunt*) as a lion my hands" — so it is read among the Chaldee translator [the Targum], who rendered it as it seemed [good] to them; but in the Hebrew exemplar it is read כארו ידי ורגלי (*Chaari iadai, veragelai*), that is, "They have **dug** (*Foderunt*) my hands, and my feet." Whence we cast away the Chaldaic translation as repugnant to the Hebrew truth. Nor does it move us at all that the [Mosaic] law did not command the hands and feet of the damned to be fixed to the cross: because, since at that time the power of judging was taken away from the Jews by the Romans, [criminals] were no longer punished exactly according to the Mosaic law, but as the Roman governor (*praeses*), who was over the province of the Jews, had given sentence, so were the penalties inflicted. Whence also Joseph [of Arimathea] asked Pilate that he would grant him the body of Jesus — which, nevertheless, according to the [Mosaic] law was to be taken down before the setting of the Sun. The breaking of the legs (*crurifragium*) also, and the transfixion of the breast, are not from the [Mosaic] law; and by the same reasoning also the infixion of nails. Truly, therefore, the words of this vaticination were fulfilled in Christ; as also those words of the eighteenth psalm [Ps 19] were most truly fulfilled in the Apostles, according to the mystical and allegorical sense, and most faithfully expounded by Paul in the epistle to the Romans. For the apostles are most truly the "heavens," who through the whole globe of the earth diffused Christ, the Sun of justice, and by his splendor illuminated the whole earth. ¹

5. Concerning the imprecations which are read in the psalms, we say that they are not evil, because they are born not from hatred, but from an ardent affection of charity. For this is the custom of the just: that they seek vengeance from their enemies in two ways — either that, by the occasion of vengeance, those who are predestined to life may be converted from evil to good; or that those who, God foreknowing, are to be damned, may die, and cease to sin, so that by this they may have a lesser penalty in hell (where each one, according to the quality of his works, will sustain the magnitude of the penalties): to which two ways a third also is added, by which, namely, the saints imprecate evils not by the wish of one desiring [them], but by the intuition of one foreseeing [them] — fore-announcing to men future evils, so that, after the fore-announced [things] shall have come to pass, they may know ² that men suffer [these things] not by chance or fortune, but by the certain deliberation and counsel of God.

OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL — Heresy VI (*De Libro Danielis. Haeresis VI*)

To cut off, from the book of Daniel — which is falsely written under his name — many fabulous narrations.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This heresy, drawn from the fountains of the Manichaeans — although all the Anabaptists most vainly defend it — yet they somewhat disagree among themselves concerning it. For some reject the whole volume of Daniel entirely, as supposititious [spurious] and false; but others receive only those [parts] which the Hebrews believe to be Daniel's, and reckon alone among the Hagiographa, the rest being cast away which are

not had in the Hebrew codices: such as are the hymn of the three boys [the Song of the Three Children], the history of Susanna, the narration of Bel, and the history of Daniel cast into the den [of lions] and of Habakkuk [Abacuch] carried off [thither].³

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

All those things which are read in the book of Daniel by the Church show [themselves] most true — the infallible and most certain outcomes of those matters which in it are found predicted many ages before they came to pass. For Daniel left [behind], as Josephus says, [some] of those things which he wrote, whence the integrity of his prophecy, and no change or variation in those things which he foretold, can be recognized. For he not only predicted future things (which is common to all prophets), but also foresaw most certainly at what time, and under what kings, and — the years being numbered in order — [that] those things ought to come to pass. Whose prophecy had so great credibility, that to incredulous men he seems not to have foretold future things, but to have narrated things past. For almost nothing is contained in the histories of the nations about the four Monarchies — of the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans — which is not read fore-announced in the book of Daniel many ages before.⁴ Since, indeed, those things which the same prophet predicted concerning the three prior Monarchies down to the times of Antiochus the Illustrious, even the Gentiles who wrote against his prophecies confessed to have been all most truly fulfilled. For Porphyry — who wrote the twelfth of his fifteen books against Daniel — when he saw all things most faithfully fulfilled just as they had been fore-announced, the histories of the Gentiles attesting to the outcome, overcome by the truth of history, could not deny that Daniel, at least down to the times of Antiochus, had most truly prophesied. But that he prophesied, without any error, concerning those things which came to pass after Antiochus, the same histories of the nations most lucidly show. Whence Jerome, in the preface to the commentaries on Daniel, rightly said that to understand this book there is need of the manifold history of the Greeks and Latins — namely of Sutorius [Callinicus], Callinicus, Diodorus, Hieronymus, Polybius, Posidonius, Claudius, Theon, and Andronicus, and also of Josephus and of those whom Josephus sets down; but especially of our [own] Livy, and Pompeius Trogus, and Justin, who narrates the whole history of the last vision, and, after Alexander, [the history] down to Caesar Augustus, of the [kings] of Syria⁵

¹ Rom. 12 (so printed; the "into all the earth their sound went out," Ps 19:4, is cited by Paul at Rom. 10:18).

² Augustine, Sermon 11 on the saints (Aug. ser. 11. de sanctis).

³ Dan. 3; Dan. 13; Dan. 14.

⁴ [Josephus,] book 10 of the Antiquities, ch. 13 (lib. 10. antiq. cap. 13).

⁵ Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.); [a dense marginal source-list:] Berosus, book 3, of the Chaldaean history; Metasthenes, book 4, of the Indica; Diocles, book 2; Philostratus ... Phoenician histories.

(printed p. 641 [PDF p. 646] — Heresy VI (Daniel): the Impugnatio concluded; then the OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (1–5, obj 5 running onto the next page).)

[the kings] of Syria and Egypt — that is, of Seleucus, and Antiochus, and of the Ptolemies — describe [their] wars. All which things defend the truth of this book not only against the heretics, but also against the infidels. To these accedes the consensus of the sacred volumes — as much of the old as of the new testament — attesting to the prophecy of Daniel. In the first book of the Maccabees, Mathathias [Mattathias], nearest to death, exhorts his sons to the observance of the law and to the toleration of hardships, examples being received from this book — of the three boys, who were freed from the furnace of burning fire, and of Daniel, who was saved from the mouth of the Lions.¹ And Christ, in Matthew, out of this book announces the destruction of the city and the abomination of the temple of Jerusalem, predicted by Daniel. And Paul, to the Hebrews, mentions the history of the three boys, and of Daniel in the den of Lions, when he says: "They **extinguished** (*Extinxerunt*) the force of fire, they stopped the mouths of the Lions." To which testimonies is added, that in all the catalogues of the divine books, through all the successions of the churches, the volume

of Daniel was always numbered among the prophets, and — together with the hymn of the three boys, and the history of Susanna, of Bel, and of Habakkuk [Abacuch] — received into authority.² For the hymn of the three boys is testified — by Rufinus, in the second book against Jerome, and by Augustine, in the forty-seventh sermon on the saints — always to have been sung, from the very beginning of the nascent Church, in every solemnity, in the sacred assemblies of the faithful. But the history of Susanna, Ignatius the martyr praises in the epistle to the Magnesians; and Rufinus, in the aforesaid book, affirms that the same history was read, for four hundred years before himself, as an exemplar of chastity and of modesty, to the married and the unmarried in the churches. And Origen, in the first homily upon Leviticus, approving the history of Susanna, says: "**But it is time** (*Sed tempus est*), against the wicked, to use the words of Susanna" — which [words] they [the heretics], as it were repudiating, cut away the history from the catalogue of the divine volumes; but we both receive [it], and opportunely bring [it] forth against them: "**Straits** (*Angustiae*) are on every side for me." But the Church, every year, reads this history at the [appointed] season in the sacred mysteries of the Mass, and with like honor venerates — reading at the same time — the history of Bel, of the Dragon, and of Habakkuk the dish-bearer [discophorus].³

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS (*Obiectiones Haereticorum*)

1. In the first place, it is sufficiently agreed that Daniel — whose deeds and visions the present volume relates — was not that Daniel who is memorialized among the holy men and prophets in certain places of holy scripture, but some other, who falsely usurped his name to himself, to whom [the things] which Ezekiel wrote concerning the prophet Daniel can in no way be accommodated. Who [Ezekiel], when he prophesied in the sixth year of Ioachim [Jehoiakim] king of Juda, reckoned Daniel the prophet among men of more advanced age and now great in birth [i.e. elderly], and among married men, having sons and daughters. But Daniel, of whom this book speaks, was in the same year of Ioachim king of Juda still a boy; and, together with the three boys Annania [Hananiah], Azaria [Azariah], and Missael [Mishael], erudite in the letters of the Chaldeans, the first chapter of this volume commemorates [him], and enumerates [him] among the royal Eunuchs.⁴ And Jerome, in the first book against Jovinian, confirms that that one [Daniel] was a eunuch (*spado*), and [that] in him was fulfilled that vaticination of Isaiah which he brought forth over King Ezechias [Hezekiah], saying: "**Of thy sons** (*De filiis tuis*), who shall be born from thee, they shall take, and make Eunuchs in the house of the king." Another, therefore, is the Daniel author of this book, [different] from him who is named among the prophets. Which also Jerome — Rufinus being witness — seemed to feel, when in the preface to Daniel he admonished the readers that this book, among the Hebrews, is not had among the prophetic books.⁵

2. It appears also that this book [was] not [written] by the prophet Daniel, but composed by an uncertain author after the times of Antiochus, who did not predict future things, but narrated things already past. The argument of which thing is, that the visions of the lion, bear, and leopard correspond to the things done by Nebuchadnezzar down to Antiochus the Illustrious; but in those things which he predicted after Antiochus, down to these our times — since he was not a seer — he deceived himself, and others who believed him. For nothing has yet been fulfilled of those things which he foresaw concerning the fourth Beast — that is, concerning the fourth Monarchy of the Romans — describing ten horns (that is, ten kings, who at one and the same time were to sit [reign] in the Roman kingdom), and immediately another little horn (that is, a little king about to ascend, and to overthrow three of those kings).⁶

3. The phrase [varied style] of the volume, moreover, indicates that not Daniel, but a certain Greekling (*Graeculus*), friendly to the Jews, was the author of the book — who, although he lied egregiously, that he might the more easily impose upon the reader by [using] as much Chaldee as Hebrew speech, nevertheless could not so long conceal the imposture but that, at last, at almost the foot [end] of the volume, he betrayed himself [as] a Greek, when he brought in Daniel responding to the elders by Greek word-plays: the word

σχίσαι (*schisai*) — that is, "to cleave" (*scindere*) — being derived from the word σχῖνος (*schinos*), that is, "the mastic tree" (*lentiscus*); and the word πρίσαι (*prisai*) — that is, "to saw" (*secare*) — from the name πρῖνος (*prinos*), that is, "the holm-oak" (*ilex*): which etymologies can be fitted neither to the Hebrew nor to the Chaldee tongue.⁷

4. But however it be believed concerning the author of this book, it certainly cannot be denied that a great part of this volume was fabricated: as that which is read in it concerning the adoration of Daniel. For — be it that it was not impossible that Nebuchadnezzar, such and so great a king, adored [worshipped] a Eunuch, his own servant (which can scarcely be believed) — nevertheless it is an impiety to believe that Daniel, a good man, suffered himself to be adored, and to be worshipped as God with sacrifice offered by his own most powerful king; when Paul was execrated [and refused], with garments rent, the same honor from the Lycaonians, who wished to sacrifice to him; and [when] the angel rebuked John, prostrating himself at his knees, saying: "**Do not** (*Ne feceris*) do [it], for I am thy fellow-servant."⁸ Similarly also the hymn of the three boys is suspected: for, beyond that it is not verisimilar that three boys had so much leisure that, in the midst of the flames, they should play [compose] in hexameters, and invoke all the elements in order to the praise of God — it [the hymn] is also found nowhere in the Hebrew exemplars.

5. Moreover, the history of Susanna — which the aforesaid etymologies of the ilex and the mastic indicate to have been written by a Greek author — the most ancient fathers of the Church reject as fabricated; and Eusebius, in the sixth book of the Ecclesiastical History, relates the opinion of Origen and of Julius Africanus concerning this history, in these words: "**Through** (*Per*)"⁹

¹ 1 Macc. 2 (1. Mac. 2).

² Matt. 24 (Matt. 24); Dan. 9; Heb. 11.

³ Dan. 13.

⁴ Ezek. 14 (Ezech. 14); Dan. 1.

⁵ Isaiah 39 (Esa. 39); Rufinus, book 2 (Rufinus li. 2); Jerome (Hier.).

⁶ Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.).

⁷ Dan. 13.

⁸ Dan. 3; Acts 14 (so the passage, the Lycaonians; printed "Act. 3"); Apoc. 19 (Ap. 19).

⁹ ch. 23 (Cap. 23).

(printed p. 642 [PDF p. 647] — *Heresy VI (Daniel): objections 5–7 concluded; then the DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS (responses 1–2 begun).*)

"**Through** (*Per*) the same time there was also Africanus, a man noble in ecclesiastical scriptures. His epistle is reported [to have been] written to Origen, objecting to him, or proposing [to him], that the history of Susanna, which is written in Daniel, seems fabricated, and alien to prophetic scripture. To whom Origen, most magnificently replying, asserts that in no way are the fabrications and frauds of the Jews to be listened to, but that this alone is to be held for true in the divine scriptures which the Seventy interpreters translated — for that alone is [true] which has been confirmed by apostolic authority." By which words it appears that Africanus thought this history [to be] the invention of a certain Greek; but that Origen esteemed the same to have been the fraud of some Jew — perhaps of Symmachus, or of Theodotion. Besides these things, also the time of the judgment of Susanna does not agree with the age of the boy Daniel. For the deed of Susanna, as is written at the foot of the 13th chapter, happened after the death of Astyages, king of the Medes and Persians, [in] the reign of Cyrus, who succeeded to the kingdom of Astyages. At which time, indeed — as is agreed from the same book — Daniel was not a boy (as he is brought in [introduced] in the judgment of Susanna), but, [being] now greater than sixty years old, lived in honor before Cyrus.¹

6. But above all [things], the destruction of Bel, and the translation of Abacoch [Habakkuk] to Daniel in the den of Lions, are fabulous. For, besides that that Dragon is feigned to have been slain by a lump of pitch, in imitation of the Cretan Minotaur; and [besides] the fraud of the priests, detected by the sprinkling of ash —

which could have been done, without any prophetic spirit, by whatsoever man even of mediocre talent — this also accedes, that the author of the fable is not consistent with himself: who, when he had first said that Daniel was only one night in the den, and thence in the first morning was drawn out by the King, afterward, little mindful [of himself], writes that he remained in the den for seven continuous days, and was refreshed by a meal by the prophet Abacuch [Habakkuk] — if, nevertheless, it be worthy to be believed that a man of heavy body traversed, in a moment of time, so great spaces of lands from Judea into Chaldea; when nothing ever similar is read to have been done in the [holy] scriptures.²

7. Wherefore, most prudently, Josephus — when he wrote out the deeds of Daniel in the tenth book of the Antiquities — omitted narrations of this kind as fabulous. And Jerome, in the preface to Daniel, called them fables, and, as [things] unworthy to be read, transfixes [them] with an obelus, or spit [veru], jugulating [them]; and truncated [them] from the rest of the volume of Daniel; and, the person of a Jew objecting being assumed, confuted those [fables] with many arguments. And in the preface of the commentaries on Daniel, deriding the defenders of these fables, "**I wonder** (*Miror*)," he says, "that certain μεμψιμοίρους (*mempsimoirous*) — that is, querulous [complainers] — are indignant at me, as if I had truncated the book; when both Origen, and Eusebius, and Apollinaris, and other ecclesiastical men and Greek doctors, confess these visions (as I said) not to be had among the Hebrews, nor [that] they ought to respond to Porphyry on behalf of those things which furnish no authority of holy scripture."

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBJECTIONS (*Dissolutio Obiectionum*)

1. The first argument which is brought by the Anabaptists, the divine Jerome, in the first book against Jovinian, dissolves in these words: "We say that Ezechiel [Ezekiel] mentioned Daniel not [as] a man, but [as] still a boy. But if any one should oppose that which is said in Ezekiel — 'Noe [Noah], and Daniel, and Job, in the sinning land could not free their sons and daughters' — it is to be responded that it was said according to a hypothesis [hypothetically]. For neither were Noah and Job [alive] at that time, whom we know to have been many ages before; and the sense is: if such and such men were in a sinning land, they would not be able to free their sons and daughters. But the boy Daniel is numbered among the two aged men, either because he was still known as a boy to the people, or on account of the interpretation of the dreams of the king, or on account of the liberation of Susanna and the killing of the elders. He is also numbered among those married men — not because he had a wife and sons, but because those three men (as the same Jerome, in the fourth book upon Ezekiel, and R. Kimki [Kimhi], upon the fourteenth chapter of Ezekiel, judge) experienced, in three diverse states, a great calamity and felicity beyond [that of] the rest. Noah saw the prosperity of the age before the flood, [its] ruin in the flood, and its reparation after the flood. Job saw his felicity, then saw the destruction of [his] sons and of all his goods, and again saw himself restored. Daniel saw himself illustrious in the palace of his kingdom before the captivity; then saw himself a captive; and after the captivity saw himself exalted to [high] rank." But as to what Rufinus objected to Jerome — that he denied Daniel to be a prophet — Jerome himself abundantly confuted [it], showing that he never denied Daniel [to be] a prophet, whom he had straightway, in the front of the prologue, confessed to be a prophet; but that he had only indicated what the Hebrews say.³

2. To the second argument of the Anabaptists — which is taken from the twelfth book of Porphyry, Jerome being witness — the same blessed father [Jerome] satisfied [answered], in the seventh chapter upon Daniel, in these words: "**Therefore** (*Ergo*) we say — that which all the ecclesiastical writers have handed down — [that] in the consummation of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans is to be destroyed, there will be ten future kings, who shall divide the Roman world among themselves; and an eleventh little king will arise, who shall overcome three of the ten kings — that is, the king of the Egyptians, and of Africa, and of Ethiopia (as in the following [passages] we shall say more manifestly); [and] these being slain, the other seven kings also will submit [their] necks to the victor." These [things] Jerome, concerning the sentence of Daniel: to

which are conformable those things which are written in the Apocalypse concerning the beast having ten horns, where thus the angel expounded that vision of Daniel, saying: "The **ten horns** (*Decem cornua*) which thou sawest are ten kings, who have not yet received the kingdom, but shall receive power as kings for one hour, etc." Nor are there lacking [those] who, by the denary [tenfold] number of kings, understand a great and indeterminate number — according to that [saying] in the fourteenth [chapter] of Numbers: "They have **tempted** (*Tentaverunt*) me now ten times." But by the little horn [is understood] the kingdom of Antichrist, which Christ shall destroy in the consummation of the age. Since, therefore, the calumny of Porphyry can be refuted in so many ways, no necessity compels us to suspect the book of Daniel [to be] written after the times of Antiochus: especially since Josephus writes that, to Alexander the Great — who preceded Antiochus — upon [his] entering Jerusalem, [the book of Daniel] was brought forth by the priests ⁴

¹ Dan. 13.

² Dan. 6; Dan., last [ch.] (Dan. ultim. [Dan. 14]).

³ Ezek. 14 (Ezech. 14).

⁴ Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Dan.); Apoc. 17 (Ap. 17); Num. 14 (Num. 14); Josephus, book 11, ch. 8 (Iosep. lib. 11. cap. 8).

(printed p. 643 [PDF p. 648] — *Heresy VI (Daniel): Dissolution of the Objections continues (responses 2 concluded, 3–6).*)

[was brought forth by the priest]s the volume of Daniel, in which it was written that a certain king of the Greeks was to destroy the power of the Persians; and [Josephus writes] that Alexander greatly rejoiced, because he judged himself to be [the one] whom the scripture signified. ¹

3. Now, that which they adduce concerning the etymologies of *σχίνου και πρίνου* (*schinou kai prinou* — of the mastic and of the holm-oak) proves nothing. For we confess that the history of Susanna — whose those words are — as Jerome and all the fathers testify, is neither read in the Hebrew codex, nor [was written] by a Hebrew writer, but [was written] by a certain pious Greek, according to the truth of the deed, in the Greek tongue; and then, indeed, by the judgment of the apostolic Church, added under [at] the end of the book of Daniel, as a thing worthy of such a prophet.

4. The fourth argument also, taken by the Anabaptists from the twelfth book of Porphyry, Jerome refutes in the third chapter upon Daniel, in these words: "Porphyry calumniates **this place** (*Hunc locum*), that a most proud king never adored a captive — as if the Lycaonians also had not, on account of the magnitude of the signs, wished to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas. But this also we can say: that the king himself expounded the causes of adoring, and of immolating victims, and of incense, and of sacrifice, saying: '**Truly** (*Vere*) God seems [to be], the God of Gods.' Therefore, not so much Daniel, as in Daniel he adores God, who revealed the mysteries. Which we read that Alexander the Great, king of the Macedonians, also did before the pontiff Ioiada [Jaddua]. But if this displeases, it is to be said that Nabuchodonosor, confused by the magnitude of the signs and by stupor, was ignorant of what he did — [so] that he, who understood [there was] a true Lord and [that Daniel was] the lord of kings, [nevertheless] adored his [own] servant, and burned incense to him. But in this the calumniator strives to reprehend the prophet: because he did not refuse the gifts, and willingly received the Babylonian honor — not considering that the king had for this reason seen the dream, and [that] the mysteries of the interpretation were revealed through the boy, that Daniel might grow, and in the place of captivity become the prince of all the Chaldeans, and the power of God be known. Which indeed we read was done to Joseph before Pharaoh, and [in] Egypt; and to Mardocheus [Mordecai] before Assuerus [Ahasuerus] — so that in each nation the captive and sojourning Jews might have solace, seeing a man of their nation to be the prince of the Egyptians, or of the Chaldeans." These [things] Jerome, concerning the honor received by Daniel. ² To which, when the Anabaptists oppose that Paul and the angel refused such things, it is to be responded that the cause was disparate in each. For Paul tore his garments at the divine honors offered [to him], because he saw that the Lycaonians wished to worship, in those honors,

not God in himself and in Barnabas — as Nabuchodonosor [worshipped God] in Daniel — but himself and Barnabas as the impious gods of the gentiles (namely as Jupiter and Mercury), moved by a certain foolish opinion. For which cause also the angel prohibited John, prostrating himself at [his] knees: because he had perceived that he [John] esteemed himself to have God present; which, lest he should falsely believe [it], the angel indicated, with a rebuke, that he was not God. But concerning the hymn of the three boys — just as we confess that it is not found among the Hebrews, so we believe that it was sung by those boys in the furnace of fire; nor does it seem wonderful to us that, in the midst of the heats of the flames, they could play [compose] in meter, and, in order, invoke the single creatures to the benediction of God; since, by the benignity of God, they could [do] much greater and more wonderful [things] — namely, walk through the midst of the fires with garments intact, and the tips of [their] hair unharmed.

5. Concerning the opinion of Origen and of Africanus, there is nothing why we should be moved: since Africanus, not by deciding, but by doubting, asked of Origen whether this history seemed to be fabricated. But Origen was so far from an opinion of this kind, that he most strongly confuted it in a long and erudite epistle, and at the foot of the same epistle so wrote in praise of this sacred history: "**These things** (*Haec*) have been said by me for the defending of the history of Susanna; and would that I could celebrate an encomium of the scripture of Susanna — as much by dwelling on the single words, as by showing the excellent senses" — that which some private [person], who shall have studiously and abundantly meditated in the divine [scriptures], will be able to compose. But neither does Eusebius relate this history [to have been] rejected by Origen, but affirms only this: namely, that he moved [a doubt], lest the fables of the Jews should be received, but only those [things] which the Seventy Interpreters translated. Which Origenic words indeed are not to be referred to the scripture of Susanna, but to certain other Apocrypha, which Origen enumerates in that epistle. But concerning the times of the boyhood of Daniel, and of the liberation of Susanna — which seem to discrepate among themselves — it is to be known that those words, "**And** king Astyages (*Et rex Astyages*) was gathered to his fathers, and Cyrus received his kingdom" — which are read at the end of the thirteenth chapter — do not pertain to the history of Susanna commemorated just above, but to the history of Bel and the dragon, and to that [which follows] next, in the 14th chapter following, whose time is designated when it is said: "**And** king Astyages was gathered to his fathers, etc." ³

6. Concerning the diverse number of days in which it is read that Daniel was in the den of lions, certain [men], following the opinion of those whom Jerome relates to have distinguished two Daniels, thus dissolve [it], saying: [that] this Daniel, who is placed in the history of Susanna, and of Bel, and of the dragon, is not he whose deeds are narrated in the book of Daniel, but another — who was not of the tribe of Juda, and a Eunuch of the king of Babylon, but of the tribe of Levi, a priest, concerning whom Abacuch [Habakkuk], son of Jesu [Jesus/Joshua], of the tribe of Levi, wrote. Accordingly there is no contradiction within [the book], since the history of Susanna, of Bel, and of Habakkuk does not pertain to the book of Daniel, but is a part ⁴ of the prophecy of Abacuch [Habakkuk], son of Jesu, of the tribe of Levi — as, according to the seventy interpreters, is placed in the title of the same history of Bel: "A certain **man** (*Homo*) was a priest, by name Daniel, son of Abda, a table-companion of the king of Babylon" — whereas [distinct from the fact that] the holy scripture testifies that Daniel and the three boys were of the tribe of Juda. These [things] they [say]. But we, approaching nearer to the continuation of the history, take away the controversy in this manner. Daniel was sent into the den not once, but twice, and for diverse causes. First, under Darius Hystaspes (Istaspes), because, against his edict, he adored his own God within the thirty prohibited days; and then — as is read in the sixth chapter of this book — he was one night only in it, and thence, in the following light [morning], was drawn out by the king. But secondly, he was again sent into the den on account of the destruction of Bel and the killing of the dragon, under Cyrus ⁵

¹ Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 8 (Iosep. li. 11. ant. cap. 8).

² Acts 14 (Act. 14); Josephus, book 11 of the Antiquities, ch. 8 (Iosep. li. 11. ant. cap. 8).

³ Jerome [on] ch. 13 upon Daniel (Hier. 13. ca. in Danielelem).

⁴ Jerome in the preface to the commentary on Daniel (Hier. in praefat. com. in Danielis).

⁵ Dan. 6; Dan. 14.

(printed p. 644 [PDF p. 649] — Heresy VI (Daniel) concluded (responses 6–7); then Heresy VII opens: Of the book of Ecclesiastes.)

[under] Cyrus the king — who reigned with Darius Istaspes [Hystaspes] two years, and after him twenty-two years — and [Daniel] was in it [the den] six continuous days, and on the seventh was freed by Cyrus the king. But that Daniel lived after Darius the king, under the reign of Cyrus, is not doubtful: since he himself, in the tenth chapter of this book, testifies that in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, in Chaldea, beside the river Tigris, he saw a vision. Nor is it wonderful that Habakkuk [Abacuch] was carried to Daniel by an angel. For if — God permitting — the Devil could carry our Savior, with the whole weight of [his] body, from the desert into the temple, and from the temple onto the mountain (as Luke says) in a moment of time, why ought it to seem incredible that — God commanding — an angel could, within the space of one hour, bodily transport Habakkuk from Judea into Chaldea? ¹

7. The last [argument], which they oppose from the judgment of Josephus and of Jerome, those same authors refute. For Josephus, in the tenth book of the Antiquities, confesses that he passed over these, and many other sacred histories — not because he judged them unworthy of his narration, but because in the ancient books of the Hebrews they were not written, which alone he had taken to translate. But Jerome, responding to Rufinus (who had noted [reproached] him concerning the cut-off codex of Daniel), writes these things: "**But as to what** (*Quod autem*) I report — what the Hebrews are wont to say against the history of Susanna, and the hymn of the three boys, and the fables of Bel and of the dragon (which are not had in the Hebrew volume) — he who criminales me [as] foolish proves himself a sycophant. For I explained not what I myself thought, but what they are wont to say against us. If I did not respond to their opinion in the prologue — studying brevity, lest I should seem to write not a preface but a book — I think that I straightway subjoined [it]; for I said: Concerning which it is not of this place to dispute. Otherwise, also, from that which I asserted — that Porphyry said many things against this prophet, calling as witnesses of this matter Methodius, Eusebius, [and] Apollinaris, who responded to the many thousands of verses of his madness — he [Rufinus] will be able to accuse me, [saying] that I did not, in a little preface, write against the books of Porphyry." These [things] Jerome. Whom, if any one should again wish to carp at, because he everywhere called these histories "fables," we will respond that he derived the name of "fable" (*fabula*) not from "fabricating" (*fabulando*), but from "speaking" (*fando*). For also those who narrate true things are said, by the common speech of the nations, to "fabulate." As, concerning the two disciples speaking on the journey about the death of Christ, Luke said: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοῦς (*kai egeneto en to homilein autous*) — which the old interpreter [the Vulgate] translated, "**And while** (*Et dum*) they fabulated [talked] with one another," that is, "conversed." And these things concerning the prophetic books, said against the heretics. Now let us accede to the books which are called Parenetic [hortatory] and Moral. ²

OF THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES — Heresy VII (*De Libro Ecclesiastis. Haeresis VII*)

To repudiate the Ecclesiastes of Solomon.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

Philastrius, in the catalogue of heresies, places this error among the unnamed heresies, whose author is unknown. Hugo of Caro [Hugh of St. Cher] in the preface of this book seems to intimate that [the error] derived from the foolish opinions of certain Jews, who indeed asserted that Solomon put forth this book for the confutation of the ancient idolatry, whose root and cause had been [the belief in] the eternity of the world.

Who [Solomon], since at the time when he wrote this he loved [was enamored of] idolatrous women — as is read in the third [book] of Kings — did not dare to write openly about the vanity of the world, and about its origin and destruction, lest, plucking out the error of those [women] from that very root, he should offend either them, or the nations of them. Whence, as it were studying to please them, he sometimes affirmed all things to have been from eternity, when he said: "**Nothing** (*Nihil*) new under the sun" — adding also many other things similar to these, for the sake of the women whom he loved.³ Jerome also, at the end of the commentaries on this book, relates that the Jews were about to cast this book from the Canon of the holy letters — because it seems to esteem the whole to be for nothing, and to prefer eating, and drinking, and passing delights to all things; but that they desisted from this opinion, on account of a few words which are found written at the end of this book.

CONFUTATIO [The Confutation]

The heretics damn this book (as Philastrius related), first, because straightway in the very exordium of the book he said that all things which are under heaven are not only vanity, but even vanity of vanities; and [because] he did not deny to himself whatever his eyes desired; and because there was nothing good in the life of man except to rejoice, and to drink, and to eat; and [because] the death of man and of beasts is the same. For which causes (as Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, bishop, in the preface to the commentaries on the Canticle of Solomon relates) certain unnamed heretics said that Solomon lacked the illustration of the Holy Spirit — not only in the composition of the present book, but also of all his books — because his heart in old age was depraved by women, and turned to the magic arts and to idols, as is written in the third volume of Kings: which the Holy Spirit would surely never have permitted, if he had ever dwelt in him.⁴

But far be it that we should think any such thing concerning Solomon — the treasury of the celestial science, through whose mouth the divine wisdom spoke — esteeming that he thought so impiously concerning God: [Solomon] who wholly lay [labored] upon this, that — in the manner of the best preacher — he might provoke the people to the contempt of this world, showing all things which are under the sun to be caducous [perishable], and to be reputed for nothing; [showing] that the world daily grows old, and that all mortals vanish among the errors of this life and the fleeting lapses of times, and that nothing solid, nothing stable, is found in the universe, but that God alone is always the same, [as] he has been; and that those alone are wise and blessed who are joined to God. But that such was the design of Solomon in this book is more manifestly demonstrated in the peroration of the volume — where Solomon, concluding his disputation, says: "Let us all alike hear the **end** (*Finem*) of speaking: Fear God, and keep his commandments; this is [the whole of] every man. All things that are done, God will bring into judgment, for every deed, whether it be good or evil." By which words the whole [sum] of the disputation, and the cata-[logue]⁵

¹ Gregory (Gregorius); Luke 4 (Luc. 4).

² Josephus, book 10, ch. 12 (Iosephus l. 10. cap. 12); Luke 24 (Luc. 24).

³ Philastrius, ch. 132 (cap. 132); 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (so the passage, Solomon's idolatry; printed "3. Reg. 4").

⁴ ch. 132 (cap. 132); Eccl. 1 (Eccl. 1); Eccl. 2; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 11 (3. Reg. 11).

⁵ Jerome (Hier.); Ecclesiastes, last [ch.] (Eccl. ult.).

(printed p. 645 [PDF p. 650] — Heresy VII (*Ecclesiastes*) confutation concluded; then Heresy VIII opens: Of the Canticle of Canticles — Assertors (the Pharaoh's-daughter theory; the divine-name argument); the Confutation begins.)

the sum of his catalogue [reckoning], compressing it as it were into this recapitulation (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις), he [Solomon] shows this one thing to have been the argument of his whole discourse [sermon]: that men, the enticements of this world being cast off, might fear and worship the Creator. **But as to what** (*Quod autem*) the heretics calumniate — that the creatures, good by their own nature, are in this volume called most vain vanity — it has an easy solution: for creatures are considered in two ways, either in themselves, or in relation

[comparison] to God. For when they are considered in themselves, assuredly the earth, the seas, and all things which are contained in this circle [orb], are indeed good in themselves; but compared to God, they are nothing, save vanity of vanities, and all vanity, and to be reputed less than nothing. And just as I hold [account] the little flame of a lamp most welcome in the darkness — which, the splendor of the sun being risen, I condemn — so, beholding the elements and the manifold variety of things, I do indeed marvel at the greatness of the works; but reconsidering that all things pass away, and that the world grows old toward its own end, and that God alone is always that which he has been, I am compelled to say, not once, but twice: **VANITY** (*VANITAS*) of vanities; and all is vanity. **But when** (*Cum autem*) they add that Solomon set the destruction [end] of men and of beasts as equal, and placed the highest good in food and in pleasure — let them know that he brought forth such things not out of his own opinion, but according to the foolish opinion of cattle-like (*pecuinorum*) men, who, thinking that man wholly perishes in death like the rest of the animals, for [their] highest beatitude account it to gorge themselves with pleasures, and to be sated with all the enticements of this world. ¹

That likewise which they mendaciously say — that Solomon lacked the inspiration [breath] of the Spirit — is expressly convicted [as] false out of the third book of Kings, in which it is written concerning him: "**Behold** (*Ecce*), [I have given] thee a wise and understanding heart, so much so that none before thee has been like unto thee, nor shall arise after thee." Who, although he afterward fell, did not therefore fall because he had not before had the Spirit of God dwelling [in him], but because the divine providence permitted him to fall — lest (as Ambrose says) on account of his admirable wisdom and incomparable felicity he should be believed by the Jews to be either God, or the Messiah promised in the law. Whose fall, however grave it was, neither ought, nor was able, to take anything from the authority of his books. Since we know it often to have happened that God spoke true and holy [things] even through evil men; for the malice of men can in no way harm the gifts of God, nor ought the gifts of God to be less commended to us if those be evil through [by] whom they are ministered to us. For the gifts of God are to be inspected, not the minister; and not who, but what is said, is to be attended to. ²

OF THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES — Heresy VIII (*De Cantico Canticorum. Haeresis VIII*)

That the Canticle of Canticles is an obscene ditty of a shameless lover, composed for the sake of pleasure [voluptuousness].

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This heresy, which the Anabaptists have now renewed, Philastrius, in his catalogue, reckoned among the Unnamed [heresies]. Which Luther, wishing somewhat to moderate, in the exordium of his Annotations upon the Canticle, followed the error of certain heretics — whom Theodoret, in the preface to the Canticles, narrates to have asserted that this little book is nothing else than a familiar colloquy between Solomon and the Commonwealth of the Jews, inviting Solomon her beloved to reign over her. But Castalio [Sebastian Castellio], in the Annotations on the same book, thinks with the Anabaptists that this Canticle is a colloquy of Solomon with a certain lover [amica] of his, a Sulamite [Shulammite], concerning whom it is said: "**Return** (*Revertere*), return, O Sulamite; return, return, that we may behold thee" — to whose courtly women [ladies of the court] Solomon sometimes directs [his] speech, and they too in turn [direct theirs] to him, and to her. This stolid opinion, Philastrius and Jacobus [James] Christopolitanus, bishop, in the preface to this book, explaining more at large, write that of old there existed certain heretics who believed this Canticle [was] composed by Solomon — [when] now depraved by his concubines — in praise of the daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, whom he loved as the most beautiful of all his women; esteeming that Solomon said concerning her: "**To my cavalry** (*Equitatu meo*) [company of horses] in the chariots of

Pharaoh have I likened thee, my love. And there are sixty queens, and eighty concubines, and of young maidens there is no number; but one is my dove, and my chosen one. The daughters of Sion saw her, and proclaimed her most blessed, and the queens praised her."³

Which words, [they held,] cannot be referred to a spiritual and divine understanding; and this they confirmed by this token [indication]: that never in this Canticle is the name of God set down. And that this is [so] stands [as agreed], against the custom of divine scripture, in which there exists no book wherein is not written that name — the τετραγράμματον (*tetragrammaton*), or four-lettered יהוה (*Iehova* [*Yahweh*]) — or at least some other name of God, of which the others are: אֲדֹנָי (*Adonai*), אֵל (*El*), שְׁדַי (*Saddai* [*Shaddai*]), צְבָאוֹת (*Zebaoth* [*Sabaoth*]), and others similar to these; none of which, since they found [none] in this book, they pronounced its matter to be profane, and accordingly [held] that Solomon, led by religion [scruple], did not dare to mingle the holy name of God with amatory songs — lest, against the precept of the law, he should take the name of God into vain discourses.⁴

CONFUTATIO [The Confutation]

But how far (*Sed quantum*) the carnal opinion of these men strays from the aim [target, σκοπός] of this divine Canticle, the very words of the Canticle demonstrate — [words] which do not suffer themselves to be expounded according to the letter. For such are the similitudes by which they describe that beloved spouse, that — understood according to the exterior sound of the voice [i.e. the literal surface] — they rather deform and disfigure her than illustrate and adorn her. For what can be said, or feigned, more inept than what is here reported concerning the spouse? — namely, that she has an ample head like Mount Carmel; eyes very like the great fishpools which are in Esebon [Heshbon]; a nose exhibiting, by its magnitude, the tower which looks toward Damascus; teeth like flocks of sheep; a neck like the citadel [tower] of Sion, from which a thousand shields hang; hands like golden spheres [globes]; legs like marble columns erected upon golden bases; and moreover, that she is fair as the place [town] of Tirza [Tirzah], comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army set in array. All which things, if [taken] even of the daughter of Pharaoh⁵

¹ Jerome on Ecclesiastes, ch. 1 (Hier. in eccl. cap. 1).

² 3 Kings [1 Kings] 3 (3. Reg. 3).

³ cap. 133 & 147 (Philastrius, ch. 133 & 147); Canticle 6 (Cant. 6); Canticle 1 (Cant. 1).

⁴ Canticle 6 (Cant. 6).

⁵ Canticle 7 (Cant. 7); Canticle 6 (Cant. 6).

(printed p. 646 [PDF p. 651] — Heresy VIII (Canticle) confutation concluded (Origen's Epithalamium; the divine-name response); then Heresy IX opens: Of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus — statement, Assertors, and the Refutation begun.)

[if] of the daughter of Pharaoh, or of a Sulamite [Shulammit] they be understood, [these similitudes] are so rude, unpolished, and rustic that far more elegant and polished are those [songs] which that rude Cyclops, among the poets, is feigned most ineptly to sing to his Galatea. It behooves us, therefore — if we would (as is fitting) free Solomon, the wisest of all men, from the mark of ineptitude — to recall the words of this Canticle from the carnal to the spiritual and mystical understanding, and in it to understand the chaste nuptials of the mystic Bridegroom CHRIST, and of his spouse the Church, or of the soul, whose Epithalamium [wedding-song] is sung in the present volume: as all the fathers testify in the preface to it, and especially Origen, who begins his commentaries in this manner: "**The little book** (*Epithalamium*) — that is, the nuptial song — seems to me to have been written by Solomon in the manner of a drama, which he sang after the likeness of a bride about to wed, and burning with heavenly love toward her Bridegroom, who is the Word of God. For he loved him — whether [as] the soul which is made to his image, or [as] the Church. But how magnificent and perfect this Bridegroom [is], [and] with what words he used [speech] toward the soul joined to himself, or [toward] the Church, this same scripture teaches us. The companions also of the bride

— young maidens [ladies-in-waiting] placed with the bride herself — what they say; and what likewise the friends and companions of the Bridegroom [say], we come to know out of the same book, which is entitled 'the Canticle of Canticles.'" These [things] Origen. From which it is most evident that, by the one lover, spouse, and dove of Solomon, is signified the Church, the spouse of Christ; and by the queens and concubines, holy souls joined to Christ through charity — as by "Solomon," that is, "the peaceable," Christ, who is truly peaceable, is designated.

As to the fact (*Quod*) that the carnal readers of this Canticle, not recognizing [it], can find no divine name in it — whereas nevertheless its single songs are full of divine names, by which God names himself, now [as] shepherd, now [as] brother and friend, now [as] bridegroom, now [as] beloved and desirable, of set purpose — those ancient names being passed over (not without the greatest mystery), by which that incomprehensible Majesty had been wont, not without fear, to be circumscribed [bounded] by men: such as **אל** (*El*), that is, "the strong"; or **אדני** (*Adonai*), that is, "lord"; or **שדי** (*Saddai*), that is, "the robust"; or **צבאות** (*Zebaoth*), that is, "mighty in arms"; or **יהוה** (*Iehova*), which by the Hebrews is reckoned **ἀνεκφώνητον** (*anekphoneton*), that is, "unpronounceable" [ineffable]. For when that heavenly Bridegroom, in the present Canticle, wished to console his mystic spouse — [who was] now for so long a time awaiting the kisses of her beloved Bridegroom, and pining away with the deferral of [her] desire — he omitted that most ancient appellation of the divine names, formidable by its very sound, [and] taking in their place new and more gracious names, by the sweetness of whose sounds he might soothe the glowing [ardent] mind of the spouse: calling himself, in place of "lord," [her] brother, friend, beloved, and bridegroom; in place of "mighty-in-arms," the peaceable one, and shepherd; in place of "strong and robust," the wounded and stricken one; in place of "ineffable," poured-out ointment, a little bundle of myrrh, a cluster of Cyprus [henna], a young hart, chosen out of thousands, fairest of all, wholly desirable and lovable: thus in turn calling his spouse — not, as of old he had been wont to call [her], the land of Israel, the daughter of Sion, the land of Juda — [but] handmaid and servant; nay rather, sister, spouse, friend [beloved], dove, beloved one, only one, fairest of women, and by many other new and coaxing appellations of this kind, by which he might sweetly refresh his beloved spouse, worn out with the long desire of the Bridegroom.

OF THE BOOKS OF WISDOM AND OF ECCLESIASTICUS — Heresy IX (*De Libris Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici. Haeresis IX*)

That the book of Wisdom is inscribed with the name of Solomon falsely; and that, accordingly, together with the book of Ecclesiasticus, it is [to be] excluded from the canon of the holy volumes.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This proposed error, of old defended by certain remnants of the Pelagians (as Hilary writes to Augustine), and lately restored by the Anabaptists and Lutherans, asserts two [things]. The first is, that the author of the book of Wisdom is not Solomon, but Philo the Jew, an Alexandrian by fatherland, most skilled in the Greek tongue — concerning whom, on account of the likeness of Platonic diction which he had, it was said: ἢ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει, ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει (*e Platon philonizei, e Philon platonizei*) — that is, "either Plato follows [imitates] Philo, or Philo [follows] Plato." The other is, that neither of these volumes is canonical. Which assertions — as the first [we shall show] to be uncertain and rashly asserted, so the second we shall show to be openly heretical.¹

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

And indeed, if the book of Wisdom was put forth by Philo the Jew, it ought not to be numbered among the books of the Old Instrument [Testament], but to be reckoned among the volumes of the New Testament: seeing that its author, Philo, flourished after the times of Christ, under Caius [Gaius/Caligula] Caesar — to

whom (as he himself wrote in the book concerning his embassy [*Legatio ad Gaium*]) he was sent, [while] a very young man, as legate of the Jews. Wherefore, since the Church places this book back among the others of the Old Testament — which, by the common custom of the Church, are for this reason called books of the Old Testament, because they were composed before the giving of the New Testament — it is manifest that it [the book of Wisdom] is not [the work] of the Jew Philo, who became renowned under the New Testament.²

Next (*Deinde*), in the second chapter of this book, the author, by a prophetic spirit, describes the future attempts of the Jews against Christ, saying: "**Come** (*Venite*), let us circumvent the just one: for he is unprofitable to us, and contrary to our works, and upbraids us with sins against the law, and defames among us the sins of our discipline [training]. He promises that he has the knowledge of God, and names himself the Son of God. Let us see, therefore, whether his words be true; and let us try what things shall come to him, and we shall know what shall be his last end. For if he be the true Son of God, he will receive him, and will free him from the hands of the adversaries. With contumely and torment let us question him, that we may know his reverence, and may prove his patience; with a most shameful death let us condemn him." Which words, as the Catholic Church believes and preaches, [treat] openly of the future passion³

¹ Wisdom 2 (Sap. 2).

² (a cluster of source-references, partly illegible); Jerome, *On Illustrious Men* (*Hier. de viris illustr.*).

³ Wisdom 2 (Sap. 2).

(printed p. 647 [PDF p. 652] — *Heresy IX: Refutation of the first assertion (that Philo, not Solomon, wrote Wisdom); then proof that both Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are canonical — New-Testament, ecclesiastical, conciliar, and patristic attestation.*)

[the words of Wisdom ch. 2 contain a] prophecy [also] of the death of Christ; which, since in the time of Philo it was already fulfilled, it follows that he was not the writer of this prophecy.

To this (*Ad hoc*) also there accedes, that the author of this book, in the same second chapter, detests the envy, emulation, and zeal [malice] of the impious Jews against that same just one, Christ, and execrates their grave malice and impiety — which it is not verisimilar that Philo did, a man most celebrated among his own, and always held in the highest honor, and besides this always versed in the law of the Jews, and alien from the worship of Christ; lest, accusing so freely and openly the so recent crime of his own fathers, he should stir up the hatred of his own [people] against himself.¹

Besides (*Praeterea*), the blessed Dionysius the Areopagite brings forth a testimony out of this book, in the first part of the fourth chapter of the book *On the Divine Names*, saying that, among the first institutions [foundations] of the scriptures, [Solomon] said certain things about the divine Wisdom more copiously: "**I became a lover** (*Amator factus sum*) of her beauty" — which is taken out of the eighth chapter of this book. Nor is it to be believed that the blessed Dionysius cited this out of the book of Philo, [as] now newly published, since he calls that book [one of] "the first institutions of the scriptures": which indicates that the book was not then first sent forth into the light, but composed many ages before, in that first institution of the divine scriptures. Which book, even if it were possible that the blessed Dionysius saw it newly published, it is still not verisimilar that so great a father would have deigned to lean, in a most grave matter, upon the authority of Philo.²

There exists (*Extat*) also a catalogue of all the works of Philo, in Eusebius, book 2 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, ch. 18, and in Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men* — in which [catalogue] the book of Wisdom is nowhere named.

But because (*Verum*) some of the Lutherans saw that the aforesaid [arguments] stood in the way of their opinion, therefore, that they might extricate themselves from these [difficulties], they said that there were two Philos: one after the times of Christ, under the emperors Caius [Gaius], and Claudius, and Nero, of

whom Eusebius and Jerome make mention; but the other more ancient, most eloquent in Greek fluency, above a hundred and sixty years before the birth of Christ, in the times of Onias the pontiff of the Jews — and [they say] that this one was the author of the book of Wisdom.

Which opinion those things wholly contradict which the author, in the ninth chapter of this book, writes concerning himself — asserting that he was king of Israel, and in the city of Jerusalem built a temple to God, in these words: "**But thou** (*Tu autem*), O Lord, hast chosen me [to be] king of thy people, and judge of thy sons and daughters; and hast said [bidden] me to build a temple in thy holy mount, and an altar in the city of thy habitation, a likeness of thy holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning." Which words, assuredly, can be accommodated to neither of these Philos — who were neither kings in Jerusalem, nor built a temple in it — but agree with Solomon alone, who reigned at Jerusalem, and first set up a temple to God; and who, as the wisest of all kings, composed this noble book of Wisdom, in whose aforesaid chapter he wrote that he prayed to God for the obtaining of wisdom, unto the rightly governing of the people, as is written in the third book of Kings.³

But above all (*Sed super omnia*), the authority of the Catholic Church, and the common consensus of the fathers, declare Solomon [to be] the author of this book. For the Church every year, on the fourth feria [Wednesday] of Pentecost, in the most holy mysteries, chants [decantat] the first sentence of this book, saying: "**Solomon said** (*Dixit Salomon*) to his sons: Love justice, you that judge the earth." With whom all the fathers, as well Greek as Latin, agree. And first, of the Greeks, Eusebius, book 4 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 22, thus says: "**But indeed** (*Verum*) this Hegesippus [Egesippus] also, and Irenaeus, and the whole choir of the ancients, called the book which is entitled 'the Wisdom of Solomon,' [Solomon's] — just as also the Proverbs." And Epiphanius, in the book *On Weights and Measures*, believed the book of Wisdom — called πανάρητον (*panareton*) [all-virtuous], from every virtue which is contained in it — to be Solomon's. And John Damascene, book 4, ch. 18, attributed the book of Wisdom, stuffed [full] with the doctrine of all virtues, to Solomon [as] author. But among the Latins, the blessed Ambrose, in the book *On the Four Difficult Questions*, makes Solomon the author of this book, thus saying: "In the book of Wisdom, Solomon relates that he besought the Lord, saying: 'I went to [approached] the Lord, and besought him: Give me, O Lord, wisdom, the assistant [attendant] of thy seats [throne].'" Augustine likewise — when at some time he had asserted that this book was not Solomon's — at length, recognizing his opinion [to be] but little probable, retracted [it] in the second book of the Retractions, ch. 4. From these [things], therefore, it is left proved that the book of Wisdom was composed by Solomon.

And as to the fact (*Quod autem*) that the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach [Syrach] — which is called Ecclesiasticus — are received into the canon of the holy scriptures, it is demonstrated by the attestation of the New Testament, by the authority of the Church, by the determination of the councils, and by the testimony of the most ancient fathers. For Paul, to the Romans in the eleventh [chapter], and to the Hebrews in the eleventh, alleges sentences [sayings] of Wisdom out of the 9th, 6th, and 4th chapters; and Peter and James, each in the first chapter of their epistles, bring forth testimonies out of the 14th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. The same do, of the book of Wisdom, Clement the Roman Pontiff in [his] first epistle, Anacletus in the second, Evaristus in the first epistle to the Africans. Similarly, of the book of Ecclesiasticus, the same do Fabian, Pope [the first], who in [his] second epistle to all the Eastern bishops takes words out of its 10th and 11th chapter; and Sixtus, Pope the first, received out of the 24th chapter of the same volume that [saying]: "**I** (*Ego*) came forth out of the mouth of the Most High, and alone compassed [went round] the circuit of heaven." John Damascene, making mention of each volume, in book 4, *On the Faith*, thus writes: "ΠΑΝΑΡΗΤΟΣ (*Panaretos* [the All-virtuous]) — that is, the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, that is, Ecclesiasticus — [these] are indeed virtuous and good, but they are not numbered [in the canon], nor did they lie in the ark; and therefore, although among the Jews they are not numbered, yet among the faithful they are held of the greatest authority." Augustine, in book 2 *On*

Christian Doctrine, says: "Those two books — one which is entitled *Wisdom*, and the other which is entitled *Ecclesiasticus* — since they have merited to be received into authority, are to be numbered among the prophetic [books]." And in book 1 *On the Predestination of the Saints*, ch. 14, of the book of *Wisdom* he thus says: "**But** (*Sed*), those who wish to be instructed by [the sayings of] the commentators [tractatores], it behooves that [they consider] also that book of *Wisdom*, where it is read: '**He was snatched away** (*Raptus est*), lest malice should change his heart' — [a book quoted] by all the commentators" ⁴

¹ *Wisdom* 2 (Sap. 2).

² *Wisdom* 8 (Sap. 8).

³ *Wisdom* 9 (Sap. 9); 3 Kings [1 Kings] 3 (3. Reg. 3).

⁴ Augustine, ch. 8 (of *De doctrina christiana*, bk 2) (Cap. 8); *Wisdom* 4 (Sap. 4).

(printed p. 648 [PDF p. 653] — *Heresy IX concluded: the conciliar/patristic seal on Wisdom & Ecclesiasticus; the Objections of the Heretics* (Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Isidore); the Solution; then *Heresy X opens: Of the book of Job.*)

[they should prefer that book of *Wisdom*] to all the commentaries [tractationibus] which they [have otherwise] preferred to themselves — [a book] which even the excellent commentators of the times nearest to the Apostles preferred to themselves, who, adducing it as a witness, believed that they were adducing nothing but a divine testimony. Not, therefore, ought the book of *Wisdom* — which is read in the Church of Christ through so great a multitude of years, in which this [saying] too is read — to suffer injury, nor ought its testimony [sentence] to be repudiated: [a book] which has merited to be recited in the Church of Christ through so long an antiquity of years, and to be heard by all Christians, from the bishops down to the lowest laity, with the veneration of divine authority. To which testimonies of the fathers there accedes, at last, the authority of the third Council of Carthage, and of the great Lateran Council, and the epistle of Pope Innocent to Exuperius, and the catalogue of Gelasius — in [all of] which each book of *Wisdom* [i.e. both *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*] is numbered [in].

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. That the book of *Wisdom* is not Solomon's, Jerome testifies in the prologue to the books of Solomon, calling it a book ψευδεπίγραφον (*pseudepigraphon*) — that is, falsely inscribed [ascribed] to Solomon, since it is [the work] of Philo the Jew, and nowhere exists among the Hebrews, and its very style savors of Greek eloquence. To whom subscribing, Augustine, in book 2 *On Christian Doctrine*, thus speaks: "**For** (*Nam*) two books — the first, which is [entitled] *Wisdom*, and the other, which is entitled *Ecclesiasticus* — are said to be Solomon's, from a certain likeness [to him]; for Jesus son of Sirach is most constantly reported to have written them." And in the seventeenth book *On the City of God* he says, to the same effect: "**Two other** (*Alii duo*) books, of which the one [is] *Wisdom*, the other truly *Ecclesiasticus* — on account of some likeness of eloquence, custom has obtained that they be called Solomon's; but that they are not his, the more learned do not doubt." ¹

2. And that neither of these volumes has canonical authority, Jerome, in the aforesaid prologue, is a witness, saying: "**There is reported** (*Fertur*) also the *Panaretos* [All-virtuous] of Jesus son of Sirach, and another pseudepigraphus [falsely-titled book], which is inscribed 'the *Wisdom of Solomon*'; and a little after: "As, therefore, the Church indeed reads the books of Judith, and of Tobit, and of the Maccabees, but does not receive [them] among the canonical scriptures — so also [it reads] these two volumes for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of the ecclesiastical dogmas." And again, in the *Helmeted Prologue* [*Prologus galeatus*], he thus speaks: "**Therefore** (*Igitur*) the *Wisdom* which is commonly inscribed [with the name] of Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach, are not in the canon." Which he confirms also in the explanation of the eighth and eleventh chapter of Zechariah [Zacharias]. But Epiphanius, concerning each book, in the little treatise *On Weights and Measures*, writes these things: "**For** (*Nam*) two

books [are] written in verse — the *Wisdom* of Solomon, called *Panaretos* [All-virtuous] from every wisdom, and the *Wisdom* of Jesus son of Sirach — and of his grandson Jesus, who wrote that Wisdom in Hebrew, so that his grandson interpreted [translated] it, that is, wrote it in Greek: [these] are indeed useful and commodious, but they are not reckoned into the number of the received [books]." Isidore also, in the sixth book of the *Etymologies*, ch. 2, rejects the book of Ecclesiasticus among the apocrypha. But neither Gregory the Theologian [Nazianzen], nor Eusebius, nor Origen, nor any of the ancients, reckons these books in the catalogue of the divine volumes.

SOLVTIO [The Solution]

1. Unjustly do the heretics impute to Jerome what he himself does not assert, but writes by way of reporting — not himself believing it, but narrating that certain ancient writers, that is, the Jews, believed it. For he says: "**The Jews** (*Iudaei*) have affirmed it to be Philo's" — so that they thought that Philo collected together the sentences [sayings] of this book, first put forth by Solomon and [then] dispersed, and compressed [them] into one volume, which afterward, from the name of the collector, was by some called "the Wisdom of Philo." But Augustine retracted the sentences [he had] adduced [advanced], in the second book of the *Retractations*, ch. 8, in these words: "**What** (*Quod*) I said concerning the author of the book which many call 'the Wisdom of Solomon' — that Jesus son of Sirach wrote it also, just as [he wrote] Ecclesiasticus — I afterward learned does not so stand [is not so certain] as was said by me; and I found it altogether more probable that this [man] is not the author of that book."

2. But as to the words of Jerome, asserting that the book of Wisdom is not received into the canon by the Church, we respond — as we have also said elsewhere — that he understood this of the Church of his own times: to which, since it did not yet sufficiently openly stand [established] concerning the authority of these volumes, it [the Church] did not dare to receive them into the canon for the proof of dogmas; but a little afterward, being more fully taught by the Holy Spirit, in the third Council of Carthage it received each volume, and thereupon the following Councils numbered each in the sacred catalogues. But if Origen and certain other fathers rejected these books from the Canon, it does not on that account follow that they are in no way canonical; but this only is gathered from the authority of those fathers — namely, that books of this kind are not of the number of the scriptures which pertain to the first order [rank] of the Canon, and concerning which there was never any doubt: which neither do we deny. For we have placed each in the second order of the canonical volumes. It is plain, therefore, that the Parenetic [hortatory] books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are, by the best right, numbered among the holy writings; concerning which, since enough has been said, let us pass on, at last, to the order of the Historical volumes.

OF THE BOOK OF JOB — Heresy X (*De Libro Iob. Haeresis X*)

That the history of the book of Job is a fiction; and that Job himself never existed among men [in human affairs].

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This also is a heresy of the Anabaptists of our age, who, deriding this book, call it a Tragicomedy of the Hebrews — that is, a fable [fiction], put forth partly according to the laws of comedy, partly according to [the laws] of tragedy: because at the beginning of the history itself the slaughter of the sons and daughters of Job is related (which is customary in tragedies), but at the end (which is proper to comedy) the happy outcomes of Job are set down.

¹ (Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* bk 2) ch. 8 (Cap. 8); [*On the City of*] *God*, bk 17, ch. 20 (Li. 17. de ci[vitate]. cap. 20).

(printed p. 649 [PDF p. 654] — *Heresy X (Job): the Refutation (Job's historicity from Ezekiel, James, and Paul); then the Objections of the Heretics — objection 1, the "comic fable" argument, with the disputed identity and name-etymologies of Job and his friends.*)

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

And this (*Atque*) impious error the re-dipped [*reincti* — a pun: the "re-dyed," i.e. re-baptized] Anabaptists received from the circumcised Jews out of בַּבָּא בַּתְרָא (*Baba Bathra*) — that is, from the third part of the fourth order of the Talmudic books. To which the divine scripture wholly contradicts, which testifies not only that Job existed among men [*in humanis*], but numbers him among the men foremost in sanctity. For in Ezekiel God says: "If (*Si*) Noah [Nohe], Daniel, and Job shall have stood in the midst [of a sinning land], they in their [own] justice shall free their souls." And James, in his catholic [epistle], proposing the admirable patience of Job for imitation in adversities: "**The endurance** (*Sufferentiam*) of Job," he says, "you have heard, and you have seen the end of the Lord." Who, if he had nowhere existed in the universe of things, scripture surely would not have so diligently noted his name, and [that] of his city, the number of his sons and of his daughters, his wife too, and the number — item by item — of all his goods, from oxen down to asses, likewise the days of his life, and the names of his friends, and their race, household, and fatherland.¹ To this accedes, that Paul and the rest of the apostles borrowed from this holy history many illustrious sentences — not as from a fabricated fable, but as from a most true scripture — such as these: "**We brought NOTHING** (*Nihil intulimus*) into this world," etc.; and, "**I will COMPREHEND** (*Comprehendam*) the wise in their own craftiness"; and, "**God is NOT** (*Non est*) a respecter of persons"; and, "**God spared NOT** (*Deus... non pepercit*) the sinning angels," and several others of this kind similar. Most true, therefore, and most holy, is this history, and worthy to be held before the eyes by all the pious throughout their whole life — inasmuch as in it is set before us the perfect form of a religious man, and truly wise, who is neither puffed up by prosperous things, nor broken by adverse, nor in either deserts his God, but, immovable in faith and constant in hope, perseveres through all kinds of temptations.² Wherefore rightly Moses translated this holy history — written first in Syriac, whether by Job or by his friends — into the Hebrew tongue, for the consolation of his Hebrews when they were being oppressed in Egypt by Pharaoh: so that, while they read those vehement sorrows of the blessed man, they might mutually console one another, and with patience and thanksgiving bear the evils which had surrounded them; and, hearing of the remuneration which God bestowed on blessed Job after [his] endurance, might themselves also hope for liberation, and expect the reward of their labors. And so this holy book — which the Councils so often mentioned received into the Canon, and the perpetual consensus of the Church has approved — is to be received by all the faithful with all veneration.³

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. That the argument [plot] of the book of Job is comic, and fabricated according to the laws of the stage [scene], appears from this: that nothing certain can be had concerning the persons, nor the place, nor the time, nor the author of this history — the writers, no less Hebrew than Greek and Latin, dissenting among themselves. And first, concerning Job himself — who holds the chief part in this history, and on whom the argument of the whole narration leans — there is no small controversy. Origen, in the first chapter of the commentaries on Job, writes that this Job was an Arab, of the race of Esau, born in the land of Uz [Vsitis] — moved by certain words which are read in the common Greek edition toward the end of that book, where Job is said to have dwelt in the land of Uz, in the confines of Arabia, whose name before had been Iobab, and [who] was son of Zareth [Zerah], of the sons of Esau, of the mother Bozra, fifth from Abraham, fourth from Esau. To whom Augustine, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, consents. But Ambrose, in the commentary on the epistle to the Romans, thinks he was a king in Edom — from the fact that in Genesis it is read that kings once reigned in Edom, of whom the first was Balach [Bela] son of Beor, after whom Iobab

reigned; whom Ambrose believed to be Job, deceived by the affinity of the words [names], which nevertheless among the Hebrews differ much, not only in the beginning, but also in the end of the word. For Job, from the letter א (*aleph*) with a hiriq point subscribed, is thus written אִיּוֹב (*Iyyob*); but Iobab, beginning from the letter Iod, is thus written יוֹבָב (*Yobab*). But Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*, esteems those to judge falsely who believe Job to have been of the seed of Esau, asserting that he descended from the stock of Nachor [Nahor] the brother of Abraham. But others, whom Jerome cites in the same book, said Job to be that Iasub [Jashub] who, in the beginning of Paralipomenon [Chronicles], after Thola [Tola] and Suhah [Shuah], is numbered in the catalogue of the sons of Israel. But all the most ancient of the Hebrews — who, as more skilled concerning their own genealogies, are the more to be believed — hand down that Job never existed among men, but that this book was fabricated by an uncertain author under the person of Job: namely, as an example of patience, unto the instruction of endurance in adversities, and unto the solace of oncoming calamities. To which argument [design] they wish all the persons of the present book aptly to correspond. For there is set, in the first place, a man tossed through all kinds of evils, and oppressed with pains intolerable to human patience, on whom, from the outcome of his own misery, is imposed the name IOB — that is, "grieving, groaning, and howling, and afflicting himself." He is feigned also, not ineptly, [to be] of the land of Hus [Uz], which is interpreted "counsel," that we may learn that by counsel and prudence every kind of misfortune and hardship is easily overcome. But there are sent against so great a man — as if about to contend in the wrestling-school [palaestra] — not any sort of manikins from the lowest commons, but [men] distinguished by splendid names: Eliphaz, Baldad [Bildad], Sophar [Zophar], and Heliu [Elihu]. For Baldad is interpreted "ancient secrets"; Sophar, "watchman, or trumpet"; Eliphaz, "the gold of God"; but Heliu, "God himself": that in these it may be shown that against a man of Uz — that is, [a man] armed with counsel and prudence — no riches of men, however great, nor power, nor wisdom, prevails. Whence also, in the last act of this fable — in which the matter obtains a happier issue, as is wont to happen in comedies — God himself is brought in, who, as the best judge, restored to the most valiant man double for all [the things] which he had lost. And that the fable might be more delightful by the variety of speech, its single parts are so disposed by a certain comic method that its exordium begins in loose [prose] speech; then there follow acts, described after the manner of a drama in hexameter and pentameter verses, sometimes also with certain jingling rhythms [rhymes] interposed; and just as in the comedies, as well of the Greeks as of the La-[tins]

¹ Ezekiel 14 (Ezech. 14); James 5 (Iac. 5).

² Job 1 (Iob 1.d); 1 Timothy 6 (1. Tim. 6); Job 5 (Iob 5.b); 1 Corinthians 3 (1. Cor. 3); Job 34 (Iob 34.b); Acts 10 (Act. 10); Job 4 (Iob 4.c); 2 Peter 2 (2. Pet. 2).

³ Origen, in the preface to [his] tome[s] on Job, [ch.] 1 (Orig. in praef. tom. in Iob 1).

(printed p. 650 [PDF p. 655] — *Heresy X (Job): objection 1 concluded (the multilingual/comedy argument; uncertainty of place, time, author); objection 2 (Job made impatient and blasphemous); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins (response 1: significant names pervade all Scripture).*)

the diverse kinds of languages of the Latins are sometimes wont to be mixed [in], for the greater delight of the hearers — as in Aristophanes, in the comedy which is entitled *Acharnians*, a certain barbarian is brought in speaking the Persian tongue; and in Plautus, in the *Poenulus*, a certain African, Hanno, speaks in Punic — so in this fable [of Job] various kinds of languages are brought in. And [they say] one part of the narration, Jerome himself being witness, is digested in the Arabic speech, another in Syriac, another indeed written in Hebrew eloquence. And this is the opinion of the ancient Jews concerning the argument [plot] of this book. To the confirmation of which makes [also] the uncertainty of the place and of the time in which Job is reported to have lived — some, with Origen, affirming him to have been contemporary with Moses; others (among whom is Augustine) believing him to have lived long before the giving of the Law. Concerning the place likewise the opinion is varied. The author of this book relates that he was born in the land of Uz [Vsitis]; Augustine [says he was] born in Idumaea, and there brought up and dead; Ambrose [that he] reigned

in Edom; Origen writes that he lived in Arabia and was an Arab. Concerning the author of the present book, similarly, no one of the writers agrees with another. For — as Gregory in the preface to Job, and Isidore in the sixth book of the Etymologies, relate — some judge Moses to be its author; others think that Job himself wrote it after the stroke of his passion [suffering]; others [that it was] the companions of Job; others, one of the prophets. Wherefore, since concerning the argument, the persons, the place, the author, and the time of the book nothing stands [established], it seems to be judged that the present history was written not according to the truth of the deed, but for the sake of example and imitation, unto the commendation of patience.¹

2. But however the matter itself may stand, the author of this narration could not be so Lynceus [sharp-eyed] but that he strayed much from the aim [σκοπός] of his proposed argument. For he, when he had set out to fashion the person of a perfect man, and above all a most enduring one — whom neither prosperous things should lift up into pride, nor adverse cast down into desperation — nevertheless, in the very course of the narration, against the order of his own design, and against all the laws of patience, more than once draws that most patient man into the crime of impatience and of blasphemy: charging him that he cursed the day of his birth, saying, "**He cursed** (*Maledixit*) his day," and says: "Let the day perish in which I was born, and the night, in which it was said, A man is conceived." And, as if this were a light crime, he describes his indignation against God — that he brought him out of the womb, and that, [Job] having come forth from the womb, he did not straightway slay him. Thereupon feigning him [to be] driven by desperation — indignant words too being premised — to run to the halter [noose], saying: "**My soul** (*Suspendium*) has chosen hanging, and my bones death; I have despaired, neither shall I now live any longer." He makes him also a boaster of his own justice, and an accuser of the justice of God, when he says: "**Would that** (*Utinam*) my sins were weighed in a balance! — as [if] the sand of the sea, [my] punishment which I suffer would be found heavier than my iniquity." Than which — what more iniquitous can be devised against the justice of God? or what more arrogantly could be pronounced than what the author here brought forth out of the mouth of Job? "**My heart** (*Non... cor meum*) does not reprehend me in all my life" — whereas, on the contrary, it is written: "There is **not** (*Non*) a holy [man] on earth, who sins not." And in another place, accusing the providence of God through the mouth of that blessed man — that his patience is not a care to him: "**Where** (*Ubi*) now," he says, "is my expectation, and who considers my patience?" Nor content with this alone, he casts him headlong into that desperation, that he should object cruelty to God — no otherwise than to some most cruel torturer — with reproach, saying: "**Thou art turned** (*Versus es*) to me into a cruel [one]: if thou scourgest, slay [me] at once; or at least laugh not at the punishments of the innocent." Which words indeed, and others of this kind — which everywhere in the book of Job are read, full of indignation, impatience, and desperation — manifestly convince [prove] that the author of this history so far digressed from his own aim that, in place of a most pious and most valiant man, he set before us a most impatient one.²

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. If it be permitted us, by conjectures so light, to pronounce concerning the holy letters — [so] that those histories in the sacred volumes be judged false which consist of a variety of languages, of verses [meters], of names, and of persons — no part of divine scripture, in which these and things similar to these are found, will be true. For by this reason the book of Psalms, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the end of the book of Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles of Solomon, and the great Canticle of Moses, will have to be reckoned among fables; and all the volumes, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, will be believed to be fabricated — because so many names are read set down in them according to the properties of the persons. Let the insane Re-baptizers turn over the book of Genesis, and they will find how nearly all human names are mystical, and how, by a certain prophetic spirit and a certain hidden disposition of God, they were imposed by the ancient fathers upon their sons from the very [moment of] birth, so that, from the appellation of the names, the future outcomes of the sons might in some way be fore-noted before they came to pass. Thus the first of all women [was called] Eve — that is, "of [all] the living" — because she was to be the mother of all

living, [and] because she was to be such, she was so called. Thus Abraham — because he was to be the author of so numerous a seed — was called Abraham, that is, "father of many nations." Thus the younger son of Rebecca, by a certain hidden mystery, was called Jacob — that is, "supplanter" — that in the name the supplanting of the brother deceived by him might be noted; and truly of him his brother Esau at some time said: "**Rightly** (*Recte*) is his name called Jacob: for he has supplanted me now this second time." Thus the two sons of David, by [reason of] the future successes of [their] life, thus God inspiring, obtained names of diverse omen: this one, Solomon [Scelomo], that is, "peaceable," was so called on account of the future peace under his reign; but this other, Absalom — namely, "the father's bitterness" — was named by an unhappy augury, that the name might portend the bitterness of sorrow which the rebel son was to bring upon [his] father. And, that I may not wander further afield — thus in the New Testament Simon, by a most happy omen, received the name of Peter, and the sons of Zebedee the surname Boanerges, from Christ: that in him [Peter] the first rock of the Church to be built, [and] in these [the sons of Zebedee] the eminence of [their] future preaching, might be shown. To the likeness of these, then, Job — by a certain secret presaging of his calamities and sorrows, before he suffered them — obtains the name of one "grieving and howling"; just as also his companions, either because they were to have a life like [their] names, thus [it being] wil-[ling] ³

¹ Job 3 (Iob 3).

² Job 7 (Iob 7); Job 6 (Iob 6); Job 27 (Iob 27); Job 17 (Iob 17); Job 30 (Iob 30); Job 9 (Iob 9).

³ Genesis 27 (Gen. 27).

(printed p. 651 [PDF p. 656] — *Heresy X (Job): Dissolution of the Objections continues — response 1 concluded (the significant names; the "three-language" and disputed-homeland objections answered, Uz = Edom = Idumaea); then response 2 (Job's supposed "blasphemies" are not to be read according to the dead letter).*)

God willing [it], they were named; or that they might commend the memory of their progenitors to posterity — so, perhaps, were Eliphaz, Baldad, and Sophar named. For we read that some of those who are reckoned in the genealogy of Esau — whence these [men] drew their origin — were called by these very names. There is taken away, therefore, out of these [considerations], all suspicion of a fabricated name. But concerning the variety of languages, by which the most unskilled Anabaptists judge the diverse parts of the book to be written, it must be known that the author of the present history — whoever he was, whether Job, or some one of his friends — was an Idumaeon [Edomite] by race, as the history itself testifies, and wrote this book in the Idumaeon tongue, as being natural to him. But just as the Idumaeon region — Pliny being witness — is partly mingled with Syria (whose farthest part toward the setting sun it is), partly indeed with Arabia Petraea, to which it is contiguous and into which it runs out — so it is to be judged that the Idumaeon tongue was compounded partly of the Syriac, partly of the Arabic language; and that the writer of this book used this [tongue], which, when afterward Moses (as it pleases Origen) had turned into the Hebrew speech, and had rendered word for word rather than sense for sense, it came to pass that the book, turned into Hebrew, so abounded in Syriac and Arabic idioms that it seems to be written in a triple tongue. ¹ And so, when Jerome, in the preface to Job, writes that his translation, out of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac speech, sounds now the words, now the senses, now both together — his words are not so to be referred to the diversity of three languages that we should believe him to have derived his edition from three fountains of diverse languages, but [are to be understood] as directed [aimed] at the manifold variety of the Hebrew diction, stuffed with innumerable Syriasms and Arabisms. Which Jerome himself also indicated in the preface to Daniel, when he said that the book of Job has very much fellowship with the Arabic tongue — by this saying expressing rather that the book of Job has a likeness to the Arabic, than that any of its parts was written in Arabic. Now indeed, as to what they say — that the writers disagree among themselves concerning the author of this history, and its fatherland — it has so little moment for shaking the truth of the history that it is altogether unworthy of consideration. For, as the blessed Gregory in the preface to Job says: "**Who** (*Quis*) wrote these

things is very superfluously asked, since the Holy Spirit is faithfully believed [to be] the author of the book: he wrote these things, who dictated these things to be written; he wrote [them], who in this work stood forth [as] inspirer, and through the voice of the writer transmitted his words to us, to be imitated." Besides this too, neither are the fathers, [when] diligently considered, at variance among themselves concerning the author of the book and its fatherland. For the same [things] concerning these the author of the book of Job — and Origen, and Ambrose, and Augustine — affirm, although the one may say he lived in the land of Uz [Vs], another in Arabia, another in Edom, another in Idumaea. For the same is the land of Uz and Edom, Jeremiah saying in the Lamentations: "**Rejoice** (*Gaude*) and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz" — and each is in Idumaea, which is joined partly (as we said) to Syria, partly to Arabia. Whence also Origen, in the first chapter on Job, says: "**The Uzzites** (*Vssitidae*) are of the race of Esau, the posterity and tribe of Edom." For the Uzzites, and the Minaeans, and the Eubeans, and the Temanites, and all the rest of the tribes were of the kindred and lineage of Esau, who was also surnamed Edom.² And all those tribes were called Idumaeans; but now they are all called by one name, Arabs. Concerning the stock of Job also — which Jerome derives from Abraham through Nachor [Nahor], but Origen, and Ambrose, and Augustine, and Gregory from the same Abraham through Esau — if the mind of each be attentively attended to, either they do not differ at all, or [but] little: since all these spoke according to the sentence [reading] of the old, and of the common Greek and Latin edition, in whose foot [appendix] these words were formerly read: "**And Job was** (*Erat autem Iob*) the son of Zareth [Zerah], of the sons of Esau a son, and of the mother Bozra." But Jerome, as he himself confesses, spoke according to the sentence of the Hebrews, among whom those words are nowhere read in the volume of Job. Nor yet did Jerome wish those to have erred who believed Job to have descended from Esau, but he believed those to be deceived who, to assert this, were moved by no other cause than by the aforesaid words, which the Hebrew verity knew not.

2. I pass now to the execrable blasphemies which the wicked impute to that most holy man — wishing the mentioned sentences to be understood according to the dead letter, which without any doubt are to be expounded according to the mystical understanding of the vivifying Spirit. The very context of the words openly convinces [of this], the preceding and following discourses compelling [us] to it — [discourses] which by no means permit the aforesaid sentences to be understood according to the letter. For how can it be that Job, out of anger and indignation, cursed the day of his birth (as his words outwardly seem to indicate) — [Job] who, after the death of [his] sons, daughters, and all his goods, after the stroke of an incurable plague, answered his ill-counseling wife: "**If we have received GOOD** (*Si bona*) from the hand of the Lord, why should we not sustain evil?" Or how would it be verisimilar that he decided, out of the desperation of [his] soul, to end his life by hanging — [Job] who with so great confidence exclaims: "**Even if** (*Et si*) he shall slay me, I will hope in him"? And how credible [is it] that he wished to proclaim his life clean from every stain — when he said, "My heart does **NOT** (*Non*) reprehend me in my life" — [Job] who confesses with public voice that he sinned, saying: "**I have SINNED** (*Peccavi*); what shall I do to thee, O keeper of men? why dost thou not take away my sin, and remove my iniquity?" And by what means shall we dare affirm that Job complained of the injustice and severity of God — [Job] who, proclaiming the justice of God, says: "**If** (*Si*) the equity of his judgment be sought, no one can speak testimony for me: for if I shall wish to justify myself, my own mouth will condemn me"? Since, therefore, these words, compared [collated] according to the letter, cannot agree with themselves, they show something else hidden in themselves, which is to be sought. Therefore, if first we understand the words of blessed Job by which he cursed his day according to the outward sound of the voice — as Origen expounds — they suffer no absurdity. For that curse is not of such [weight] that for its sake that holy man should be accused. Since, when he cursed his natal day — which had already passed away, and no longer was — he truly cursed nothing: for a past day is neither in nature, nor in act, nor in its own power, but only an empty name, and altogether nothing. He, therefore, who cursed nothing, sinned nothing. But if we follow the mystical [exposition of Gre-]³

¹ (Pliny,) bk 5, ch. 13 (li. 5. c. 13).

² Lamentations 4 (Thren. 4).

³ Gregory in the preface [to] Job, ch. 3 & 4 (Greg. in praef. Iob c. 3 & 4); Job 13 (Iob 13); Job 9 (Iob 9).

(printed p. 652 [PDF p. 657] — Heresy X (Job) concluded: the Gregorian mystical reading of Job's "blasphemies"; then Heresy XI opens: Of the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, and Esther — statement, Assertors, and the start of the Refutation.)

[if we follow the mystical] exposition of Gregory, we shall recognize that a curse of this kind is holy, not depraved — inasmuch as it arises not from a wish of vengeance, but from the rectitude of judgment, and from tranquillity of soul: so that thence we may learn that there is a twofold day of our life. The one, of the first condition and of the human creation, in which man was created in justice and sanctity — that is, the day of justice, of innocence, of sanctity, and of grace. But the other, an execrable day, and obnoxious to malediction — namely, the day of the latter [second] birth, in which man is born in sin and iniquity, the day of sin and of human corruption. When, therefore, Job cursed his day, he did not say: "Let the day perish in which I was **created** [conditus]," but "the day in which I was **born** [natus]." As if he openly said: Let the day of sin and of fault perish, [let] the day of our mortality [perish], and let the day of innocence, of sanctity, and of grace — the day of glory and of immortality — break forth. And according to this sense it is to be understood that Job wished he had perished as an abortive [birth], and had not come into this life — namely, into the life of sin, iniquity, and fault. ¹ Similarly, that which he says: "**My soul** (*Suspendium*) has chosen hanging, and my bones death" — is expounded of a spiritual kind of hanging and of death: so that by "the hanging of the soul" we understand its elevation from earthly things to heavenly, from carnal to spiritual. For thus also Paul chose hanging, when he says: "**With CHRIST** (*Christo*) I am fixed to the cross." But by "desperation" are to be understood the renouncing of earthly pleasures, and the casting-off of worldly hope. ² That also, which he adds: "**Would that** (*Utinam*) my sins were weighed in a balance," etc. — is said mystically of Christ hanging on the cross for our sins. For Job, wishing to show the gravity of the Lord's passion: "Would that," he says, "my sins were weighed in the scale of the divine justice — mine, indeed, not by [my] fault, but by the assumption of a penalty, by which I merited the wrath of the Father; [and] the punishment which I suffer would certainly be found much heavier than the fault of man for which I suffer: because he who suffers is infinite, but he for whom he suffers, finite." ³ But when Job said: "My heart does **NOT** (*Non*) reprehend me" — we ought to consider that there are two kinds of sins: some which can be avoided by the just; but some which cannot be avoided even by the just. And these indeed are the perverse thoughts of sins; but those [others] are the consent and the executions of the perverse thoughts. He, therefore, who slips in the thoughts of sins, if he resists them, and repairs himself before he slips, through consent, into depraved operations, has nothing whereby he may afterward, weeping, be reprehended by his own heart. Thus, then, Job — who according to the sentence of Solomon had confessed himself a sinner — then confesses that he is not reprehended by his own heart: because, even if perhaps by thinking he failed in something unlawful, yet, resisting the thought, he failed nothing either by consenting or by working. ⁴ Finally, when we hear the words by which he seems to reproach cruelty to God, we ought to believe that they were brought forth by blessed Job not out of anger and indignation. For just as the holy scriptures call God, after the human manner, "zealous without zeal, angry without anger" — so by the holy man Job, after the human manner, God was called "cruel without cruelty." For he is called "cruel" who, striking strictly, spares not: so that, namely, in this place "cruel" may be understood [as] "striking strictly." As also Isaiah — wishing to show that the last day of judgment is to come not now with pardon, but with strictness — said: "**Behold** (*Ecce*), a cruel day shall come, and full of indignation." But those [words] which he subjoined, saying, "**If** (*Si*) thou scourgest, slay at once," etc., were likewise sent forth not out of hatred and reproach, but out of an ardent desire of human redemption [directed] to God the Father, by a certain prophetic spirit. And that the sense of these may become clearer, it must first be noted what is signified by "the punishment of the innocent," and by "the laughter of God." ⁵ Accordingly, the laughter of God — or [for God] to laugh — is

[for him] to be unwilling to pity human affliction; but the punishment is the deferral of desire, Solomon saying: "**Hope** (*Spes*) that is deferred afflicts the soul." The "punishments of the innocent," therefore, are those most ardent desires of the ancient fathers, by which, their soul glowing, they longed to see the mysteries of the Incarnation. But for God "to laugh" was not to fulfill their desires. For, so long as, not compassionating, he deferred the vows of his elect, what else was it than to laugh at the punishments of the innocent? And so the holy man, considering the gifts of the coming Redeemer, and patiently tolerating the deferral of his vows, says: "**If** (*Si*) thou scourgest, slay at once, and laugh not at the punishments of the innocent" — as if he openly prayed, saying: Since our life is daily worn away by the scourge of vengeance for [our] fault, let him now come who may once for us die without fault, that God may no longer laugh at the punishments of the innocent, if he himself appear passible in the flesh, in whose desires our mind chastens itself. Enough, therefore, out of these [things], let the blasphemies of the Anabaptists be confuted.⁶

OF THE BOOKS OF ESDRAS, TOBIT, JUDITH, AND ESTHER — Heresy XI (*De Libris Esdrae, Tobiae, Iudith, et Esther. Haeresis XI*)

To cast away the books of Esdras [Ezra], Tobit, Judith, and Esther, as histories of uncertain faith and authority.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

The Anabaptists reject these books in general; but Luther says that he doubts whether the book of Tobit and [that] of Judith are to be received into the order of the sacred volumes.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

The authority of the whole Church, the decrees of the Councils, and the testimonies of the fathers, damn this heresy. For the first and second [book] of Esdras — which is called Nehemiah [Nehemias] — not only are found in all the catalogues of the most ancient fathers of the Church, and their testimonies are cited in the decrees of the Pontiffs, but also among the Hebrews are reckoned among the כתובים (*Chetubim* [Ketuvim]) — that is, the Hagiographa, or holy writings, which were placed in the ark. But Tobit, although among them [the Hebrews] it is not in the Canon, yet the Church of the Christians, from the third Council of Carthage down to these our times, always had it in the Canon; and all the most ancient fathers of the Church brought forth various testimonies concerning it, as [from] canonical scripture. Among others indeed, Clement the first pontiff of that name, in [his] first and second epistle, and Anacletus in his first decree, [and] Alexander

¹ Gregory, book 4 of the Morals, ch. 6 (Greg. libr. 4. moral. cap 6); (gloss:) "A twofold day: natural and infused" (*Dies duplex, naturalis & influxa*).

² Galatians 2 (Gal. 2).

³ Isaiah 53 (Esai. 53).

⁴ Gregory, book 18, ch. 85 (Greg. lib. 18. cap. 85).

⁵ Job 9 (Iob 9).

⁶ Gregory, book 9 of the Morals, ch. 20 (Greg. lib. 9. moral. c. 20); Proverbs 13 (Prov. 13).

(printed p. 653 [PDF p. 658] — Heresy XI: the Refutation continues (papal and Hebrew witness to Tobit, Judith, and Esther; the Purim institution); then the Objections of the Heretics — 1: Esdras; 2: Tobit & Judith not in the canon; 3: the chronological difficulties of Judith; 4: Esther begun.)

But Alexander, Pope the first, in [his] first epistle, for the confirmation of the most holy Trinity, uses the testimony of the benediction of Tobit, saying: "If the Trinity is not, why is Tobit — when he sent his son into the city of Rages with Raphael the Archangel — taught to have blessed them, saying thus: 'May God [of] Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, himself fulfill his benediction in you?'" Similarly also Innocent the first, in his decretal epistle to Exuperius; Callistus, Pope the first, in [his] second decree; and

Marcellus, Pope the first, in [his] second epistle, used the testimonies of this history. The book of Judith also, not only the holy Nicene Synod (Jerome himself being witness) received into the number of the holy scriptures, but the Hebrews likewise hold [it] among the histories worthy of faith, placing it, together with the book of Tobit, among the sacred writings which among them were kept outside the ark, and were not guarded within the ark with the rest of the canonical books. They hand down, too, that the author of this book was Joachim the priest, son of Jesus the high priest — whom Philo the Jew, in [his] second booklet of the Chronography, mentions in these words: "**Jesus, then, held** (*Gessit*) the first pontificate up to the twelfth year of Assuerus Priscus [the Elder], thirty-six years; but Joachim his son, in [his] absence, eight years. He also wrote out the deeds of Judith, and instituted the anniversary memory of the liberation, to be kept yearly."

¹ But concerning the book of Esther — although of old, among certain Greek fathers, it was doubted whether it was canonical — nevertheless all the Councils reckoned it in the catalogues of the sacred volumes, and the Hebrews numbered it among the holy **Chetubim** (*so printed "Cherhubim"* [Ketuvim, the Hagiographa]) books. Most of the Latins think this [book] was published by Mardocheus [Mordecai]; but Philo the Jew, in the place above mentioned, asserts [it was] written by the same Joachim the pontiff — who, when he was now for the second time pontiff, at the exhortation by letters of Mardocheus the Hebrew, the adoptive father of Esther herself, committed this history to writing, and instituted the annual solemnity פורים (*Phurim* [Purim]) — that is, "of lots" — which is noted in the volume of Esther, and is celebrated by the Jews down to this time, every single year, in memory of the Jewish liberation. ²

OBIECTA HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. What is to be thought concerning the books of Esdras, Jerome, in the preface to Esdras, indicates in these words: "**Nor let** (*Nec*) any one be moved that one book only is published by us, nor let [any] be delighted with the dreams of the apocryphal third and fourth book: for among the Hebrews the discourses of Esdras and of Nehemiah are compressed into one volume; and those [things] which are not had among them, nor are of the twenty-four elders [books], are without doubt to be rejected." From which words it is manifest that the third and fourth of Esdras contain nothing but mere and vain dreams, and that only two books out of the four remain in the canon: of which the one — namely the second, which is called Nehemiah — Isidore, in the sixth book of the Etymologies, ch. 2, casts out of the canon, affirming that the second and third books of Esdras are not had among the Hebrews, but are by them reckoned among the apocrypha.

2. But concerning the books of Tobit and Judith — that they are not in the canon — Jerome openly testifies in the prologue to Tobit, saying: "**The book** (*Librum*) of Tobit indeed, which the Hebrews record [as] consigned, from the catalogue of the divine scriptures, among the apocrypha"; and in the Helmeted Prologue: "Judith," he says, "and Tobit, and the Shepherd [Pastor], are not in the canon." And lest any one should think that he spoke of the Jewish canon only, in the preface to Proverbs he added: "The books of Judith, and of Tobit, and of the Maccabees, the Church of God indeed reads for the edification of the people, but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures."

3. And deservedly indeed does the Church of God not receive the book of Judith into the canon, on account of the uncertainty of the history — whose neither deeds nor times agree with the approved histories of the nations. For those two kings of the Medes who are named at the beginning of the book of Judith — namely, Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor — in whose times the deeds of the present history are narrated to have happened, are nowhere commemorated in the histories of the nations. Nor does that make anything to the matter, which Lyra, and the author of the Gloss, and Eusebius in the Chronicles bring forward — that those two kings were called by diverse names among the Hebrews and among the profane historians: so that, whom the Greeks call Cambyzes, second king of the Persians, the Jews name Nabuchodonosor; and whom the Greeks make Diocles [Deioces], fifth king of the Medes, founder of the city Ecbatana, the Hebrews call that same [man] Arphaxad, founder of Ecbatana. For if it be so, how could Nabuchodonosor — by the Greeks called Cambyzes, in whose time Eusebius in the Chronicles writes that this history happened — fight

against Arphaxad (whom the author of the Gloss asserts to be Diocles, the builder of Ecbatana) in the great plain of Ragau, and obtain his kingdom (as is written in the exordium of the present history), when between Cambyses and Diocles more than a hundred and twenty years intervened? in which (as is gathered from the Chronicles of Eusebius) four intermediate kings reigned one after another, namely: Phraortes [Phaartes], twenty-four years; Cyaxares, thirty-two years; Astyages, thirty-eight years; Cyrus, thirty years — which, joined together, comprehend a hundred and twenty-four years. The history of this book is rendered uncertain also by many other [things] which are contained in it. As, concerning Arphaxad, or Diocles — whom Eusebius, and all the later chronographers, write to have held the kingdom of the Medes fifty-four years — but the beginning of the book of Judith narrates that he reigned only twelve years, and that in the twelfth year of [his] reign he was vanquished and cast down from empire by Nabuchodonosor, or Cambyses, king of the Assyrians.³ And concerning the city Ecbatana — which the author of the book of Judith records that Arphaxad (otherwise Diocles) built most mightily of squared stone — Pliny, book 6, ch. 14, hands down [that it was] founded by King Seleucus a long time afterward. To which so open contradictions accedes also the authority of Josephus, who — although he professed to commit to writing all the Jewish antiquities, whatsoever he believed true — [yet] made no mention of this history, [and thus] rendered it uncertain and suspected of falsity: since no cause ought to have restrained him from transmitting to posterity so magnificent a victory of his own nation, had he esteemed it worthy of faith and of history.

4. Concerning the book of Esther likewise, there is no less suspicion than concerning the book of Judith: because (as Jerome in the pre-[face]

¹ Jerome in the preface to the book of Judith (Hier. in praefat. libri Iudith).

² ch. 9 (of Esther) (cap. 9).

³ Judith 1 (Iudith 1).

(printed p. 654 [PDF p. 659] — Heresy XI: objections 4–5 concluded (the additions to Esther; the chronological impossibility of Mordecai's age); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins — response 1 (the third and fourth Esdras; the Nehemiah/Isidore point); response 2 (Tobit and Judith) begun.)

[as Jerome, in the pre]face to Esther, affirms — the theme of the history being taken, [the book] was written with historical artifice, these [things] being added at the writer's discretion which could, according to the occasion, be said and heard — just as it is customary in scholastic disciplines [school exercises], a theme being taken, to devise with what words he could use who has suffered an injury, or who has done an injury. That this opinion of Jerome is true, the last six chapters of this book show — namely from the tenth to the sixteenth — which are not had in the Hebrew volume, but were fabricated either by Josephus, or by some other writer. For both the copy of the letters of Aman [Haman], which are recited in the thirteenth chapter, and the copy of the epistle of King Artaxerxes, which is recounted in the sixteenth chapter, are excerpted into this book — with almost no word changed — out of the sixth chapter of the eleventh book of the Antiquities of Josephus. For Josephus, as he was skilled in the historical law [method], when he had noticed either that this history was rendered suspect, or that the king could easily be noted for inconstancy and levity — because, after the letters in which he had ordered the whole race of the Jews to be abolished, [being] suddenly changed, he revoked his sentence by new letters sent forth — inserted into the third and eighth chapter, and into very many other places of this history, many [things] by which he might vindicate this change of mind in the king, together with the narration of the history, from all suspicion of calumny or of fiction. But what was done by him in these chapters, it is credible that the same was done in the rest, either by him, or by other corruptors.

5. Besides these [things], the parts of the history are so dissonant among themselves that what before is reported to have been done in it under one king and time, the same is later read to have happened under another king and time. For although in its second chapter it is written that Bagatan [Bigthan] and Thares

[Teresh], royal eunuchs and doorkeepers of the royal palace, who had conspired against the murder of King Assuerus, were detected, and both hanged upon a gibbet — and that after the seventh year of King Assuerus — below, in the eleventh and twelfth chapter, the same is reported to have been done by the same eunuchs, and by Mardochaeus, under a different king and time, namely under King Artaxerxes, against whom those eunuchs are written to have conspired in the second year of his reign. And if any one should say that this Artaxerxes is the same with him who above was called Assuerus (as Eusebius notes in the Chronicles) — thinking this [man] to have been Artaxerxes Memnon, son of Darius Nothus and of Parysatis — then another, greater controversy arises, which overturns the whole authority of the history. For if the present history happened in the time of Artaxerxes, it is consequent that Mardochaeus the Jew was then two hundred years of his life — which exceeds all credit of truth: especially indeed since the history describes him as having exercised the royal services in the palace of the king with strength still entire, and to have ridden vigorously through the city, and to have accomplished many other [things] of this kind not sluggishly — which [things] it is not verisimilar that he could perform in so decrepit an age, [while] passing the two-hundredth year of [his] age. For we find that he lived so many years, if we reckon the time from his captivity down to King Artaxerxes. For Mardochaeus was of the sons of the captivity, whom Nabuchodonosor king of the Assyrians carried over into Babylon, together with Joachim, surnamed Jeconiah [Jechonias], king of the Jews; and that (as Eusebius writes in the Chronicles) in the eighth year of Astyages, the eighth and last king of the Medes. And it is verisimilar that Mardochaeus was then a boy, at least of ten years; to which if there be added the thirty years of Astyages — who reigned thirty-eight years — they will be forty; to which if there be added the number of years in which the eleven kings of the Persians reigned one after another — from Cyrus (who first transferred the kingdom of the Medes to the Persians, their king Astyages being conquered) down to Artaxerxes Memnon son of Darius Nothus — they will be a hundred and ninety-nine years: which sum of years it is necessary that Mardochaeus not only completed, but even survived by many years after. For it is written, in the tenth chapter of Judith ¹, that King Assuerus, after the event of this history, waged many wars, and subdued to his dominion all the land and the islands of the sea, and thereupon set Mardochaeus over the rest, [and] made him ruler over his whole empire. Which, since it presents no likeness of truth, it is plain that the history of Judith ², the theme being taken from an uncertain author, was fabricated for the exercise of style (as Jerome hints).

DILVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Concerning the third and fourth books of Esdras — which Jerome calls "dreams," and does not take into the Canon — although we judge that nothing need be answered to the heretics, nevertheless we do not dare to damn them, and altogether to reject them: especially since the blessed Ambrose (as we already showed in the first book) receives the fourth volume of Esdras, and Augustine indicates that some [things] which are in the third book are to be understood mystically, as of Christ. As is that [passage] where — a question having arisen among certain young men, [as to] what should be most powerful [strongest] in things — one said kings, another wine, the third women, who for the most part command kings; yet the same third demonstrated that truth is victorious over all: which certainly can most fittingly be applied to Christ, who is the highest truth. But concerning the second book, which Isidore seems to exclude from the Canon, we say that it is one book of Esdras which he calls "second" and rejects from the canon, and another that is the second book of Esdras which we receive in the canon. Ours begins: "The **WORDS** (*Verba*) of Nehemiah, son of Helchiah [Hachaliah]" — which among the Hebrews is the same with the first Esdras, and makes one single book with it. But the second [book], according to Isidore, begins thence, whence among us the third Esdras takes its beginning — namely from these words: "**And JOSIAS made** (*Et fecit Iosias*) [the Passover]" — which, together with the following book, does not exist among the Hebrews. But that Isidore receives, as canonical, the book which we, from the name of Nehemiah, made the second, is plain from the very words of Isidore, which he premised a little before, saying: "The book of Esdras is prenoted with the

title of its author, in whose text the discourses of Esdras and of Nehemiah are alike contained." ³

2. Concerning the books of Tobit also, and of Judith, we briefly respond, that nothing of authority is taken from them because the Jews reckon them among the apocrypha; for although the Synagogue of the Jews does not receive them, yet the holy Church of Christ receives [them] in the Canon; and them like-[wise]

¹ so printed; the reference is to Esther 10

² so printed; the argument throughout concerns Esther

³ Augustine, book 20 of the City of God, ch. 25 (Aug. l. 20 de ciu. dei c. 25); book 18 of the City [of God], ch. 36 (Li. 18. de ciu. cap. 36); 3 Esdras 3 (3. Esdr. 3).

(printed p. 655 [PDF p. 660] — *Heresy XI: response 2 concluded (the two orders of the Canon; why Jerome and Augustine differ); response 3 (the chronological objections against Judith and Esther rest on which historians one follows — Herodotus vs. Ctesias, Metasthenes, and Philo; the authenticity of Philo's Chronography defended).*)

and them [Tobit and Judith] it reads and venerates with equal veneration with the other holy books. But to that opinion of Jerome, by which he asserts that these books are by no means received by the Church of God among the canonical scriptures, we say [that] his words, thus considered without any distinction, are not wholly true: since Augustine, contemporary with Jerome, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, ch. 8, enumerates each in the order of the canonical books; and the third Council of Carthage, at which Augustine was present, enumerates [them] in the catalogue of the sacred scriptures. From which it most evidently stands [established] that these books were, even in the time of Jerome, received into the Canon by the Catholic Church. Accordingly Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, meeting this argument, says that the "Church" is sometimes taken in two ways among the ancient writers: sometimes for those who preside over the rest in the Church of God — as are the doctors, pastors, and rectors of the Church — of which Church Christ wished himself to be understood, when he said: "**Go** (*Vade*), and tell the Church"; but sometimes the "Church" is taken for the whole assembly of the faithful, but especially for those who are inferior, and of the flock of sheep which are subjected to the pastors — of which Church Paul, admonishing the pastors, says: "**Take heed** (*Attendite*) to yourselves, and to the whole flock, in which God has placed you to rule the Church of God." And of this Church Jerome spoke, when he said that the Church of God in his time had not yet received these books among the canonical scriptures — certain seditious [men], namely, still making tumult, and, together with them, a certain vicious custom of the multitude resisting — lest they should be received by the whole congregation of the faithful, generally. But among the Church, taken in the first signification, these books were always held as canonical. These [things] Ambrose. ¹ But since, in the beginning of this work, it was shown that very many fathers of great name, and leaders of the Church, reckoned the volumes of Tobit and of Judith among the apocrypha, it must be known — as we already warned in the first book — that there are two orders of the Canonical volumes: of which the prior contains the books concerning whose faith and authority there was never any controversy among the prelates and pastors of the Church; but the latter embraces the scriptures not straightway, in the exordium of the nascent Church, recognized and received by the fathers and pastors, but a long time after — when there had first been doubts, and diverse judgments among them, concerning these. Jerome, therefore, together with some fathers, looking to the first order, pronounced the books of Tobit and of Judith not to be Canonical — that is, [not] of the number of the canonical [books] of the first order; but Augustine, with other fathers, having regard to the second order, reckons the same books among the Canonical; nor does Jerome disapprove this.

3. But what they bring forward concerning the uncertainty of the history is easily dissolved, if we consider that all the ambiguity of the alleged difficulty consists in the reckoning of the various times and kings who were [living] through those times — in which [reckoning] the historians of the Greeks (whose prince is Herodotus, whom our Eusebius followed) differ very much from the historians and chronographers of the Jews and of the Persians, such as are Metasthenes the Persian, Ctesias [Cthesias] of Cnidus, and Philo the

Jew: and on account of this diversity, it is necessary to reject some of them. Rejected, therefore, are Eusebius and the rest, who, in reckoning up the kings of the Persians and Medes, and in recounting their names and times, followed the fabler [fabulatorem] Herodotus; but received, for a most just cause, are Ctesias of Cnidus, Metasthenes, and Philo. For Ctesias (as Diodorus Siculus reports in the third book of his history) brought the annals into Greece out of the public faith [record] and Library of the Persians — for which cause Diodorus himself judges that his opinion, rather than Herodotus', is to be stood by. But Metasthenes, for the same cause, is preferred to Herodotus: because (as he himself reports) in numbering the series and time of the kings of the Persians and Medes, he used no other author than the public Susian Library of the Persians, in which the annals of the kings of the Persians were, in his age — that is, in the time of Alexander the Great — still preserved whole and incorrupt. But Philo the Jew is for this reason alone received of the Hebrew writers: because he most diligently collected the times of the four Monarchies, and especially the years and the names of those who reigned in Israel from Moses down to Herod — not following uncertain opinions, as Josephus did, but drawing most certain testimonies out of the books of the seventy Elders, whom the Hebrews call Zanedrin [Sanhedrin].

Nor does it move me, that the Anabaptists, enemies of the truth, object: that the Chronography which is reported under the name of Philo is not his — because neither Eusebius, in book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18, nor Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, made mention of this volume, whereas each of them wove a long enough catalogue of the individual works of Philo. Since [in fact] both confess that Philo wrote more books, besides those numbered by them in the catalogue, which did not come to their hands. To this accedes also that which most declares the book to be Philo's — namely, the very testimony of the author of this Chronography: for the author writes, at the foot [end] of the third booklet, that he, quite a young man, was sent by his [fellow] Jews from Alexandria as legate to Rome, in the twenty-first year of Herod the tetrarch — which words can suit no one but Philo the Alexandrian Jew, whom Josephus, in the eighteenth book of the Antiquities, and Eusebius, in book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 5, hand down was sent, [while] still a young man, to Rome to Caius [Gaius] Caesar, against Apion the accuser of the Jews, and wrote a book concerning that legation, in which the single [deeds] done by him were contained.

These [things] have been said by us for this [reason]: that out of this Chronography of Philo we might open a very broad way to the dissolution, not only of the present difficulty, but of all other ambiguities of this kind which can emerge in the apparent contradictions of the sacred histories. Now, therefore, responding to the proposed difficulty of the Anabaptists, we say that Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor are not those whom they themselves think — namely Diocles and Cambyzes — but far others, whom Metasthenes the Persian and Philo the Jew recorded in the second book of the Chronography. For Arphaxad was neither a king of the Medes nor of the Persians, but a certain notable and most powerful favorer (as Philo says) of the Tamyric [Tamyris] faction, who rose up immediately after Cyrus was killed by Tamyris the queen of the Scythians; and into whose place was substituted Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus, who in the book of Judith

¹ Matthew 18 (Matt. 18); Acts 20 (Act. 20).

(printed p. 656 [PDF p. 661] — Heresy XI: response 3 concluded (the identification of Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor via Metasthenes and Philo; the two Ecbatanas; why Josephus omitted Judith); response 4 (Jerome did not call Esther a fiction — only its Vulgate translation "vitiated"); response 5 (the additions are apocryphal appendices; Mordecai's great age defended from Philo).)

who, in the book of Judith, is surnamed Nabuchodonosor — first king of the Medes, the Persians, and the Assyrians, son of Darius Hystaspes [Istaspis], who, together with his colleague Cyrus, had ruled the Medes, Persians, and Assyrians (Baltassar [Belshazzar] king of the Babylonians being conquered), as is had in the first book of Esdras, and in the volume of Daniel. This Arphaxad, then, prince of the Tamyric faction — Cyrus being dead — increased the number of his own [followers]; and, Media being occupied, restored

Ecbatana, the royal seat of the Medes (once built by the kings of the Medes, and afterward half-ruined by Cyrus), and fortified it with squared stones (as is read in the book of Judith). He also compelled the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians to defection [revolt], and armed them against Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus, surnamed Nabuchodonosor, who still kept himself within the bounds of Babylon. Meeting whom, Artaxerxes surnamed Nabuchodonosor — in the twelfth year of his reign (as the history of Judith narrates) — routed him in a memorable battle in the great plain of Ragau; and, vengeance being taken against the rebels, obtained his paternal kingdom, pacified on every side. After which victory, when in the following year he had heard that Holophernes, sent by himself, was beheaded by the Jews, being gravely indignant, by a public edict he forbade the temple to be raised — as is noted in the fourth chapter of Esdras. Nor ought it seem wondrous to any one that this Artaxerxes Priscus Assuerus is called Nabuchodonosor in the book of Judith — because (as is written in the book of Judith, and Philo confirms) Arphaxad had invaded the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians; but this Artaxerxes Assuerus held Babylonia alone, where the ruler is, by the common appellation of dignity, called Nabuchodonosor — just as in Egypt the kings were called first Pharaohs, then Ptolemies, and among the Romans, Caesars. These [things], therefore, being disposed according to the order of Metasthenes and of Philo, all the doubt of the Anabaptists is removed concerning Arphaxad and Nabuchodonosor, who are not found in the catalogues of the kings of the Persians and Medes among the Greeks. Likewise, concerning the number of years in which Diocles reigned, this alone remains to be discussed: how Pliny says that the city Ecbatana was first built by Seleucus (who reigned after Alexander the Great), and why Josephus did not mention this history. It behooves [us], therefore, to know that the Ecbatana of which Pliny writes is different from that of which the book of Judith speaks, and of which Strabo makes mention in the eleventh book, saying: "**Media** (*Media*) is divided into two parts, the one of which they call the greater, whose metropolis was the city Ecbatana, head of the Median empire, which now the Parthians also use as a royal seat." But the [other] Ecbatana, of which Pliny makes mention, is not in Media, but a city of Syria, founded by King Seleucus near the Caspian gates, twenty thousand paces [distant] — which some, writing it "Epiphania," others "Egbatana" (with a *g*), named. And that Josephus passed over this history is not without reason, since among the Hebrews it is not in the canon: for Josephus took to write only those things which were had in the canon of the Hebrews. Whence Josephus himself, excusing [himself] that he left untouched many sacred histories of the Hebrews, thus speaks: "Let **NO ONE** (*Nemo*), then, blame me, in that I have thus narrated the single [matters], just as they are found written in the ancient books. For at the very beginning of my history, on account of those who raise questions and strive to blame [me] in something, I asserted, saying that I would translate the Hebrew books into the Greek speech, and open [expound] these — promising neither to add anything apart, nor to subtract." ¹ But why the Hebrews do not have this book in the canon, neither does it sufficiently stand [clear], nor is it to be anxiously investigated by us — since the Christian Church willed it to be among the canonical [books]. Thus far concerning Judith.

4. Concerning the book of Esther — which the Anabaptists contend was written upon a fabricated theme — I would not believe them to be so unskilled that they could not see into the meaning of Jerome; but [I would believe them] rather wicked and impudent, who were unwilling to understand Jerome. For he does not affirm that this history was written by its first Hebrew author upon a taken or fabricated theme; but he asserts that its Vulgate translation was vitiated [corrupted] by the fault of the translators, who — a narration-theme being taken (as is the custom in the schools) — mixed in much of their own head [invention] into this translation. For these are the very words of Jerome: "The **BOOK** (*Librum*) of Esther, it is agreed, is vitiated by various translators: which I, disclosing [it] out of the archives of the Hebrews, translated word for word more expressly; which book the Vulgate edition drags out with tattered fringes of words here and there, adding those [things] which could, according to the occasion, be said and heard — just as it is customary in the scholastic disciplines, a theme being taken, to devise with what words he could use who has suffered an injury, or who has inflicted an injury." Thus Jerome. Accordingly, if the translators added something, either from Josephus or out of some other pious intention, this derogates nothing from the Hebrew verity, which

always remained inviolate in its own sincerity, and has come to us in its integrity out of the translation of St. Jerome — who, as appears from his scholia, cut off those last six chapters as adventitious [ascititious], and the Catholic Church neglected the same, as adventitious and apocryphal.

5. From which it becomes plain that the controversy of the Anabaptists, between the second chapter of this book and the eleventh and twelfth chapters of the same book, is null — as [being one] which leans upon the additional and apocryphal appendices of the book. Yet we confess that that Artaxerxes, who is treated of in those apocryphal chapters, is the same with that Assuerus of whom mention is made in the whole book of Esther according to the Hebrew verity: who also (Philo being witness) was called Great Artaxerxes, and Assuerus Darius Mnemon, the fifth king after Cyrus of the Persians, Medes, and Assyrians. In the twelfth year of whose reign this history happened — as is narrated in the third chapter of Esther — Mardocheus being then nearly in the one-hundred-and-eightieth year of his life. And lest it seem incredible to any one that Mardocheus could survive so long a time, we have the testimony of Philo, who in the second book of the Chronography thus writes: "Him succeeded Joachim — likewise second [time] pontiff — for forty-eight years, up to the twelfth year of the great Artaxerxes; who wrote the deeds of Esther, and instituted the memory of פורים (*Phurim* [Purim]), at the exhortation, by letters, of Mardocheus, who by eighteen years exceeded the age of Isaac" — signifying by these words that Mardocheus lived a hundred and ninety-eight years. For Isaac, as is read in Genesis, lived a hundred and eighty years.² Nor is it to be esteemed impossible that a man so long-[lived]

¹ Josephus, *Antiquities*, book 10 (printed "19"), ch. 12 (Iosephus li. 10. ant. c. 12).

² Genesis 35 (Gen. 35).

(printed p. 657 [PDF p. 662] — *Heresy XI concluded (God prolonged the lives of Mordecai, Jesus the priest, Tobit, and Judith); then Heresy XII opens: Of the books of Maccabees — statement, Assertors (Luther and the Anabaptists), and the Refutation (their usefulness against modern heresies; the fulfillment of Daniel and Zechariah; patristic witness).*)

so long-lived an old man served, with strength still entire, in the royal court — since nothing is impossible with God, who, out of the love with which he most especially cherished his people, led such a man to that age beyond the usual course of human life, that the people, oppressed by the yoke of the nations, might, while he lived, be freed. Thus also he willed Jesus the high priest (as Philo writes) to be a survivor of a hundred and thirty years, that with him — together with Esdras, and Zorobabel the leader — the people might be recalled from Babylon into Jerusalem. Thus he led Tobit the elder (as the last chapter of his history testifies) to the hundred-and-second year, or (as the Greek edition has) up to the hundred-and-fifty-eighth year, that the calamity of those who were in the captivity of Salmanassar might, by him as consoler and benefactor, be partly relieved: as, for that same cause, he prolonged the life of his son Tobit up to the ninety-ninth [year], or (as it is had in Greek) up to the hundred-and-twenty-seventh year; and made Judith reach the hundred-and-twenty-fifth year, that, she surviving, the fatherland, freed by her, might longer enjoy its liberty.

OF THE BOOKS OF MACCABEES — Heresy XII (*De Libris Maccabaeorum. Haeresis XII*)

That the books of Maccabees are neither canonical, nor worthy to be numbered among the sacred books.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is the heresy of Luther and of the Anabaptists. For Luther, since he denied the suffrages of the dead, and the invocation of the saints, and the dedications of temples, and saw that these books opposed his errors, rejected their authority. But the Anabaptists — who, besides these [things], also affirm that the saints sleep

perpetually outside the kingdom of heaven until the day of judgment, and pray for no one — when they noticed that their [own] assertion was destroyed by the testimonies of these volumes, subscribed to Luther in this same heresy.

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

That the books of Maccabees are to be received among the divine and canonical scriptures, the authority of the Gospel and of the Church shows, and their vast usefulness persuades. For they are exceedingly useful for confuting especially the heresies of our times. For there are had, in the second volume of Maccabees, most clear testimonies concerning Purgatory, concerning the suffrages to be made for the dead, and concerning the prayers of the saints who have gone hence to immortal life. But to piety, and to all the virtues, they contribute very much — provoking us to fortitude, to patience, and to hope in afflictions, and to the sustaining of death, if need be, for piety's sake, by the example of the noble Eleazar, and of those seven brothers who, for the sacred laws, suffered such dire torments: whom their pious mother, while they were pressed with diverse tortures, not only did not weep [over], but even, rejoicing, exhorted to the glory of [their] passion.¹ These books are also worthy to be reckoned among the sacred writings, for the certainty and confirmation of many things which are found in the other books of sacred scripture. For very many things predicted beforehand by the prophets are read most truly fulfilled in these books. As, that which Daniel foresaw concerning the abomination to be [set] in the temple, these volumes indicate to have been fulfilled in Antiochus — who set the abominable idol of desolation (namely his own statue) upon the altar of God in the temple, and burned the books of the Law, and did other unworthy [things] here and there, which are commemorated in the present history. Likewise, that which God foretold through Zechariah — that he would visit upon the he-goats, and that there would go forth out of Israel [those] who should exact [vengeance from] and vanquish those he-goats in great glory — Jerome, not disapproving the opinion of the Hebrews, expounded [as] fulfilled in the Maccabees, who prevailed mightily against the he-goats, that is, against Antiochus, Demetrius, Gorgias, and Nicanor, who are designated by the he-goats by Daniel, in the kingdom of the Greeks. In the Gospel of John, too, a testimony is adduced concerning the feast of the Encaenia [Dedication] — that is, of the renewal of the temple — of whose institution treatment is made in the first and second volume of Maccabees.² Nor are there lacking also most grave authors who, with Theodoret bishop of Cyrus, assert that Paul, writing to the Hebrews, understood [the reference to] the slaughter of the seven brothers, which is reported in the second book, when he said: "But **OTHERS** (*Alii*) were racked [stretched out], not accepting redemption" — which words agree with none more than those seven brothers, without any remission of penalties, torn apart through every kind of torments. Nay, also the most ancient custom of the Church approves these books as canonical, when, in the sacred mysteries which are performed for the dead, it takes out of the latter volume the history of Judas Maccabaeus offering gifts for the sins of the dead. And although so many were just in the Old Testament, nevertheless the Church of Christ, by a certain singular privilege (as Bernard says), decreed an annual solemnity for these alone out of all the ancient just. To these accede innumerable testimonies of the most ancient fathers, drawn out of these books as [out] of canonical scriptures. Origen, in the commentaries upon the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, refuting the error of the Valentinians (who said that in the Old Law no one dared to die for the God of the Old Testament, because they knew that he was not good), using the testimony of this history as canonical, says: "**But** (*Sed*) what will they do? for we find, in the Law also, many martyrs. Let them read the books of Maccabees, where, with all constancy, the blessed mother, with seven sons, underwent martyrdom; who not only receive martyrdom patiently, but even heap reproaches upon the tyrants. And let them see whether what they say be true."³ Eusebius of Caesarea, in the twelfth book of the Evangelical Preparation — showing that the souls of the saints, loosed from the body, bring us help in [our] necessities — uses the authority of these volumes, saying: "It is to be believed, therefore, that the pious souls of the dead have a certain power, by which, even after death, they aid human affairs. Thus certainly the Jews contend it was handed down concerning

Jeremiah, and the history of the Maccabees related, that he himself was seen, after death, to pray for the people." Ambrose, in the first book of the Offices, builds up [confirms], by the examples of the Maccabean leaders, [that the saints...] ⁴

¹ 2 Maccabees 12 (Mac. 12).

² Daniel 9 (Dan. 9); Jerome on [Daniel] 9 (Hier. sup. 9); Daniel and [Jerome] on Matthew 24 (Dan. et super 24. Mat.); 1 Maccabees 1 (1. Mac. 1); Zechariah 10 (Zach. 10).

³ 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 2 Maccabees 10 (2. Mac. 10); Hebrews (Heb.); 2 Maccabees 7 (2. Mac. 7); 2 Maccabees 12 (2. Mac. 12.g); Bernard, epistle 313 (Ber. epi. 313).

⁴ 2 Maccabees 15 (2. Mac. 15).

(printed p. 658 [PDF p. 663] — Heresy XII (Maccabees): the Refutation concluded (patristic and conciliar witness); then the Objections of the Heretics — 1: Alexander said to have "first" reigned in Greece; 2: the discrepant regnal years; 3: the contradictory accounts of Antiochus' death; 4: the contradiction over the temple's purification begun.)

[Ambrose, by the examples of the Maccabean leaders, builds up] that warlike virtue befits the saints also. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, writing to the bishops of all Egypt, in the fourth Paschal book, exhorts them to abstinence from meats, by the example (taken from this history) of the seven brothers, who, lest they should feed on unlawful meats, offered their bodies to torments. Augustine also, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, places the two books of Maccabees in the canon of the divine scriptures. And in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, concerning the authority of these volumes he says: "The books of **MACCABEES** (*Maccabaeorum*), not the Jews, but the Church holds as canonical, on account of the vehement and wonderful passions of certain martyrs, who — before Christ had come in the flesh — contended, even unto death, for the Law of God, and bore the gravest and most horrible evils." And this same [thing] he testifies also in other places of his works, but especially in the book *On the Care to be had for the Dead*, and in the 44th sermon to the brothers in the desert — in which places, out of the twelfth chapter of the latter book of Maccabees, he proves that prayers [and] sacrifices are to be offered for the dead. ¹ I omit, for brevity's sake, the third Council of Carthage, the epistle of Pope Innocent to Exuperius, the catalogue of Pope Gelasius, and the decree of the Council of Florence under Eugenius the Fourth — in which, out of the testimony of these volumes, the error of the Greeks concerning Purgatory was condemned — and other innumerable [testimonies] which protect the authority of these books; and, lest I beget tedium for the reader, I betake myself to the objections of the heretics.

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. Many things are in these books which discrepate from the common consensus of all histories, and dissent from the truth of the Christian faith, on account of which they seem deservedly to be rejected. And first, as to what pertains to the truth of history, straightway at the beginning of the first volume it is read that Alexander the Macedonian, son of Philip, "first reigned in Greece." To which opinion all the histories are repugnant. For Eusebius of Caesarea, the most diligent reckoner of times, and the rest of the Chronologers, write that many reigned in Greece before Alexander, and especially among the Macedonians: of whom the first was Gramaeus [Caranus], by some also called Carranus [Caranus]; at which time, among the Hebrews, there reigned in Juda Ozias [Uzziah], and in Israel Jeroboam. But Alexander the Macedonian reigned [as] the twenty-fourth in Greece, Jaddo [Jaddua] being high priest among the Hebrews, in the year of the world 4860, in the hundred-and-eleventh Olympiad. ²

2. There likewise it is written that Antiochus Epiphanes began to reign in the hundred-and-thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks — which began from Alexander. But in the Chronicles of Eusebius, and in the other annals of the Greeks, numbering from Alexander to the beginning of the reign of Antiochus through the individual kings, many more years are found — namely, a hundred and fifty-three. Whence not ineptly

did John Annius [Annius of Viterbo], a most skilled Chronographer, seeing that this controversy could not be settled, write in the commentaries upon the Chronography of Philo, that Josephus rendered these books apocryphal, while he wished to distinguish [set out] their history by ill-reckoned times.³

3. Concerning the death of Antiochus likewise — and the kind, cause, place, and time of [his] death — the books of Maccabees narrate things as contrary to the histories of the nations as to themselves. For, concerning the kind of death, in the first volume it is written that he, from sadness of soul, fell into [his] bed, and — a testament being made, and a successor to the kingdom appointed — died: but, on the contrary, at the beginning of the second book, it is read that he perished by a violent death, being struck with stones (namely, by the priests), and, together with his companions, his head cut off, torn limb from limb. Then, in the ninth chapter of the same book, he is reported to have perished by yet another kind of violent death: namely, that, fleeing, he fell from his chariot, and — the members of his whole body crushed, his flesh withering everywhere, and worms swarming over his whole body — amid horrible pains and stench, miserably expired. But concerning the place of death, in the first book he is said to have departed [this] life at Babylon, in his own bed, worn out by long sickness. But at the beginning of the second book it is written that he was slain by the priests of the temple, within the shrine of Nannaea [Nanaea], in Persia; while below, in the ninth chapter of the same book, he is read to have perished on the journey, having now passed over into Ecbatana.⁴ Nor is the diversity less as to time: while the first [book] of Maccabees asserts that Antiochus died in the hundred-and-forty-ninth year of the kingdom of the Greeks; but otherwise, at the beginning of the latter book, it is narrated that the same died in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks; and, from the ninth chapter of the same book, it is gathered that the same died in the hundred-and-forty-sixth year of the kingdom of the Greeks. For he died two years before the purgation of the temple of Jerusalem, made by Judas Maccabaeus; which indeed (as the first [book] of Maccabees testifies) happened in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu [Chisleu], that is, of the ninth month. Concerning the cause of his death too, the history of the Maccabees by no means agrees with the external histories of the nations. For Polybius of Megalopolis (whom Josephus names a most excellent man, and Livy calls a not-to-be-contemned author), and, together with Polybius, Diodorus Siculus — both report that Antiochus Epiphanes, trying to plunder the most wealthy temple of Diana in Elymais, and overwhelmed by the guards, and put to flight by the neighboring nations round about, [being] turned into madness by certain phantasms and errors, at last perished of disease for this cause: because he had wished to violate the temple of Diana. But each book of Maccabees casts the cause of all the evils and of the death of Antiochus upon the calamities unjustly inflicted on the Jews, and [upon] the Jewish temple, defiled by him with all impieties.⁵

4. There is also an implacable contradiction concerning the deeds done by Judas Maccabaeus, and concerning his death, between the two books. For, while in the first volume the author testifies that the temple was purged by Judas, and the altar of God restored, in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu — namely, one year before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes — in the second volume the same author writes that the same purification of the temple was made by Judas two years after the death of Antiochus, namely in the year of the kingdom of the Greeks⁶

¹ 2 Maccabees 7 (2. Mac. 7); [Augustine, On Christian Doctrine 2] ch. 8 (cap. 8); [On the City of God 18] ch. 36 (cap. 36); Gaudentius, epistle, ch. 23 (Gaud. epist. cap. 23).

² 1 Maccabees 2 (1. Mac. 2).

³ 1 Maccabees 8 (1. Mac. 8).

⁴ 1 Maccabees 6 (1. Mac. 6).

⁵ 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); Josephus, Antiquities book 12; Livy, [3rd] decade; Jerome in [his] commentary; Daniel 9 (Dan. 9).

⁶ 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 1 Maccabees 10 (1. Mac. 10).

(printed p. 659 [PDF p. 664] — Heresy XII (Maccabees): Objections continue — 4 concluded (the discrepant dates of the temple-purification and of Judas' death); 5 (the "fabulous" hidden-fire/ark stories fathered on Jeremiah); 6 (the suicide of Razis praised); 7 (a profane Greek/Josephus abridger); 8 (the fathers who excluded the books); then the Dissolution of the Objections begins — response 1 (Alexander "first" = first over all Greece).)

[in the year] of the Greeks' [kingdom] the hundred-and-fifty-first. To which Eusebius, in the Chronicles, consents, writing that Judas cleansed the temple from the images of idols in the second year of Antiochus Eupator, three years after it had been contaminated by Antiochus Epiphanes. Concerning the death of Judas likewise, in the first book of Maccabees it is said that he was killed at the outset, in battle against the generals of Demetrius Soter; in the sixth year of Demetrius (as Eusebius notes), that is, eight years after the death of Antiochus the Illustrious, but in the hundred-and-fifty-second year of the Greeks' kingdom. But the beginning of the second [book] of Maccabees shows Judas living thirty years after this time — under Demetrius the fourteenth king of Syria (who reigned fourth after Demetrius Soter) — [and] writing, together with the senate of the Jews, a letter to Aristobulus the tutor of Ptolemy Philometor, in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Greeks' kingdom.¹

5. There are contained likewise in this history not a few fabulous and uncertain [things] which — what is even worse — are confirmed by testimonies falsely adduced from the books of the prophets. Such is that which is recounted in the latter volume: namely, that the priests, by command of the prophet Jeremiah, hid the fire taken from the altar in a valley where there was a deep and dry well; which, after many years, Nehemiah, returned from captivity, ordered to be dug out by the grandsons of those priests who had hidden it. And again, that Jeremiah, at the same time of the transmigration [exile], hid the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense in a cave of Mount Nebo, onto which Moses, about to die, had ascended. Moreover, it confirms these [things] from the books of Jeremiah the Prophet and of Nehemiah — whereas nothing such is ever read to have been done, or said, in the whole Old Testament, nor was it even possible to be done: because Jeremiah, the whole time of the siege of Jerusalem, up to the last destruction of the city, was in prison (as appears from the 37th and 38th chapter of his book) — who, as he could not do these [things] before the destruction of the city, so neither after.² For, the city being taken, the Chaldeans immediately seized all the precious things of the temple, and carried [them] away into Babylon (as is found written in the fourth [book] of Kings); but among the precious things, the most precious were the tabernacle — in which (as is read in Exodus) were innumerable golden rings, [and] boards and columns covered with golden plates, [and] golden and silver bases very many — [and] the ark too, covered within and without with plates of the purest gold. Which, who would believe that the Chaldeans, greedy for plunder, gave to Jeremiah as a gift — [they] who abstained not even from things of lesser price, breaking all the vessels of silver and of bronze, and carrying [them] with them into Chaldea? Which [things], even if Jeremiah had received them from them as a gift, he would not have been silent about — since he was not silent even about lesser benefits received from them, nor passed over in silence the victuals and little gifts received from the master of the Assyrian army.³

6. Nor is it to be omitted that in these books some [things] also are proposed to be imitated against the divine and natural law — but especially at the end of the latter book, in which place the author, with quite magnificent words, extols the voluntary killing [suicide] of Razis [Razias], praising him because he bravely laid hands upon himself, and preferred to fall generously by his own hands, by a noble and honest death, rather than basely to live in the power of enemies, and, against the splendor of his birth, to experience insults from unworthy men.⁴ Which deed, so far is it from meriting any praise of fortitude, that it is even worthy of the mark of the highest timidity and impatience — not only among the faithful, but also among the pagan [ethnic] philosophers; of whom the chief, Aristotle, indicated what he felt concerning this deed, in the third book of the Ethics [Morals], in these words: "But to procure death for oneself, in order to flee poverty, or love, or anything grievous, is [the mark] not of a brave man, but rather of a timid one. For it is softness to flee

laborious [things]. For [such a one] does not seek death because death is honorable, but because he thinks to avoid an evil."⁵

7. Wherefore not undeservedly the Hebrews cast these books out of the canon of the divine scriptures, as profane, and as written by a profane and gentile author from the lying histories of the Greeks — as the author himself testifies in the second volume, in these words: "The books comprehended [gathered] by Jason of Cyrene into five [books], we have tried to abridge into one volume." Which abbreviator some think was a certain Greek (as the style indicates), before the times of Christ; but others — among whom Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, and in the second book against the Pelagians — esteem to have been Josephus the Hebrew.⁶

8. But of whatsoever author the history be, it is plain that among the ancient fathers it was of no authority. For if we speak of the Greeks: Origen, in the preface to the first Psalm, cut the books of Maccabees from the Canon; Melito, bishop of Sardis, responding to Onesimus (who consulted him concerning the canonical books), made no mention of this history in his catalogue; and Epiphanius, in the book *On Weights and Measures*, did not receive these books into the number of the sacred [books]. But among the Latins, Philastrius explodes [rejects] them from the catalogue of the divine volumes; and Jerome does the same, in the preface to Proverbs, writing these [things]: "The books of **MACCABEES** (*Maccabaeorum*) the Church indeed reads, but does not receive among the canonical scriptures for confirming the authority of the ecclesiastical dogmas." And he repeats this same [thing] in the Helmeted Prologue. Nay, also Gregory, in the nineteenth book of the *Morals*, excusing himself that he receives testimonies out of the books of Maccabees: "We do **NOT** (*Non*) act disorderly," he says, "if, out of books not canonical, yet published for the edification of the Church, we bring forth testimonies." By which words indeed he indicates that in his time — namely, six hundred years after Christ — these books were not canonical. The Council of Laodicea also does not enumerate them in the catalogue of the holy scriptures.⁷

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. The Anabaptists, deceived by inexperience of histories, hallucinate in a matter clearer than light. For it is not to be understood that Alexander so "first reigned in Greece" [as] that no king was in Greece before him, but [rather] that he was the first who ruled over all Greece throughout — the other kings who reigned in it being excluded — as Metasthenes, a writer of that time, testifies.

¹ 1 Maccabees 9 (1. Macc. 9); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1).

² 2 Maccabees 1 and 2 (2 Mac. 1. et 2).

³ 4 Kings 25 (printed "28"); and Exodus 26 (& vlt. Exod. 26).

⁴ 2 Maccabees 14 (2. Mac. 14).

⁵ Ethics, book 3, ch. 20 (3. Eth. c. 20).

⁶ 2 Maccabees 2 (2. Mac. 2).

⁷ Eusebius, book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18 (Eus. li. 6. hist. eccl. cap. 18); the same, book 4, ch. 26 (idem lib. 4. cap. 26); Philastrius in the catalogue, ch. 88 (Philastrius in cat. c. 88); ch. 27 (cap. 27).

(printed p. 660 [PDF p. 665] — *Heresy XII (Maccabees), Dissolution of the Objections: response 2 (the regnal-year discrepancy resolved by the Seleucid vs. Alexandrian era); response 3 (the kind, time, and place of Antiochus' death reconciled — Nanaea, Persepolis/Elymais, Ecbatana, Babylon); response 4 (Judas purged the temple twice) begun.*)

2. But what they assert in the second place, concerning the years of the reign of Antiochus, has so easy a solution that it is not necessary — with [John] Annius — to reject the reckonings of the years of this history as [things] super-added by Josephus: since Eusebius, in the *Chronicles*, easily recalls the present diversity of the reckonings to a true concord, saying that in each book of Maccabees the years of the kingdom of the Greeks are reckoned, not from Alexander the Great (as the external histories reckon), but from Seleucus

surnamed Nicanor — who, eleven years being completed from the death of Alexander, began to reign in Syria: to which [years], if the five years be added in which Alexander reigned as monarch over all Greece, there results the number of a hundred and fifty-three years, which is had in the histories of the Greeks. Therefore, if according to the first volume of Maccabees we take the beginning of the kingdom of the Greeks, we find that Antiochus entered upon the kingdom in the hundred-and-thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks. But if we reckon the years of the same kingdom of the Greeks from Alexander (as the histories of the Greeks do), we find that Antiochus began to reign in the hundred-and-fifty-third year of the kingdom of the Greeks.

3. But concerning the kind of the death of Antiochus, there are not lacking [those] who believe that that Antiochus — whose slaughter the epistle of the Senate of Jerusalem to Aristobulus reports — is a different [Antiochus] from that one whom the history of the Maccabees narrates to have perished from sickness of soul. We, however — esteeming that the same Antiochus is everywhere described — say that the parts of this history in no way discrepate among themselves; for each is most true: both that Antiochus, dismayed with grief of soul, fell into a languor (as the first [book] of Maccabees testifies), and that, oppressed with the same languor, he fled from Persia, and in flight was thrown from [his] chariot, and — by the collision of [his] limbs, and the convulsion of [his] entrails, amid pains and stench — perished (as is read in the second [book] of Maccabees).¹ But concerning the diversity of times about the death of Antiochus, there is no dissension, if we recur to the various reckonings of times. For [Antiochus], who in the first [book] of Maccabees is written to have died in the hundred-and-forty-ninth year of the kingdom of the Greeks according to the reckoning begun from Seleucus, that same [Antiochus] is said, at the beginning of the latter volume, to have died in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year — not indeed of the kingdom of the Greeks (as the crafty Anabaptists added), but in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Hebrew reckoning — reckoning, namely, the number of years, not from the beginning of the kingdom of the Greeks, but (as Rabanus, Lyra, and Hugh of St. Cher [Carensis] teach) from the twelfth year of King Assuerus, from which some of the Hebrews began their reckonings; because in that year happened that admirable liberation of the sons of Israel through Esther and Mardocheus. From which time, if a reckoning be made through the individual years of the kings down to the death of Antiochus, a hundred and eighty-eight years are found. To which two computations a third reckoning also corresponds, which is gathered from the tenth chapter of the second book, where it is written that Antiochus died two years before the purification of the temple made by Judas. But this happened — not (as the Anabaptists dreamed) in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, but in the hundred-and-fifty-first year of the same kingdom — as is gathered from the aforesaid chapter of the second book. Nor does that stand in the way, which is produced by them out of the first book of Maccabees — namely, that Judas purged the temple in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks, on the twentieth day of the month Casleu — since this is to be understood of the first purification of the temple, made by Judas one year before the death of Antiochus; but this [other], which is written in the second book, is to be understood of the second purification of the temple, made by the same Judas, again, two years after the death of Antiochus.²

Concerning the place of the death of Antiochus likewise, all controversy is removed, if the words of the latter book — produced indeed by the Anabaptists, but not understood — be more diligently inspected. For they thought that Antiochus was slain in the temple of Nannaea [Nanaea] in Persia, together with [his] companions: because at the beginning of that book it is written: "**And** (*Et*) when Antiochus had entered the temple, [the priests,] casting stones, struck the leader, and those who were with him." But from these words it is not elicited that Antiochus was slain, but only struck with stones. And what is immediately subjoined under the aforesaid words — "**And** (*Et*) they divided [them] limb from limb, and, the heads being cut off, cast [them] forth" — is referred to his companions; upon whose slaughter, while the priests were insisting too much, Antiochus in the meantime escaped. Nor does that discrepate from this opinion which is read in the ninth chapter of the same book — that Antiochus entered Persepolis (which is also called Elymais in the first

[book] of Maccabees), the metropolis of Persia (as Ptolemy writes). And when he had wished to spoil the temple, the multitude running together to arms, [he was] turned to flight; in which, when he had now passed beyond Ecbatana, he fell from [his] chariot. And in the Babylonian region (as is read in the first and second book) — a successor to the kingdom, Antiochus Eupator, being left [behind] — he died, amid torments and stench: not indeed for the cause written by Diodorus and Polybius, but for the sacrilege of the temple of Jerusalem perpetrated by him. As Antiochus himself, dying, confesses in each book, and Josephus, in the twelfth [book] of the Antiquities, confirms — refuting Polybius in these words: "**I wonder** (*Miror*) that Polybius of Megalopolis, a good man, says that Antiochus perished for this [cause]: that he wished to violate the temple of Diana in Persia. For he who in no way did the sin, but only thought [it], is held by no guilt of the deed. But if it seem to Polybius that Antiochus therefore ended [his] life, it is believed far more verisimilar that he perished on account of the sacrilegious devastation of the temple of Jerusalem." ³

4. I pass now to the deeds of Judas Maccabaeus, which suffer no difficulty at all, if they be distinguished according to the aforesaid reckonings. For it is agreed (as we warned above) that Judas twice purged the temple: first indeed in the year one before the death of Antiochus, immediately after it had been violated by him — that is, in the hundred-and-forty-eighth year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus (as is read in the first [book] of Maccabees); but the second [time], two years after the death of Antiochus, namely in the hundred-and-fifty-first year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus — for thus in the second book of Macca-[bees] ⁴

¹ 2 Maccabees 6 (2. Mac. 6); 2 Maccabees 9 (2. Mac. 9); 1 Maccabees 6 (1. Mac. 6); 1 Maccabees 1 (1. Mac. 1).

² 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1).

³ Ptolemy, [Geography] book 6 (Ptol. 1. 6); 2 Maccabees 1 (2. Mac. 1); ch. 9 (of 2 Maccabees) (ca. 9).

⁴ 1 Maccabees 4 (1. Mac. 4).

(printed p. 661 [PDF p. 666] — *Heresy XII (Maccabees), Dissolution continues: response 4 concluded (the two Demetriuses; Aristobulus dated); response 5 (the hidden fire/ark drawn not from canonical Jeremiah/Nehemiah but from lost "commentaries"; apocryphal citation defended); response 6 (Razis — Augustine: his deed narrated, not praised); response 7 (the Hebrews' opinion is irrelevant once the Church receives the books).*)

for thus in the second book of Maccabees it is written, and is had in Eusebius, that Judas purged the temple three years after it had been profaned by Antiochus. After which purgation, in six years or thereabouts, Judas dies, in the sixth year of Demetrius (as the first book testifies). But this Demetrius is not that one whom the Anabaptists, falsely transposing the names, lyingly [allege] — namely, the tenth king of Syria, surnamed Soter; but another Demetrius, the fourteenth king of Syria, in whose sixth year Judas fell in war — namely, in the hundred-and-fifty-sixth year of the kingdom of the Greeks reckoned from Seleucus, or thereabouts (as Eusebius hands down). But he [Judas] had earlier written the letter which is had at the beginning of the second volume, to Aristobulus, while Demetrius Soter reigned, in the hundred-and-eighty-eighth year of the Hebrew reckoning from Assuerus — which, according to the Greek reckoning from Seleucus, is nearly the fifty-fifth year: at which time it is openly agreed that that Aristobulus lived — the tutor of Ptolemy Philometor king of Egypt, a Jew by nation, a philosopher by profession, a Peripatetic by sect — who, to the same king of Egypt (Eusebius being witness), wrote commentaries upon Moses. ¹

5. But that which they say — that certain fabulous [things] are falsely introduced into this history from the sacred books of Nehemiah [and] of Jeremiah, which are nowhere read in those sacred volumes of theirs — is a calumny of the heretics: since nothing out of the divine and Canonical volumes of Nehemiah, or of Jeremiah, is cited in the second book of Maccabees, but only certain "descriptions" [records], and "commentaries," of Nehemiah and of Jeremiah. For thus it is written in that place: "It is **FOUND** (*Invenitur*) in the descriptions of Jeremiah the prophet"; and a little after: "But **they were brought in** (*Inferebantur*) in

the descriptions and commentaries of Nehemiah." Which certainly no one who understands the signification of "commentary" will think to be those [books] which are counted in the Canon of the Old Testament. For commentaries, as appears from Cicero's *Brutus*, are books in which the daily events are noted — not more broadly and more diffusely, as they are described in a [formal] history, but as briefly and as strictly as can be. But in the aforesaid books which are had in the canon, the single [events] are extended, in the manner of a history, drawn out into a long narration. It is to be believed, therefore, that there were of old other commentaries in which these [things] about the fire, the ark, and the hidden altar were contained — written either by Jeremiah, or by Baruch his scribe, or by some other; and, because they contained the deeds of Jeremiah, entitled with his name: which perhaps, because they had nothing pertaining to prophecy, were not received among the divine books. For Jerome also, in the 27th chapter on Matthew, testifies that he read a certain apocryphal book of Jeremiah, which a certain Jew of the Nazarene sect had brought to him. Nor is the author to be damned on this account — that he adduced testimonies out of apocryphal writings in true and sacred matters: since Paul, as we showed elsewhere, took testimonies not only out of apocryphal, but out of profane books — namely, out of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides — and Jude, in his epistle, cited the apocryphal book of Enoch.² But as to what they say — that it could in no way happen that the ark, the altar, and the tabernacle were hidden by Jeremiah — is asserted by them too impudently. For what forbids that these, before, or in the very destruction of the city, at the exhortation of Jeremiah (existing [then] in prison), could have been concealed by pious men? — as the very words of the history seem to intimate, when they say: "It is **FOUND** (*Invenitur*) in the descriptions of Jeremiah the prophet, that he commanded them to take the fire — [those] who were being transmigrated [into exile], as has been signified — and as he charged those transmigrated." Nor are the ancient fathers lacking who believed this to have been most truly done by Jeremiah — as Theophylact, in the commentaries upon the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews; Epiphanius, in the life of Jeremiah the prophet; and Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, in the Synopsis in which he embraces the lives of the prophets. Nor does it stand in the way, that in the second [book] of Maccabees it is written: "**And** (*Et*) Jeremiah, coming thither, found a place of a cave, and brought in thither the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar, and blocked the door." For it can happen that what was done by others — [when Jeremiah was] detained in prison, at the command of Jeremiah, before the sacking of the city — is said that Jeremiah himself did [it], according to the common custom of divine scripture, which frequently is wont to attribute to the author that which was done by others at the author's command.

6. Concerning the deed of Razis — for whose cause the Anabaptists wickedly vituperate the whole history — Augustine, in the sixty-first epistle to Dulcitius, responds in these words: "In the books of **MACCABEES**, although Razis was praised, yet his deed is narrated, not praised, and set before the eyes rather to be judged than imitated: not by the judgment which we, as men, might have, but by the judgment of sober doctrine, which is clear also in those old books themselves. For that Razis was far from those words where it is read: '**RECEIVE** (*Omne*) whatever shall be applied to thee, and in pain sustain [it], and in humility have patience.' For that man was not wise in choosing death, but impatient in bearing humility [humiliation]. It is written that he wished to die nobly, but not wisely. For God says: 'The **INNOCENT** (*Innocentem*) and the just slay not.'" And the same [Augustine], in the second book against the second epistle of Gaudentius, ch. 23: "Razis — [the text] says — because he could not flee, is perhaps less guilty of his own blood, in that he inflicted death upon himself, than the enemy would have inflicted [on him] if [he had been] captured. Razis was praised as a lover of [his] city, as one very well spoken-of — that is, of good repute — because he was called father of the Jews, and because he held continence in Judaism. But it [Scripture] narrated that death of his [as] more wonderful than [it was] more prudent — how it was done, [it] praised, not as [something] that was to be done." The heretics, therefore, lie, asserting that this deed was praised, and set before us for imitation.³

7. Concerning the opinion of the Hebrews about these books — whatever it be — it matters nothing, since the Catholic Church receives them in the canon. Nor is anything derogated from their faith [authority], even if they were written by a profane author — since the faith of a book depends not on the author, but on the

authority of the Catholic Church. And what she has received, it behooves to be true and indubitable, by whatsoever author it be said — whom I would dare affirm neither sacred nor profane; nor did Jerome ever, out of his own opinion, [reprove] those books

¹ 2 Maccabees 9 (2. Mac. 9).

² 2 Maccabees 2 (2. Mac. 2).

³ Exodus 23 (Exod. 23).

(printed p. 662 [PDF p. 667] — *Heresy XII (Maccabees) concluded: the "Josephus" attribution corrected (the real Josephan work is 4 Maccabees); the three-author theory of the two books; response 8 (the fathers who excluded them spoke of the Hebrew canon). Then Heresy XIII opens: Of the translations of Sacred Scripture — statement and Assertors (the ancient five heretical versions, and their modern sixth: the Protestant editions).*)

[nor did Jerome ever, out of his own opinion, reprove] those books, or affirm [them to be] of Josephus, or of any other; but, "**JOSEPHUS** (*Iosephus*)," he says, "is reported [to be] the writer of the [Maccabaeian] history." But that it was thus believed by some, came perhaps thence: because they had heard, in Eusebius or other authors, that Josephus wrote a book of the Maccabees, and thought this to be that [book] which is numbered among the canonical [ones] — which indeed is not so. For that book which Josephus wrote concerning the Maccabees still exists in Greek, and in some Bibles of the Greeks is placed immediately after the two books of Maccabees, with its author's name prefixed — namely, Ἰωσήπου εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβαίους (*Iosepou eis tous Makkabaious* — "Of Josephus, upon the Maccabees"). Of which little book Eusebius, in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, brought forth testimony with such [words]: "There is **also** (*Est*) another elegant volume of Josephus, entitled εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός (*ei autodespotos esti ton pathon ho eusebes logismos* — 'whether pious reason is self-master [autocrat] of the passions') — which little book some have entitled 'of the Maccabees,' for the reason that the contests therein, and the struggles undergone for piety's sake by the Maccabees, are contained." It is plain, therefore, that nothing certain can be affirmed concerning the author of the present history — except that it was written by diverse authors, as the diversity of phrase indicates, and the repeated iteration of the same history, which it is not verisimilar that one and the same author made. For to what purpose would he have wished to repeat again, in the second volume, those same [things] which he had abundantly narrated in the first volume? I, for my part, would believe (as I already indicated in the first volume of this work) that these books were written by three diverse authors: the first indeed by a Hebrew author, and in the Hebrew tongue (as the style shows, and Jerome, in the Helmeted Prologue, affirms that he read it written in Hebrew). But the second — except its first chapter, and the half of the second chapter (the beginning being taken from those words, "**OF JUDAS MACCABAEUS AND HIS BROTHERS** (*De Iuda Maccabaeo et fratribus eius*)," whence the preface of the second book begins) — up to the end, I judge was abridged by a Greek author out of the five books of Jason of Cyrene, as the abbreviator himself affirms in the preface. But the third part of this history — from the beginning of the second book up to the half of the second chapter, in which those two letters of the Senate of Jerusalem are contained — I think was written by a public scribe of the senate, to the Jewish brethren dwelling in Egypt, as the salutations of the letters themselves indicate. ¹

8. Finally, to those [things] which they object concerning the fathers who do not receive these books in the canon, we respond that most of them spoke, not of the canon of the Christians, but of the canon of the Hebrews. For thus Origen says on the first Psalm: "It is **NOT** (*Non*) to be ignored that there are twenty-two books in the canon of the Old Testament, as the Hebrews hand down"; then, after the enumeration of the books, he adds: "**And** (*Et*) in these they conclude the canon of the divine volumes; but the books of Maccabees they have extrinsically [outside]." But as to that which Jerome and Gregory seem to intimate — that neither of these volumes is of the canon of the Christians — I recall that I already responded above: that there are two orders of the canonical volumes, from the prior of which Jerome and Gregory deservedly

exclude the books of Maccabees, because concerning these it was long doubted in the Church.² And hence it is that the Council of Laodicea, and many of the fathers, did not number them in the catalogues of the sacred volumes — lest, in a matter so grave (concerning which many were not yet fully instructed), they should rashly define anything. But after — a diligent discussion being made — they recognized these books to be divine, then they referred them into the Canon, and left them to us so approved, that it is now no longer permitted to doubt concerning their certainty.

OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF SACRED SCRIPTURE — Heresy XIII (*De Translationibus Sacrae Scripturae. Haeresis XIII*)

That, all the editions of holy scripture which the Church has hitherto used being rejected, new editions are to be used, as more certain and more faithful.

ASSERTORES HVIVS HAERESEOS [The Assertors of this Heresy]

This is **not** (*Non*) a new heresy, or lately invented by the heretics of our time — who rashly boast that the Church of Christ, before this our age, had no sincere and faithful translation of the divine books — but of old too, above eleven hundred years [ago], this same heresy flourished in the Church. Of which Philastrius also, in his catalogue, made mention diffusely enough, enumerating around it five orders of heretics, who — the interpretation of the holy Seventy-two interpreters (which the Catholic Church then used) being cast off — followed the versions of diverse heretics. Of whom the first received only the translation of Aquila of Pontus; the second, another edition of certain thirty men, who had imitated Aquila in many things; the third, another translation of certain six men, full of depraved dogmas; the fourth, the interpretation of Symmachus and of Theodotion, the Ebionites; but the fifth chose a certain version, taken not from the authentic exemplars of the Hebrews, but from certain Hebrew codices, which they said had been found inside a cask [jar] after the Babylonian captivity. To whom, as in a sixth order, can be subjoined certain insolent heretics of our times — namely, the Sacramentarians, the Anabaptists, the Servetans, and the Lutherans — who, the interpretation of the sacred volumes being repudiated (which the Catholic Church has venerated for so many ages), follow the suspect editions of diverse heretics: as, in the Old Testament, [those] of Conrad Pellican, John Oecolampadius, Ulric Zwingli, Martin Luther, Sebastian Münster, and Sebastian Castalio [Castellio]; in the New Instrument [Testament] likewise, translations — or rather "recognitions" [revisions], or certain "castigations" [corrections] — of the same Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Luther, Castalio, and Michael Servetus, the Arian and Manichaeans. These editions, therefore, each one embracing according to his own lust, they so prefer to our Vulgate edition, that [they assert] their interpreters alone attained the mind and words³

¹ [Jerome] against the Pelagians, book 2 (Con. Pel. li. 2); ch. 10 (cap. 10); (cross-reference:) page 46 (Pag. 46).

² [Eusebius,] book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 18 (Lib. 6. hist. eccl. cap. 18).

³ ch. 13 (of Philastrius) (cap. 13).

(printed p. 663 [PDF p. 668] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Refutation — the endless daily proliferation of rival Protestant versions; the need for the Church's judgment on ambiguous words, illustrated at length by the disputed הימים of Genesis 36:24 (Anah in the desert) and the קיקיון/"gourd vs. ivy" riot over Jonah 4.)

they so prefer [these editions] to our Vulgate edition, that they boast that their interpreters alone understood the mind and words of the prophets and apostles, and truly and faithfully expressed [them].

IMPVGNATIO [The Refutation]

But this is nothing else than to excite new tumults daily in the Church of God. For if, the old editions being rejected, we strive to introduce newer translations into the Church daily, what will be either the end or the measure of interpreting the sacred books — of restoring, of recognizing [revising], of castigating

[correcting], of observing? — while each one daily, according to the opinion of his own mind and the affection of his own dogma, sends forth new subversions [eversions], castigations, [and] recognitions — now to the Greek, now to the Hebrew verity — pernicious scholia, annotations, and glosses (pertaining to their own dogmas) being everywhere interjected; and while the interpreters, contending among themselves with the highest dissension, each rejects, confutes, and damns the other — so that Luther reprehends Oecolampadius and Zwingli as incautious; Münster in turn accuses Luther, that he dissimulated many errors of the old interpreter; Pellican vituperates Münster, that by his foul barbarity he befouled all the divine scripture; but Castalio [Castellio] explodes all the interpreters before him as ignorant of the Latin speech, and esteems that he alone interpreted the sacred books in the Latin tongue. Which, therefore, of these interpreters will the heretics follow? or whose edition will they bring forth into the midst, if they be compelled — against their own adversaries — either to confirm their own dogmas out of the sacred codices, or to repel diverse [ones]? Assuredly, if the Anabaptists adduce testimonies of the scriptures out of the edition of their [own] Servetus, straightway the Sacramentarians will cry out, and will say that these were derived from the depraved version of the Anabaptists, and are not so read in the emended and true codices of Oecolampadius and Zwingli. And likewise the Anabaptists will answer the Sacramentarians, when they feel themselves pressed by them with testimonies of the scriptures. But if any one, coming upon them, should say that neither edition is to be stood by, but that recourse must be had to the Greek or Hebrew fountains, that by their reading the proposed controversy may be ended — straightway a far sharper contention will arise, while each, pertinacious in his own error, will contend that the Greek or Hebrew word is to be turned otherwise and otherwise — but especially if the word be ambiguous, as almost innumerable [words] are among the Hebrews; and in this manner, altercating, they will never be able to agree among themselves, unless — contention being cast off, and their own judgment renounced — they submit themselves, by unanimous consent, to the judgment of the Catholic Church: that she, as a true arbiter and judge, may pronounce in which interpreter's opinion one ought to acquiesce. For there are, in the sacred codices of the Hebrews, certain words and sentences so uncertain, ambiguous, and so variously explained — even by the highest and most illustrious interpreters — that, however erudite you be, and skilled in tongues, you would nevertheless not know to which side to turn, and would always be compelled to be doubtful, unless the authority of the Catholic Church admonished you to embrace the interpretation of this [one], but to dismiss that of that [one].

And that the matter may become more illustrious by an example applied, there is a place in the thirty-sixth chapter of Genesis, famous by the contention of all interpreters, namely: "**It** (*Ipsa*) is Ana [*Anah*] who found הַיִּמִּים (*haiimim*) in the desert, while he was pasturing the asses of Zebeon his father." ¹ Of whose interpretation (as Jerome reports in the book of Hebrew Questions) there are as many opinions as [there are] interpreters. Some think יָמִים (*iemim*) [means] "seas" [*maria*] — because "seas" are written with the same letters as this particle of the present sentence; and they hold that Anah, while he was pasturing his father's asses in the desert, found "congregations of waters" — which, according to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, יָמִים (*iemim*) — that is, "seas" — is called; namely, because he found a pool, the finding of which is difficult in the desert, and [which] Diodorus denies [any] to be found in that solitude. Some — among whom [is] the author of the Vulgate edition — held that "hot waters" [*aquae calidae*] are signified by this word, according to the nearness of the Punic tongue, which is conterminous with the Hebrew, and that it is so to be turned. Others are [those] who judge that "wild asses" [onagri] were admitted by this Anah to the she-asses, and that he found this kind of coupling, so that the swiftest asses might be born from these; and that the word ought now to be turned "swiftest asses." Very many think that he first made the herds of mares to be mounted by asses in the desert, so that from thence new animals against nature — mules — might be born; and, according to this understanding, they esteem [the word] is to be interpreted "mules." But Aquila turned this place thus: "**It** (*Ipsa*) is Ana, who found σὺν τῷ σιμένῃ (*syn to simen*)"; and Symmachus, "τοὺς σιμέν (*tous simen*)" — which interpretation signifies the plural number. But the Seventy and Theodotion — only the Hebrew characters being changed into Greek letters — turned [it] "τὸ ἰαμέν (*to iamen*)," which indicates the

singular number. Concerning which word there has been no less doubt among these recent interpreters. Some — among whom Pellican, [following] the Seventy — now think [it] is to be left [untranslated], as a word not yet understood; Münster and Castalio turn [it] "mules"; Sanctes [Pagninus], "congregations of waters"; Galatinus, "wild asses"; others, according to Symmachus, "Symin" [σιμίν]; but some say that "hot mares" — that is, [mares] warm with the ardor of coitus — was formerly written in the emended codices, [and] afterward, by the fault of the scribes, "mares" [*equas*] was changed into "waters" [*aquas*]. Since, therefore, in this place, and in like [places] of this kind, there is so great a variety of translators, how will the wavering mind explain itself, unless it consult upon this the judgment of the Church? or how will the contentions and altercations be settled, if each one goes on to defend the interpreter of his own sect and faction, and each contends to read according to his own edition — unless the definition of the Church supervene, which by its authority may dissolve strifes of this kind?

Nor let any one say that these [things] are so light and minute that from them — howsoever they be interpreted and read — no peril of sedition, or endangering of salvation, could arise. For that name too, קיקאיון (*Kikaion* [Kikayon]), which was turned "gourd" [*cucurbita*] in Jonah by the old interpreter, was of small moment; and yet (as Augustine writes in the epistle to Jerome) so small a matter excited a huge tumult in Africa. For when a certain bishop, in the church over which he presided — making words [a sermon] to the people — had read, for "gourd," "ivy" [*hedera*], according to the new translation of Jerome, so great a tumult suddenly arose among the people (especially the Greeks arguing, and clamoring the calumny of falsity), that

2

¹ Genesis 36 (Gen. — printed "37").

² Jonah 4 (Iona 4).

(printed p. 664 [PDF p. 669] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the danger of vowel-points (the Arian repointing of John 1:1; Servetus's repunctuation of Romans 9:5); the Council of Trent's decree fixing the Vulgate as authentic; the pernicious editions of Münster and Castalio criticized (the one crudely Judaizing, the other effeminately paraphrastic).*)

so that the bishop was compelled first to implore the aid of the Jews, that they might bring forth for him testimony from their codices; then, they answering variously, he was compelled to recant his error before the people. But what is lighter or more minute than points [vowel-points]? And yet such very small things, if they be placed otherwise than in the editions and exemplars received by the Catholic Church, very often provide great fuel [foments] to heresies. Which Augustine also, in the third book *On Christian Doctrine*, showed by an example, in those words of John: "**IN the beginning** (*In principio*) was the Word." Which sentence the heretics — who denied the Word of God to be God — read with the points changed: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and [there] was God"; and here, a point being interposed, there followed: "This **WORD** (*Verbum*) was in the beginning with God." By a like example, in our times, the impious Servetus, in the second of the three books which, with a blasphemous title, he inscribed *On the error of the Trinity*, perverted that sentence of the divine Paul to the Romans, namely: "**Whose** (*Quorum*) [are] the fathers, of whom [is] Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things God blessed unto the ages, Amen." Which, when he — who denied Christ to be God — saw manifestly to gainsay him, [the point being transposed] he wished it to be read thus: "**Whose** (*Quorum*) [are] the fathers, of whom [is] Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things." Then, a point being affixed [inserted], it is to be added: "**GOD** (*Deus*) [be] blessed unto the ages. Amen" — as [if] a certain eucharistic [thanksgiving] epiphonema, by which the Hebrews frequently are wont to close the end of a prayer with thanksgiving and the praise of God: as, at the end of the eighty-eighth psalm, for this cause is placed: "**BLESSED** (*Benedictus*) [be] God unto the ages, Amen, Amen." ¹ Therefore, that all altercations, doubts, and heresies (which could arise from the diversity of many editions) may be taken away out of the midst, there must be some one

interpretation, approved by the common consent of the whole [body] of the faithful, and by the determination of the Church — by whose authority all controversies of this kind may be removed.

Accordingly, the sacrosanct Tridentine Synod, observing this, rightly, in the fourth session, second decree, sanctioned that, out of all the Latin editions which are circulated, the old and Vulgate edition alone — which by the long use of so many ages has been approved — be held as authentic, and in the divine offices, and sacred mysteries, and in sermons, and public readings, and disputations, be alone read and cited; and let no one dare to reject it under any pretext. And deservedly indeed: since — besides that it has now been received by the Church with so great a multitude of years [/consecrated by so great a reverence of years] — there is not even, among these editions of the more recent interpreters, [any] which is more certain, safer, and more faithful than this our Vulgate edition. For — to be silent about the other translations of our age (of Pellican, namely, of Zwingli, of Oecolampadius, of Luther, and of other heretics, which the heretics themselves confess to be "recognitions" rather than new translations) — I will name only two editions of the two Sebastians, namely of Münster and of Castalio [Castellio], which the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists hold in price above all [others]. Whereas, nevertheless, they are pernicious, and to be fled by the pious reader like a lethal poison — because everywhere they are full of nefarious annotations, scholia, observations, glosses, little prefaces, arguments [summaries], and like traps and snares set for the destruction of the reader. Of which, because it would be too long to relate all, let it suffice to have indicated only two places: of which the one Münster annotated on the first [chapter] of Malachi, against the true and corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar; the other Castalio annotated on the third [chapter] of Exodus, against the consubstantiality and equality of the Father and the Son — following in it the sentence of Arius, so often already condemned.

But if to these [things] the heretics respond that they speak not of their scholia and annotations, but of the kind [manner] of interpretation, and of the best manner of turning [translating] employed by them; and that for this cause they wish the editions of their [own] interpreters to be preferred to our edition, as more polished and more eloquent, and accommodated, by a more diligent industry, to the Latin custom of speaking — we shall not much resist. For we know that the office of a faithful interpreter is not to affect elegance of speech, that he may seem eloquent, but above all the certainty and truth of the sentence [sense]. And in this we affirm that our Vulgate edition is to be preferred to the rest in fidelity, integrity, and authority — discussing nothing at present about the style, and the choice of words, and the candor [purity] of the discourse: all which, because they are alien to the purpose of the present work, we leave to be judged by the professors of tongues.

Yet we cannot be wholly silent about what very many most learned men — even as regards the kind [manner] of interpreting — vehemently condemn in these two authors: namely, that each is, without measure, extreme. The one, in affecting the Jewish idioms, is hard, rustic, barbarous, and plainly a Jew; the other, on the contrary, in ineptly affecting the individual locutions of the gentiles, shows himself gentile and profane rather than Latin: so that, of their translations, the one may deservedly be called [that] of the Jews, the other of the Pagans. For Münster — everywhere horrid, thorny [senticosus], and rough — so far followed the horror of the Hebrew speech that, although he could have accommodated many things softly to Latin ears, he nevertheless so studied to preserve all the properties and phrases of the Hebrew speech that he was unwilling to omit even the very harsh sounds [stridores] of the Hebrew names: thrusting into Latin ears everywhere — for Ozias, "Vzjzhau"; for Ezechias [Hezekiah], "Iehizkiahu"; for Ezechiel, "Iehezechel"; for Cyrus, "Choresch"; for Darius, "Dariauesch"; for Nabuchodonosor, "Nabuchednezzar"; for Baltasar [Belshazzar], "Beltzezzar" — and many other words of this kind, which no Latin can pronounce without a huge straining of breath and of tongue. But Castalio — whom I know not whether I should call a paraphrast rather than an interpreter — is, on the contrary, so delicate and soft that he suffers nothing that smells [olfacere] of a Hebraism; nor does he think that he truly speaks Latin, unless he speak most effeminately, and

— without all the majesty of divine scripture, and the gravity of a divine interpreter — paints, in the manner of little harlots, and sears with a curling-iron [calamistrum], each single sentence, luxuriating in a certain wanton affluence of soft words: as he did in the Canticles of Solomon, in which, whatsoever the old interpreter turned chastely and gravely concerning the divine loves of Christ and of the Church, that man [turned] with every allurement [lenocinium] of words, and with all the voices of little women, and [their] affec-[tions]

¹ John 1 (Ioan. 1); Romans 9 (Rom. 9); Psalm 88 (Psal. 88).

(printed p. 665 [PDF p. 670] — *Heresy XIII (translations): Castalio's effeminate diminutives in the Canticle and his paganizing vocabulary catalogued; his "palo deligatum" for the crucifixion and the stir it caused; then the history of the ancient Greek versions — the Seventy, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Fifth and Sixth found by Origen, and the Seventh (the κοινή / "Lucianic").*)

[and using all the voices and affections of little women,] he translated so impudently (not to say obscenely), as if he had been about to publish the colloquies of harlots and panders — in almost every third word inculcating certain diminished, lubricious, and softly-jingling little words [*voculae*]: such as these are: "**COME hither** (*Huc ades*), O my little sister, my little friend, my dove, my little heart, in the little holes of the rock, in the hiding-places of the snail." And that: "**HOW pretty** (*Quam bella*) thou art, O little dainty one! Show me thy little face, make [me] hear thy little voice; for thou hast both a charming little voice, and a pleasant little face." And that: "**CATCH** (*Capite*) for us the little foxes, the little ravagers of the vineyards." ¹ And again: "**AH, thee** (*Ah te*), pretty one! ah, thee, comely one! Thou hast a little neck very like an ivory little tower. Thou hast a little head very like Carmel, and little curls like royal purple; and thou hast little dove-like little eyes, interspersed with little curls. Thou hast little cheeks like the rinds of a pomegranate, set among little curls, and little breasts more shapely than a fawn." And that: "**OPEN** (*Aperi*) to me, my little sister; I will bring thee into the house of my little mother, of my little parent." Nor is it wonderful if Castalio so impudently [sporting] in a divine matter — even as, with Catullus, he sported about the little sparrow of Lesbia, and the swelling little eyes of the girl, and the golden apple: because (as he himself indicated in the little glosses added at the margin) he never believed that, in that divine Canticle, the mystical loves of Christ and of the Church are described, but that an amatory colloquy was woven of the venereal and profane [loves] of Solomon, and of his lover [*amica*] the Sulamite, and of the loves of the [other] women of the same [Solomon].

And just as he contaminated this book of Solomon with dishonest allurements, so he profaned all the divine scripture with profane, gentile, and impious words, locutions, and sentences — this half-pagan and half-gentile interpreter: who, as if it shamed him to use the words which the Holy Spirit used through the mouths of the saints, changed the name of God, and of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, into "Jove" [*Iupiter*], "Diuus," "Armipotens" [the Mighty-in-arms], "Gradivus" [Mars], and "Coelicola" [Heaven-dweller]; calling his divine charity "Cupid," and his Angels "the genii of Jove," and the temple of God "the shrine and fane of Jove," and the seat of God "the Augustale [palace] of Jove"; putting everywhere — for holy men, "Heroes"; for holy Israel, "the Augustan Israelite"; for the holy prophets, "seers [*vates*] and soothsayers [*fatidici*]; for the prophetic spirit, "the fatidic spirit"; and for "to prophesy," "to rave [*bacchari*]; for the giants likewise, "the offspring of the Titans"; for the Sun, "Phoebus and Apollo"; for lightnings, "the Jovian fire"; for hell, "Orcus and Tartarus"; for the inhabitants of hell, "the Manes"; and for the perdition of hell, "Pluto"; for sanctification, "lustration"; and for the sacred chant, "the Paeon" — and innumerable other [things] like these, drawn from the very midst of the impiety of the gentiles, which no one truly pious would hear with equal [patient] ears. I omit, consulting brevity, the violent and ambiguous locutions which prepare matter for heresies: as when, for that which the Church reads in the Gospel of John — "And the Word was made flesh" — I know not whether he turned [it] Latin rather than Sarmatian [barbarous]: "**AND the**

DISCOURSE (*Et sermo*) **WAS EMBODIED** (*corporatus est*).¹ As if the blessed Jerome had erred, when he turned that *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* (*kai ho logos sarx egeneto*): "And the Word was made flesh"; and that which Peter, in the Acts, said of Christ — *ὃν προσπῆξαντες ἀνείλετε* (*hon prospexantes aneilete*), that is, "**WHOM** (*Quem*), affixing [to the cross], ye slew" — this half-gentile interpreter, the [self-styled] pillar of the Roman tongue, translated: "**WHOM YOU** (*Quem vos*), FASTENED TO A STAKE [*ad palum deligatum*], LIFTED UP [*sustulisti*]."² Which words, in recent years — among certain Jews received to the faith [converted] by the Anabaptists of the city of Florence, not without huge peril to the Anabaptists — excited a great rumor in their conventicles, those Jews doubting whether Christ, according to the old custom of the Romans and Hebrews, had been affixed to a cross, or rather fixed to a stake [*palus*] (according to the present custom of the Turks), as the edition of Castalio seemed to signify. And such egregious fruits do these Ciceronian editions of the recent interpreters produce — celebrated with such great praises by the heretics. But perhaps I have been more [prolix] in this matter than the reader would have wished.

But since the heretics boast that the Church of God, before these new interpretations, had no faithful and sincere translation of the divine scripture — that we may repress this boasting of theirs, it is worth the while, having begun somewhat higher, to see briefly: first, how many and what kind of translations both the Greek and the Latin Church had; then indeed, of what authority each one of them was in the Catholic Church.

The **FIRST** (*Prima*) Greek edition of the Old Testament, therefore — which the Church first used — was the version of the seventy-two interpreters. The **SECOND**, of Aquila of Pontus, published nearly 120 years after Christ. The **THIRD**, of Symmachus the Samaritan, composed in the year 190 of human salvation. The **FOURTH**, of Theodotion of Ephesus, elaborated in the year 200 from the birth of Christ. Concerning which four Greek translations — since, in the fourth book of this Work, under the proper titles of the same authors, we have spoken copiously — we judge it superfluous to repeat the same in this place. The **FIFTH** Greek edition, together with very many other Hebrew and Greek volumes, was found at Jericho, in jars [*dolia*], by Origen Adamantius; who also, not much after, found another certain translation on the Actiac shore, at Nicopolis, hidden in the same manner in jars, and called it the **SIXTH** edition. And, joining these to the other four translations, he constructed, with wonderful artifice, the Hexapla and Octapla of the Greek editions, in that order which I have already commemorated in the book [already] cited, when I reviewed the writings of Origen. A **SEVENTH** — after all these — a certain Greek edition was found; and it was never placed either in the Hexapla or in the Octapla. This Isidore, in the sixth book of the Etymologies, thinks was found by Origen himself; which was called by the Greeks *κοινή* (*koine*) — that is, "common and vulgate" — but by some was called *λευκιανός* (*leukianos* [Lucianic]), or "*ΛΕΥΚΙΑΝΤΑ*": because it was believed to have been published by Lucian the Martyr. Concerning which Jerome, in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela, thus writes: "**BRIEFLY** (*Breviter*) I admonish this — that you may know there is one edition, which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea call *κοινήν* (*koinen*), that is, 'common,' and which is now by very many called *λευκιανός* (*leukianos*); [and] another, of the Seventy interpreters, which is found in the Hexapla codices, and has been turned by us into the Latin tongue, and is chanted at Jerusalem and in the churches of the East. But that *κοινή* (*koine*) is, according to the places and times, a corrupt edition, by the will of the old copyists; whereas that [other], which is had in the Hexapla, and which we have turned, is the very one which, in the books of the learned, is preserved [as] the incorrupt and immaculate translation of the Seventy interpreters." These [things Jerome]

¹ Canticle 2 (Cant. 2); Canticle 7 (Cant. 7); Canticle 5 (printed unclear).

² John 1 (Ioan. 1); Acts 2 (printed unclear).

(printed p. 666 [PDF p. 671] — Heresy XIII (translations): the two Latin editions (the old "Vulgate/common" from the Greek, and Jerome's new one from the Hebrew); the New-Testament translations and Jerome's revision under Damasus; the five editions received into authority; the Church's

exclusive public use of them; and the threefold pre-eminence of the Septuagint (antiquity; divine inspiration — the separate-cells miracle).)

These [things], therefore, concerning all the famous editions of the Greeks, we have taken from Aristeas, Josephus, Eusebius, Justin, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, and Jerome.

After which, two other Latin editions of the Old Testament were in the Latin Church — namely, a new and an old: the old indeed received the name of the "Vulgate and common" edition — both because it had no certain author, and because it was taken, not from the Hebrew fountain, but from the κοινή (*koine*), or from the Septuagint interpretation, as Augustine, in the eighteenth [book] *On the City of God*, and Jerome, in the preface to the Gospels, testify; whose reading the Church used long before the times of Jerome, and also long after, down to the times of Gregory the Pope. But the new was turned by Jerome — not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew verity — into Latin speech: which the Church, from the very times of Gregory, used together with the old edition. For Gregory mentions each in the preface to the Morals, saying: "**The NEW** (*Novam*) translation I defer; but when the cause of proof demands [it] of me, I take now the old, now the new, for testimony: so that — since the Apostolic See, over which, God being author, I preside, uses both — my labor of study also may be supported by each." And let these [things] be said concerning the translations of the Old Testament, both Greek and Latin.¹

But concerning the **TRANSLATIONS** (*Traductionibus*) of the New Testament — which it is agreed was written in Greek, but sometimes with Hebrew phrases — we cannot know their certain number. Yet that they were many, Jerome indicates in the Preface to the four Gospels; but among others he intimates that there was a certain old edition, vulgate in the Church long before himself, which — when, by dozing copyists, in the progress of times, it had become corrupt — Jerome, at the command of Pope Damasus (a collation of many Greek exemplars being made), corrected, emended, and restored to the Greek verity. Which castigation of Jerome — or rather edition — the Roman Church, from the times of the blessed Jerome down to this day, has perpetually used. So many, then, down to this age, have been the editions in the Church, both of the Old and of the New Testament.

Of whose number the Latin and Greek churches — all other editions being omitted — have hitherto received only five into authority: namely, in the New Testament two, the old and the new; and in the Old Testament three, namely, one only Greek, of the Seventy interpreters, and two Latin, that is, the Old and the New. Of the Septuagint edition alone being received by the Church, Eusebius (book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History) is witness; and Augustine, *On the City of God*, book 18, writes on the same matter in this manner: "**For** (*Nam*) although there were also other interpreters, who translated those sacred oracles from the Hebrew tongue into Greek — as Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion; as also is that interpretation whose author does not appear, and for this [reason is] without the name of an interpreter, [and] is called the Fifth edition — nevertheless the Church so receives this [one], which is [that] of the Seventy, as though it were the only one; and the Greek Christian peoples use [it], most of whom are ignorant whether there be another." These [things] Augustine. But of the Latin translations, it is agreed that only two were received by the Church:² first, that Vulgate edition, published in Latin not from the Hebrew origin, but from the translation of the Septuagint — which alone the Latin Church used down to the times of Augustine and Jerome (as Augustine himself testifies in the place already cited), and which (as we already said) Gregory writes, in the preface to the Morals, was in use in the Roman Church down to his own times. After which old and Vulgate edition, the Church began to have (as was said above) the new translation of Jerome, taken from the Hebrew verity; and received also the new castigation of the same [Jerome] into the New Testament, as appears from the third epistle of Augustine to Jerome. And with only these editions, down to the present day, has the Catholic Church publicly used — as authentic, true, and worthy of the highest faith — in the divine mysteries, and sacred sermons, and readings, in confirming the dogmas of our faith, and in refuting the heretics. But the rest the fathers used, not publicly, nor as authentic, but as extraneous, for their particular uses: namely, that from their collation they might

understand the Septuagint interpretation more clearly, and that from the comparison of the Septuagint with the other editions they might refute the falsity of those.³ And for this cause (as Philastrius and Epiphanius hand down) editions of this kind were never placed in the Hexapla in the middle column, but were assigned to the right and the left, so that — placed on this side and on that, as contrary, and not of full truth — they might be shown [to differ] from the true edition of the Seventy Interpreters, which was placed in the middle. All these translations, therefore, being passed over — which the Church either rejects as heretical, or, as suspect and corrupt, does not accept — let us see only how much authority and faith the aforesaid five translations had in the Church, and what the catholic fathers thought of each of them; that, from the gravity of their judgment, we may cast down the arrogance of those who boast that no entire and certain translation of the divine scripture has hitherto been in the Church.

Concerning the integrity, then, and faith of the Septuagint edition, there are so many and so great testimonies of the fathers, that time would fail me if I should wish to review them. Yet all agree in this: that it is to be preferred to the rest chiefly for three causes. First, because it is the most ancient of all editions. Then, because it was published by divine light, and not by human genius, by the seventy-two men full of the Holy Spirit:⁴ since (as Justin Martyr writes, in the *Admonition to the Gentiles*, and Irenaeus in the third book) King Ptolemy — fearing lest the Seventy interpreters should not interpret fully and ingenuously the truth inserted in the divine volumes, but should of set purpose conceal some [things] — separated them each from the other, and commanded [them], placed apart, to interpret the same [texts]. But it was done by divine will that all wrote with the same words, the same names, and sentences, from the beginning even to the end — so that the king, and the gentiles themselves, manifestly recognized that those divine scriptures had been interpreted, not by human, but by divine nod and counsel. But Epiphanius, in the little book *On Weights and Measures*, more fully describing the number, situation, and form of the cells of the twenty-two [*so printed; the seventy-two*] interpreters,⁵

¹ [Augustine, *City of God* 18] ch. 43 (cap. 43).

² ch. 1 (cap. 1); ch. 43 (cap. 43).

³ Isidore, book 6 of the *Etymologies*, ch. 5 (Isi. lib. 6. et[ym.] cap. 5).

⁴ Jerome in the preface to Isaiah (Hie. in praef. Esaiae).

⁵ ch. 24 (of Irenaeus, book 3) (cap. 24).

(printed p. 667 [PDF p. 672] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Septuagint's inspiration (the separate cells) and pre-eminence (patristic testimony, apostolic use); the Old Latin's authority (Augustine, Gregory); Jerome's new version defended in his own and others' words (the Psalter preface, the Helmeted Prologue, Augustine, Isidore); the New-Testament editions; then the Objections of the Heretics begin.*)

but it was done by divine will that all wrote with the same words, the same names and sentences, from the beginning even to the end — so that the king, and the gentiles themselves, manifestly recognized that those divine scriptures had been interpreted, not by human, but by divine nod and counsel. But Epiphanius, in the little book *On Weights and Measures*, more fully describing the number, situation, and form of the cells, recounts that the twenty-two [*so printed; the seventy-two*] volumes of the Old Testament were translated by them, and that in diverse, separate cells — the traces of which the martyr Justin left written that he saw on the island of Pharos, in the *Admonition*. With whose opinion Philastrius in the catalogue, Rufinus against Jerome, and Augustine agree. The third cause why this edition is preferred to the others is, that the Apostles and Evangelists took testimonies from it, as from a true and faithful interpretation. And after them the whole Church, down to Pope Damasus, always held it in the highest veneration — as the most frequent testimonies of the most ancient fathers testify. Origen, in the epistle to Julius Africanus, attributed so much to this one alone, that he said that only that is to be held for true in the sacred scriptures which the Seventy interpreters translated.¹ And Augustine, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*: "The **CHURCH** (*Ecclesia*) of Christ," he says, "judges that no one is to be preferred to the authority of so many men, chosen by Eleazar

(the then pontiff) for this so great work: for — even if there had not appeared in them one, without doubt, divine Spirit, but the Seventy, learned [men], had, after the manner of men, conferred among themselves the words of their interpretation, that what had pleased all might remain — no old interpreter ought to be preferred to them." Jerome too, in many places, and especially in the preface to Paralipomenon, asserts that the Seventy interpreters were men full of the Holy Spirit, and wrote by the authority of the Holy Spirit. I pass over other innumerable testimonies of the fathers, lest I inflict tedium on the readers.

But concerning the Latin edition of the Old Testament — which was formerly called the "old and vulgate" — Augustine, in the book already cited, testifies that it was, among the Latin churches, in such authority and reverence, that it was preferred to all other editions. And Gregory, in the preface to the *Morals* (as we mentioned above), testified that even in his own times it was, in the Roman Church, in the highest veneration — writing these words in the twentieth book of the *Morals*: "**But nevertheless** (*Sed tamen*), because this new translation is reported to have transfused for us all things more truly from the Hebrew, whatsoever is said in it is to be believed; and it behooves that our exposition search out its words more subtly." ²

But concerning the Latin edition of the Old Testament made by Jerome — how faithful, certain, true, lucid, and exact it was — Jerome himself indicates. To whom, since he adduces the reason of his opinion as a pledge, it is fitting that we believe. For thus he speaks of himself in the preface to the *Psalter*, to Sophronius: "**CERTAINLY** (*Certe*) I will say confidently, and I will cite many witnesses of this work, that I have changed nothing at all of the sentence [sense] from the Hebrew verity. If, therefore, anywhere my edition shall discrepate from the old ones, ask any of the Hebrews, and you will clearly foresee that I am torn in vain by rivals — who prefer to seem to condemn illustrious things rather than to learn [them]." And in the *Helmeted Prologue* he similarly says: "**To myself** (*Mihi*) I am not at all conscious of having changed anything of the Hebrew verity. Certainly, if you are incredulous, read the Greek and Latin codices, and compare [them] with these little works which we lately emended; and wherever you see [them] to discrepate among themselves, ask any of the Hebrews to whom you ought rather to accommodate faith; and if he confirm ours, I think that you will not esteem him a conjecturer — as [though] to have divined, in the same place, equally with me." ³ But if the heretics will not believe the divine Jerome, bearing testimony as of himself, let them hear Augustine, who, in the 18th [book] *On the City of God*, thus says of Jerome's version: "**There was not lacking** (*Non defuit*) in our times the presbyter Jerome, a most learned man, and most skilled in the three tongues, who translated the divine scriptures into Latin, not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew; whose so great labor of letters the Hebrews confess to be truthful." Isidore, agreeing with Augustine: "**The presbyter** (*Presbyter*) Jerome," he says, "most skilled in the three tongues, translated the divine scriptures eloquently from the Hebrew into the Latin speech, which he transfused: whose interpretation is deservedly preferred to the rest, for it is more tenacious of the words, and clearer in perspicuity of sentence, and — as being a Christian interpretation — truer." To which testimonies of the fathers the Greeks too gave [their] consent — [Greeks] who, while Jerome was yet living, turned his edition from Latin into Greek, as the same Jerome writes in his first *Apology* against Rufinus.

As to the two Latin editions of the New Testament: the common assent of the ancient fathers, from the beginning of the nascent Church down to Pope Damasus, approved [the old one] by long use. But that the new edition, or castigation, of Jerome was received by the Church with the greatest favor — even while he yet lived — Augustine indicates, in the third epistle to Jerome, in these words: "**ACCORDINGLY** (*Proinde*), we give no small thanks to God for thy work, that thou hast interpreted the Gospel from Greek into Latin; because in almost all [things] there is no offense, when we have collated the Greek scripture. Whence, if any one shall be contentious of the old falsity, the codices being brought forth and collated, he is either most easily taught, or refuted. And if certain very rare [things] deservedly move [him], who is so hard that he would not easily pardon a labor so useful, to which it does not suffice to render a reward of praise [in turn]?" From these [things], therefore, it is concluded: either that these translations — received by the Church

with such veneration, and celebrated by all the fathers — were true and faithful; or, if they were not such, that the Church of God (which believed them to be such as, in reality, they were not) was gravely deceived through so many centuries of years, and basely deluded. Which no one will ever be able even to conceive in mind, unless [he be] utterly destitute of the ecclesiastical spirit, and wholly addicted to the Lutherans, Sacramentarians, Anabaptists, Servetans, and the rest of the pests of this kind. But now let us pass to their contentions [objections].

OBIECTIONES HAERETICORVM [The Objections of the Heretics]

1. The purpose (*Pro-[positum]*)

¹ [Augustine,] book 18 of the City of God, ch. 43 (Li. 18. de Ci[vit.] Dei, cap. 43); Eusebius, book 6 of the [Ecclesiastical] History, ch. 33 (Euseb. lib. 6. hist. cap. 33).

² ch. 43 (cap. 43); ch. 13 (cap. 13).

³ ch. 43 (cap. 43); [Isidore,] book 6 of the Etymologies, ch. 5 (Lib. 6. etym. Cap. 5).

(printed p. 668 [PDF p. 673] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections of the Heretics — 1: the "Septuagint" is misnamed (the Seventy rendered only the Pentateuch) and was not inspired (Jerome: interpreters, not prophets); 2: it omits many Hebrew passages (the NT-quoted messianic texts absent from it); 3: it adds words not in the Hebrew (Gen 3, Sodom, Ps 22:1, Deut 21/27) — and small additions breed grave heresies.*)

1. The purpose (*Propositum*) of our disputation is to show that the churches of the Latins and Greeks, before the editions of the more recent interpreters were put forth, had no interpretation of the divine scriptures which was not deformed by almost infinite faults and errors. Beginning, therefore, according to the series of times, from that first version of the whole Old Instrument [Testament] — falsely called by the name of "the Seventy interpreters" — we shall detect all its faults, if first we admonish our adversaries that this edition was falsely ascribed to the Seventy interpreters, and [that] it was wrongly believed that it was composed by them by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. For Aristéas, the satellite [attendant] of Ptolemy, in the book *On the Seventy Interpreters*, and Philo the Jew in his *Chronography*, and Josephus in the preface to the *Hebrew Antiquities* and in the twelfth book of the same work, and the author of the book *Seder Olam* the Lesser, and all the Rabbis of the Hebrews who have made any mention of the Seventy — all these report that the Seventy interpreters, at Ptolemy's exhortation, translated only the five books of Moses, no enumeration being made of the other books of divine scripture. With whom Jerome too agrees in almost innumerable places, but especially in the commentaries on Micah, ch. 2, where he thus says: "The **INTERPRETATION** (*Interpretatio*) of the Seventy — if, however, it be [that] of the Seventy: for Josephus writes, and the Hebrews hand down, that only the five books of the law of Moses were translated by them, and delivered to King Ptolemy." And in the preface to the *Hebrew Questions*, the same thus writes: "There accedes to this also, that Josephus — who sets forth the history of the Seventy interpreters — relates that only the five books of Moses were translated; which we too confess to consonate [agree] with the Hebrew more than the rest." All which [things] show that this edition, which is had for the whole Old Testament, is not [that] of the Seventy interpreters, but of some other translator of uncertain name and authority. But of whatsoever [translator] it be — even if it were of the Seventy interpreters — Jerome abundantly testifies that the translation which is believed [to be that] of the Seventy was not published through the [Holy] Spirit; and that the Seventy wrote, not as [men] inspired by the divine Spirit, but as men, who in many things could err, and [did] err. And thus Jerome speaks of them, in the preface to the *Pentateuch*: "I know **NOT** (*Nescio*) who first, by his own lie, built the seventy cells of Alexandria, divided into which they wrote the same [texts] — whereas Aristéas, the ὑπαρασπιστής (*hyparaspistes* — shield-bearer, bodyguard) of the same Ptolemy, and, long after in time, Josephus, related nothing such, but write that, gathered together in a basilica, they conferred [compared], [and did] not prophesy. For it is one thing to be a seer [*vates*], another to be an

interpreter: there the [Holy] Spirit predicts future things; here erudition, and copiousness of words, transfers those [things] which it understands. Unless, perhaps, Tully [Cicero] is to be thought to have translated the *Economics* of Xenophon, and the *Protagoras* of Plato, and the [oration] of Demosthenes *For Ctesiphon*, inspired by a rhetorical spirit." ¹

2. But that this edition is stuffed with many errors, not only the Jews themselves affirm (as Augustine noted in the eighteenth [book] *On the City of God*), but many illustrious [men] of the Christians confirm — and the edition itself most manifestly betrays its own errors. For, since the office of the best interpreter is to take nothing away from the author's meaning, to super-add nothing of his own, to change nothing either into an ambiguous or a contrary sense — in all these [respects] the Seventy are found to have failed. And first, how many places from the Hebrew codices they passed over, Jerome indicates in almost all the prefaces of the sacred books, but especially in the preface to the Pentateuch, in which, enumerating some of those [things] which the Seventy omitted, he says: "We read **MANY** (*Multa*) [things] of the Old Testament which are not had in ours — that is, in the codices of the Seventy interpreters. As that: 'Out of Egypt I called my son'; and, '**Because** (*Quoniam*) he shall be called a Nazarene'; and, 'They shall **SEE** (*Videbunt*) [him] into whom they have transfixed [pierced]'; and, '**Rivers** (*Flumina*) of living water shall flow from his belly'; and, '**Which** (*Quae*) neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it ascended into the heart of man, [the things] which God hath prepared for them that love him'; and many others, which require [their] proper composition [*σύνταγμα* (*syntagma*)] — of which the first is placed in Osee [Hosea], the second in Isaiah, the third in Zechariah, the fourth in Proverbs, the fifth likewise in Isaiah — of whose error it is not mine to expound the causes." ² And a little after, accusing them that of set purpose they passed over all [the things] which they had found, in the sacred letters, concerning the holy mysteries of the Trinity, he thus adds: "**FINALLY** (*Denique*), wherever the scripture testifies anything sacred concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, either they interpreted [it] otherwise, or were altogether silent."

3. But how many [things] they super-added of their own, which are not had in the Hebrew codices, the same Jerome — in the book of Hebrew Questions, and in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela, and in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting* — plucking a few from almost infinite places, noted. As that in the third [chapter] of Genesis, where in the Hebrew it is written, "Upon thy breast shalt thou go," they added, "**AND** [thy] **BELLY** (*Et ventrem*)," which the Hebrew codex has not; and [in] Genesis ch. 13, for that which the Hebrews read, "**that** (*Ut*) the men of Sodom were evil, and sinners exceedingly," they apposed, "**IN the sight** (*In conspectu*) of God" — which, as superfluously added, Jerome damns: because the Sodomites were not only evil in the sight of God, but also in the sight of men. And whereas at the beginning of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22] there is written only *אלי אלי למה עזבתני* (*Eli, eli, lama azavtani* — printed "hazabathani"), which is interpreted, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" — they interposed two other words, namely, "**LOOK UPON ME** (*Respice in me*)." And for that which is read in Deuteronomy 21, "**Cursed** (*Maledictus*) by God [is he] who hangeth on a tree," they — as Jerome notes in the third [chapter] to the Galatians — added, "**EVERYONE** (*Omnis*) who hangeth on a tree." [And] in Deuteronomy 27, where it is written, "**CURSED** (*Maledictus*) [is he] who shall not have remained in the words which are written in the book of the law," three particles being added, they turned [it]: "**CURSED** (*Maledictus*) [is] EVERY MAN who shall not have remained in ALL the words which are written in the book of the law." And lest any one should esteem additions of this kind to be of light moment, let him know that from these additions — however small — very often the gravest heresies have arisen: as can be shown by the example of the Manichaeans, who, from this last universal particle "**EVERY** (*Omnis*)" — which the Seventy added to the testimony of Moses

¹ ch. 43 (cap. 43).

² Hosea 11 and Matthew 2 (Ose. 11 & Mat. 2); Isaiah 2 and Matthew 2 (Esa. 2 & Mat. 2); Zechariah 13 (Zach. 13); John 19 (Ioan. 19); Proverbs 18 (Prou. 18); John 7 (Ioan. 7); Isaiah 64 (Esa. 64); 1 Corinthians 2 (1. Cor. 2).

(printed p. 669 [PDF p. 674] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections of the Heretics continued* — 3 (concl.): the Manichaeans abuse the added "Omnis" to blaspheme Moses; 4: the LXX translated things in a contrary sense (Gen 26 the well "saturity" vs "oath"; Ps 18 "for the sun" vs "in the sun he set his tabernacle" — which made the Manichaeans adore the sun); 5: from ignorance of proper speech it rendered things into an alien sense (Gen 30 marked/unmarked flocks; Gen 31 "ten times" -> "ten lambs"; Gen 35 "chibrath" -> "hippodrome"); 6: one argument suffices — Jerome's very labor proves the version's imperfection; 7: the Old Latin, an impure rivulet from an impure fount, is contaminated with all faults (Jerome on Joshua, Job, Esther, Daniel).)

3. [from this last universal particle "Every," which the Seventy added to the testimony of Moses, saying, "**CURSED** (*Maledictus*) [is] EVERYONE who hangeth on a tree,"] took occasion of calumniating and rejecting Moses, calling him (as Augustine writes in the sixteenth book against Faustus) now sacrilegious, now a blasphemer: because he had shut up [included] Christ, the Apostles, and the martyrs hanging on a tree, all under one and the same universal curse.

4. But of those [things] which the Seventy translated in a **contrary sense** (*contrario sensu*), Jerome too enumerates not a few in the places above mentioned. As in Genesis 26, for that which, according to the Hebrew verity, is read: "**THERE CAME** (*Venerunt*), in that very day, the servants of Isaac, announcing concerning the well which they had digged, and saying: We have found water: whence its name was called Saturity [*Satiety*]" — the Seventy turned [it] utterly from the opposite: "**AND** (*Et*) the boys of Isaac came, and announced to him concerning the well which they had digged, and said to him: We have **not** found water; whence its name was called Oath [*iuramentum*]." Which to be falsely translated, Jerome shows from the very etymology of the name: "**FOR what** (*Quae enim*) etymology is [there]," saith he, "that it should for this cause be called 'Oath,' because they had not found water? — whereas the contrary also is done [stated] in the Hebrew, and Aquila and Symmachus in translating have agreed, that they found water, and that for this cause the well was named: [namely,] 'Saturity,' or 'Abundance.'" And in the eighteenth Psalm, for that which is read in the Hebrew, "**For the sun** (*Soli*) he set a tabernacle in them" — that is, that God gave to the Sun in heaven a dwelling and a bridal-chamber, out of which, as a bridegroom, it should proceed in the early morning — the Seventy turned [it] in a contrary sense: [namely,] not that the sun was placed in a tabernacle, but that a tabernacle was placed in the sun, saying, ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκηνῶμα αὐτοῦ (*en to helio etheto to skenoma autou*), that is, "**IN** (*In*) the sun he set his tabernacle." Which bred an occasion to the Manichaeans, that they should adore the sun; because from these words they had esteemed that Christ, after he ascended into heaven, had constituted for himself a dwelling in the sun, and thenceforth had dwelt in it as in [his] own tabernacle: for thus Augustine writes of the Manichaeans, in the twentieth book against Faustus.

5. There are **MANY** (*Multa*) [things] also which, from ignorance of the proper speech [idiom], seem to have been translated by the Seventy wrongly, and into an alien and diverse sense. Some examples of which Jerome adduced in the places already said. As in Genesis 30, where concerning the flocks of Jacob and Laban it is had in the Hebrew, "**MADE** (*Facta*) were those [things] which were of the late season Laban's, and those of the first time Jacob's" — the Seventy, the Hebrew words not being understood, turned [it], Ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἄσημα τοῦ Λαβάν, τὰ δὲ ἐπίσημα τοῦ Ἰακώβ (*Egeneto de ta asema tou Laban, ta de episema tou Iakob*), that is, "**MADE** (*Facta*) were, however, the un-notable [unmarked] Laban's, but the notable [marked] Jacob's": which Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, says pertains nothing to the sense [makes no difference to the meaning]. Likewise in Genesis 31, for that which is in the Hebrew, "**HE CHANGED** (*Mutavit*) my wage ten times [*decem vicibus*]" — the Seventy, deceived by unskillfulness of the proper word, turned [it] τῷ δέκα ἀρνῶν (... *deka arnon*), that is, "[with] ten lambs [*decem agnis*]": whence Jerome, refuting them in the Hebrew Questions: "I know **NOT** (*Nescio*)," saith he, "by what opinion the Seventy, led [astray], put the Hebrew word מנים (*monim*) [as] 'ten lambs' — whereas it signifies rather a number than lambs: and finally, from the consequents [context] too the sense of number is the more proved.

But Aquila also translated δέκα ἀριθμούς (*deka arithmous* — ten in number); Symmachus indeed translated δεκάκις ἀριθμῶ (*dekakis arithmo* — tenfold, in number) — each of them consenting with Jerome concerning the number." Likewise in Genesis 35, for that which is read, "**GOING FORTH** (*Egressus*)" thence, however, he came [a] כְּבֵרֶת (*chibratha*)" — that is, according to Jerome, "in the vernal time [springtime]," or (as others expound) "as it were a stadium [furlong]" — the Seventy, not holding the propriety of the word, turned [it], "**IN** (*In*) the hippodrome"; which Jerome, in the aforesaid book, marvelling at: "I know **NOT** (*Nescio*)," saith he, "meaning what, the Seventy translated 'hippodrome,' since 'chibrath' cannot be a hippodrome." These [things], out of the innumerable errors of this edition, let them be [a] few collected for example's sake.

6. Although for all these [purposes] one single argument might suffice to show the utmost imperfection of this translation — namely, that unless grave and frequent lapses had been in it, in vain would Jerome have expended so much of labor and of vigils [wakeful nights], to publish a new translation from the Hebrew fount, and to furnish it to the Church to be read. Neither would the Church have received the edition of Jerome, so diverse from the interpretation of the Seventy, unless both Jerome and the Church had perceived that the translation of the Seventy departed much from the Hebrew verity, and in very many [places] erred not lightly. Let these [things be said] concerning the first version, of the Seventy interpreters.

7. But concerning the **Latin** (*Latina*) edition of the Old Testament — which they call the Old [*Vetus*] — it cannot be denied but that it was contaminated with all faults. For if the Greek edition of the Seventy interpreters abounded in so many depravations — whence [as its source] the Old Latin edition, as an impure rivulet from an impure fount, flowed forth — it is necessary that the Latin version too was deformed with much graver blemishes and errors: as also Jerome almost everywhere testifies, now cutting it back as superfluous and redundant, now supplying it as curtailed and amputated, now correcting and emending it as depraved, and in almost all the prefaces of the divine books always indicating its diverse faults. As in the preface of the book of Joshua, concerning the exemplars [copies] of the Old Latin edition, he complains in these words: "**AMONG** (*Apud*) the Latins," saith he, "there are as many exemplars as codices, and each one has added, or subtracted, at his own pleasure, what seemed [good] to him; and assuredly that cannot be true which is dissonant." And in the prefaces of the book of Job he complains that in the Vulgate edition the whole book of Job is torn and truncated, and that there are lacking in it above eight hundred verses; and that truly, among the Latins, that book, gnawed by the worms of errors, lies in the dung. But on the contrary, in the preface of the books of Esther and of Daniel, he damns the Old Vulgate edition, because it handles the sacred histories with ragged [tattered] endings of words, adding those [things] which can be said and heard extempore — as is wont to be done in the schools by those who, with feigned arguments, exercise themselves in writing history, excogitating what could have been said according to place, time, and persons: as was done in the book of Esther, in which six chapters are apposed [added] beyond the Hebrew verity; and in the book of Daniel, in which the judgment of Susanna, and the fables of Bel and of the Dragon, are added, outside the sum of the Hebrew narration.

(printed p. 670 [PDF p. 675] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections continued* — 8: the "Old" Latin now in church use is not really Jerome's (it keeps none of his emendations — Gen 4 "he had regard" vs Theodotion's "he kindled"; Gen 4 "let us go forth"; Ps 2 "lay hold" vs "adore purely"; Ps 126 "sons of the shakers" vs "sons of youth"); it is Theodotion's or Aquila's or Symmachus's, sold under Jerome's prefaces — and even Jerome's own version was faulted by Palladius, Augustine, Rufinus, and Lyra, and Jerome confessed his own errors (Isa 19, Jer 6); 9: whosoever it is, the Vulgate teems with errors in proper names (Gen 2 *bdellium*, Gen 12 *Moreh*, Gen 27 "prudently"->"fraudulently," Gen 33 "a hundred coins"->"a hundred lambs"), transmutes place and time (Gen 35 "a stretch of land"->"in springtime"), swaps deeds (Gen 36 "mules"->"hot waters"), and gives contrary, ill-sounding senses (Gen 6 "shall not judge"->"shall not remain").)

8. Concerning the **edition** (*editio*) of the Old Testament which is believed to be Jerome's, this one [thing] first of all is certainly agreed: that it is not Jerome's — Jerome himself being witness; who, in the preface of the book of Kings, speaking of his own edition, says that he changed nothing of the Hebrew verity. Which, assuredly, in the Vulgate edition of the Old Testament — which the Church now uses — we do not see to have been observed: since in it there are so many [things] which dissent from the Hebrew verity. To which this also accedes: that, out of so innumerable places which Jerome commemorates that he either emended, or turned otherwise, or judged ought to be read otherwise than they are now read, there is found in this our edition no place at all which corresponds either to Jerome's castigation or at least to his judgment. Which will clearly appear, if we compare some places of our edition with those concerning which Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, indicated his opinion. And first, in Genesis 3 [4], where our edition has: "**HE HAD REGARD** (*Respexit*), God, to Abel and to his gifts; but to Cain and to his gifts he had not regard" — Jerome, according to the interpretation of Theodotion, thought it ought to be read: "**AND** (*Et*) the Lord kindled [fire] upon Abel and upon his sacrifice, but upon Cain and upon his sacrifice he did not kindle [it]"; adding that this interpretation is most true, because Cain could not otherwise have known that God had accepted his brother's gifts and repudiated his own, unless he had kindled his brother's sacrifice according to Theodotion — fire being wont to come from heaven for devouring the sacrifice, as is read in the dedication of the temple under Solomon, and when Elijah built an altar on Mount Carmel. Likewise concerning that which our edition has in Genesis 3 [4]: "**LET US GO FORTH** (*Egrediamur*) abroad," or "into the field" — Jerome thus writes: "And Cain said to Abel his brother" — [there] is understood, "those [things] which the Lord had spoken." It is superfluous, therefore, that in the volume of the Samaritans, and in ours, there is read: "**LET US GO FORTH** (*Egrediamur*) abroad," etc. Likewise in the second Psalm, for that which we now read, "**LAY HOLD OF** (*Apprehendite*) discipline" — Jerome, in the Apology against Rufinus, testifies that he turned [it]: "**ADORE** (*Adorate*) purely." And in the exposition of Psalm 126, to Marcella, for that which we now read in that psalm, "**THE SONS** (*Filii*) of the shakers-out [*excussorum*]" — he says that he translated: "**THE SONS** (*Filios*) of youth [*iuventutis*]," as Theodotion had done: because in the Hebrew it is had, כֶּן בְּנֵי הַנְּעוּרִים (*chen bene hannehurim* — "so [are] the sons of youth"). From which places, and from many others of this kind, it is manifest that this edition is not Jerome's. Which both Paul, bishop of Fossombrone [Forosempronensis] (not to adduce meanwhile Münster and Luther), and very many others skilled in Hebrew letters affirm — esteeming that this our edition is either Theodotion's, or Aquila's, or Symmachus's, which an interpreter of uncertain name turned into Latin, and — Jerome's prefaces being appended [to it] — hawked [*venditarit*] it for Jerome's edition. And yet neither was Jerome's own edition (whatsoever it may have been) so perfect in every part that it could avoid just reprehension. For — to pass over Palladius the Galatian, who first of all reprehended it in so many places — Augustine, in the first epistle to Jerome, not only does not approve Jerome's edition, but damns Jerome's zeal in translating the Old Testament as superfluous, and exhorts him to desist from translating the Hebrew scriptures as from a rash undertaking. Rufinus too, in the second book against Jerome, thinks Jerome's edition much worse than the Seventy's, and accuses it of many crimes. Nicholas of Lyra likewise shows Jerome reprehensible in his translation — both elsewhere in many places, and especially in the forty-seventh Psalm, where at the close of it he thus says: "**JEROME** (*Hieronimus*), nevertheless, seems to say less well [rightly], because in all the Hebrew bibles which I have seen, עֲלֻמּוֹת (*halmuth*) here is one word [*una dictio*] — but why [dwell] on more [instances]?" Jerome himself, in his translation, confesses that he himself erred — in the commentaries upon Isaiah, chapter nineteen, where he thus says: "I think it **BETTER** (*Melius*) to reprehend my own error, than, while I blush to confess unskillfulness, to persist in error — [namely] in that which I translated, 'AND the land of Judah shall be to Egypt for a festivity.'" And in Jeremiah, chapter six, he did not deny that he was ignorant of the signification of certain words.

9. But of whatsoever [authorship] this Vulgate edition be, it is manifest that it stands far from the Hebrew verity, and everywhere teems with innumerable blemishes — the names of places, cities, men, animals, and

plants being frequently varied [altered]. As in Genesis 2, for that which is had, הבדלח (*habbedolach*), our edition has "bdellium" — whereas that signifies to the Hebrews, not bdellium, but a precious stone, on the testimony of Jerome, and also of Lyra. And for that which is put in our edition, "UNTO (*Ad*) the place [of] Shechem, even to the illustrious valley," the Hebrew has אלון מורה (*elon moreh*) — that is, "the plain [*planitiem*] of Moreh"; for according to the Gerundensian [Nachmanides of Gerona] it is a man's name. And [in] Genesis 27, for that which in the Hebrew is במרמה (*bemirmah*) — which according to Lyra signifies "PRUDENTLY (*Prudenter*)" — our edition has "FRAUDULENTLY (*Fraudulenter*).". And [in] Genesis 33, for that which in the Hebrew is קשיטה במאה (*bemeah kesitah*) — that is, "for a hundred coins [*nummis*], or oboli" — our [edition] has "for a hundred LAMBS (*agnis*).". Sometimes also it transmutes places into times, and times into places: as in Genesis 35, where these words are written to the letter [literally]: ויסעו מבית אל ויהי עוד כברת הארץ לבוא אפרתה (*va isehu mibeth el, ve iehi hod chibrata ha arez labo ephratha* — with printer's slips for *vayyis'u mibbeth-el vay'hi 'od kibrath ha-arets lavo ephratha*), that is, "And they set forth from Bethel, and there was yet as it were a stadium [*furlong*] of land to come to Ephratha" — for which our edition thus reads: "GOING FORTH (*Egressus*), however, thence, he came, in the vernal time, to the land which leads to Ephratha." Sometimes it puts other deeds to have been done for others: as when, in Genesis 36, the scripture says that Anah found הימים (*ha iemim*) — that is, a new generation of mules — in the desert, our translation puts "hot waters," which are nowhere found in that desert. Sometimes it puts senses altogether contrary to those which are had in the Hebrew, and ill-sounding in the faith: as in Genesis 6, for that which is read, לא ינוח רוחי באדם לעלם (*lo iadon ruchi baadam leolam*), that is, "MY SPIRIT shall NOT (*Non*) judge in man for ever" — our edition has: "MY SPIRIT shall NOT (*Non*) remain [*permanebit**] [in man for ever]." Which interpretation Jero-

(printed p. 671 [PDF p. 676] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Objections concluded* — 9 (concl.): Gen 6 "shall not remain" makes God bloodthirsty, whereas the Hebrew "shall not judge" sounds His clemency; 10: the New-Testament editions — the old one Jerome (pref. to Damasus) judged unworthy of trust, the new one (denied to be Jerome's) is riddled with the errors Erasmus catalogued in his seven indices; conclusion: the Church has hitherto had no whole and sincere translation. Then the refutation begins — **DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM** — answer 1: against objection 1, the Seventy did translate the whole Old Testament (Jerome, Eusebius's Evangelical Preparation, Epiphanius, Origen, Philo, and the whole chorus of fathers), and translated by the Holy Spirit's afflatus, though not as prophesying seers; answer 2 begins.)

9. [Which interpretation ("My spirit shall not remain")] Jerome, in the book of Hebrew Questions, damns as cruel, because it makes God bloodthirsty and truculent: whereas rather that sentence, as it is had in the Hebrew, sounds the clemency of God. For he saith: "MY SPIRIT shall NOT (*Non*) judge in man for ever, because he is flesh" — that is, "because the condition in man is fragile, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but will here restore to them those [things] which they merit." Therefore [it sounds] not severity, as it is read in our codices (saith Jerome), but the clemency of God — while the sinner is here visited for his own wickedness, lest in another age he be damned for ever. From these, therefore, and from similar places contained in our edition, we gather that the Church, before our times, never had a whole edition of the Old Testament.

10. But what is to be thought concerning the editions of the New (*novi*) Testament — and especially concerning that which, in Jerome's time and before, was read in the Church — Jerome indicates in the preface to Damasus, esteeming it altogether unworthy that faith should be given to it: because there were as many exemplars of it as codices, and those [were] either badly edited by faulty interpreters, or perversely emended by unskilled presumers, or, by dozing copyists, either added to or changed — in which very many [things] discrepated from the Greek verity, and even from their own selves. But the new edition, which we now use, and which not only Erasmus alone, but also many other learned men, deny to be Jerome's — it would require a proper work [of its own], if we should wish to comprehend its every error. But let those

seven indices which the most diligent Erasmus prefixed to his edition suffice for explaining all its errors. In the first of which he digested the inexcusable solecisms admitted through [by] the interpreter. In the second he collected nearly all the obscure places, in which interpreters of great name have lapsed. In the third he set in order the manifestly depraved places. In the fourth, the places redundant in our edition. In the fifth he apposed the places deficient in our edition. In the sixth and seventh he subjoined the places changed by the interpreter, and wrongly inverted. From which anyone will easily recognize with how many blemishes, solecisms, barbarisms, amphibologies, hyperbata, and a thousand other errors our edition of the New Testament is stuffed. It remains, therefore, [to conclude] that the Church of the Christians has hitherto had no whole, faithful, true, and sincere translation of sacred scripture — which indeed we assumed from the beginning [as the thing] to be demonstrated.

DISSOLVTIO OBIECTORVM [The Dissolution of the Objections]

1. Although we know it to be the opinion of almost all the Hebrews that the Seventy interpreters published in Greek only the five books of Moses, we prefer nevertheless to follow the certain and undoubted opinion of all the Christian fathers in this matter, rather than, with the Judaizing heretics, to follow the uncertain opinions of the Jews. But among the fathers, chiefly the divine Jerome affirms that the Seventy translated not only the five books of Moses, but also all the books of the prophets. Which Eusebius had testified long before, in the eighth book of the Evangelical Preparation — in which he also rendered the cause why the books of the prophets ought to have been turned by the Seventy interpreters, thus writing: "**WHEN** (*Cum*) now the times of our Saviour seemed to draw more nearly nigh, and it was most conducive to the salvation of all nations to understand whatsoever had been written by the prophets, He set forth the Judaic scripture to all through the Greek tongue — which almost all nations understood. For either we should not have had it after the times of our Saviour, the Jews from envy concealing [it]; or they would have given us more corrupt [copies]; or, if they could rightly be had, the translators would easily be called into suspicion. Our Saviour, therefore, who as God provided all things, instilled the best disposition into Ptolemy king of the Egyptians, that through the Seventy Hebrew interpreters he might translate the books of the prophets." But Epiphanius, in the little book On Weights and Measures, reports that not only the law and the Prophets, but also the rest of the books of the Old Testament — which he even names by name — were translated by them; and Origen before him thought the same, and, long before both, Philo the Jew: with whom the whole chorus of the Greek and Latin fathers consents. ¹ Nor does Jerome discrepate anything from their consent — although (as the heretics object to us) he sometimes seemed to dissent; but rather he doubted out of others' mind than out of his own, whether the Seventy had translated the whole Old Testament. For always, in all his commentaries, he confessed that the Seventy interpreters translated the whole Old Testament. Nay, in the commentaries on the Twelve Prophets, as he testifies of himself against Rufinus, he always, together with his own edition, also discussed the Septuagint interpretation under their name. And at last, what he thought of this matter, he opened in the same commentaries in these words: "**ALTHOUGH** (*Quanquam*) the learned approve that only the five books of Moses were translated by the Seventy — as Josephus, and the Hebrews [do] — yet we, having followed the authority of the ancients, of Irenaeus, Tertullian, [and] Origen, say that the whole Old Testament was translated by the Seventy." But if, for the most part, Jerome contemns those Septuagint cells as published by an uncertain author, and wrote that the Seventy interpreters were not prophets and seers, but only interpreters — not for that reason does he yet deny that they translated with the Holy Spirit illuminating [them]: nay rather, that they, full of the Holy Spirit, and moved by the authority of the Holy Spirit, translated most truly, he constantly affirms in very many places, and especially in the preface of the book of Paralipomenon [Chronicles]. And although he asserted that they neither prophesied in interpreting, nor had the prophetic Spirit, nowhere nevertheless does he deny that they, imbued with the Holy Spirit, approached the translation of scripture. He denied indeed that they had the Spirit by which, foreseeing future things, they might divine and write [them]; but he did not deny that they had, within, the divine Spirit of understanding,

and the afflatus of the interpretation of divine scripture — by the auspice of whose internal light they might convert, from one tongue into another, those [things] which had been written by the prophets. For the spirits of prophecy and of interpretation differ among themselves: this one interprets speeches [words], but that one prophesies things to come.

2. But as for those errors of which the Seventy are accused by the heretics — namely, that they [passed over] many testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ especially (*praesertim*)

¹ ch. 1 (cap. 1).

(printed p. 672 [PDF p. 677] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 2 (concl.): the Seventy omitted messianic and Trinitarian texts for three just causes (the mysteries were not yet perspicuous; not to scandalize Ptolemy into thinking the Jews held two Gods; not to cast pearls before swine); answer 3: their additions concern sense, not words — as Mark added "I say to thee" to "Talitha cumi," and the LXX added "look upon me" to Ps 21 for emphasis, and rendered the double sense of Hebrew "al gachon" (breast and belly) at Gen 3:14; the Deut "Omnis" was in the old Hebrew (Jerome found "cal" in the Samaritan volumes) and the Manichaean scandal was their own malice; answer 4 begins: the places seeming to fight the Hebrew are not truly contrary (Augustine, Jerome).)*

2. [that they passed over many testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ, and] especially (*praesertim*) [those] concerning the holy Trinity, in silence — Jerome defends them egregiously in many places, demonstrating that they omitted much concerning the sacraments [mysteries] of Christ, and the mysteries of the holy Trinity, neither negligently nor maliciously, but by a prudent and pious counsel. **First**, because, since they interpreted before the advent of Christ, they could not know many sacraments of the Christ to come, not yet in those ages fully perceived — God so disposing, that all the mysteries of his divinity should be reserved to be unfolded at the rising of the splendor of the evangelical light of Christ. And so, what they were ignorant of, or did not fully know, they either translated in doubtful and ambiguous sentences, or were altogether silent — willing rather to be well silent about the unknown, than, by speaking, to pronounce ill of those [things] which they knew not. **Secondly**, lest they should scandalize Ptolemy king of Alexandria, they concealed much concerning the Son of God and concerning his advent; lest perhaps the king, hearing that God had a Son, should have thought that the Jews, according to the dogma of Plato, held a double divine power [*numen*], and had two Gods — whom he therefore [would have] made much of [reckoned great], because they were said to worship one God. **Thirdly**, they were silent about many other sacraments also besides these, lest they should betray all the mysteries of their faith to the heathen — esteeming it unworthy, according to the sentence of Christ, to give the holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine. For these most just causes, therefore, Jerome hands down that so many [things] were omitted by the Seventy interpreters. ¹

3. But concerning those [things] which were **added** by the same [interpreters], the divine Jerome, in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting*, shows that in those [places] the words are not to be considered, but the sense — to which the Seventy themselves added nothing of their own, although they adjoined certain words which were not in the Hebrew. But since they noticed that certain Hebrew senses could not so significantly pass into the Greek tongue with an equal number of words preserved, for that cause they sometimes added some diction[s], so that what they could not fully express with an equal number of words, they might — other words being added — express more significantly and more efficaciously. Which the apostles and evangelists also sometimes did: as we read in Mark, who, when he had introduced the Lord saying to the dead girl, "**TALITHA CUMI**" (printed "*THABITHA CVMI*"; Mark 5:41), immediately subjoined: "**WHICH** (*Quod*) is interpreted, Damsel (I say to thee) arise" — in the interpretation of whose sentence, two words, namely, **I SAY TO THEE** (*Tibi dico*), which are not in the Hebrew saying of Christ, he added of his own; and, that he might make the command of the commanding Christ ἐμφατικώτερον (*emphatikoteron*) — that is, more significant — and might more strongly express the sense of the one calling and commanding. ²

So too the Seventy, for the sake of emphasis, often added many words of their own: as when, among those words of the twenty-first psalm [Ps 22], "**MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME?**", they interposed πρόσχες μοι (*prosches moi* — printed corruptly "πρόσχευσομοι") — that is, "**LOOK UPON ME** (*Respice in me*)" — that they might more powerfully and vividly explain the affection of one supplicating and expostulating. And this is the one cause why the Seventy added some [things] of their own. But the other is the equivocation and multiple signification of words, which is wont to happen among the Hebrews more than in the other tongues of other nations — [namely] that one and the same word often signifies many [things]. Whence the Seventy, wishing for the most part to show the multiple signification of some Hebrew word, and seeing that it could not be done by a single word, by apposing several words, interpret several significations of the same word: as they did in Genesis 3, in the place remembered by the heretics — where, since in the Hebrew is written יחגל על (*al gachon*), which signifies as well "upon the belly" as "upon the breast," the Seventy, desiring to express both significations of the word, translated: ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει σου, καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ πορεύσῃ (*epi to stethei sou, kai te koilia poreuse*), that is, "**UPON** (*Super*) thy breast, and belly, shalt thou go." Sometimes also it can happen that some [things] in the Hebrew codices — whether by malice, or negligence, or unskillfulness of the scribes — are omitted; which, since afterward they were found in the edition of the Septuagint interpreters (who translated from codices as yet whole), seem to have been apposed by the Seventy above [beyond] the Hebrew verity. As in those two places of Deuteronomy produced by the heretics, Jerome thinks it happened — who speaks thus of these in the commentaries on the Galatians, chapter three: "We hold it **UNCERTAIN** (*Incertum*), whether the Seventy added '**EVERY MAN** (*Omnis homo*)' and '**IN ALL** (*In omnibus*)'; or whether it was so in the old Hebrew, and afterward was deleted by the Jews. But into this suspicion that thing goads me: that the word '**EVERY**,' and '**IN ALL**,' as if necessary to his sense for proving that [statement], that whosoever are of the works of the law are under a curse — the apostle Paul, a man of Hebrew skill, and most learned in the law, would never have produced, unless it were had in the Hebrew volumes. For which cause, re-reading the Hebrew volumes of the Samaritans, I found כָּל (*cal*) — which is interpreted 'every,' or 'in all' — to be written, and to concord with the Seventy interpreters. In vain, therefore, did the Jews take it away, lest they should seem to be under a curse if they could not fulfill all [things] which are written: since more ancient letters of another nation also testify that it was there placed." Thus Jerome. But if the Manichaeans were scandalized by that word — esteeming that Moses blasphemed Christ, because he placed him under the universal curse of those who hang on a tree — this scandal was the heretics' [own], taken not from the occasion of the scripture, but from their own malice: as if the apostle Paul also (whom the Manichaeans venerate) had not said that Christ was not only under a curse, but was even made by God sin, and a curse, for us — made, I say, a curse of his own will, not born as [the] sin which man had committed through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, [and] which he himself, hung [appended] on the tree, might blot out, as Augustine says against Faustus. And let these [things be said] concerning the places super-added by the Septuagint.³

4. But concerning the places which among the Septuagint seem to fight with the Hebrew verity, Augustine rightly said, in the eighteenth book *On the City of God*, chapter forty-four, that there are many [things] among the Septuagint interpreters which — though they be thought to discrepate from the Hebrew verity — if they be well understood, will be found not to be contrary to it; and the divine Jerome [likewise], in the book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting*: "**They DISCREPATE** (*Discrepant*)," he says, "the [translation] of the Septuagint interpreters, and ours; and yet the variety of the speeches [words] concords in the unity of the spirit. Whence it is **not** (*non*) to be believed"

¹ Jerome in the preface to the Pentateuch (Hier. in praefat. Pentateuchi).

² Mark 9 (Mar. 9) — the phrase "Talitha cumi" stands at Mark 5:41.

³ Galatians 3 (Gal. 3. b).

(printed p. 673 [PDF p. 678] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 4 (concl.): the Gen 26 well is not contrary, only a variant reading (the Seventy's codices had לא "lo" = "not," the later ones לו "lo" = "to him," aleph dropped by scribes), and the "oath" etymology stands; the Ps 18 "for the sun / in the sun" difference is the spiritual sense (Christ's tabernacle in the Church), which the Manichaeans abused into sun-worship; answer 5: the alleged blunders (monim, chibrath) are scribal corruptions, not the interpreters' ignorance — Jerome never charged them with unskillfulness (Reuchlin wrongly says he did), and the Greek church's text is now corrected (Gen 35 reads "Chiphraitha," not "hippodrome"); answer 6: Jerome's new version was not aimed against the Seventy (his self-defense to Rufinus and the preface to Chronicles).)

4. [Whence it is **not** to be believed] that the Seventy ever turned anything into a contrary sense. But if they translated that place of Genesis 26 in another sense than the later interpreters did, the cause was that in the codices of their own time they had a diction [reading] contrary to that which Aquila and Symmachus had in their codices. Whereby it came to pass that their interpretation differed from the Septuagint interpretation. For that which the Seventy had in their exemplars — לא (*lo*), terminating in aleph, which signifies, namely, the negative particle **NOT** (*Non*) — the later interpreters, in their codices, perhaps by the carelessness of the scribes, the aleph being omitted, had לו (*lo*), which signifies the pronoun "to him," or "to it." Whence both the Seventy and the later [interpreters] most aptly translated what they had in their codices: those [the Seventy], according to the negating particle: "**THE SERVANTS CAME, AND ANNOUNCED TO HIM; AND SAID: WE HAVE NOT FOUND WATER**" (*Venerunt servi, et nuntiaverunt ei; et dixerunt: Non invenimus aquam*); but these [the later], according to the demonstrative particle: "**THE SERVANTS CAME, AND ANNOUNCED TO HIM, AND SAID TO HIM: WE HAVE FOUND WATER**" (*Venerunt servi, et nuntiaverunt ei, et dixerunt ei: Invenimus aquam*). But which of these is the true and genuine sense of that scripture, is not to be very anxiously inquired by us — since neither of them is adverse to the dogmas of our faith, and each can equally be fitted to the history. To me, nevertheless, the Septuagint interpretation seems more fitting, lest the pronoun "to him" be superfluously repeated once and again, without any necessity, when it is said, "the servants came, and announced to him, and said to him" — whereas it would have sufficed to have said once, "they announced to him, and said." Nor does anything hinder [the objection] which they oppose concerning the etymology of the well — namely, that the denomination of "oath" cannot be deduced from waters not found: since neither the Seventy, nor Moses himself, said that the surname "oath" was derived from waters not found, but from the oath which, beside that same well, Isaac struck [swore] together with Abimelech and his friends banqueting with him — as appears a little above from the words of the history itself. Similarly, the place of the eighteenth psalm, if it be rightly weighed as to the mystical understanding, does not fight with the Hebrew verity. For that which, according to the dead letter, is read among the Hebrews: להם שם אהל בהם (*la scemes sam ohel bahem*), that is, "**FOR THE SUN** (*Soli*) he set a tabernacle in them" — the Seventy, transferring [it] according to the vivifying spirit, said: ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ (*en to helio etheto to skenoma autou*), that is, "**IN** (*In*) the sun he set his tabernacle" — thus, the divine Spirit dictating to them, that by those words might be designated the perpetual sacrament of Christ and of the Church, in which, as in a Sun, that divine Bridegroom, the Son of God (as Augustine, in the exposition of that psalm, says), placed his tabernacle and his perpetual habitation. Which spiritual and mystical sense, if the impious Manichaeans had followed [it], they would by no means have fallen into so great impiety as to exhibit that unique worship — which is owed to the immortal God alone — to a mortal and corruptible star [the sun].

5. But concerning the places which they charge to have been badly translated by the Seventy out of ignorance of the proper tongue, we respond that the Seventy are easily vindicated from that calumny out of the almost infinite places of their edition which — since they are far more obscure and more difficult than these which the detractors have indicated — make it perspicuous that the Seventy, being no less skilled in the Hebrew than in the Greek tongue, could not have erred in turning words so open [plain] as are מנימ (*monim*) and

כברת (*chibrath*). Therefore it is rather to be believed that errors of this kind happened by the fault of the copyists, than by the unskillfulness of the most learned interpreters. To assert which, two causes vehemently induce us. One, that Jerome — who detected all the defects of the Septuagint interpreters — nowhere noted them for unskillfulness [ignorance]. Nor do I know how John Reuchlin, in the third book of the Hebrew Institutions, dared to impute [impinge] upon Jerome that he sometimes damned the Septuagint interpreters for unskillfulness — since this is found in none of Jerome's writings; but only this is found, that the Septuagint edition, corrupted by the fault of the scribes, did not remain in its purity. But the other cause is, that many of those [things] which Jerome adduces out of the Septuagint edition — which he read as vitiated — are now had emended in the Septuagint edition which the Greek Church reads. As [in] that [place] where Jerome marvels that the word "hippodrome" was placed by the Septuagint for the word כברת (*chibrath*): the Greek edition of the Septuagint themselves, of our time, does not so have [it], but, according to the Hebrew verity, thus: ἐγένετο δὲ ἡνικά ῥῃγγισεν εἰς χιφραθὰ (*egeneto de henika engisen eis chiphratha*), that is, **IT CAME TO PASS** (*Factum est*) after he had drawn near in Chiphratha." Whence it clearly appears that the Greek codex of Jerome was in many [places] corrupt, and that he himself pronounced [judged] according to that which he had in his codex — not reprehending the Septuagint, but convicting those depravations which had crept into the Septuagint edition by the fault of the corrupters.

6. But that [thing] which they say — that the new labor [version] of Jerome most evidently convicts the Septuagint edition — is an old calumny, formerly also inflicted upon the divine Jerome by his own rivals; which he himself very often refuted throughout the several prefaces of the sacred books, showing that he undertook that labor not against the authority of the Septuagint interpreters, but for many other causes. Whence, against Rufinus (who had objected this same thing to him), he thus says: **"I have (*Ego*) neither** spoken anything against the Septuagint interpreters: whom, very many years ago, I gave, most diligently emended, to the studios of my tongue; whom daily I expound in the assembly of the brethren; whose psalms I chant by continual meditation. I should be a fool, to wish, as an old man, to forget what I learned in boyhood. All my treatises are woven with the testimonies of these [the Seventy]; my commentaries on the Twelve Prophets expound both my edition and the Septuagint edition," etc. But the causes which impelled Jerome to this edition [his own] are these. First, that those [things] which in the Septuagint edition had been depraved by the fault of the scribes might be emended out of his interpretation. Which cause he himself indicates, in the preface of Paralipomenon, in these words: **"IF (*Si*)** the edition of the Septuagint interpreters had remained pure, and as it was turned by them into Greek, you would, in vain, O Chromatius — most holy and most learned of bishops — impel me to translate the Hebrew volumes into the Latin speech. For that which had once occupied the ears of men, and had strengthened the faith of the nascent Church, it was just to approve by our silence. But now, since, according to the variety of regions, diverse ex-[emplars are carried about]"

(printed p. 644 [PDF p. 679] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 6 (concl.): Jerome's eight causes for making his new version (to emend scribal corruptions; to restore omitted/obscure passages [Job preface]; to stop Jewish taunts; to curb Greek arrogance [Ezra preface]; to spare the vast cost of buying all the editions; to remove error from the unskilled; to end the discord of the Greek and Latin churches over the divergent recensions of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen; to aid Latin language-study) — none of them against the Seventy's authority; answer 7: the argument that the Old Latin is corrupt because it flowed from a corrupt Greek fount collapses, since the Greek is shown faultless — and though single codices were corrupt in places, the Church always held the whole and incorrupt text in the totality of its codices, God so protecting them.*)

6. [since, according to the variety of regions, diverse] exemplars [are carried about], and that ancient and genuine translation is corrupted and violated, you think it [pertains] to our judgment either to indicate, out of many, what is true, or to fashion a new work upon the old work." **Secondly**, that he might restore, supply,

and illustrate the many [things] which had been omitted by the Seventy, or obscurely translated for the causes already said: as he himself, writing in the preface to Job: "**LET** my dogs **HEAR** (*Audiant*)," he says, "that I labored in this volume, not to reprehend the ancient interpretation, but that those [things] which in it are obscure, or omitted, or certainly depraved by the fault of the scribes, I might make more manifest by our interpretation." **Thirdly**, lest the Jews should any longer insult the Church of Christ, reproaching [it] that in the Hebrew it is not so had as the Church of Christ and the Septuagint interpreters read [it]; and lest the Jews should any longer have byways of subterfuge, if ever they should be pressed by the Christians in disputation, and be laid low by their own arms; nor would the Christians any longer have need to consult the Rabbis of the Jews, and implore their help, if ever a suit concerning the Hebrew verity should arise. **Fourthly**, that he might restrain exulting Greece (as he himself says in the preface to Ezra), and repress the proud haughtiness of the Greeks — who so extolled themselves over the Latins as to say that the Latins had nothing of the divine scriptures which they had not received on loan from the Greeks. **Fifthly**, to avoid the huge expenses of those who — wishing to find the truth from the collation of many exemplars — were compelled, at intolerable cost, to buy the exemplars of the Septuagint interpreters, of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Origen, Lucian, [and] Hesychius the presbyter, [and] of the fifth, sixth, and seventh edition, and many others, which could not be procured without great expenditure of money, and by the rich alone. **Sixthly**, that he might take away the occasion of confusion and error from those who handled the diverse exemplars without skill in Hebrew letters — who, since, out of ignorance of the Hebrew speech, they knew not how to discern which among so many interpreters had spoken more truly, erred the more gravely. Which [thing] Jerome, in the preface to Ezra, testifies happened even to a certain most wise man among the Greeks in his times, who, since he knew not Hebrew, often — leaving the sense of scripture — followed the error of each interpreter. **Seventhly**, that he might take away the dissension of both the Greek and the Latin churches concerning the edition of the Septuagint interpreters: which [churches], although they publicly handled the same Septuagint interpretation, yet did not (as Jerome writes in the preface to Paralipomenon) have the same exemplars of the same edition, but plainly diverse and mutually fighting [ones]. For Alexandria and Egypt used the edition of the Septuagint interpreters emended by Hesychius, presbyter of the Church of Jerusalem; but Constantinople, even to Antioch, read the same Septuagint edition, yet in other exemplars emended by Lucian the martyr, once presbyter of the Church of Antioch, and afterward bishop of Nicomedia; but the provinces midway between these read the Palestinian codices, which — elaborated by Origen — Eusebius and Pamphilus published. To take away, therefore, so great a [variety] of exemplars, Jerome undertook a new translation from the Hebrew. **Eighthly**, that he might aid the studies of the Latins in the tongues (as he himself, against Rufinus, is witness), and kindle the minds of his [countrymen] to the love of the holy tongue, and to the handling of the Hebrew exemplars, lest thenceforth we should have need of the help of the unbelieving Hebrews. These causes, therefore, impelled Jerome to the new edition; and the same moved the Latin Church, that, after the old Septuagint edition, they should receive the new interpretation of the divine Jerome. So much hitherto concerning the Septuagint interpreters.

7. From which the argument of those is entirely overturned, who inferred the old translation of the Old Testament among the Latins to be vitiated for this reason, that it had flowed from the vitiated edition of the Septuagint interpreters, as from a vitiated fount. Which [edition], since we have now shown to lack all fault, it cannot be that any fault was derived from it into the old Latin edition. If Jerome detected many errors in it, and corrected [them], not for that reason does it follow that the Latin Church before Jerome had no true and sincere edition of the Old Testament. For although some exemplars were once corrupt, which afterward Jerome corrected, it does not therefore follow that all the codices, however many the Church had, were universally and wholly corrupt. And be it [granted] that all were even corrupt in some [places], yet it cannot come to pass that all at once were depraved in the same places — so that that should remain whole and inviolate in no exemplar which was vitiated in many exemplars. It follows, therefore, that out of several corrupt codices — a collation of them being made with one another, or with the Greek codices — a true and

whole translation of any place whatsoever could easily be had by the learned, who conferred exemplars of this kind into one; and really [indeed] was always had by these. We gather, therefore, against the opinion of the heretics, that, although the Church, in the several separate codices, did not have a sincere and whole translation of the Old Testament, nevertheless it never — in all [the codices] at once, and in the exemplars gathered from everywhere — lacked an exact and absolute translation of the Old Testament; but always, in that general universality of the codices, what was corrupt in one and another codex, that same [thing] remained whole and incorrupt in this or in another codex — God so protecting the codices of the scriptures, lest his Church should for any time be defrauded of the truth of the divine reading, but that it might have it [the truth] at least in the whole simultaneous compass of all the codices [together], which it could not have in the several separate codices. Nor does that which Jerome said weaken this our opinion — [namely] that the old Vulgate edition is deficient in many places (as in the book of Job, in which nearly eight hundred verses were lacking), and in very many other places superfluously redundant (as in the book of Esther, and in the book of Daniel). Because, as much as pertains to those [things] which are lacking, it is possible that in the codices which Jerome had seen — and which certain particular churches then used — those eight hundred verses, and also many other [things], were lacking, which nevertheless in the rest of the [codices] of the other church-

(printed p. 645 [PDF p. 680] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 7 (concl.): the "redundant" passages were added extrinsically as apocrypha, marked with obeli and spits, and only later received into the canon; answer 8: the new Vulgate OT, though denied to be Jerome's, is largely his — it keeps his corrections (Gen 13 "in the sight of God" dropped; Gen 35 "springtime" for "hippodrome") and is compounded of his two versions (from the Hebrew, and from the Greek — as the Gallican Psalter shows); his version was praised, not condemned, and Augustine, Rufinus, Palladius faulted only its timing, not its fidelity (Augustine's letter); Jerome's admitted slips (Isa 19 "festivity"->"fear") he himself corrected, and unknown archaic words are no fault, as with Cicero; answer 9 begins: the Vulgate concords with the Hebrew in sense, if not always in words.)

7. [which nevertheless, in the rest of the codices of the other] churches, remained in the exemplars. For both the ancient edition of the book of Job, which Gregory discussed in the *Morals*, and the Greek edition of the Septuagint interpreters which now is extant, are found to have nothing less than the Hebrew exemplars and Jerome's translation have. But as much as regards those [things] which are superfluous [redundant] in the Vulgate edition, it is manifest that the truth of the translation was never corrupted by these — because they were not put into that common edition as genuine and proper, but were added extrinsically as exoteric and apocryphal, for the supplement of the histories; and — with obeli and spits [*veru*] slaying [them] — were transfixed [marked], both in the Greek and in the Latin codices. Which [things], afterward, because they seemed piously and holily written and added, merited authority by the succession of time, and were received by the Church into the sacred canon.

8. Concerning the new edition of the Old Testament, which they deny to be Jerome's, we respond that, just as it does not seem to be Jerome's (for the causes adduced by the adversaries), so, for the same causes, it does not seem altogether other than [different from] Jerome's interpretation. For just as they, from many places which in our edition are had otherwise than Jerome emended [them], argue that this edition is not that which Jerome translated from the Hebrew verity, so we too, by the same argument, can show that it is not entirely diverse from that interpretation of the divine Jerome — because in it many places are had just as Jerome testified that he had emended [them]. As [in] that [place] which in the Septuagint interpreters was read: "**THE MEN** (*Viri*) of Sodom were evil, and sinners in the sight of God." He himself wished it to be read, as it is now read in our edition, without those two words, "in the sight of God." And [in] Genesis 36¹, for that which the Seventy had, "**GOING FORTH** (*Egressus*) thence, he came into a hippodrome," he says that he set "into the place of a hippodrome" [as] "in the vernal time," as is read in our edition. And lest I wear away

time in reviewing similar places of our edition corrected by Jerome, let whosoever will, inspect the Commentaries of Jerome on the prophets, in which he discusses two editions — namely the Septuagint's, and his own translated from the Hebrew verity; and he will see that Jerome's edition discrepates almost nothing from our Vulgate edition. Accordingly it is credible that this our Vulgate edition consists of two editions of Jerome: namely, of that which Jerome published according to the Hebrew verity, and of that which he himself translated from the Greek edition of the Septuagint interpreters. For the divine Jerome testifies that he did both — both in the Apology against Rufinus, and in almost all the Prefaces of the Old Testament. Which the Psalter of our edition also indicates: for that very [Psalter] is not the same which he translated for Sophronius according to the Hebrew verity, but another, which he writes (in the epistle to Sunias and Fretela) that he turned from the Septuagint edition. But howsoever it be, this is certainly most true: that Jerome's edition was never damned [condemned] — either for unskillfulness in the tongues, or for falsity, as these [heretics] feign — but was, in a wonderful manner, praised by Augustine, Gregory, Isidore, and other most illustrious men. But if at some time Palladius the Galatian — envious of Jerome's rival glory (whom Epiphanius, writing to John bishop of Jerusalem, admonished was to be shunned as a heretic) — and likewise Augustine, and Rufinus, and certain others, seemed to accuse this translation of Jerome, it is to be known that they disapproved not the form [manner] of interpreting, and the fidelity, but the occasion, the opportuneness, and the counsel of the translator — because they deemed it unlawful [*nefas*] to depart from the now-inveterate authority of the Septuagint interpreters, and esteemed that this new edition of Jerome could not be divulged without the greatest perturbation of the churches, and scandal of the faithful. And that he spoke to this sense, Augustine himself declares, when he wrote to Jerome concerning this matter, in these words: "I indeed (*Ego sane*) would rather that you interpret for us the Greek canonical Scriptures, which are reported [to be established] by the authority of the Septuagint interpreters. For it will be very hard, if your interpretation shall have begun to be read more frequently throughout many churches, that the Latin churches should be dissonant from the Greek — chiefly because the gainsayer is easily convicted, the Greek book being produced, that is, [the book] of a most-known tongue. But if anyone, in that which is translated from the Hebrew, shall be moved by anything unusual, and shall charge the crime of falsity — either scarcely, or never, does one come to the Hebrew testimonies by which the objection may be defended. And if even it be come to them, who would bear that so many Latin and Greek authorities be damned?" By which words it appears that Augustine disapproved in Jerome not the form of interpretation, but the untimely office of translating. But as for that [fact], that Jerome sometimes confesses himself to have lapsed, and even not to have understood certain Hebrew words — this derogates nothing from the authority of his edition, since he himself diligently emended those [things] in which he had recognized that he had erred. As he did in the place adduced by the heretics from Isaiah: in which, when he had badly translated "**FESTIVITY** (*Festivitatem*)," afterward, emending the place, he put, for "festivity," "**FEAR** (*Pavorem*)."⁹ But concerning those words the significations of which he ingenuously confessed himself to be ignorant, this is not to be turned to his fault, as [though] to an unskilled [man], but is to be imputed to the words [themselves], now obsolete by too great age and antiquity. Just as no one will give it for a fault to the most illustrious orator Marcus Tullius [Cicero], that he confessed himself ignorant of many words antiquated by age, which were read in Varro and Cato: such as "*nasciterna*," "*scutrisum*," "*urpex*," "*to make lessum*," and other dictions of this kind — to which all those words are nothing dissimilar, whose signification Jerome did not deny that he knew not.

9. But to that [charge] in which they accuse [it], saying that our Vulgate edition — of whatsoever [authorship] it be — discrepates utterly from the Hebrew verity, we say that, although in the words it sometimes discords from the Hebrew, yet everywhere it concords in the truth of the sense, and in the unity of the sentence [meaning]. Nor is it a marvel if in the words it sometimes dissents from the Hebrew, since it (as has been said) was not purely and simply deduced from the Hebrew fount, but mixedly and confusedly taken from the two editions of Jerome — of which he himself translated the one from the Hebrew fount, the other

from the Greek verity. Although neither in the words themselves would our edition, if it be diligently considered, [discrepate] from the He-

¹ recte 35

(printed p. 646 [PDF p. 681] — Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution continued — answer 9 (concl.): the Vulgate departs from the Hebrew only in a few ambiguous words, because the interpreters worked from unpointed codices where one spelling (e.g. שם, read five ways) admits many senses, from archaic names now obscure even to Hebrews, from near-identical points (Zere/Patach), and from letters easily confused (כל "all" vs בל "heart," Dan 6) — hence the "hard words" the heretics cite (habbedolach, alon, bemirma, chibrath, and Gen 6 "lo yadon") are not blunders but genuine ambiguities, and the Vulgate is right in sense though sometimes free in word; answer 10 begins: the New-Testament Latin — Jerome only corrected, not re-translated, it (his own testimony in *De viris illustribus* and the prefaces to *Damasus* and *Eustochium*), and though real faults remain (noted by Pagninus, Cajetan, Forerius, Oleaster) the Church has never lacked a true, whole New Testament, for nothing in it is heretical or hides the faith.)

9. [our edition, if diligently considered, would not] dissent from the Hebrew verity, except in certain dictions, in which the interpreters are necessarily compelled to vary from the exemplars, and to dissent somewhat among themselves — namely, when there occur to them certain ambiguous and uncertain words. But the Hebrew dictions are rendered uncertain to the interpreters for many causes. For sometimes the codices which the interpreters use in translating are destitute of vowel points: such as was the codex which Jerome used, and such as is now the volume of the law which the Jews commonly use in the synagogues. Since, therefore, the letters are not distinguished by their little marks [points], and there occur some dictions written with the same letters, then those [dictions] can be read and translated in many ways. As the word שם (*Sem* [shem]), written without the apices, the points being added, can be read שם (*Scem*) — and then it signifies "name"; or שם (*Sciam* [sham]) — and then it denotes "there," or "in that place"; or שם (*sam*) — which signifies "he set"; or שם (*Scam*) — which sounds [means] "desolate." But sometimes, as we have said, there occur certain very ancient names of places, animals, plants, and stones, the significations of which — even among the Hebrews themselves — have perished by the antiquity of the word and the long duration of time. Sometimes there occur dictions written with the same letters, and distinguished by almost similar points: as happens in these two words, שם (*Sciam*) and שם (*Scem*). In which, if those two points "Zere" (.), which are placed under one of those dictions, should — either by a slip of the pen, or by the carelessness of the writer — become a little nearer to one another, they will make the form of the point "Patach" (_), which was placed under the other diction; and thus a transition from one signification to another will come about. Sometimes also it happens that dictions are varied by the writers on account of the too great similitude of the letters among themselves: as if anyone, for כל (*cal* — "all"), which signifies "every [all]," should write בל (*bal*), which in the sixth chapter of Daniel signifies "heart." Since, therefore, by these and other such causes it often happens that the interpreters are impeded, they are not to be damned if sometimes, in a few places, they fall short of the truth of the Hebrew reading. Such certainly are those [places] which these sharp-nosed [captious] heretics object to our interpreter: as הבדלח (*habbedolach*), which — on the testimony of Josephus, Jerome, and R. Kimchi — signifies both "bdellium" and a stone of sufferings [a gem], a union [pearl], onyx, crystal, and carbuncle; and אלון (*alon*), which can be translated not only for "valley" and "plain," but also for "oak," as Augustine, bishop of Chisamus, noted; and במרמה (*bemirma*), which signifies "WITH GUILE (*Cum dolo*)" and "with prudence"; and for "Chibrath," which, according to the Septuagint, signifies "a place," and, according to Jerome, "the vernal time [spring]," and, according to David Kimchi, "a certain measure of a journey"; and that [word] likewise which is read in Genesis 6: לא ידון (*Lo Iadon*), which signifies both "to judge," and "to remain," and, as it were, "to sit as a judge." Whence also the Seventy — whom our interpreter followed — rightly translated οὐ ἔσται καταμείνῃ (*ou me katameine*), "IT SHALL NOT REMAIN (*Non permanebit*)": so that the sense is, "My spirit shall not remain, or sit as judge, in man" — which is the same as if you should

say, "My spirit shall not judge in man." From which it clearly appears that our edition rarely discrepates from the Hebrew verity in the words, and never in the sentence [meaning].

10. But concerning both Latin editions of the New Testament — and first concerning the new one — we do not much care whether it be of the divine Jerome or not, since that cannot be known clearly enough from his writings; and it rather appears that he emended that old edition of the New Testament, than that he published a new edition into a wholly new Testament. Because he himself, in the catalogue of Illustrious Men, writes that he restored [gave back] the New Testament to the Greek fidelity [verity], but translated the Old according to the Hebrew verity. Which words indeed indicate that he himself set a distinction between "translating according to the Hebrew fidelity," and "rendering to the Greek fidelity"; and that by these [words] he signified that he did not translate the New Testament from the Greek, but only corrected [it]. Which he also intimates in the preface of the Gospels to Damasus, saying: "**THEREFORE** (*Igitur*), this present little preface promises the four Gospels — a collation of Greek codices, but of old ones, being emended; nor, in those [places] which did not much discrepate from the custom of the Latin reading, have we so tempered the pen [as to change all]; but, those only being corrected which seemed to change the sense, we have suffered the rest to remain as they were." And in the preface of the seven canonical [epistles], to Eustochium: "**THE EVANGELISTS** (*Evangelistas*)," he says, "we lately corrected to the line of the Greek verity." From which it appears that Jerome rather emended the New Testament, previously turned by others, than that he again turned it from the Greek into Latin. And it is likely that this our edition is that which Jerome emended. But concerning the errors which Jerome noted in the old translation, and which more recent [scholars] have likewise noted in this new edition, we too ingenuously confess that many errors were emended by Jerome in the old translation; and that likewise, in this our new edition, there are found some blemishes, solecisms, barbarisms, hyperbata, and many [things] turned little aptly, and less Latinly expressed, obscurely and ambiguously interpreted; and likewise some [things] super-added, some omitted, certain [things] transposed, changed, and depraved by the fault of the scribes — which Sanctes Pagninus, Thomas Cajetan, Franciscus Forerius, and Jerome Oleaster (men most learned, of the Dominican Order) have indicated in their interpretations and explanations. Nevertheless, it does not follow from these [things] that the Church, even to this day, has not had a true, sincere, whole, and faithful edition of the New Testament: because, although errors of this kind are found in it, it is nevertheless certain that neither in the old, nor in the new, edition was anything ever found which

(printed p. 647 [PDF p. 682] — *Heresy XIII (translations): the Dissolution concluded — answer 10 (concl.): the Fathers left the New Testament's minor faults uncorrected on just grounds (no danger to faith or morals; not to unsettle the faithful accustomed from infancy to the old edition; to honor the ancient interpreter's holy simplicity and follow their forebears, who — like the apostles with the imperfect Septuagint — did not despise it but preached it and built the foundations of the faith on it); therefore it is rash and heretical to spurn the Vulgate for its light defects and bring in the heretics' profane versions, especially after the Council of Trent's decree declaring the old Vulgate authentic and forbidding its rejection. Sixtus's closing apology for prolixity. Book VIII — and the main body of the Bibliotheca Sancta — ends here.*)

10. [It does not follow that the Church has had no true New-Testament edition — nor is it] because so many most learned and most holy [doctors of the] Church either did not recognize those errors, or approved them, but because they saw themselves impelled, by just causes, to dissimulate [overlook] them. **First**, because they had noticed that no peril in faith and morals threatened from these so light errors. **Then**, lest the faithful should be offended by the importunate and too-exact novelty of correction — [the faithful] whose ears, even from infancy, that old edition had occupied [filled]. **Lastly**, that they might venerate that ancient edition, which had educated [nourished] the faith of the nascent Church, and had strengthened and exalted [the faith] of the growing [Church]; and that they might honor, by their own approbation, that holy and venerable simplicity of the ancient interpreter — who sought not the ornament of speech, but the truth of the history;

and might follow the footsteps of their elders [ancestors], who, led by a certain sacred piety, tolerated those same errors, by the example of the holy apostles — who, although they knew that the edition of the Septuagint interpreters was redundant in many [places], and deficient in many, nevertheless did not condemn it, but everywhere preached it, and from it laid the first foundations of our faith. It is therefore rash — nay, plainly heretical — on account of certain light defects which are found in our Vulgate edition (without any detriment of faith and morals), to spurn it and cast it away, and to introduce in its place new and profane translations of the heretics: especially after the decree of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, whose words, approving the Vulgate edition, thus stand: "**The Most Holy Synod** (*Sacrosancta Synodus*), considering that no little utility can accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which — out of all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation — is to be held for authentic: establishes and declares, that this very old and Vulgate edition, which by the long use of so many ages has been approved in the Church itself, be held for authentic in public readings, disputations, and expositions; and that no one dare, or presume, to reject it under any pretext whatsoever." And let these [things] concerning the translations of the divine scripture have been said — more prolixly, perhaps, than was fitting.

The End of the Eighth and last book of this [work]. (Octavi & ultimi huius libri Finis.)

(PDF p. 732 — the theologians' approbation [imprimatur] of the whole work. The in-book indexes that follow the text of Book VIII — PDF 683–731 — were passed over as out of scope; this leaf, a single full-width block bearing no running-head folio number, is the closing endorsement of the entire eight-book Bibliotheca Sancta, here appended as the final page of Book VIII.)

The written attestation [Syngrapha] of the theologians whom — according to the pious ordinances of the Order of Preachers — the Reverend Father John Mary of Lignasco [Lignascensis], Provincial, superior [Antistes] of both Lombardies, chose for the examination [recognition] of this work.

HAVING BEEN ordered (*Libros... iussi*) by our Reverend Father Provincial of both Lombardies, Father Friar John Mary of Lignasco, of the Order of Preachers, to examine the eight books of the *Bibliotheca Sancta* of the Reverend Father Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers, a most excellent preacher — so that they might, as soon as possible, be sent forth into the light [published] — we took care to accomplish this not undiligently [i.e. with all diligence]. Those [books], therefore, having been read through by us, we give assurance [certify] that nothing is asserted in them by the author himself — so far as we ourselves are able to judge — which is adverse to good morals, or to the catholic doctrine of the sacrosanct Roman Church. For the rest, we judge that the labors of so learned a father, so great [as they are], if they be publicly printed, will be exceedingly welcome, and useful, to pious and learned men.

At Genoa, the 29th day of January, 1566.

Brother Stephen of Finario [Finale], lecturer in Theology, by his own hand.

Brother Paul of Ferrara [Ferrara], of the Order of Preachers, lecturer in Theology.

Brother Jerome of Genoa, Inquisitor of all Liguria, as he affirms above, by his own hand.