

Sixtus of Siena, O.P. (Sixtus Senensis)

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA

Liber Quintus — Annotationes on the Old Testament

Complete English translation with topical & name indexes — Liber Quintus

TABLE OF CONTENTS & INDEX

The Preface and 264 Annotations of Liber Quintus, located by PDF page

□ *Topical Index · Index of Persons*

- Page 8:** Preface
- Page 11:** Annotation I, Whether the beginning of Genesis pertains to the Trinity (Genesis 1:1)
- Page 12:** Annotation II, Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods (Genesis 1:1)
- Page 12:** Annotation III, Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (Genesis 1:1)
- Page 13:** Annotation IV, Augustine of Kissamos wrongly taught that the empyrean heaven was not created (Genesis 1:1)
- Page 13:** Annotation V, Whether an invisible world and angels were created before this world (Genesis 1:1)
- Page 15:** Annotation VI, Whether faith and charity are from ourselves (Genesis 1:2)
- Page 15:** Annotation VII, Whether the spirit that was borne over the waters was the Holy Spirit (Genesis 1:2)
- Page 17:** Annotation VIII, Whether angels and demons are corporeal (Genesis 1:6)
- Page 18:** Annotation IX, Whether there is only one heaven, as Chrysostom seems to hold (Genesis 1:6)
- Page 19:** Annotation X, Whether the firmament is between the upper and lower waters (Genesis 1:6)
- Page 19:** Annotation XI, Whether the upper and lower waters are real water, or rather Angels, as Origen held (Genesis 1:7)
- Page 19:** Annotation XII, Whether the binary [double] number is infamous, as Jerome held (Genesis 1:8)
- Page 20:** Annotation XIII, The ancients denied that there are Antipodes (Genesis 1:9)
- Page 21:** Annotation XIV, Whether it must be believed that the stars are fixed in the heaven (Genesis 1:17)
- Page 21:** Annotation XV, For the stars foreshow the future events of men, as Origen held — whom the judicial Astrologers follow (Genesis 1:17)
- Page 22:** Annotation XVI, Whether satisfaction is necessary for penitents (Genesis 1:19)
- Page 23:** Annotation XVII, Whether the angels, together with God, created man — as Origen held (Genesis 1:26)
- Page 24:** Annotation XVIII, Whether God is corporeal (Genesis 1:26)
- Page 25:** Annotation XIX, Whether the stars are animate (Genesis 1:26)
- Page 25:** Annotation XX, Whether, if Adam had not sinned, there would have been coitus (Genesis 1:27)
- Page 26:** Annotation XXI, Whether the first parents would have had children if they had not sinned (Genesis 1:28)
- Page 27:** Annotation XXII, Whether herbs and trees are given as food to the animals (Genesis 1:29)
- Page 27:** Annotation XXIII, Whether God completed his works on the sixth day (Genesis 2:2)
- Page 27:** Annotation XXIV, Whether the six days of the world's creation are real days (Genesis 2:2)
- Page 28:** Annotation XXV, Whether the Jews sacrificed in the lands of the gentiles (Genesis 2:2)
- Page 28:** Annotation XXVI, Whether the soul alone is man (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 28:** Annotation XXVII, The breath breathed into Adam is the rational soul, as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and others hold (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 29:** Annotation XXVIII, Whether the body was made before the soul (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 29:** Annotation XXIX, Whether man was created first in the species than in the individual, as Francesco Giorgio held (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 30:** Annotation XXX, Whether the soul was created with the angels on the first day (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 30:** Annotation XXXI, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 30:** Annotation XXXII, Whether man, formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul, is the man whom God created to his own image (Genesis 2:7)
- Page 31:** Annotation XXXIII, Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 31:** Annotation XXXIV, Francesco Giorgio tries to prove by four arguments that there is no terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 33:** Annotation XXXV, Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 34:** Annotation XXXVI, Whether Paradise, after Adam's fall, entirely ceased to exist (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 35:** Annotation XXXVII, Whether the terrestrial Paradise was created before the world (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 36:** Annotation XXXVIII, Whether the earthly Paradise reaches up to the orb of the Moon, as Bede held (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 36:** Annotation XXXIX, Tertullian held that all souls are in the underworld until the day of judgment (Genesis 2:8)

- Page 36:** Annotation XL, Whether the places and punishments of souls after this life are only spiritual, as St. Augustine seems to hold (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 37:** Annotation XLI, Whether Moses and Paul saw the very essence of God with the mind, but not with the eyes of the body (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 38:** Annotation XLII, Whether the place of the underworld is under the earth (Genesis 2:8)
- Page 38:** Annotation XLIII, Whether God threatened the first man with bodily death, or rather only the death of the soul (Genesis 2:17)
- Page 39:** Annotation XLIV, For what cause abortion is a grave sin, even if the embryo was not [yet] animated (Genesis 2:18)
- Page 39:** Annotation XLV, Whether Adam was created androgynous, as Francesco Giorgio thinks (Genesis 2:20)
- Page 40:** Annotation XLVI, Whether Eve was formed from Adam's rib (Genesis 2:21)
- Page 41:** Annotation XLVII, Cajetan denies that a rib was truly taken from Adam (Genesis 2:21)
- Page 42:** Annotation XLVIII, Whether it is lawful for Christians to swear (Genesis 2:24)
- Page 42:** Annotation XLIX, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Genesis 3:7)
- Page 43:** Annotation L, No one's nature is harmed by another's sins (Genesis 3:15)
- Page 43:** Annotation LI, Whether the giants sprang from the seed of the devil, as Francesco Giorgio thought (Genesis 3:15)
- Page 44:** Annotation LII, Whether sin brought upon Adam the necessity of bodily death (Genesis 3:19)
- Page 44:** Annotation LIII, Whether the tunics of skin of the first parents were the skins of animals (Genesis 3:21)
- Page 45:** Annotation LIV, Whether the tunics of skin were true skins (Genesis 3:21)
- Page 46:** Annotation LV, Whether the letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false (Genesis 3:21)
- Page 46:** Annotation LVI, Whether Adam, cast out of paradise, was placed before the door of paradise (Genesis 3:24)
- Page 46:** Annotation LVII, Whether the Cherubim are angels, or specters (Genesis 3:24)
- Page 47:** Annotation LVIII, Theodoret denies that the Cherubim are spiritual and blessed minds (Genesis 3:24)
- Page 49:** Annotation LIX, Whether Moses died (Genesis 3:24)
- Page 50:** Annotation LX, Whether the Cherubim are incorporeal substances (Genesis 3:24)
- Page 50:** Annotation LXI, Whether Moses has yet died (Genesis 4:1)
- Page 51:** Annotation LXII, Whether priests bind and loose (Genesis 4:1)
- Page 51:** Annotation LXIII, If the first parents had not sinned, whether there would have been generation (Genesis 4:1)
- Page 52:** Annotation LXIV, Whether the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, enjoy the divine vision (Genesis 4:1)
- Page 53:** Annotation LXV, A passage from the fourth chapter of Genesis, badly translated by the Seventy (Genesis 4:7)
- Page 53:** Annotation LXVI, The clause "let us go out into the field," superfluously added by the Septuagint (Genesis 4:8)
- Page 54:** Annotation LXVII, The clause "vagabond and fugitive," badly rendered by the Septuagint (Genesis 4:12)
- Page 54:** Annotation LXVIII, The years of the illustrious men wrongly reckoned by the Septuagint (Genesis 5:7)
- Page 57:** Annotation LXIX, Whether the curse of the earth was removed under Noah, as Francesco Giorgio thought (Genesis 5:29)
- Page 57:** Annotation LXX, That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen (Genesis 6:2)
- Page 57:** Annotation LXXI, Whether the angels are aerial souls, as Philo thought; or whether the stars are animate, as the same [Philo] reckoned (Genesis 6:2)
- Page 58:** Annotation LXXII, Whether the angels are called "sons of God" in the sacred letters (Genesis 6:2)
- Page 58:** Annotation LXXIII, Whether the angels can have intercourse with women (Genesis 6:2)
- Page 61:** Annotation LXXIV, The clause "My spirit shall not remain," etc., badly rendered (Genesis 6:3)
- Page 61:** Annotation LXXV, Whether God restricted the life of man to 120 years (Genesis 6:3)
- Page 62:** Annotation LXXVI, Whether the giants were men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size (Genesis 6:4)
- Page 62:** Annotation LXXVII, Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women (Genesis 6:4)
- Page 64:** Annotation LXXVIII, Whether God can be seen by the angels (Genesis 6:9)
- Page 64:** Annotation LXXIX, The number of the years and the months of the Flood [is] corrupted (Genesis 7:11)
- Page 65:** Annotation LXXX, Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (Genesis 7:11)
- Page 65:** Annotation LXXXI, Whether the Noachic Flood could have been foreknown from observation of the stars, as Pierre d'Ailly thought (Genesis 7:11)
- Page 66:** Annotation LXXXII, The days of the ceasing Flood wrongly reckoned (Genesis 8:4)

- Page 66:** Annotation LXXXIII, Whether the raven returned into the ark (Genesis 8:7)
- Page 67:** Annotation LXXXIV, What kind of branch the dove brought (Genesis 8:11)
- Page 67:** Annotation LXXXV, Whether circumcision conferred anything to the soul's salvation (Genesis 8:21)
- Page 68:** Annotation LXXXVI, Of what kind was Noah's drunkenness (Genesis 9:20–21)
- Page 68:** Annotation LXXXVII, There was only one language for all before the tower was built, as St. Chrysostom rightly held (Genesis 11:1)
- Page 69:** Annotation LXXXVIII, An error in the number and the years of the generations of Shem (Genesis 11:11)
- Page 70:** Annotation LXXXIX, Whether Abraham lied (Genesis 12:13)
- Page 72:** Annotation XC, Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held (Genesis 14:18)
- Page 73:** Annotation XCI, Whether Melchisedech was the Holy Spirit (Genesis 14:18)
- Page 74:** Annotation XCII, Whether it is lawful for soldiers to take booty (Genesis 14:23)
- Page 74:** Annotation XCIII, Whether hell is only the conscience of sinners, as Philo held (Genesis 16:2)
- Page 74:** Annotation XCIV, Whether Abraham's intercourse with Hagar was adultery (Genesis 16:3)
- Page 75:** Annotation XCV, Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held (Genesis 16:11)
- Page 76:** Annotation XCVI, Whether circumcision conferred grace on infants (Genesis 17:10)
- Page 77:** Annotation XCVII, Why circumcision was given on the eighth day (Genesis 17:12)
- Page 77:** Annotation XCVIII, Whether Abraham sinned by unbelief (Genesis 17:17)
- Page 78:** Annotation XCIX, The dove descending upon Christ — whether it was truly an animal (Genesis 18:2)
- Page 79:** Annotation C, Whether this passage pertains to the Trinity (Genesis 18:3)
- Page 79:** Annotation CI, Whether divine grace comes before us, or is preceded by us (Genesis 18:16)
- Page 81:** Annotation CII, Whether the Son of God was an angel (Genesis 22:12)
- Page 81:** Annotation CIII, That "Sabek" is wrongly expounded as "a he-goat." (Genesis 22:13)
- Page 82:** Annotation CIV, Whether the Virgin Mary ever labored under unbelief (Genesis 25:21)
- Page 82:** Annotation CV, Whether the heavens emit a vocal sound by their motion (Genesis 26:18)
- Page 83:** Annotation CVI, The Septuagint wrongly translated, "We have not found water." (Genesis 26:32)
- Page 84:** Annotation CVII, Whether it is lawful for a good man to lie (Genesis 27:19)
- Page 87:** Annotation CVIII, Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held (Genesis 28:12)
- Page 89:** Annotation CIX, Mandrakes [rendered] for lilies (Genesis 30:14)
- Page 89:** Annotation CX, An error of the Septuagint interpreters (Genesis 30:42)
- Page 90:** Annotation CXI, Whether Jacob contended with the Angel in a bodily wrestling (Genesis 32:24)
- Page 90:** Annotation CXII, Many have not rightly interpreted the word "Israel." (Genesis 32:28)
- Page 91:** Annotation CXIII, Whether Joseph's brothers accused him of a most wicked crime (Genesis 37:2)
- Page 91:** Annotation CXIV, Whether Tamar, in lying with Judah, perpetrated a crime (Genesis 38:16)
- Page 92:** Annotation CXV, Whether the world is the Son of God, as Philo held (Exodus 28:4)
- Page 93:** Annotation CXVI, Whether Moses's face was horned (Exodus 34:29)
- Page 93:** Annotation CXVII, Whether Christ suffered for the Angels, as Origen taught (Leviticus 1:5)
- Page 94:** Annotation CXVIII, Whether bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people (Leviticus 8:4)
- Page 96:** Annotation CXIX, Whether Christ still mourns our sins (Leviticus 10:9)
- Page 96:** Annotation CXX, Whether the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than his doctrine (Leviticus 10:14)
- Page 97:** Annotation CXXI, And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord (Leviticus 16:13)
- Page 97:** Annotation CXXII, Whether it is lawful for priests to possess temporal goods (Leviticus 25:32)
- Page 98:** Annotation CXXIII, Concerning Moses's wife (Numbers 12:1)
- Page 98:** Annotation CXXIV, Whether the rods brought to Moses were more than twelve (Numbers 17:6)
- Page 98:** Annotation CXXV, The man said, whose eye is stopped up (Numbers 24:3)
- Page 99:** Annotation CXXVI, Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Numbers 25:4)
- Page 101:** Annotation CXXVII, Whether all the blessed shall see God (Numbers 26:53)
- Page 101:** Annotation CXXVIII, Whether the saints, immediately after the judgment, are raised to the contemplation of God (Numbers 33:1)
- Page 102:** Annotation CXXIX, Whether the land of promise is to be understood according to the letter (Numbers 34:2)
- Page 103:** Annotation CXXX, Whether from this passage the mystery of the Trinity ought to be elicited (Deuteronomy 6:4)
- Page 104:** Annotation CXXXI, Whether the demons and hell shall suffer everlasting punishments (Joshua 8:28)

- Page 106:** Annotation CXXXII, Concerning free will (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:6)
- Page 106:** Annotation CXXXIII, Concerning Seba and Sceba (3 Kings [1 Kings] 10:1)
- Page 107:** Annotation CXXXIV, Concerning the Trinity (Job 1:1)
- Page 108:** Annotation CXXXV, Impious dogmas concerning the Trinity are falsely ascribed to Origen (Job 1:17)
- Page 108:** Annotation CXXXVI, As it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done (Job 1:21)
- Page 108:** Annotation CXXXVII, Whether infants are punished with the punishments of the damned (Job 9:17)
- Page 110:** Annotation CXXXVIII, Whether the just man sins in every work [he does] (Job 9:28)
- Page 110:** Annotation CXXXIX, Whether the souls of the blessed see all things which are done here (Job 14:21)
- Page 111:** Annotation CXL, Whether the souls of Christians are blessed immediately after this life (Job 17:12)
- Page 111:** Annotation CXLI, Whether the fire of hell is incorporeal (Job 20:26)
- Page 113:** Annotation CXLII, Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal (Job 25:5)
- Page 113:** Annotation CXLIII, Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born (Job 38:12)
- Page 114:** Annotation CXLIV, The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Job 38:29)
- Page 114:** Annotation CXLV, Whether anyone may be certain that he does not always sin (Job 42:16)
- Page 114:** Annotation CXLVI, Origen seems to have thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Psalm 1:1)
- Page 115:** Annotation CXLVII, Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound (Psalm 1:1)
- Page 115:** Annotation CXLVIII, Whether the future resurrection will be in the [self-same] individual (Psalm 1:5)
- Page 116:** Annotation CXLIX, Concerning the beginning of Genesis (Psalm 2:1)
- Page 117:** Annotation CL, I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession (Psalm 2:8)
- Page 117:** Annotation CLI, Whether this passage was well rendered by Jerome (Psalm 2:12)
- Page 118:** Annotation CLII, Concerning the Eucharist (Psalm 3:2)
- Page 118:** Annotation CLIII, Concerning the invocation of the saints (Psalm 4:2)
- Page 118:** Annotation CLIV, Whether Mary hesitated at the death of Christ (Psalm 13:3)
- Page 119:** Annotation CLV, Concerning the eight little verses added to Psalm 13 (Psalm 13:3)
- Page 119:** Annotation CLVI, In what manner the Blessed Virgin was sanctified by the entrance of Christ (Psalm 14:2)
- Page 120:** Annotation CLVII, Whether the Psalms speaking literally of David can be expounded literally of Christ (Psalm 15:1)
- Page 120:** Annotation CLVIII, Eusebius of Caesarea thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (Psalm 15:2)
- Page 120:** Annotation CLIX, Whether a man can be made impeccable (Psalm 15:7)
- Page 121:** Annotation CLX, Whether the body of Christ was placed in the Sun (Psalm 18:5)
- Page 121:** Annotation CLXI, Whether the prayer of Christ was heard (Psalm 21:3)
- Page 122:** Annotation CLXII, Whether Christ truly feared and grieved (Psalm 21:3)
- Page 123:** Annotation CLXIII, Whether the Eucharist is to be denied to sinners (Psalm 21:30)
- Page 123:** Annotation CLXIII, Concerning the Eucharist, the heretics feign that St. Chrysostom thought wrongly (Psalm 22:5)
- Page 124:** Annotation CLXV, Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell (Psalm 30:11)
- Page 124:** Annotation CLXVI, Whether it is lawful to use lots (Psalm 30:16)
- Page 125:** Annotation CLXVII, Whether all the works of unbelievers are sins (Psalm 31:1)
- Page 125:** Annotation CLXVIII, Whether this passage pertains to the Holy Spirit (Psalm 32:6)
- Page 126:** Annotation CLXIX, Whether the souls of the saints are in heaven before the resurrection (Psalm 36:10)
- Page 127:** Annotation CLXX, Whether after this life all, both good and evil, shall enter the fire of gehenna (Psalm 36:14)
- Page 129:** Annotation CLXXI, Whether all Souls, after this life, are to be tried by fire (Psalm 36:15)
- Page 132:** Annotation CLXXII, Whether one ought to pray in an unknown tongue (Psalm 46:3, 8)
- Page 132:** Annotation CLXXIII, Whether penance is to be repeated (Psalm 50:3)
- Page 133:** Annotation CLXXIV, Concerning satisfaction (Psalm 50:3)
- Page 133:** Annotation CLXXV, Whether sacramental confession is necessary (Psalm 50:5)
- Page 136:** Annotation CLXXVI, Whether the royal power is to be preferred to the sacerdotal (Psalm 50:6)
- Page 137:** Annotation CLXXVII, Whether Adam's sin transmitted to posterity only the death of the body (Psalm 50:7)
- Page 137:** Annotation CLXXVIII, Concerning original sin (Psalm 50:7)

- Page 137:** Annotation CLXXIX, Whether the sin contracted from Adam is only the occasion of sin, and not sin [itself] (Psalm 50:7)
- Page 138:** Annotation CLXXX, If the first parents had not sinned, whether [there would have been] conception and generation (Psalm 50:7)
- Page 138:** Annotation CLXXXI, Whether Peter, in the denial of Christ, lost [his] faith (Psalm 52:4)
- Page 139:** Annotation CLXXXII, Whether hunger, thirst, grief, and death were natural to Christ (Psalm 53:5)
- Page 139:** Annotation CLXXXIII, Whether our merits are the cause of the eternal election (Psalm 64:5)
- Page 139:** Annotation CLXXXIV, Whether men shall rise again in the same individual [body] (Psalm 65:12)
- Page 140:** Annotation CLXXXV, Whether Souls, on account of sins committed in heaven, are thrust down into bodies (Psalm 65:11)
- Page 145:** Annotation CLXXXVI, Whether Christ's humanity was, by its own nature, capable of grief and misery (Psalm 68:2)
- Page 147:** Annotation CLXXXVII, Whether trading [commerce] is condemned (Psalm 70:15)
- Page 148:** Annotation CLXXXVIII, Whether the punishment of Hell exceeds the gravity of the sin (Psalm 71:14)
- Page 148:** Annotation CLXXXIX, Whether the Soul was created before bodies (Psalm 89:1–2)
- Page 148:** Annotation CXC, Whether the age of the world consists of only six thousand years (Psalm 89:4)
- Page 151:** Annotation CXCI, On the theme of Psalm 90 (Psalm 90:1)
- Page 152:** Annotation CXCH, On the merit of good works (Psalm 90:14)
- Page 152:** Annotation CXCH, On the merit of good works (Psalm 98:5)
- Page 152:** Annotation CXCH, On the merit of good works (Psalm 98:5)
- Page 152:** Annotation CXCH, On the Eucharist (Psalm 98:5)
- Page 152:** Annotation CXCV, Whether good works are meritorious (Psalm 102:4)
- Page 154:** Annotation CXCVI, On the Holy Spirit (Psalm 103:30)
- Page 154:** Annotation CXCVII, On predestination and reprobation (Psalm 108:18)
- Page 154:** Annotation CXCVIII, On God swearing (Psalm 109:4)
- Page 155:** Annotation CXCIX, On the merit of works (Psalm 114:7)
- Page 155:** Annotation CC, Whether the divine vocation is from the merits of those called (Psalm 115:1)
- Page 155:** Annotation CCI, On the number of the alphabetic Psalms (Psalm 118:1)
- Page 156:** Annotation CCII, Whether all the saints must be purged by the fire of the conflagration (Psalm 118:20)
- Page 156:** Annotation CCIII, Whether the possession of secular things befits the clergy (Psalm 118:57)
- Page 157:** Annotation CCIV, On the Oath (Psalm 118:106)
- Page 157:** Annotation CCV, Whether sins are remitted to those remaining in unbelief (Psalm 118:137)
- Page 157:** Annotation CCVI, On the sons of those cast out (Psalm 126:4)
- Page 158:** Annotation CCVII, On the correct rendering of this passage (Psalm 127:2)
- Page 158:** Annotation CCVIII, Whether the Soul was formed before the body (Psalm 129:2)
- Page 160:** Annotation CCIX, Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient (Psalm 138:6)
- Page 160:** Annotation CCX, The error of Origen concerning souls thrust into bodies (Psalm 141:8)
- Page 161:** Annotation CCXI, Whether Solomon was a prophet (Proverbs 1:1)
- Page 161:** Annotation CCXII, Whether the stars are animate (Ecclesiastes 1:6)
- Page 162:** Annotation CCXIII, Whether before this world there were other worlds, and whether there will be [others] after this (Ecclesiastes 1:9)
- Page 163:** Annotation CCXIV, Whether after this life there is given a place from which Souls, once entered, can go out (Ecclesiastes 11:3)
- Page 163:** Annotation CCXV, Whether the Angels are corporeal (Canticle 1:1)
- Page 164:** Annotation CCXVI, Whether the Angels desert those whom they have received into [their] custody (Canticle 1:1)
- Page 164:** Annotation CCXVII, On the merits of the just (Canticle 2:10, 14)
- Page 165:** Annotation CCXVIII, On the author of the book of Wisdom (Wisdom 1:1)
- Page 165:** Annotation CCXIX, On the author of the book of Wisdom (Wisdom 1:1)
- Page 166:** Annotation CCXX, A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy (Isaiah 2:22)
- Page 166:** Annotation CCXXI, On God being seen (Isaiah 6:1)
- Page 166:** Annotation CCXXII, On the Trinity (Isaiah 6:3)
- Page 166:** Annotation CCXXIII, A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters (Isaiah 9:6)

- Page 167:** Annotation CCXXIV, Whether angels have a soul (Isaiah 13:7)
- Page 167:** Annotation CCXXV, Whether the souls of the damned shall at some time have rest (Isaiah 14:19)
- Page 168:** Annotation CCXXVI, Every beard shall be shaven (Isaiah 15:2)
- Page 168:** Annotation CCXXVII, Whether it is a lighter [sin] to sin openly than to feign holiness (Isaiah 16:14)
- Page 168:** Annotation CCXXVIII, Whether the saints in heaven remember [their] past evils (Isaiah 65:16)
- Page 169:** Annotation CCXXIX, Whether the fire of hell is metaphorical (Isaiah 66:24)
- Page 171:** Annotation CCXXX, The expiatory fire (Jeremiah 2:22)
- Page 171:** Annotation CCXXXI, The Oath (Jeremiah 4:2)
- Page 171:** Annotation CCXXXII, Whether anyone in this life is truly just (Jeremiah 13:12)
- Page 172:** Annotation CCXXXIII, Whether the opinion of the Chiliasts is to be condemned (Jeremiah 19:11)
- Page 176:** Annotation CCXXXIV, On Christ (Jeremiah 22:30)
- Page 176:** Annotation CCXXXV, On free will (Jeremiah 23:28)
- Page 177:** Annotation CCXXXVI, On souls fallen down from heaven (Jeremiah 24:5)
- Page 177:** Annotation CCXXXVII, The incarceration of souls (Jeremiah 28:13)
- Page 178:** Annotation CCXXXVIII, On the history of Susanna (Jeremiah 29:22)
- Page 178:** Annotation CCXXXIX, On hypocrisy (Lamentations 4:6)
- Page 178:** Annotation CCXL, Whether charity once had can be lost (Ezekiel 1:12)
- Page 180:** Annotation CCXLI, Whether one sin is remitted without another (Ezekiel 3:11)
- Page 180:** Annotation CCXLII, Whether the earth is an animal capable of reason (Ezekiel 14:13)
- Page 182:** Annotation CCXLIII, Not only Christ is to be imitated (Ezekiel 16:16)
- Page 182:** Annotation CCXLIV, Whether clerics ought to have beard or hair shorn (Ezekiel 44:20)
- Page 188:** Annotation CCXLV, On the Appendix of Daniel (Daniel 1:1)
- Page 190:** Annotation CCXLVI, On the kingdom of the Romans (Daniel 2:40)
- Page 190:** Annotation CCXLVII, Whether the sacred Images are to be venerated (Daniel 3:18)
- Page 194:** Annotation CCXLVIII, On the time of the world's destruction (Daniel 9:24)
- Page 195:** Annotation CCXLIX, On the calumny imposed upon St. Jerome (Daniel 9:24)
- Page 195:** Annotation CCL, Whether the history of Susanna is to be received (Daniel 13:1)
- Page 198:** Annotation CCLI, Whether the fallen, after penance, are to be restored to their former dignity (Amos 5:2)
- Page 199:** Annotation CCLII, Whether [there are] only two places after this life (Amos 9:2)
- Page 200:** Annotation CCLIII, Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it be licit to die by one's own hand (Jonah 1:12)
- Page 203:** Annotation CCLIV, A passage badly translated by the Seventy (Jonah 3:4)
- Page 204:** Annotation CCLV, On the ivy of Jonah (Jonah 4:6)
- Page 205:** Annotation CCLVI, Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Micah 6:1)
- Page 206:** Annotation CCLVII, Whether God has knowledge and providence of the least things (Habakkuk 1:13)
- Page 207:** Annotation CCLVIII, On the power of the priesthood (Zephaniah 3:4)
- Page 208:** Annotation CCLIX, On the Trinity (Zechariah 4:3, 4)
- Page 208:** Annotation CCLX, Whether it is licit for Christians to swear (Zechariah 8:17)
- Page 208:** Annotation CCLXI, Whether the bosom of Abraham and the hell of the damned are the same (Zechariah 9:11)
- Page 209:** Annotation CCLXII, Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi (Malachi 1:1)
- Page 210:** Annotation CCLXIII, Whether election and reprobation are from the foreknowledge of merits (Malachi 1:2, 3)
- Page 210:** Annotation CCLXIV, Whether the mother of the Maccabees died of joy (2 Maccabees 7:41)

*(printed folio 526 [PDF p. 343], beneath a full-width title banner — the opening of **Liber Quintus (Book V): Annotations and Censures upon the interpreters of the Old Testament**, with its **Preface**. Sixtus states the book's purpose and rebukes two opposite faults in handling the Fathers: heretics who abuse their words, and critics who reject a whole author for a single slip.)*

F. SIXTUS OF SIENA, OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS — ON THE ANNOTATIONS AND CENSURES:

upon the interpreters and expositors of the divine volumes of the Old Testament.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA, BOOK FIVE.

PREFACE.

(folio 526, left column)

In the preceding book I reviewed the Catholic Expositors of the sacred volumes — all whom I was able to come to know, whether by varied reading or by sure report — together with all their exegetical writings. Now, in this fifth book of the work, I shall annotate, according to the order of the divine volumes, a number of passages worthy of annotation and censure, which I have gathered out of the various explanations of those same expositors: not because I myself desire in any part to obscure, or to render suspect, the sincere piety and admirable erudition of those most holy and most learned men, but that by the present labor I may take counsel for those who are offended by the writings of the holy expositors — whether from prudence, or from malice, or from immoderate zeal — and who likewise give offense.¹

◇ **1. Left margin:** Heretics abuse the writings of Catholics in order to confirm their own impious dogmas.

Of their number, those who do harm maliciously, and the more [grievously], are certain perverse men addicted to detestable errors: who, while they wish to make their heresies more easily persuasive, generally snatch out of the orthodox commentaries of the ancient expositors certain opinions — either obscurely written, or put forth by [the Fathers] through carelessness — and drag them off to the confirmation of their own perfidy, lest they seem to be the first, or the only ones, to hold such things. Thus of old the most impious Arians drove the letters of blessed Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria — however much those letters resisted — to the overthrowing of Christ's divinity. Thus once the Pelagian heretics fought against original sin and against the aid of divine grace, wrongfully making use of the opinions of Chrysostom and Augustine. Thus five hundred years ago Bertram the Priest and Berengarius the Deacon, by violently wresting the sayings of Ambrose and Augustine, attempted to take away the Lord's Body and Blood from the Church of Christ. Thus too, in this wretched age of ours, Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bodius [Bucer], Calvin, Illyricus [Flacius], and very many other heresiarchs, clad in false →

(folio 526, right column)

→ arms and spoils — that is, covered over with the testimony of the holy Fathers, whether feigned, or corrupted, or falsely interpreted — assail the uncorrupted integrity of our faith. These men I judge worthy of no pardon whatsoever: whether because they do not shrink from serving up to others the poisons of heresies; or because they iniquitously defame the venerable memory of the saints, imputing to them things they never held; or because they call back into the light again — not without great harm to Christians — certain now-slumbering errors of the Fathers, which ought to have been buried in perpetual silence — following in this the footsteps of their most wicked author, Ham:² who not only did not cover the nakedness of his father Noah, but proclaimed it to the rest to be mocked. But contrariwise the other brothers, Shem and Japheth, far unlike their brother, endured neither to look themselves upon the father's nakedness which was to be revered,

nor to have it looked upon by others, but, turned away (as it is written), covered it — showing by such an example that the errors of the holy Fathers, if not to be approved, are yet rather to be concealed than to be published.

◇ **2. Right margin:** Heretics are imitators of Ham. Genesis 9.

There are, next, others so extreme toward the contrary side that, if they find in the catholic and ever-so-ancient commentaries of the expositors anything that has the appearance of error, at once, seized by a certain headlong severity, they cast away the whole work and condemn the author most severely. These men seem to me indeed to have a zeal for God, but — as Paul says — **not according to knowledge**.³ For they ought with mature consideration to weigh the not-few occasions on account of which those ancient masters of the churches did at times stray somewhat from the intended mark of truth.⁴ **First**, because they set out upon a road never before attempted, with no guide going before, and — the first, as the proverb has it, to break the ice — opened a way for those who came after, by which the hidden senses of the Scriptures might be tracked out; and the first attempts of any discipline are not wont to be in every part successful and free of all fault. **Secondly**, they said, dictated, and wrote things almost innumerable according to the opportunity of the times, places, and persons.

◇ **3. Right margin:** Romans 10:2. — "they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge."

◇ **4. Right margin:** By what reasons the errors of the ancients are to be excused. — the margin numbers the reasons **1, 2** (continuing on the next folio).

[...continues on folio 527 (PDF p. 344): the further reasons by which the Fathers' occasional errors are to be excused.]

*(printed folio 527 [PDF p. 344] — continuation of the **Preface**. Sixtus completes his five reasons for excusing the Fathers' occasional errors, names the three kinds of reader Book V addresses (malicious heretics, over-severe critics, simple incautious readers), and states his method: to flag cautionary passages from the authors themselves and supply parallel-passage "antidotes.")*

(folio 527, left column)

→ and, as Augustine says, excusing himself by a saying of Solomon, declares: "In much speaking there is no lack of sin"¹ — especially since no one is so keen-eyed that he cannot often be deluded, and does not sometimes grow dim of sight; for even the good Homer sometimes nods. There are, indeed, certain moles even on the most beautiful bodies; and nothing in human affairs is in every part blessed. Moreover, those men of old burned with so great an ardor of sincere piety and of catholic defense that, while they strove with every effort of their powers to destroy one error, they often either fell into the opposite one, or seem in some way to have fallen — after the manner of farmers,² who, wishing to straighten the trunk of a tender tree bent crooked, sometimes exceed the measure by an immoderate pull, and draw the very plant into the contrary and opposite shape. Thus Dionysius, Bishop of the Corinthians — as Basil writes in his letter to Bishop Maximus³ — while he strove too vehemently and sharply to combat Sabellius (who asserted one person of Father and Son), did not perceive that he was, by an excessive zeal for controversy, being carried into the opposite fault, and was defending a difference and inequality of the two substances. Thus the divine Augustine, while with all ardor of spirit and words he fights in defense of divine grace against the Pelagians — who exalted free will to the injury of divine grace — seems to slip, as it were, into the other pit, and at times to attribute to man's free will less than is fair. And on the contrary Chrysostom, in the heat of disputing with the Manichees and pagans — who asserted that man is either evil by nature or often driven to sin by the necessity of fate — raises the powers of our nature higher than is right.

◇ **1. Left margin:** Proverbs 10:19. — "In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin."

◇ **2. Left margin:** A most fitting simile. — the farmer over-bending the sapling.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Nicephorus, book 6, chapter 25.

[4.] Add to these that, although some lapses which cannot be dissembled exist in the books of the ancients, yet nothing is thereby taken from their sanctity and erudition: since in those times the Church had not yet either called into question, or defined by a settled determination, anything about these matters which are now condemned; and the authority of divine Scripture seemed ambiguous on either side, nor was it yet forbidden to anyone to hold an opinion about these things, and to teach what he would.

[5.] Nor should this be passed over either, which Pamphilus the Martyr, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus, and Rufinus complained of⁴ — namely, that very many of the writings of Clement, Dionysius, Origen, Athanasius, and of the other noble Doctors were of old most wickedly handled by heretics: who, in order to win credit and authority for their heresies under the name of the most illustrious Fathers, corrupted, altered, and cut away much in their books, and also inserted much of their own dogmas at variance with what those celebrated men had held and taught — [men] of whom it is not credible that in the same volumes, on the same matter and at the same time, they either held or wrote contrary things, especially since they were neither mad nor utterly forgetful.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** The writings of the Catholic Doctors were corrupted by heretics.

(folio 527, right column)

In the third place, finally, there are certain simple and incautious readers who, without any judgment or observation, are carried heedlessly into the reading of the illustrious expositors, and devour and gulp down everything without any distinction or selection — by no means discerning for what cause the things they read were written, to what feelings, occasions, places, times, and persons they were accommodated, whether they were said for the sake of disputing, of objecting, or of rebuking, or were confirmed under the settled definition of a fixed assertion. And while these inconsiderate readers take no notice of this, it necessarily follows that they for the most part slip into a number of errors — errors which, in the expositors' works, either the authors themselves left behind, as much by occasion as by carelessness, or heretics thrust in by fraud. Most prudently admonishing this so shameless a class of men, D. Anselm, in his commentary on the second Epistle to the Corinthians, left it thus written: "In the books of the holy doctors, which the Church reads as authentic, there are sometimes found certain depraved or heretical things: yet neither the books nor the authors are on this account condemned. Let the prudent reader read their books through, and he will find that what I say is true."

For this threefold variety of readers, then, this Fifth book is written; in which, according to the order of the volumes of both Testaments, I have gathered out of many commentaries of the divine expositors — and especially of the ancients — **passages to be read with caution**: not indeed all and every one, but only those which could not be dissembled either without offense to catholic piety or without great disturbance of the readers. And these same [passages] I have almost always indicated not in my own words — lest perhaps I should not be believed — but by the testimonies of the authors who noted such passages. I have also appended, wherever it could be done, to each suspect passage its own **antidotes** — that is, other passages and opinions of the same authors, either openly at odds with the passages cited or at least diverse and foreign to them, which by their own testimony show that those passages were either explained elsewhere more openly by the authors themselves, or wholly retracted; or were not well understood by the slanderers; or were violently wrested by heretics to the overthrow of Catholic assertions and the defense of depraved dogmas; or were falsified or adulterated by forgers, or added to; or perhaps were at first published in a disordered way by the very authors of the works, and afterward — whether by chance or by some excusable occasion — left without any correction.

Now I have gathered all these things to this end: **first**, lest the incautious reader, unrolling the commentaries of the catholic expositors, dash himself against some reef he has not noticed; **next**, that over-severe readers may recognize that the errors of the divine interpreters are to be excused with all pardon and piety, and

softened with the gentlest mildness; →

[...continues on folio 528 (PDF p. 345): "*lastly* (postremò)...", the third and final purpose of the collection.]

(printed folio 528 [PDF p. 345], with a section banner; the **Preface** ends and the collection proper begins. **Annot. I–III** (Gen 1:1): Cajetan on the plural "Elohim" (defended against Catharinus); Philo's "heaven as dwelling of the gods" (= angels); and Procopius denying heaven is spherical or mobile.)

(folio 528 — top, concluding the Preface [set across the two columns])

→ **lastly**, that those who abuse the explanations of the saints to their own ruin and that of others may desist from so wicked a contrivance, once they have seen these impostures and frauds of theirs to be detected. But let us now approach the work itself: in which we shall fit together annotations and censures upon the explainers of the blessed volumes, keeping the order of the books and chapters of divine Scripture, proceeding from the beginning of Genesis all the way to the last book of the New Testament.

ANNOTATIONS AND CENSURES

upon the expositors of the divine volumes of the OLD Scripture, arranged according to the order of the books and chapters of the Old Testament.

(folio 528, left column → right column)

Annotation I

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether the beginning of Genesis pertains to the Trinity.

Thomas Cajetan, Cardinal-Priest, in the beginning of his commentaries on Genesis, explaining why Moses in the first words of Genesis called God by a plural number — saying אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, that is, "Gods" ("In the beginning God created heaven and earth") — taught that God is named by Moses with a plural appellation not to signify a plurality of divine persons in the Trinity, but because the name *Elohim* lacks a singular number;¹ adding that this passage in no way favors a Trinity of persons, since — as Athanasius testifies in his Creed — a divine person can be called neither "Gods" nor "lords" in the catholic sense.

◇ **1. Left margin:** The name *Elohim* lacks a singular number.

Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa, in the fourth book of the Annotations which he published against this same Cajetan, execrates this opinion as Jewish and abhorrent from the view of the most excellent Fathers, rejecting it among the other propositions of Cajetan for which he judges him to have thought ill concerning the holy Trinity. He also derides Cajetan's argument — that from Athanasius's Creed he wished to establish that divine persons are falsely called "Gods" or "lords" — since Athanasius does not teach that, but only that "three Gods" or "three lords" cannot be pronounced in the catholic sense. Yet this reasoning does not follow: "They cannot be called three Gods, therefore not Gods [at all]" — because many things are falsely said conjointly which are truly said separately. Wherefore the Master of the Sentences [Peter Lombard], and Thomas, and the rest of the doctors admit that they can be called "Gods," but not likewise "three Gods." Thus far Ambrose.

But it was certainly not fitting for him² to bring his brother, for such trifling causes, under suspicion of injuring the Trinity — [a Trinity] which Cajetan not only most openly proclaims in his commentaries on this

first chapter, expounding that "Let us make man," etc., but also learnedly and piously teaches and defends in all his writings. Ambrose ought also to have noticed that Cajetan had no expositor to imitate, out of the Greek, Latin, or Hebrew writers, who expounded that word *Elohim* of the Trinity — except only Peter Lombard, who in the first [book] of the Sentences had somehow touched this interpretation in passing, and Paul of Burgos, the bishop, who had copied the same interpretation out of the same book of the Sentences. From whose opinions many not-ignoble men, even before Cajetan, had openly dissented without any note of heresy. Nor do I wish this to have been said by me to derogate in this part from the authority of those who expounded this passage mystically of the Trinity: for it delights me greatly — to use Augustine's words — that in the very opening of the holy book of Genesis the Trinity is commended, when it is said: "In the beginning" — that is, in the Son — "God" (namely the Father) "made heaven and earth."³

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Cajetan is defended.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Genesis 1:1.

Annotation II

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods.

Philo the Jew — whom Origen, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine followed in most of their expositions — in his book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, narrating the present passage, says that heaven was made by God to be the most sacred dwelling of the gods, both of those not apparent [to sense] and of those obvious to sense. Lest anyone suspect this opinion to incline toward the error of the pagans, who introduce many gods, it must be known that Philo — as appears from the same work of his — understands by the name of "gods" the spiritual, rational, and heavenly substances called by us Angels:⁴ of which he says some are incorporeal and invisible, but others not without bodies — such as are the stars, which appear to our eyes.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** By the name of "gods" Philo understands Angels.

Annotation III

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether heaven is spherical and mobile.

Procopius of Gaza, in his commentaries on Genesis, expounding this saying, declares that the assertion of those who say heaven is of a spherical shape and is turned with a circular motion does not agree with orthodox truth, but contradicts Moses, the prophets, Paul, and Christ: who everywhere in the divine scriptures refute this opinion, teaching that heaven is neither borne in a circle nor has a spherical form, but is utterly immobile; and he repeats this same thing below in the exposition of chapter 7. This opinion Procopius seems to have taken, in almost the same words, from homilies 14 and 27 of Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews — although →

[...continues on folio 529 (PDF p. 346): the rest of Annotatio III.]

(printed folio 529 [PDF p. 346]. **Annot. III–V** (Gen 1:1): Augustine's warning not to defend as faith what secular science has disproved; Kissamos on an uncreated empyrean (censured by Catharinus); and whether an angelic world was created before the visible one — affirmed by Basil and many Fathers, yet seemingly condemned by Lateran IV.)

(folio 529, left column → right column)

Annotation III (continued)

— although Lactantius Firmianus held and wrote the same, many years before Chrysostom, in the third book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 24.¹

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Lactantius, Chrysostom, and Procopius denied that heaven is of spherical figure and moves in an orbit.

Augustine, in the first and second books of *On Genesis to the Letter*, most strongly condemns those who so defend this — and opinions like it about celestial matters, contrary to all the professors of philosophy — as [a point] of faith, that they think those who hold otherwise are not catholic.² For [Augustine warns that] when nature, heaven, the stars, and other things of this kind are treated, we must beware lest we shamefully err about matters that have been proved by most certain reason and most manifest experience by those skilled in secular things; and — what is worse — lest we confirm our errors out of misunderstood testimonies of Scripture. For this is exceedingly disgraceful, and pernicious chiefly for two reasons. **First**, because when unbelievers see them thus raving, and erring by the whole breadth of heaven, they will mock both us and our authors, and will reprehend and spit them out as unlearned and false. **Next**, because if they hear that the divine scriptures err so gravely in those matters which they themselves know best and have tested, they will by no means believe the other things in them that are useful and necessary for salvation, but will suppose that these too were deceitfully composed with a like vanity. (*See below, Annotation 14.*)

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The teaching of St. Augustine, to be diligently observed by theologians.

Annotation IV

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Augustine of Kissamos wrongly taught that the empyrean heaven was not created.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, is reprehended by Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa, because in his *Cosmopoeia* (for so he entitled his work on the first three chapters of Genesis), in elucidating this passage, he judged that the empyrean heaven was not created, but coeternal with God — being, however, ready to recant if he thought wrongly; yet, as the same Ambrose says, it would have been better not to commit such dangerous things to writing than to offer oneself to a palinode. For who will recant in the name of that man who has already died and left his error alive in his writings?

Annotation V

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth." — Genesis 1:1

Whether an invisible world and angels were created before this world.

Basil, in the first homily of the *Hexaemeron*, narrating this passage, seems to hold that God, many ages before this visible world, created another invisible world, and in it founded the angelic nature long before the creation of this visible world. For he speaks in this manner: "Moses set this word in front, saying *In the beginning he made*: because even before this world there was (as is likely) something which indeed our intelligence is permitted to contemplate. But he omitted to narrate it, because that knowledge is little suited to those still being introduced [to the faith] and to babes. There was surely a certain state of the world, older in origin — suited to those powers withdrawn from the concretion of matter and more excellent than the [material] world — prior also in the condition of time; eternal, namely, and everlasting, that is, never subject to any corruption and destruction. And in it the Founder of all perfected his works: a spiritual light befitting the beatitude of those who love the Lord, rational and invisible natures, and every adornment of intelligible things which exceed our understanding, whose very names it is not possible to find. For these fill up the essence of the invisible world — as Paul teaches us, saying that *in him were founded all things, whether visible or invisible, whether thrones or dominations or principalities or powers* or might, whether the hosts of angels or the prefectures of archangels.³ *In the beginning*, therefore, he says — [meaning] that which is

'with respect to time' — narrating, after the invisible and intelligible things, the beginning of the origin of these visible things and of the principles apprehensible by sense." Again in the second homily, explaining that *The earth was void and empty*, he confirms the same with these words: "Let us consider, then, that whatever existed before the constitution of this sensible and corruptible world was surely in light. For neither the dignities of the angels, nor all the celestial hosts, nor, in sum, anything named among the rational and ministering spirits, dwelt in darkness, but in light, and possessed a state agreeable to themselves with all spiritual gladness."

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Colossians 1[:16].

These opinions, which of old among the Greeks **Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea**, and **Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus**, had refuted with many argumentations,⁴ the **Lateran Council** — celebrated at Rome under Innocent III in the year 1215 — seems among the Latins to have condemned, from the words which it placed in the first chapter of its decrees.⁵ They are these: "The **Creator** of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporeal, by his omnipotent power together from the beginning of time founded out of nothing both creatures, the spiritual and the corporeal — namely the angelic and the mundane."

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Acacius, in his book of Select Questions; Diodorus, on Genesis, chapter [—]; Theodoret, on Genesis, question 3.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** The Lateran Council seems to disapprove the opinion of those asserting that the angels were created before this corporeal world.

Thus far the words of the Council. On whose occasion one must beware not to determine anything rashly about this opinion, accusing of heresy very many illustrious men who assert it: among whom (to pass over Origen for the moment, who first asserted this in the books *Peri Archōn* [On First Principles] and in homily 4 on Isaiah) there is, foremost, **Gregory Nazianzen**,⁶ who in his sermon *On the Nativity* speaks thus: "God first indeed devised the angelic and celestial powers; and the thing devised was straightway fulfilled by the Word and consummated by the Spirit; and thus subsisted the second splendors, ministers of that first Splendor. But after these had first rightly succeeded, he secondarily devised the material and visible world: this is the mingling of heaven and earth and of the things that are in between." Thus Gregory: whom his disciple **Jerome** followed, writing thus in his commentaries on the Epistle to Titus: "Six thousand years of our time are not yet complete — and how great times, and how many origins of ages, must we suppose there were, in which the angels, the Thrones, the dominations, and the other orders served God?" Coming to the same opinion, **Ambrose**, in the first book of the *Hexaemeron*, chapter 5, expounding this passage, brought forth these words: "The world therefore was made, and that which was not began to be. But the Word of God was in the beginning, and always: yet also the angels, dominations, and powers, although they began to be at some time, nevertheless were [already in being] when this world was made." Likewise in his preface to the first Psalm: "The angels praise the Lord," he says, "and before the very beginning of the world the Cherubim and Seraphim, with the sweetness of a melodious voice, were saying: Holy, Holy, Holy." To these is added **Hilary** in the twelfth book *On the Trinity*, not far from the end, and in the little book →

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Gregory Nazianzen thinks the angels were created before this world.

[...continues on folio 530 (PDF p. 347): the rest of *Annotatio V.*]

(printed folio 530 [PDF p. 347]. *Annot. V–VII* (Gen 1:1–2): more Fathers on angels-before-the-world (Cajetan and Aquinas read the Lateran decree by its intention; Augustine leaves it open); Augustine's seemingly-Pelagian words on "the void earth" (self-corrected); and the "Spirit borne over the waters" taken as wind/air (Cajetan defended).)

(folio 530, left column → right column)

Annotation V (continued)

[Hilary] — in the little book against Auxentius, a little before the end. **Isidore**, Bishop of Seville, in the first book *On the Highest Good*, ch. 12; and **John Damascene** in the second volume of the *Orthodox Faith*, ch. 3; together with very many others, both Greek and Latin — whom, since it would be long to enumerate them, it may suffice that **John Cassian**, in the 8th book of the *Collations*, indicates that this was in his time the common opinion of all catholics,¹ in these plain words: "That before the constitution of this visible creature God made the spiritual and celestial powers — which, for this very reason, that they knew themselves to have been produced out of nothing to so great a glory of beatitude by the Creator's benefit, giving thanks to him, cling unceasingly to his praises — no one of the faithful doubts." **Bede**, in the little book of *Separate Questions*, q. 9: "The angels (he says) were created before the creation of the world; and before all creation of angels, the Devil was founded [created]: as it is written, 'He is the beginning of the ways of God.'"

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Cassian asserts that in his time it was the common opinion of catholics that the angels were created before this world.

Accordingly, as Thomas Cajetan says, we ought to interpret the aforesaid opinion of the synodal decree rather according to the Council's intention than according to the sense of the words.² And the Council's purpose is — as St. Thomas says in his exposition of the first Decretal — to refute the error either of Origen, or of those who said that spiritual substances were first produced by God so that they might enjoy spiritual dignity, and then, when they had sinned, that all bodies were created, into which, thrust as into prisons, they might pay the penalties of their crimes. Although St. Augustine rather approves the opinion of those who assert the angels were created together with the world, yet in the 11th book of *The City of God*, chapter 32, he permits everyone to hold freely in this matter what he wishes³ — provided only that he does not make spiritual substances coeternal with God, and affirms all things, visible as well as invisible, to have been founded by God in time. Subscribing to him, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus [Cyrhus], in question 3 on Genesis, after disputing much against Basil, finally added this: "Further, it is necessary to know that all things whatsoever that exist, except the holy Trinity, have a nature liable to corruption. And this being granted, if anyone says that the throngs of angels were created before heaven and earth, he will not offend against the word of piety."

◇ 2. **Left margin:** See St. Thomas, part 1, question 61, article 3, and Cajetan on the same place.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** St. Augustine's opinion on the time of the creation of the angels.

Annotation VI

"And the earth was void and empty." — Genesis 1:2

Whether faith and charity are from ourselves.

Augustine, in the first book *On Genesis, allegorically*, chapter 3, explaining this, seems to assent somewhat to the Pelagian heresy,⁴ when he says: "All men can believe God, and can turn themselves from the love of visible and temporal things to fulfilling the precepts, if they will." Which words Augustine, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 11, says are not true unless our will is first prepared by God, and charity so increased by him that we are able to accomplish the precepts.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation VII

"The Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters." — Genesis 1:2

Whether the spirit that was borne over the waters was the Holy Spirit. — Right margin: Ambrose of Compsa does not rightly reprehend Cajetan.

Thomas Cajetan, in his exposition of this sentence, has been gravely reprehended by Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa. For in the fourth volume against Cajetan he accuses him of having asserted that the aforesaid passage, "The Spirit of the Lord," etc., pertains not to the Holy Spirit but to some wind or other that blows — and this against the sense of the saints, against the decrees of the Pontiffs, and against the authority of the Church, which on the holy day of Pentecost sings of the Holy Spirit: "Thou who wast to be over the waters didst bear them," etc. I think that Ambrose, when he wrote this, did not have at hand Cajetan's commentaries on Genesis, in which he might read the exposition of the present passage. For he would have seen there that not a word — nay, not a syllable — is written about wind, whether blowing or not blowing. Although I do not see why Cajetan should have been so bitterly branded, even if he *had* referred this passage to wind, since many Greek and Latin expositors did the same before him. Of these, **Basil**, expounding Moses's words both of the Holy Spirit and of wind and air, in the second homily of the *Hexaemeron* writes thus: "Whether one call this a 'spirit' — namely a diffusion of air — recognize the writer [Moses] as enumerating for you the parts of the whole world; or rather (which is truer, and approved by our elders) [understand] the Spirit of God — here it is called the Holy Spirit." **Augustine**, in the unfinished book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 4, having said that three things can be understood by "the Spirit of God" — namely the Holy Spirit, and a certain vital creature by which the whole visible world is contained and moved — straightway added this: "A third opinion about this spirit can arise: that by the name 'spirit' the element of air is expressed, so that the four elements are intimated, out of which this visible world arises — namely heaven, earth, water, and air. And any one of these opinions is true." **Diodorus**, Bishop of Tarsus, judges that these words are to be fitted first to air and wind, then to the Holy Spirit, saying thus: "By 'the Spirit of God' understand the wind, which by its motion alters the nature of the waters, whence too it draws its origin. And he added 'of God' in order to ascribe the cause of this work to God. But if anyone understands 'the Spirit of God' as the Paraclete Spirit, he will not stray from the truth; for the Spirit adorns all things that are." St. John **Chrysostom**, the disciple of Diodore,⁵ in homily 3 on Genesis, says that the Spirit of the Lord is a certain vital operation, implanted in the waters by God, from which the waters had not only motion but the power of procreating animals. **Theodore**t, Bishop of Cyrus, constantly affirms that Moses spoke more of air than of the Holy Spirit, writing in this manner in the *Questions* on the book of Genesis, question 8: "To some it seems to have been the Holy Spirit, who vivified and made fruitful the nature of the waters, prefiguring in a way the water of baptism. But I should reckon it truer that here you understand 'spirit' as air. For when he had said that God created heaven and earth, and had mentioned the waters under the name of 'the abyss,' he necessarily made mention also of air, permeating from the surface of the water all the way to heaven. For it is the nature of air to be borne and agitated about the lower bodies. And most fittingly that word 'was borne [moved]' indicates the mobile substance of air. But if anyone does not assent to this interpretation, because it is written 'The Spirit of God was borne over the waters,' let him hear blessed David saying of God, the Founder of all: 'His spirit [breath] shall blow, and the waters shall flow.'"⁶ **Origen**, in the first book of the *Peri Archōn* [On First Principles], says that this passage →

◇ **5. Right margin:** Chrysostom was the disciple of Diodore of Tarsus.

◇ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 147:18.

[...continues on folio 531 (PDF p. 348): *Origen and the rest of Annotatio VII.*]

(printed folio 531 [PDF p. 348]. **Annot. VII–IX** (Gen 1:1–6): *Origen's allegorical reading of the Spirit; whether angels have subtle bodies (Augustine and many affirm, Aquinas and most deny — Sixtus leans incorporeal, with Bernard's confession of ignorance); and Chrysostom's single heaven, reconciled by Aquinas.*)

(folio 531, left column → right column)

Annotation VII (continued)

— [Origen says] this passage is to be understood according to allegory concerning the Holy Spirit, but according to the letter, by no means.

Annotation VIII

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether angels and demons are corporeal.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 17, in expounding the passage before us, hands down that the angels, both good and evil, have subtle bodies;¹ and in the third book of the same work, chapter 10, he shows these to be aerial, but indissoluble through death, because in them the elements more apt for acting than for suffering prevail — that is, air and starry fire (which two are more apt for acting, as earth and moisture for suffering). Agreeing with this opinion, in Epistle 115 to Nebridius he writes that angels are aerial or ethereal living beings of the keenest sense. And in the third book *On the Trinity*, chapter 1, he says they have a spiritual body — not one to which they are subject, but one which they bear as subject [to them]. In the exposition of the eighty-fifth Psalm he asserts that the bodies of the blessed after the resurrection will be such as are the bodies of the angels; and he repeats this very thing in the explanation of Psalm 145, adding that the angelic body is inferior to the soul. Likewise in the 11th book *The City of God*, chapter 23, he teaches that the bodies of demons are aerial; and in the 15th book *The City of God*, chapter 23, he asserts that demons have such bodies as they can couple with women. And in the book which is entitled (under Augustine's name) *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, chapters 11 and 12, it is most constantly affirmed that nothing is incorporeal except God, but that the angels, and all the celestial powers, are corporeal.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Several Doctors of the Church hold that angels are corporeal.

Peter Lombard (2 Sentences, distinction 8) says that Augustine brought these things forth not thinking so himself, but reporting the opinion of others² — though nevertheless it is not likely that Augustine spoke from another's opinion in so many places, but rather from his own, imitating namely Philo (in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*), Origen (in the first book of the *Peri Archōn*, ch. 6, and in the second book of the same work, ch. 2), Lactantius, Hilary, Basil, and the consensus of nearly all who wrote in his time. To this opinion subscribe **John Cassian** (7th book of the *Collations*, chapter 13), **John Damascene** (second book of the *Theology*, ch. 3, and the third book against the Iconoclasts), and likewise the **Second Nicene synod**, in whose fourth session the words of **John, Bishop of Thessalonica**, are approved, who writes in this manner: "Concerning the Angels and archangels, and their powers — to which our soul also is joined — the Catholic Church itself thinks thus: that they are indeed intelligible, but not entirely devoid of body, but endowed with a thin and aerial or fiery body, as it is written: 'Who makes his angels spirits, and his ministers a burning fire.'³ And thus we have learned that many of the holy Fathers thought — among whom is Basil surnamed the Great, and blessed Athanasius, and Methodius, and those who stand [in succession] from them; but God alone is incorporeal. And although the angels are not corporeal as we are — namely [made] of the four elements and of that gross matter — yet no one would call either the angels, or the demons, or the soul incorporeal."

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Lombard did not rightly answer on St. Augustine's behalf.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Psalm 103:4.

From these dissent **St. Thomas** and most professors of Scholastic Theology, following (they too) authors not to be ashamed of, especially **Dionysius the Areopagite**:⁴ who in the first chapter of the *Celestial Hierarchy* names the Angels not only incorporeal and immaterial substances, but also deiform simplicities and immaterialities. With him concur Chrysostom (homily 22 on Genesis, and the homily on 1 Corinthians 17 & 32, and in the explanation of the sixth chapter of Isaiah), and Cyril (in the fourth book of the commentaries on John, ch. 10). Nor does the decree of the Lateran Council dissent from these, decreeing that one must

believe not only corporeal but also incorporeal creatures — that is, angels — to have been founded out of nothing.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The Scholastic theologians teach that the angels are incorporeal.

Although I myself think this latter opinion the stronger — because the angels need bodies neither for subsisting, nor for understanding, nor for moving themselves — yet in this part I choose to embrace the modesty of **Bernard**, who in the fifth homily on the Canticle of Canticles, leaving such a controversy undiscussed, concluded his sermon with these words:⁵ "But whether these spirits have natural bodies, as men have their own, or whether the spirits themselves take up bodies when there is need, and again, the work completed, lay them aside into the same matter from which they were taken, to be dissolved — I do not wish it to be required of me. The Fathers seem to have thought diversely about such things; nor is it clear to me from what [source] I should teach either alternative, and I confess that I do not know. But I judge that the knowledge of these things does not contribute much to our progress." Thus he.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** St. Bernard writes that he does not know whether the angels are corporeal or incorporeal.

Annotation IX

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether there is only one heaven, as Chrysostom seems to hold.

Chrysostom, in homily 4 on Genesis, in expounding this sentence, asserts that those who teach there are many heavens are impelled to say this not from divine Scripture, but against divine Scripture and ecclesiastical dogmas, out of their own head and out of their own violent opinions: for Moses taught us that there is only *one* heaven; and further, that what is read in the psalm, "Praise him, you heavens of heavens," is not said because there are many heavens, but because it is the custom of the Hebrew tongue to name heaven, water, and many other singular things in the plural number. He holds the same in the exposition of Psalm 148,⁶ where, expounding that "Praise him, you heavens of heavens," he says: "Saying here 'heavens of heavens,' he does not show a multitude; yet the same [Scripture] also says 'the heaven of heaven.' For the language of the Hebrews names heaven in the plural number." This opinion of Chrysostom seems to be opposed to all the schools of theologians and philosophers. Expounding it in the first part of the *Summa*, question 68, article 4, St. Thomas says that by these words are not condemned the theologians and philosophers who distinguish the starry heaven — that is, that whole celestial body which encloses this lower world, or globe of elements — into many particular heavens or orbs;⁷ but [what is condemned is] certain heretics and philosophers who taught that beyond this whole starry globe there are other starry heavens, and other worlds.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Psalm 148:4.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** St. Thomas piously explains St. Chrysostom.

Annotation X

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Augustine →

[...continues on folio 532 (PDF p. 349): Annotatio X.]

(printed folio 532 [PDF p. 349]. Annot. X–XIII (Gen 1:6–9): Augustine on the firmament dividing the waters (retracted); Origen's waters-above-are-angels (condemned); why "it was good" is omitted on the second day; and the antipodes, denied by the Fathers but now proved by the voyages to the New World.)

(folio 532, left column → right column)

Annotation X

"Let there be a firmament." — Genesis 1:6

Whether the firmament is between the upper and lower waters.

Augustine, in the 13th book of the *Confessions*, chapter 32, expounding this passage, writes that the firmament was made between the spiritual upper waters and the corporeal lower ones;¹ which — as said not considerably enough in so obscure a matter — he revokes in the second book of the *Retractations*, chapter 6.

◇ 1. Left margin: St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XI

"He divided the waters that were under the firmament," etc. — Genesis 1:7

Whether the upper and lower waters are real water, or rather Angels, as Origen held.

Origen — as Epiphanius witnesses in his letter to John of Jerusalem, and Jerome in his letter to Pammachius — when he discussed these words upon Genesis in his *Tomes*, said that the waters which are above the firmament are not waters but holy angels, and the waters which are under the firmament are evil demons fallen from heaven. Against this opinion, which Epiphanius and Jerome condemn as an error, **Basil**, in homily 3 on the *Hexameron*, suppressing Origen's name, writes this:² "We have a word also for certain ecclesiastics concerning the divided waters — [those] who, under the pretext of a withdrawal from sensible things into the heights and of a loftier understanding, fled to allegories, saying that spiritual and incorporeal powers are figuratively signified by the waters; and that above, indeed, above the firmament, the better ones remained, but below, in earthly and material things, the malignant ones stayed. On this account, forsooth, they say that God even praises the waters above heaven — that is, that the good powers, on account of their purity of mind, complete a hymn to their Founder — but that the waters under heaven are spiritual malignities, fallen from their natural height into the depth of malice, which, being turbulent and seditious and overflowing and boiling with tumults and passions, are named 'sea.' But relegating such discourses as being on a level with dreams and old wives' fables, let us understand water [to be] water, and let us understand the division made by the firmament according to the cause we have rendered."

◇ 2. Left margin: St. Basil condemns Origen's opinion.

Annotation XII

"And it was made evening and morning, the second day." — Genesis 1:8

Whether the binary [double] number is infamous, as Jerome held. — with a running tag: Genesis 1:8.

Rabanus [Maurus], Bishop of Mainz, in his commentaries on Genesis, inquiring why after the second day's work it is not said — as of the other five days' works — "God saw that it was good," answers, on the authority of the ancient Fathers, that this came about because the binary [double] number is infamous and unclean, on account of the cause of corruption, which first proceeds from it. And this is Jerome's opinion, at the beginning of his commentary on Haggai and in the first volume against Jovinian, where he writes thus: "It must be observed, according to the Hebrew truth, that whereas Scripture, on the first, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth day — the works of each being completed — said, 'And God saw that it was good': on the second day it withheld this entirely, leaving us to understand that the double number is not good, which divides from unity and prefigures the covenants of marriage. Whence also in Noah's ark all the animals which enter two by two [in pairs] are unclean." **Nicholas of Lyra**, in the *Postil* on Genesis, explodes this opinion as a deception, preferring to it the exposition of Rabbi Solomon [Rashi], who says that God did not call the second day's work "good" because the work of the waters — which was afterward completed on the third day — was not

yet perfect, hinting that what is not yet perfect is not worthy of the appellation of "good." Yet Paul of Burgos, the bishop, refutes this confutation of Lyra.

Annotation XIII

"Let the waters that are under heaven be gathered together." — Genesis 1:9

The ancients denied that there are Antipodes.

Procopius of Gaza, in his commentaries, explaining this, endeavors to establish, from the testimonies of divine Scripture, that there is no land below us opposite to our globe, which Antipodes inhabit, turning their footsteps against ours. For he writes thus: "That the whole earth subsists in the waters, and that there is no part of it, situated below us, empty and denuded of waters, I reckon is known to all; for thus Scripture teaches: 'Who spreads out the earth above the waters.'³ And again: 'For he founded it upon the seas.'⁴ Understand, therefore, only the surface of the earth which is near us, when he says, 'Let the waters that are under heaven be gathered together into one place.' Nor is it fitting that we believe any land below us to be opposite to the globe of our heaven. For if there were Antipodes, certainly Christ would have gone there too, and would have accomplished there the other things that pertain to the salvation of the human race; but also Adam, the first origin of our race, and the serpent, who circumvented the human race by guile, and the flood too, would have existed over against the opposite region." Thus Procopius: before whom **Lactantius**, in the third book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 24, had held the same. And **Augustine**, in the 16th book *The City of God*, chapter 9, had constantly affirmed, on the authority of the sacred Letters, that it must by no reasoning be believed that Antipodes are found who, in the contrary part of the earth — where the Sun rises when it sets for us — press their footsteps opposite to our feet. Because, since divine Scripture testifies that men are begotten from the one Adam in this our hemisphere, it is too absurd to say that some men could have sailed from this into another hemisphere, the immensity of an impassable Ocean being crossed, so as to propagate the human race there also.

◇ 3. Right margin: Psalm 135:6.

◇ 4. Right margin: Psalm 23:2.

But in our own times it is so certain that there are Antipodes, that to deny them would be of the utmost madness:⁵ for our merchants continually sail to them, and within a short space of time return to us, having traversed and re-traversed almost the whole Ocean. Nevertheless Procopius, Augustine, Lactantius, and the other Christian authors who thought otherwise are to be excused⁶ — because the navigations of the Spanish had not yet uncovered the new worlds which have now been discovered, and it was a report, confirmed by the assent of all writers, that between this Northern region and that Southern one a vast Ocean was interposed, which no one had ever crossed, nor even could cross. These things being considered, the most prudent Fathers denied the Antipodes, lest, if they had granted them, they should at once be compelled to confess that those men did not descend from the seed of Adam. But as for what Procopius objects from the authority of Psalms 23 and 135 — that the other hemisphere is so immersed in waters that it is entirely uninhabitable — it does nothing to the point: for [the claim] that the earth is made firm, founded upon the seas and established upon the rivers (to omit other expositions for the present) →

◇ 5. Right margin: No one of sound mind at this time can deny that there are Antipodes.

◇ 6. Right margin: The ancients who denied that there are Antipodes are excused.

[...continues on folio 533 (PDF p. 350): the rest of Annotatio XIII.]

(printed folio 533 [PDF p. 350]. **Annot. XIII–XVI** (Gen 1:9–19): "the earth founded on the seas" as a Hebraism; whether the heaven or the stars move; Origen's stars-as-signs, the root of judicial astrology (refuted); and Chrysostom seeming to say that desisting from sin suffices with God.)

(folio 533, left column → right column)

Annotation XIII (continued)

— is the same as if you should say that the earth received a greater constancy, firmness, stability, and foundation than the sea and the waters.¹ For the Hebrews are frequently wont, in place of the comparative, to add to positives the preposition "*super*" [above], as in Psalm 118[:72]: "The law of thy mouth is good to me, above thousands of gold and silver"; and [118:127]: "I have loved thy commandments above gold and topaz"; and in the fourth [chapter] of Canticles [4:10]: "The odor of thy ointments is above all aromatics."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** What it is for the earth to be "made firm upon the waters and established upon the rivers." — with scripture tags: Psalm 118[:72, 127]; Canticles 4:10.

Annotation XIV

"He set the stars in the firmament." — Genesis 1:17

Whether it must be believed that the stars are fixed in the heaven.

Chrysostom, in homily 6 and homily 13 on Genesis, expounding this, says: "When we hear 'God set the stars in the firmament,' far be it that we should think God fixed the stars in the heaven; for we see them move, and each of them accomplish its course by passing from place to place. But it is the same [to say] 'He set the stars in heaven' as that he commanded that the stars should be in heaven and should revolve — just as when he said, 'God placed Adam in paradise,'² not that he fixed him in paradise, but that he willed him to dwell there." And again, in homily 12 to the people of Antioch, discoursing how the stars run about through the heaven — which he says is wholly immobile³ — he writes thus: "God made the world, neither leaving it wholly immobile, nor commanding it to be wholly moved: but the heaven indeed remained unmoved, as the prophet says: 'Who established the heaven like a vault, and stretched it out like a tent';⁴ but the Sun, with the rest of the stars, is daily revolved in it." Although the professors of Scholastic Theology, together with the Peripatetics and astronomers, explode this opinion with unanimous assent, and St. Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, numbers it among the heresies,⁵ yet I do not judge it contrary to the divine scriptures and to the ancient school of the theologians. For **Origen** (in the fifth book against Celsus, and book 1 of the *Peri Archōn*, ch. 7) affirms that the Sun, Moon, and stars are not parts of heaven — just as the parts of the earth are not living beings — and that each of these is moved in its own order and course. **Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa**, and **Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus** — Chrysostom's teachers — in the exposition of the present passage hand down that the stars, like travelers, accomplish their journey through the heaven, which stands wholly fixed and immobile. And **Procopius** has the same on the seventh chapter of Genesis. **Augustine** too, in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 10, affirms that it can happen that, the heaven standing immobile, the stars accomplish all those diverse and mutually contrary courses which we observe in them; and that this was shown by the most certain demonstrations of the mathematicians of his times. St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa*, question 69, article 4, strives to direct Chrysostom's opinion to the astronomical standard,⁶ saying that his words are to be understood of the Planets, which, according to Ptolemy, are rotated by their own proper motion within the concavities of their orbs. Read above, annotation 3.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Genesis 2:8.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** In Chrysostom's judgment the heaven is immobile.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Psalm 103:2.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** The Scholastic theologians think the stars are parts of the heaven.

◇ 6. **Left margin:** St. Thomas endeavors to teach that St. Chrysostom agrees with the Peripatetics.

Annotation XV

"He set the stars in the firmament." — Genesis 1:17

For the stars foreshow the future events of men, as Origen held — whom the judicial Astrologers follow.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis — as Eusebius relates in the 6th [book] of the *Preparation for the Gospel*, chapter 9 — when he expounded this particle, said that the stars were placed by God in heaven to be "for signs"; that is, that through their various aspects and conjunctions [God] might signify all and each of the causes of human affairs — though they would not effect them. For God painted in the stars the significations and reasons of all the future events of the human race, so that the powers of the supernal spirits might read in them, as in books, whatever things would come to pass among men (yet without any compulsion of free will) through the several intervals of time; and thence they might reveal to men, the observers of the stars, some part of this science, which exceeds the powers of human wit. And according to this sense Origen thought a certain opinion was to be understood, [taken] from a book whose title is *The Narration of Joseph* — once received into authority among many catholics — in which the Patriarch Jacob is introduced saying these things to his sons: "Read in the tablets of heaven whatever things are to come upon you and your sons." **Augustine**, in the fifth [book] *The City of God*, chapter 1, writes that this opinion — although it belonged to men not mediocresly learned, and although it decrees that the stars do not *make* but only *signify* — is nevertheless convicted as fallacious and false by argument and experience:⁷ namely of two twins, sown in the same intercourse and at the same moment, and coming into the light at the same time — of whom, since there is the greatest diversity in their actions, events, professions, arts, honors, and the rest pertaining to human life and death, it cannot be that the same star, set in the same station of heaven, at the same time and same aspect, portends such contrary significations of diverse events. **Procopius**, in his commentaries on this chapter, reprobates Origen's opinion as by no means catholic and unworthy of a Christian, because Christians have no need of the significations of the stars in order to know what is to be followed or fled, since the divine Law admonishes whatever they must do or avoid. **St. Thomas**, in the opusculum which he entitled *On the Judgments of the Stars*, declares that they sin gravely who use the significations and judgments of the stars in those things which depend on the free will of men.⁸ But an observation of nearly the like argument you have below, in Annotation 81 of this book, and in book 6, Annotation 10.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** St. Augustine excellently refutes the judicial Astrologers.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** They sin gravely who wish to tell, from the stars, things that depend on the free will of man.

Annotation XVI

"And it was made evening and morning, the fourth day." — Genesis 1:19

Whether satisfaction is necessary for penitents.

Chrysostom, in the sixth homily on Genesis near the end, where he expounds this very thing, exhorting his hearers to please God by the confession of sins, and not to relapse into sins after confession, says: "It suffices for God, on account of his great mercy, that we desist from sins." Explaining the same more fully in the oration on Blessed Philogonius, he says: "I testify and pledge my faith, that if each of us who are liable to sins, withdrawing from his former evils from the heart, and truly promising →

[...continues on folio 534 (PDF p. 351): the rest of Annotatio XVI (whether satisfaction is required of penitents).]

(printed folio 534 [PDF p. 351]. **Annot. XVI–XVIII** (Gen 1:19–26): Chrysostom's "it suffices that we desist from sin," seized by Calvin and Oecolampadius against satisfaction and indulgences (answered); Philo's "Let us make man" with angel-cooperators; and whether God is corporeal (Melito's book vindicated as anti-anthropomorphic).)

(folio 534, left column → right column)

Annotation XVI (continued)

[Chrysostom, on Blessed Philogonius:] "...and promise to God that he will hereafter never return to those [sins], God will require nothing else for further satisfaction: for he is benign." Which opinion **John Calvin**, in the ninth chapter of his *Institutions*,¹ cites against the "satisfactionists" (for so the impious man calls the catholics, because they teach that satisfaction is the third part of penance); and **John Oecolampadius**, once a Brigittine monk, standard-bearer of the recent heretics, in the codices of Chrysostom translated by himself, over against this same sentence, placed in the margin a heretical objection in these words: "If it suffices God that we desist from sins, where then remain satisfactions and indulgences?" Retorting this man's insane questioning upon the author himself, let us in turn ask him: If it suffices God that we desist from sins, and there is no further need of satisfactions and indulgences, why does Chrysostom everywhere preach the satisfactory works of penance?² Indeed in homily 10 on Matthew, showing that it does not suffice to cease from sin unless we make satisfaction through those things which are contrary to the offenses committed, he says: "Let us do penance — penance, I say — not only that we desist from former evils, but also that we be filled with the fruits of good works. 'Bring forth,' says John, 'fruits worthy of penance.' But in what way shall we be able to bear fruit, unless we do the things contrary to our sins? For example: you have stolen others' goods — begin now to give your own; you have fornicated a long time — suspend yourself from the lawful use of marriage, and meditate perpetual continence by [at least] a chastity of a few days. For it does not suffice for the wounded man, unto his safety, only to pluck the darts from his body, but it is also needful to apply remedies to the wounds," etc. Again, in the homily on Psalm 106, which is carried among the works of Chrysostom, it is thus written: "When sin has brought death, confession brings health. For confession shows penance; satisfaction wins pardon for oneself by the divine mercy." And below it follows: "It is worse not to placate God's offense by satisfaction, than to offend God's goodness by sinning." And a little after: "Let confession restore what sin had taken away; let penance lack nothing; what the stain of offenses had defiled, let the serpent's venom be cured by the antidote of satisfaction." Thus Chrysostom. Answering Oecolampadius on his authority, we say: it suffices God indeed — for granting us the remission both of guilt and of eternal punishment — that we desist from sins now confessed to a Priest; but there remain satisfactions and indulgences to expiate the temporal punishments to which, as the sacred Letters teach, after the crimes are pardoned and the eternal punishment [remitted], we are still liable, whether in this life or in another.³ See below, Annotation 174 of this book, and 161 of the following book.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Under the name of "satisfaction" St. Chrysostom thinks something is understood — by way of self-excuse. Calvin, book 4 of the *Institutes*, ch. 4, §38.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** St. Chrysostom everywhere inculcates satisfactory works.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** By satisfactions and indulgences the temporal punishment is expiated.

Annotation XVII

"Let us make man to [our] image." — Genesis 1:26

Whether the angels, together with God, created man — as Origen held.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, narrating this proposition, writes thus: "God said, 'Let us make man' — which indicates that others were taken up as cooperators, so that both the reprehensible wills and the actions of man (when he conducts himself rightly) are, [the good ones,] referred as accepted to God the ruler of all, but the contrary ones to those others who are subject [to him]. For it behooved that the Father not be the cause of evils to his own children." By which words he seems to indicate that the first man was made partly by God, partly by the angels, God's cooperators. Which also among us Basilides and Cerinthus, heretics, held⁴ — whom Chrysostom (homily 8 on Genesis) and Theodoret (question 19) refute. And the demonstration by which Philo shows this opinion of his seems to allude to those words of Plato, by which he introduces the supreme God, in the *Timaeus*, speaking to the lesser gods concerning the creation of living beings. See below, Annotation 93 of this book.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Origen's opinion, which Basilides and Cerinthus defended, is deservedly condemned by Catholics.

Annotation XVIII

"Let us make man." — Genesis 1:26

Whether God is corporeal.

Melito the Asian, Bishop of Sardis, in his book *περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ* — that is, *On God clothed with a body* — expounding the present passage, seems to assert that the image of God, to which man was made, is corporeal, just as God himself is corporeal, having human form, figure, and members. Which opinion Epiphanius reckons among the heresies of the Audiani, who are also called Anthropomorphites. For Theodoret writes thus about Melito, on Genesis question 20: "It must, however (as I said before), first be discussed where that 'to the image' resides — in the body, or in the soul. And first let us see what [arguments] those use who assert the former. Of whose number is Melito, who left writings in which he asserts that God is corporeal. For 'we call them the members of God,' they say, 'when we find "the eyes of God looking upon the earth,"⁵ and "his ears attentive to their prayers," and "God smelled the odor of sweetness,"⁶ and "the mouth of the Lord has spoken,"⁷ and "the arm of God," and hands, and feet, and fingers.⁸ From which they immediately infer that these things teach nothing other than the form of God." These things Theodoret reports about Melito according to the Latin translation of John Pico the Gaul. But since the same Theodoret, in the fourth book of *Heretical Fables*, disputing against the Audiani, the assertors of this madness, ascribes nothing of the sort to Melito, and since there is no approved writer who accuses him of this kind of error, I would never dare to believe that a man greatest in sanctity and erudition — whom Tertullian asserts was held by Christians as a prophet — fell into such madness; and especially since the aforesaid words of Theodoret stand far otherwise in the Greek copies than in the Latin translation. For what Pico translated as "of whose number is Melito, who left writings in which he asserts that God is corporeal," is read in the corrected Greek codices in this manner: Ὡν ἐστὶ καὶ Μελίτων συγγράμματα καταλέλοιπε, Περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ — that is, "Among which are the writings that Melito left, *Concerning what is called the attribution of a body to God.*" For indeed, as Eusebius and Jerome testify, Melito wrote a book to which he gave the title *περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ* — that is, *On God clothed with a body*, or *On the God to whom the divine Scripture attributes a body* — in which he most powerfully confuted the arguments of those who assert God to be corporeal, and who think the image of God, to which man was made, is corporeal; as also appears clearer than light from the following words of Theodoret, set down in the same 20th question:

◇ 5. **Right margin (a):** Psalm 33:16.

◇ 6. **Right margin (b):** Genesis 8:21.

◇ 7. **Right margin (c):** Isaiah 40:5.

◇ 8. **Right margin (d):** Isaiah 51:1.

[...continues on folio 535 (PDF p. 352): the following words of Theodoret (Annotatio XVIII).]

(printed folio 535 [PDF p. 352]. **Annot. XVIII–XXII** (Gen 1:26–29): Melito cleared of anthropomorphism; Philo's living stars; whether propagation in innocence would have been sexual (Aquinas: yes, without lust); and Augustine's retracted view that sin was needed for offspring.)

(folio 535, left column → right column)

Annotation XVIII (continued)

In the book of Theodoret printed at Cologne at the expense of the widow and heirs of John Stelsius in the year 1573, there is no word about Melito — although the translator is said to be John Pico, president of the inquisitorial courts of the Parisian Senate. For thus it is written in that place: "Certain overly simple people

say that the human body was made to the image of God, because they hear the divine voice saying, 'Open your eyes and see,' and 'Incline your ear and hear,' and 'The Lord smelled the odor of sweetness,' and that, 'The mouth of the Lord has spoken these things,' and, 'In his hand are the ends of the earth,' and the like. Wherein the stupid did not observe that the Lord God speaks to men in a human manner, accommodating his discourses to the weakness of the hearers," etc.

Annotation XIX

"Let us make man to [our] image," etc. — Genesis 1:26

Whether the stars are animate.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, on that "Let us make man to the image," etc., asserts that the stars are intelligent living beings. See below, Annotation 108.

Annotation XX

"To the image of God he created him." — Genesis 1:27

Whether, if Adam had not sinned, there would have been coitus.

Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, in the book *On the Creation of Man*, chapter 28, examining an opinion of this kind, says that, if the first parents had not sinned, the generation of offspring and the propagation of the human race would not have been by coitus, but by a certain most perfect manner of multiplication, by which the Angels are multiplied; for this generation, which comes about by intercourse, was introduced through sin. These are Gregory's words: "Although among the Angels, as has been said, there are no marriages, yet they exist in infinite thousands of hosts of Angels, as the prophet Daniel intimates in his visions. Therefore, in the same manner, if no excess of sin had drawn us away from that angelic dignity, marriages would in no way have been proved necessary for us for the multiplication of the human race; but by a motion of nature — whatever it be, most perfect indeed — by which the Angels are multiplied, the Creator's will would have multiplied the human race up to the number of the predestined." And after a few words about generation introduced through sin, he added: "That great David seems to me, having compassion on human misery, to bewail his nature in such words: 'That man, when he was in honor, did not understand'¹ — calling it 'honor' that he had been like to the holy Angels in conversation and in that most sublime manner of multiplication. Therefore he was compared to the senseless beasts, and made like to them. For truly he was made like to a beast, who took upon himself, in his own nature, this animal generation, on account of the fall of his conversation, which befell him from the conformation of matter." Subscribing to this opinion, **John Damascene**, in the fourth book of the *Orthodox Faith*, chapter 25,² put forth in writing these things: "Wherefore, lest the human race be exterminated and consumed by death, marriages were instituted, so that by the procreation of offspring the race of men might be preserved. But perhaps they will say: What then does this mean, 'male and female'? What this, 'Increase and multiply'?³ To which we shall say that this 'Increase and multiply' does not at all signify the multiplication [that comes] by the nuptial association. For God could have multiplied this race in another way too, if they had kept his commandment, and preserved it unbroken to the end; but God, knowing by his foreknowledge — which knows all things before they come to be — that they would be transgressors and to be condemned by death, anticipating [this], made male and female, and commanded [them] to be increased and multiplied." Thus Damascene: before whom Augustine wrote this very thing (on Genesis, ch. 1), Chrysostom, and Procopius (on Genesis, ch. 4); and after him Euthymius, on Psalm 50.

◇ 1. Left margin: Psalm 48:13.

◇ 2. Left margin: Damascene has the same in book 2, *On the Faith*, chapter 11.

◇ 3. Left margin: Genesis 1:28.

Weighing this opinion, **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 98, article 2, writes thus: "But this is not said reasonably: for the things which are natural to man are neither withdrawn from man nor given to him by [reason of] sin.⁴ Now it is manifest that, for man according to the animal life which he had even before sin (as was said above), it is natural to generate by coitus, just as for the other perfect animals; and the natural members, appointed for this use, declare this. And therefore it must not be said that the use of these natural members would not have existed before sin, any more than [that of] the other members. There are therefore two things to be considered in coitus, according to the present state: one, which is of nature, namely the union of male and female for generating — for in every generation an active and a passive power is required, and since in all [creatures] in which there is a distinction of sexes the active power is in the male, and the passive in the female, the order of nature requires that for generation male and female should come together by coitus. But the other thing that can be considered is a certain deformity of immoderate concupiscence, which would not have existed in the state of innocence,⁵ when the lower powers were entirely subject to reason. Whence Augustine says in the 14th book of *The City of God*: 'Far be it that we should suspect that offspring could not have been produced without the disease of lust: but those members would have been moved by the same nod of the will as the other members, and without ardor and enticing stimulus, with tranquillity of soul and of body.'" Read the following Annotation, together with Annotations 63 and 80 of this book.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** From man the things natural to him are not withdrawn on account of sin.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** In the state of innocence there would have been generation by the union of male and female, without the disease of lust.

Annotation XXI

"Increase and multiply." — Genesis 1:28

Whether the first parents would have had children if they had not sinned.

Augustine, in the first book *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 19, on these words says that the first parents would not have had children as men [by human generation] unless they had sinned. To which opinion he wrote a not-dissimilar one in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, where, expounding that "Whosoever shall put away his wife, save for the cause of fornication," etc.,⁶ he said that consanguinities and the bonds of blood and kinships came about from the sin and death of the first parents. Which opinion Guido, Bishop of Elne, in the book he wrote against heresies, numbers among the profane dogmas of the Armenians. But Augustine openly disapproves [it] in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapters 10 and 19; because, as he himself says in the 8th book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 10: "Men before sin could command their generative members for procreation, without the foul itch of pleasure; and there could have been in paradise honorable marriages, and an undefiled marriage-bed, without the ardor of lust and without the labor of childbearing."

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Matthew 5:32.

Annotation XXII

"Behold, I have given you every herb." — Genesis 1:29

Augustine →

[...continues on folio 536 (PDF p. 353): *Annotatio XXII.*]

(printed folio 536 [PDF p. 353], the last page of the first working batch. **Annot. XXII–XXVII** (*Gen 1:29–2:7*): retracted allegory of animal food; the LXX "sixth" vs Hebrew "seventh" day; whether the six days are literal; whether Jews sacrificed among gentiles; Giorgio's Neoplatonic soul-as-man; and the "breath of

life" (soul, or a grace?).)

(folio 536, left column → right column)

Annotation XXII (continued)

Augustine, in book 1 *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 20, says that the green herbs and fruit-bearing trees which, in the book of Genesis, are given as food to all birds, all serpents, and every kind of beast, are to be understood in an allegorical signification only.¹ He disapproves this same [view] in book 1 of the *Retractions*, chapter 10.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether herbs and trees are given as food to the animals. — and: St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXIII

"God completed his work on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether God completed his works on the sixth day.

The **Seventy interpreters** [Septuagint], as Jerome noted in the *Hebrew Traditions*, for what is read in the Hebrew truth, "God completed" (בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי), that is, "on the seventh day all his work," translated *ἡμέρα τῆ ἕκτῃ*, that is, "on the sixth day." And Philo and Theodoret cite and expound this passage in the same manner. But it does not much matter whether you say God completed his work on the sixth or on the seventh day: for what Moses said — that God completed [it] on the seventh day by *resting* — the Seventy said, that God completed [it] on the sixth day by *finishing*.

Annotation XXIV

"God completed his work on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether the six days of the world's creation are real days.

Philo, in the first book of the *Allegories of the Law*, expounding the same passage, says: "It is of rustic simplicity to think that the world was made in six days, or indeed in any fixed time at all, because the whole vicissitude of the world is [that] of days and nights, which the motion of the Sun, passing over and under the earth, necessarily produces. But the Sun is reckoned a part of heaven: so that it must be confessed that time is posterior to the world, seeing that it is an effect of the world. For the motion of heaven indicated the nature of time. Therefore, when you hear 'He completed the works on the sixth day,' you must not understand it of a number of some days, but of the perfection of the universe, which is signified by the perfect senary [six] number." Some catholic authors have followed this opinion of Philo: of whom, among the Latins, **Augustine** referred the enumeration of six days made by Moses not to a succession of time, but to the natural order of the works, which is attributed to days; or to the order of the revelation of the six works, which God revealed to the angels one after another. But **Procopius**, among the Greeks, said the number of days was assumed by Moses not for the sake of time, but for the sake of teaching, on account of the weakness of our understanding, which could not comprehend the order of created things in another way, because of their multitude. This dogma, therefore, although it ought by no means to be disapproved, is nevertheless not to be so rashly asserted that we should think Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and the other most learned Fathers — who taught the world was founded in the space of six days — thought rustically and unlearnedly: especially since Philo's aforesaid argumentation derogates nothing from their opinion. Dissolving which [argument], St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*,² says that, although before the construction of the firmament there was not that time which measures and follows the motion of heaven, yet there was a time which would measure another motion — namely that first motion, and the succession of conceptions and affections in the angelic minds, in which thoughts so numerous could not supervene except one before another and one after another; but "Before" and "After" are nothing else than distinctions of time.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** St. Thomas, part 1, question 66, article 4, reply to [objection] 3.

Annotation XXV

"God rested on the seventh day." — Genesis 2:2

Whether the Jews sacrificed in the lands of the gentiles.

Augustine, in book 1 *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 23, hands down that the Israelite people practiced sacrifices in the lands of the gentiles. Which, said indeed of the Paschal lamb, he says (in *Retractations* 1, chapter 10) is to be understood [in that sense], since the Jews could not sacrifice among the gentiles.³

◇ 3. **Right margin:** It was not permitted to the Jews to sacrifice among the Gentiles.

Annotation XXVI

"God formed man of the mud of the earth." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the soul alone is man.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in the first volume of the *Problems*, twists the exposition of this passage to the opinion of those who think that the soul alone is man, the body being the garment of the soul, and the soul itself created in heaven long before the body. For he writes thus, in Problem 26: "God formed man, dust, from the earth — that is, he clothed him with an earthy garment, namely the earthly body. For first God decreed to make man; then he created him in heaven; thirdly he formed his body, as a garment." And he confirms this same thing in Problem 27, where he says that man was wrapped about by God with a corporeal garment; and in Problem 159 of the same volume, when he says that man was clothed with dust in the field of Damascus. These things seem partly to allude to Origen's dogma of souls created before their bodies, partly to the tenet of those who deny that the soul is the form of the body.⁴ But both were condemned in the Council of Vienne by Clement V, as the title *On the Supreme Trinity*, at the beginning of the Clementines, is witness.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The soul is not created before the body of which it is the form.

Annotation XXVII

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

The breath breathed into Adam is the rational soul, as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and others hold.

Chrysostom, expounding this in homily 12, says that that breath is the substance of the rational soul, through which man was made not only a living animal but also partaker of reason. Which assertion Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, numbers among the heresies in chapter 99 of his *Catalogue* — no author of the assertion being named, however; and he says that that breath is not the soul itself, but the inspiration of the divine spirit — that is, the grace of the Holy Spirit infused into the soul of Adam, already created and already united to the body, such as [Christ] also gave to the apostles after the resurrection, or such as God bestows on all the just. With Philastrius agrees **Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria**, who, elucidating this very passage, says: "When it is said in Genesis that God breathed into the face of man the breath of life, that man might become a living soul, we do not call that breath the soul itself; for thus the soul would be unchangeable and would not sin, because it would be of the divine essence: but Moses called it the effusion of the Holy Spirit, placed at the very beginning [as an addition] to the human soul." St. Augustine, however, in the preface of the book *On Heresies* to Quodvultdeus, writes that Philastrius numbered among heresies many assertions which are not heresies.⁵ Of which number I would believe this to be one — in which he himself imprudently slipped, while [he condemned] the true and pious [teaching] of Chrysostom and of all the Catholic interpreters →

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Philastrius, in St. Augustine's judgment, numbered many things among heresies which are not heresies.

[...continues on folio 537 (PDF p. 354): the end of *Annotatio XXVII* (which he "condemned").]

(printed folio 537 [PDF p. 354], six annotations on Gen 2:7 and the image of God. **Annot. XXVII–XXXII:** the "breath of life" as the soul, not a grace; body and soul made together (retracted); Giorgio's superadded light; the soul created with the angels; the image lost by sin (retracted → deformed); and Philo's archetypal "man" as the divine idea.)

(folio 537, left column → right column)

Annotation XXVII (continued)

[Augustine] condemns the opinion. Likewise also, in the 15th [book] *The City of God*, chapter 24, he derides those who believe that the breath which God breathed into Adam's face is a certain grace conferred on Adam's soul, and not rather the soul itself. But as for what pertains to Cyril, St. Thomas, in the book which he wrote against the errors of the Greeks, chapter 27, says thus: "Cyril's exposition is against the exposition of Augustine, who posits the human soul by that breath. And [Cyril] shows that it does not follow on this account that [the soul] is of the divine substance; for it is a figurative expression, that [God] is said to have breathed not corporeally, but because he made a spirit — that is, a soul — out of nothing. And what is more, [Cyril's exposition] seems to be repugnant to the sayings of the Apostle, who in 1 Corinthians 15 says: 'The first man Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a quickening spirit';¹ but not first what is spiritual, rather what is animal — where he expressly says that that life of the soul is other than the life which is through the Holy Spirit. Whence that inspiration, by which it is said 'Man was made into a living soul,' cannot be understood of the grace of the Holy Spirit. Whence it must be said that Cyril's exposition cannot be literal, but only allegorical."

◇ 1. Left margin: 1 Corinthians 15[:45–46].

Annotation XXVIII

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the body was made before the soul.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis Allegorically*, chapter 8, teaches that the body of man was not founded before the creation of the soul, but together with the soul itself at one and the same time.² He disapproves this same [view] in book 1 of the *Retractions*, chapter 10.

◇ 2. Left margin: St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXIX

"He breathed into him the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether man was created first in the species than in the individual, as Francesco Giorgio held.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in volume 1, Problem 27, in explaining this passage, brings a hard and unwonted discourse about the creation and animation of man, asserting first that man was first created in the universal and specifically — that is, as specific or common: like a certain mass of masculine and feminine power, whence every male and female would receive life; but then, when he was wrapped about with a corporeal garment, then he was made a particular man; and that into this particular man the breath of life was breathed by God. In the second place, he affirms that that breath, which God breathed into man, is a certain light which shows God to man, and always exhorts him to good and dissuades him from evil, and provides him strength for working well: of which light, when the damned are deprived, they can neither know God nor work good. By which words indeed he intimates that that breath is not the substance of the rational soul, but rather a certain light superadded to the soul. Which error Alphonsus of Castro, in book 2

against heresies, under [the entry] "Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia," condemns.

Annotation XXX

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether the soul was created with the angels on the first day.

Augustine, in the seventh book *On Genesis to the Letter*, which he wrote upon this particle, chapter 24, seems to establish that the soul of the first man was created with the angels on the first day of the world's making, and then, on the sixth day, infused into the human body: which indeed is repugnant to the opinion of all the theologians. St. Thomas, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 90, article 4, shows that Augustine did not put this forth by asserting it, but left it to the judgment of the readers³ — which his own words also demonstrate, when he says: "Let them believe [it], provided, however, that no authority of the scriptures, or reason of truth, contradicts." An observation of this kind you have below, in Annotation 189 of book 1 of this [work].

◇ 3. **Right margin:** St. Augustine is excused by St. Thomas.

Annotation XXXI

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God].

Augustine, in the sixth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapters 27 and 28, treating this very passage, writes that Adam through sin lost the image of God, impressed in the spirit of the mind, according to which he was created. He retracts this same thing in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 24,⁴ saying that this opinion is not to be so taken as though none [of the image] remained in him; but that it remained so deformed that it had need of reformation. Read Annotation 49 of this book.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation XXXII

"He breathed into his face the breath of life." — Genesis 2:7

Whether man, formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul, is the man whom God created to his own image.

Philo, in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, in the exposition of that sentence, teaches that the first man — formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul — is not the man whom God created to his own image; because the man made to the image of God is the archetypal and intelligible man himself, or the very idea of man in the mind of God. Which words indeed seem, at first glance, to disprove that spiritual and divine image which all Catholic authors place in the mind of man, led by the authority of the divine voice saying: "Let us make man to our image and likeness."⁵ It is by no means to be thought that Philo, by these words, wished to strip the mind of man of the divine image, which above in the same work he had attributed to man; but it is credible that he brought these things forth not absolutely, but by comparison — having regard to the sensible man in relation to the archetypal man in the divine mind: in comparison with whom the sensible man scarcely has any image of God; for the archetypal and intelligible man has such an image and likeness of God that in a certain manner he is God himself. For that the archetype and the idea are nothing other than the divine essence, St. Thomas is witness,⁶ in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 15, article 1.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Genesis 1:26.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** The idea of man in the divine mind, according to St. Thomas's opinion, is the divine essence itself.

I should like also here to note another thing about the image of man, which Philo left written not far from the preface of the same book — namely, that the whole universe reflects the divine image more than man does, who is a part of the world.⁷ Which opinion seems foreign to the common consent of the theologians, who say that man surpasses the other corporeal creatures in this, that he alone was made to the image of God. But it is resolved if we say that the divine image is considered in two ways: either according to *extension and diffusion* — in which manner indeed the universe, more than man, represents the image of the divine goodness, because in its compass it embraces that whole multitude of creatures, of which Moses said →

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Whether the world is more made to the image of God than man, as Philo held. — and: The divine image is considered in two ways.

[...continues on folio 538 (PDF p. 355): the second way the divine image is considered, and the rest of *Annotatio XXXII.*]

(printed folio 538 [PDF p. 355]. **Annot. XXXII–XXXIV** (Gen 2:7–8): man as microcosm and truer image of God; Philo dissolving Paradise into allegory; Origen accused of denying an earthly Paradise; and Giorgio reviving that allegory (refuted), then Noviomagus's "Paradise = this world.")

(folio 538, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXII (continued)

[Moses] said: "God saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good."¹ Or [the divine image is considered] according to *intension and the gathering-together of perfection* — in which manner indeed man rather presents the image of the divine loftiness, both because he is capable of divine felicity, and because in him, as in a brief compendium and in a little world [a microcosm], all the wonders of the greater world are beheld.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Genesis 1:31.

At the end of the same book, and in the first book of the *Allegories of the Law*, [Philo] so treats the things which Moses wrote about Paradise that it appears he destroys the whole history of the truth, and places that garden, the plants, and the rest which are described in it, in allegory alone. Which error Origen, and very many others of ours (as we shall indicate below), followed.

Annotation XXXIII

"God had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis, is said to have subverted the whole history of Paradise which is narrated in this second chapter.² Methodius, in the dialogue whose title is *Aglaophon*, and Epiphanius, in the book *Anchoratus* and in the Epistle to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, charge him with having denied that Paradise is on the earth, and with having placed it in the third heaven — understanding by the trees the angelic powers, and by the rivers the waters which are above the back of the firmament. Some strive to show that Origen was not of this mind, from certain words written by him in the thirty-first homily on Numbers. These are they: "Adam, after sin, is thrust down into the dry land; for before, he was not in the dry land, but in the [good] earth — for Paradise is not in the dry land, but in the earth." Which words, how much they avail, let those weigh who wish. Read the six following Annotations.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Whether Paradise is on the earth.

Annotation XXXIV

"God had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Francesco Giorgio tries to prove by four arguments that there is no terrestrial Paradise.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio Veneto], in the first volume of the *Problems*, expounding this, called back into the light Origen's error about the allegorical Paradise — now extinguished a little before our age — and endeavored to make it persuasive with these arguments. **First**, that in the sacred letters it is nowhere found that Paradise, or that garden, was planted on the earth. **Secondly**, that Moses would say in vain that this garden was planted with material plants and trees on the earth after the sixth day, since he had before written that all the plants and trees of the whole earth were produced by God on the third day. **Thirdly (item)**, that God would in vain and with idle counsel have built a terrestrial garden for the first parents — one which would not be of use to them even immediately [because of] their sins, and which after Adam's sin would be cultivated by no one. **Finally**, he brought in this too: that Jerome, having considered these things, declared that Paradise was founded by God before he made heaven and earth — namely, to signify by these words that that Paradise described by Moses is not situated on this visible earth, but in that "land of the living," which was created before this visible world in the invisible world. These things Francis wrote in many places, but especially in the first volume of the *Problems*, where, from Problem 1 to Problem 48, he contends to destroy the whole history of Paradise with long windings of allegories — yet with no valid reason adduced for it.

For what he proposed in the first place — that it is by no means established from the sacred letters whether Paradise is on the earth — is most false.³ For Moses most clearly declares that Paradise was planted by God in a region of the Eastern land, which is called Eden. And that Eden is the proper name of a place appears from the fourth chapter of Genesis, where we read that Cain dwelt to the eastern region of Eden;⁴ and in Ezekiel chapter 27 it is had that Eden was near Charran [Haran], a region of Mesopotamia.⁵ But that which Moses writes — that the garden of delights was planted by God after the sixth day — by no means conflicts with what he reported before, namely that all the plants were brought forth on the third day.⁶ For it can be, as Augustine judges, that the plants which had been produced on the third day according to certain seminal reasons were, after the works of the six days, again produced and completed in act; or, according to Basil's and Chrysostom's opinion, it can be said that all the plants, together with the plants of Paradise, were founded at once on the third day, but that Moses, after the works of the six days, again by way of epilogue made mention of the production of the plants of Paradise.

◇ **3. Right margin:** The 1st argument of Fr. George is answered.

◇ **4. Right margin:** Genesis 4:16.

◇ **5. Right margin:** Ezekiel 27:23.

◇ **6. Right margin:** The 2nd argument of Francis is answered.

Which Paradise, even if it were inhabited by no one after sin, no one of sound mind would call superfluous.⁷ For just as (by Augustine's testimony) it must not be said that the immortality of the body was given to man in vain — which he was not going to preserve — so neither ought one to think that that Paradise was founded in vain, because human habitation is not there after sin. For although that place does not serve man for dwelling, yet it profits him for instruction: that he may recognize himself to have been cast out thence by the fault of the first parent, and that, through the things which are written to be in it corporeally, he may lift up his mind to the spiritual and invisible mysteries of the heavenly paradise. But as to that which, in the last place, he violently wrests from Jerome's words — namely, that Paradise was founded by God in that invisible world which preceded the constitution of this visible world⁸ — satisfaction has been made in Annotation 37, in which this opinion of Jerome has been most exactly discussed.

◇ **7. Right margin:** The 3rd argument is answered. — and: Paradise, though it does not profit man for dwelling, is yet profitable for instruction.

◇ **8. Right margin:** The 4th argument of Francis is answered.

John Noviomagus, in the scholia published by him on Bede's book *On the Nature of Things*, himself also thinks that the whole passage about Paradise is to be understood enigmatically and allegorically — yet in a sense different from Origen and those who followed Origen's opinion. For they think Paradise to be nothing other than *this world*:⁹ for just as the Gentiles call the world a dwelling and a certain temple of the Gods, from its inexplicable beauty and its work of highest veneration, so [Noviomagus] supposes that in the sacred Letters this world is to be understood [as] the "place of pleasure," than whose absolute elegance nothing more adorned can be conceived — in which adornment the mind of man, admiring the variety of nature, cannot be sated with delight. For he interprets that fountain, from which the four rivers flow, as the Ocean, whence (as pleased Homer too) all rivers and fountains take the force and beginning of their course. He thinks also that it cannot be that the Ganges, the Nile, and the Euphrates should [flow], in regions so far apart as those of Armenia, India, and Ethiopia, from one →

◇ 9. **Right margin:** John Noviomagus thinks that Paradise is this world.

[...continues on folio 539 (PDF p. 356): the rest of *Annotatio XXXIV* (Noviomagus on the four rivers).]

(printed folio 539 [PDF p. 356]. **Annot. XXXIV–XXXVII** (Gen 2:8): "Paradise = this world" refuted (the four rivers, the guarding Cherub); Ambrose defended as holding a twofold Paradise, earthly and heavenly; Kissamos's three deviations on Paradise (all excused); and Jerome on the Hebrew "Mikedem.")

(folio 539, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXIV (continued)

[the Ganges, Nile, and Euphrates cannot proceed] from one fountain of Paradise, unless we accept that Paradise is the globe of the earth, and the fountain the sea — which, by hidden subterranean channels, poured out far and wide, supplies moisture to all the rivers. But this too is far from the truth.¹ For if Paradise is the globe of the earth, how does Moses say that Paradise was planted in the region of the East? How were the first parents expelled from it? How does the Cherub keep watch before its doors, lest the now-ejected parents return again into Paradise? Nor indeed ought it to seem a wonder to anyone if Moses writes that those rivers flow from one fountain: for thus, from the beginning of the nascent world, God willed them to flow from one and the same fountain. But after, in the universal Flood, the fountains of the abyss were burst open, it is credible that the places of the fountains and the beginnings of the rivers were so changed that one took the beginning of its course from the East, another from the South.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** John Noviomagus, who thought Paradise to be this world, is refuted. — and: To be read diligently.

Annotation XXXV

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise.

Ambrose, in the book *On Paradise* — which he consumed wholly in an allegorical explanation of Paradise — seems to assert two things foreign to the common consensus of the theologians. **First**, that Paradise is not on the earth, but in the third heaven² (which error is attributed to Origen). For since in the preface of the book he proposes to investigate what and of what kind Paradise is, he shows the very great difficulty of this inquiry chiefly from this: that Paul, caught up into this Paradise, denies that he can remember whether he saw it in the body or outside the body,³ adding also that he heard and saw in it things which it is not permitted to utter. And — lest you think Ambrose holds that Paul was caught up not into the heavenly but into the terrestrial paradise — the same [Ambrose], in the exposition of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, openly affirms that the Apostle was taken up to the heavens into the heavenly Paradise of God the Father. **The**

second is that, in imitation of Philo, he seems to understand Paradise, and whatever is written in it, according to allegory alone, the historical sense being rejected:⁴ that is, by Paradise, the soul; by man, the mind; by woman, sense; by the serpent, delight; by the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, wisdom; and by the other trees, the virtues implanted in the soul. Which assertion he seems to express in plainer words in the epistle to Sabinus (which he also wished to be the final resolution of this matter), writing thus: "Having read the *Hexaemeron*, you thought fit to inquire whether I had suppressed Paradise, and that I should indicate what opinion I held of it — and that you wished studiously to learn this. But I, long ago (being no longer a fresh priest), wrote about it; and I have found that the opinions of very many about it are diverse. For Josephus, being a Historian, says [it is] a place of the earth filled with very many trees and shrubs, watered also by a river which is divided into four streams; others [say] otherwise. Yet all agree in Paradise, and in the tree of life rooted [there], and the tree of knowledge which discerns good and evil; and the other trees also, full of vigor, breathing full of vivification, and rational — from which it is gathered that Paradise itself cannot seem earthly, [nor to be] in any soil, but in our principal part [the soul's ruling faculty], which is animated and vivified by the soul with virtues and by the infusion of the spirit of God." These are Ambrose's words. From which, however, I cannot be led to believe that he assented either to Philo or to Origen in this part — especially since, in the exposition of the sixth chapter of the first [Epistle] to the Corinthians, he constantly affirms that **Paradise is twofold**,⁵ one earthly, in which Adam was placed, the other heavenly, into which Paul was caught up. For these are his words in that place: "There is both a lower Jerusalem and a higher — which the Apostle calls our mother; there is both a lower Paradise, in which man was placed [and] received the commandment, both that he should work there and that he should keep it; and there is that heavenly one, into which the Apostle, caught up, heard secret words."

◇ **2. Left margin:** It is attributed to Origen that he held Paradise to be in the third heaven.

◇ **3. Left margin:** 2 Corinthians 12:3.

◇ **4. Left margin:** What is written about Paradise, Philo understands according to allegory alone.

◇ **5. Right margin:** Paradise is twofold.

Annotation XXXVI

"And the Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether Paradise, after Adam's fall, entirely ceased to exist.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, in the *Annotations on the Pentateuch*, while he pursues the exposition of this passage most profusely, seems to deviate in three ways from the rule of right faith. For he asserted, first, that that paradise, in which the first parents were created, began little by little to be abolished, with all its adornment, after Adam's sin; then, the Flood succeeding, [it was] so overturned by the inundation of the waters and dissipated by the most rapid whirlpools that it entirely ceased to be — no vestige of the divine place now remaining, because of the crimes of men. **Secondly**, he asserted that Enoch and Elijah were not translated into that paradise,⁶ since it was, immediately from Adam's fall, destitute of cultivation and habitation, and finally, after the Flood, utterly emptied. **Thirdly**, he affirms that the fault for which the first parent was cast out of paradise brought upon man not the death of the body, but only of the soul.⁷ Of these, the first assertion is repugnant to the common consensus of all the Fathers. The second not only contradicts the Fathers, but divine scripture also: which, in the book of Ecclesiasticus, says, "Enoch pleased God, and was translated into Paradise, that he might give wisdom [repentance] to the nations";⁸ nor is it right to understand this testimony of the heavenly Paradise, since it does not fit that anyone should descend thence to preach penance. The third opposes not only Augustine and very many other Fathers, but also the authority of the African Council, which condemned this position, against Pelagius its author, as appears below in Annotation 52. Yet this man — well-deserving in the studies of the sacred letters — can be kindly excused, from the words which he immediately added under these positions, writing in this manner: "These things I say, not being ignorant that the gravest and most holy men hold otherwise; which, if they are too little

Christian, I retract, and readily refute." Ambrose, Archbishop of Compsa [Catharinus], also noted these things before me, in his commentaries on the book of Genesis.

- ◇ 6. **Right margin:** Whether Enoch and Elijah are in the terrestrial Paradise.
- ◇ 7. **Right margin:** Whether Adam's sin brought bodily death.
- ◇ 8. **Right margin:** Ecclesiasticus 44:16. — *A later editorial note added in the margin here reads:* "See Benedict Pererius, book 7, Commentary on Genesis 9.7, where he refutes Sixtus, who teaches it to be a dogma of faith that Enoch is in the terrestrial Paradise."

Annotation XXXVII

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the terrestrial Paradise was created before the world.

Jerome, at almost the beginning of the *Hebrew Traditions*, annotating this, rejects the Seventy interpreters, who, for that which Moses said מִקְדֵּם *Mikedem* — and our Vulgate edition →

[...continues on folio 540 (PDF p. 357): Jerome on "Mikedem" (from the beginning / in the East).]

(printed folio 540 [PDF p. 357]. **Annot. XXXVII–XL** (Gen 2:8): the Hebrew *Mikedem* ("from the beginning" vs "in the East" — Jerome defended); Paradise raised to the Moon's sphere (Aquinas: only a figure); Tertullian's souls held in the underworld till Judgment; and Augustine on the spiritual (not corporeal) places and pains of souls.)

(folio 540, left column → right column)

Annotation XXXVII (continued)

[our Vulgate edition] has "from the beginning" (*A principio*), [the Seventy] translated Κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολάς, that is, "toward the East"; and [Jerome], following the version of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion — of whom the first translated ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, that is, "from the outset"; the second ἐκ πρώτης, that is, "from the beginning"; the third ἐν πρώτοις, that is, "among the first" — infers from their consensus a conclusion of this kind: "From which it is most manifestly proved that, before God made heaven and earth, he had beforehand founded Paradise — as it is also read in the Hebrew: 'And God had planted a paradise in Eden from the beginning.'" This inference **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, disapproving in the Annotations on Genesis, says that Jerome falsely deduced, from this word מִקְדֵּם *Mikedem*, that Paradise was made before heaven and earth: because *Mikedem* in this place signifies not time but place, as is proved from another similar sentence below, chapter 3, where it is had [in Hebrew], that is, "And he placed cherubim at the eastern part of the garden of Eden." I do not think Jerome was so stupid as to have believed that Paradise was founded before all creation of heaven and earth; for human reason cannot hold this — that Paradise, a local and earthly place, indeed an adornment of the earth, existed before the earth. But I think that by his words he wished to signify that, before God perfected heaven and earth by distinguishing and adorning them, he planted Paradise on the third day. **Alcuin**, however, in the book of Questions on Genesis, judges that Jerome's opinion is to be understood just as his words sound. Moreover **Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons**, set down the same assertion, in the same words of Jerome, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis, chapter 2.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio], in volume 1, Problem 31, supposes that Jerome placed Paradise before the world for this reason: that, according to bare allegory, he believed Paradise to be nothing other than the happy state of the rational creatures, which God created before this visible world. But Jerome himself openly protests, in the tenth chapter of the commentaries on Daniel, saying thus: "Let the ravings of those be silent, who — following shadows and images in the truth — endeavor to overthrow the truth itself,

so that they think Paradise, and the rivers, and the trees must be undermined by the laws of allegory."

Annotation XXXVIII

"God had planted a Paradise in Eden." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the earthly Paradise reaches up to the orb of the Moon, as Bede held.

Bede the Priest, when he took up this passage to explain, said that Paradise is a place situated in a higher part of the earth, and raised up from the plain of the earth so far that it touches the Lunar globe. Following his opinion, the Master of the *Scholastic History* [Peter Comestor], in book 1, chapter 13, says: "Paradise is a most pleasant place, secluded from our habitable zone by a long tract of land and sea, so elevated that it reaches up to the Lunar globe; whence the waters of the Flood did not reach thither." **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 102, article 1, reply to [objection] 1, thinks this opinion false if it be understood of a loftiness of place — which is entirely uninhabitable for human nature; but true, if we understand there to be there a perpetual pleasantness and likeness of temperateness, such as is the temperateness in that Lunar region, removed from all the intemperance of this murky air.

Annotation XXXIX

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Tertullian held that all souls are in the underworld until the day of judgment.

Tertullian, in the book *On Paradise*, published by him for the exposition of the present chapter, asserts that all the souls of the deceased — both good and bad — are sequestered in the underworld until the day of judgment. See Annotation 345 of the sixth book.

Annotation XL

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the places and punishments of souls after this life are only spiritual, as St. Augustine seems to hold.

Augustine, in the 12th book *On Genesis to the Letter*, where he disputes about Paradise, chapter 22, says that the places in which souls, stripped of their bodies, are affected, whether well or ill, are not corporeal but spiritual; which — together with various likenesses of corporeal things, both glad and sad — are represented to the souls of the deceased, not otherwise than [they are] to those to whom, either set in sleep or withdrawn from the senses, now grave terrors and torments, now glad and long-desired things, are exhibited. He seems to confirm this same thing in the 21st book *The City of God*, chapter 10, where he intimates that the fire of hell, by which that rich man was tormented, is spiritual, in these words: "I would indeed say that spirits will burn thus, without any body of their own, as that rich man was burning in the underworld when he said, 'I am tormented in this flame'¹ — did I not see that it can be fittingly answered that that flame was of such a kind as [were] the eyes which he lifted up when he saw Lazarus; of such a kind the tongue, on which he desired a little moisture to be poured; of such a kind the finger of Lazarus, from whom he asked this to be done for him — where, however, the souls were without bodies. So then, both that incorporeal flame with which he burned, and that little drop which he begged, are such as are also the visions of sleepers, or of those beholding incorporeal things in ecstasy, which yet have likenesses of bodies. For man himself, too, when he is in such visions with the spirit, not the body, nevertheless then sees himself so like to his own body that he cannot at all distinguish [it]." Thus Augustine — to whom the consensus of all the recent Theologians seems repugnant: who, following the opinion of St. Gregory (explained in his fourth Dialogue), establish that the infernal places are corporeal, in which the souls suffer not imaginary and similitudinary punishments, but true ones — namely corporeal, and truly burning fires.

◇ 1. Right margin: Luke 16:23–24.

Accordingly, **St. Thomas**, in the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 44, weighing that former opinion from book 12 on Genesis, writes thus: "Augustine's saying can be taken in this way: that that place, to which souls are borne, is said to be non-corporeal to this extent — that the soul does not exist in it corporeally, namely in the manner in which bodies exist in a place, but in another, spiritual manner, as the angels are in a place; or it must be said that Augustine speaks by way of opinion, and not by way of determination, as he frequently does in those books." **Nicholas Trivet**, in the scholia which he published on the books *On the City of God*, annotating the latter passage cited from the same books, says that Augustine did not bring forth those words to assert that the fire →

[...continues on folio 541 (PDF p. 358): whether the fire [of hell] is spiritual — the rest of Annotatio XL.]

(printed folio 541 [PDF p. 358]. **Annot. XL–XLIII** (Gen 2:8–17): Augustine really held hell-fire corporeal (Trivet); whether Moses and Paul saw God's essence (yes, with the mind); whether the underworld is beneath the earth (Augustine's retracted doubt: yes); and Philo's death-of-the-soul-only reading (refuted).)

(folio 541, left column → right column)

Annotation XL (continued)

[Nicholas Trivet says that Augustine did not bring forth those words to assert] that the fire of hell is incorporeal — which through that whole chapter he had taught to be corporeal — but to show that his own assertion about a corporeal fire could not be confirmed by the example of the rich man burning in the flame, since it would easily be eluded by one who should answer that those flames were of such a kind as were the eyes and the tongue of the rich man suffering without his [own] body. See the observations pertaining to this below, in Annotations 42, 93, 141, and 227 of this book.

Annotation XLI

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether Moses and Paul saw the very essence of God with the mind, but not with the eyes of the body.

Augustine, in the twelfth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, where he treats of Paradise, when he discourses (in chapters 27 and 28 of the same book) about those who saw God, wrote that Moses and Paul saw God not in any likeness or image of a corporeal creature, but in that essence and nature of the subject by which God *is* [as he is in himself], as far as a man is able to grasp it, withdrawn from all sense of the body; and he confirms this same thing in the book (or epistle) *On Seeing God*, to Paulina, chapters 12 and 13. This opinion the same Augustine seemed to some to have disapproved, in book 2 *On the Trinity*, chapters 17 and 18, where he reckons those to be foolish who believe that God was seen by mortals in his [own] substance. **James, Bishop of Christopolis**, who in the preface of his explanation on the Psalms noted a contradiction of this kind, settled it by bringing a distinction of a twofold vision:¹ namely, [vision] *a priori* — that is, through the light of glory, by which the blessed see God in the fatherland — and [vision] *a posteriori* — that is, from an ascent from creatures up to the divine essence: as if someone, in a circle, should arrive at the vision of the center (invisible by its own nature) through the vision of the lines going out from the center to the circumference of the circle. In which way indeed he says that Augustine thought, in the epistle to Paulina and in the 12th book on Genesis, that the divine essence was beheld by Moses and Paul — but not *a priori*, or seen through the light of glory, as the same [Augustine] left written in the second book *On the Trinity*. But if anyone will more accurately inspect both passages of Augustine in their author, he will confess that no reconciliation is needed. For what he had taught to be attributed to Moses and Paul — that with the eye of the mind they for an hour beheld that which is God — this he denied could be done with corporeal eyes, concluding thus in book 2 *On*

the Trinity, chapter 18: "For that very nature, or substance, or by whatever other name that very thing which God is must be called — whatever it is — cannot be seen corporeally."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** The vision of God, in the judgment of James of Christopolis, is twofold.

Annotation XLII

"The Lord had planted a Paradise." — Genesis 2:8

Whether the place of the underworld is under the earth.

Augustine, in the twelfth book *On Genesis to the Letter*, in which he inquires about Paradise, chapter 33, seems to hold that the underworld [*infern*] is not under the earth, when he proposes a question about these things in this manner: "Whence, however, [it is that] the underworld is said to be under the earth — if it is not under the earth — is rightly asked." Answering which question, in the following chapter 34, he says that the underworld is said and believed to be under the earth for a twofold reason: either because, just as a place under the earth is assigned to dead flesh, so the likeness of a subterranean place is represented to the soul dead through the sin of the flesh; or because, just as in corporeal things those are called "lower" which are heavier, so in spiritual things those are called "lower" which are sadder. Whence also, among the Greeks, the name ᾠδης [*Hades*], by which the underworld is called, took its origin from the fact that it has nothing sweet. Retracting which words, Augustine, in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 24, speaks thus:² "About the underworld, I seem to myself rather to have had to teach that they are under the earth, than to give a reason why they are believed or said to be under the earth — as though it were not so." See above, Annotation 40.

◇ 2. **Right margin:** Augustine retracted himself. — and: Hell is under the earth.

Annotation XLIII

"In whatever day you eat of it, you shall die the death." — Genesis 2:17

Whether God threatened the first man with bodily death, or rather only the death of the soul.

Philo the Jew, at the end of the second book of the *Allegories of the Law*, asserts that God, in the proposed words, did not threaten the first parent with the death of the body, but only with the death of the soul.³ For he writes in this manner: "God says, 'In whatever day you shall eat of it, you shall die the death.' But after eating they not only do not die, but even beget children, and become to others authors of living. What, then, must be said? That there is a twofold death: one proper to man, the other to the soul. The death of man is the separation of the soul from the body; but the death of the soul is the corruption of virtue and the assumption of vice. And therefore, not content to say 'about to die,' he says, 'By death you shall die' — indicating not this common [death], but that eternal one which by excellence is called death, which is [death] as often as the soul is buried in the affections and in all vices. When, therefore, he says, 'By death you shall die,' it must be observed that a *penal* death, not a natural one, is signified. Natural [death], moreover, is that by which the soul is separated from the body; but *penal*, when the soul dies out of the life of virtue."

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Philo thinks God threatened only the death of the soul.

Eucherius, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis, following Philo's opinion, expounds this passage similarly,⁴ saying: "He speaks, therefore, of the death of the soul, not of the body — because they did not die at that time when they ate. Therefore this death which God now threatened, we must not take [as] that by which the flesh is separated from the soul, but this, by which it [the soul] is alienated from God, who is its life — as if he should say, 'On the day you forsake me by disobedience, I will forsake you by justice.' For just as the body lives from the soul, so the soul, that it may live blessedly, lives from God; therefore the soul forsaken by God is rightly called dead." **Augustine**, refuting this opinion in the 13th book *The City of God*, chapter 12, speaks thus:⁵ "When, therefore, it is asked with what death God threatened the first men, if they should transgress the commandment received from him and not keep obedience — whether [the death]

of the soul, or of the body, or of the whole man, or that which is called the second [death] — it must be answered: *all*. For the first consists of two, but the second is whole, [made] of all. For just as the whole earth [consists] of many lands, and the whole Church consists of many churches, so the whole death [consists] of all — since the first consists of two: one of the soul, the other of the body; so that the first death is [the death] of the whole man, when the soul, without God [and] without body, pays penalties for a time; but the second [is that] where the soul, without God, with the body, shall pay eternal penalties. When, therefore, God said to that first man, whom he had established in Paradise, concerning the forbidden food, 'In whatever day you eat of it, you shall die the death,' [he threatened] not only the prior part of the first death, where the soul is deprived [of God] →

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Eucherius approves Philo's opinion.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** St. Augustine refutes Philo's opinion.

[...continues on folio 542 (PDF p. 359): the rest of Augustine's refutation (Annotatio XLIII).]

(printed folio 542 [PDF p. 359]. **Annot. XLIII–XLVII** (Gen 2:17–21): "you shall die the death" = every death; abortion of a formless embryo (still gravely sinful); Giorgio's androgynous Adam (refuted); Chrysostom's literal reading of Adam's rib; and Cajetan reading the rib as parable.)

(folio 542, left column → right column)

Annotation XLIII (continued)

[that threat comprehended] not only the prior part of the first death, where the soul is deprived of God, nor only the posterior, where the body is deprived of the soul, nor only that whole first [death], where the soul, separated both from God and from the body, is punished: but whatever of death there is, up to the very last — which is called the second, and than which there is none later — that threat comprehended [it all].

Annotation XLIV

"Let us make him a help like unto himself." — Genesis 2:18

For what cause abortion is a grave sin, even if the embryo was not [yet] animated.

Procopius of Gaza, in the exposition of this saying, has these things: "Wherefore he who is the cause or author that a formless embryo is cast out by abortion, according to the divine law incurs no penalties, nor is affected with punishment; because an imperfect embryo is not yet numbered among men." Which words are to be understood not of all penalties and punishments simply, but only of those with which homicides are wont to be punished:¹ because the procured abortion of an unformed birth is not homicide. But those who procure the poisons of sterility and cast out foetuses not yet animated, Augustine affirms to sin most gravely (book 1 *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, chapter 15, and Sermon *On the Season* 244).

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Exodus 21:22.

Annotation XLV

"For Adam there was not found a helper like unto him." — Genesis 2:20

Whether Adam was created androgynous, as Francesco Giorgio thinks.

Francis George [Francesco Giorgio], in the first volume of the *Problems*, so explains this passage that he asserts man was, from the beginning, created androgynous — that is, a man in whom two bodies, namely of male and female, were joined around the back.² For he writes thus, in Problem 29: "Man was, from the beginning, twofold [*geminus*] — that is, male and female together — created; and, as Plato teaches, male and

female were joined in him by the back, and afterward cut, so that they might be joined face to face for procreating offspring. And in this Plato was taught by the most upright philosopher Moses — which Scripture also teaches, where it is had that, the side or rib of the protoplast being cut, the woman was formed; for צלע (*tsela*) signifies both, namely rib and side. The section therefore being made, the woman was the help of the man, namely as one standing face to face, as the Hebrew truth has it — for which the common edition [Vulgate] has 'like unto himself.'" **St. Augustine** refutes this opinion, in the third book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 22, saying:³ "Again, lest in man both sexes should be thought to be — as in those whom they call Androgynes — he subjoined in the plural, 'Male and female he created *them*.'" **Strabo [Walafrid]**, agreeing with Augustine, rejects this same opinion among the condemned fables of the Jews, in these words: "'Male and female he created them' — not because he first created and established Adam himself in both sexes, as the stupid Jews fable, but because he distinguished the human race by both sexes, and willed it to subsist in a twofold person."

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Genesis 1:21 [i.e. 1:27].

◇ 3. **Left margin:** St. Augustine refutes that Jewish opinion which Francesco Giorgio approved. — with: Genesis 1[:27].

Annotation XLVI

"The Lord sent a deep sleep upon Adam." — Genesis 2:21

Whether Eve was formed from Adam's rib.

Chrysostom, in homily 15 on Genesis, illustrating this sentence by his exposition, brought forth these words: "'And he took,' he says, 'one of his ribs' — do not take in a human manner the things that are said, but consider that these gross words are suited to human weakness; for unless Scripture had used these words, how could we have learned such hidden mysteries? Let us not, therefore, be addicted to the words only, but let us think all things about God as is fitting; since, when it is said 'He took,' [it] and all such things are said on account of our weakness." From these words a certain **Spaniard** endeavored to bring aid to Thomas Cajetan — who (as we shall say presently) opined that the formation of Eve from Adam's rib is to be understood not according to the truth of history, but as the narration of a figurative parable — which opinion the Spaniard thinks was expressed by Chrysostom, many ages before Cajetan, in the aforesaid words. But how far this man strays not only from the truth, but from Chrysostom's mind, Chrysostom himself shows a little before, when he says: "He who is the wise and powerful Fashioner of our nature, being about to take away one of his ribs — lest, by feeling pain, [Adam] should afterward become hostile to the woman formed from him, being mindful of the pain — for this reason, sending an ecstasy, oppressed him with so deep a sleep that, as if seized by a certain heaviness, he took no perception of the thing that was being done; and he filled up flesh in place of it, lest, the sleep being shaken off, he should perceive from the emptiness what had been done. And so, that he might afflict him with sadness neither in the taking-away nor on account of the removal, he so dispensed both, that he both took it away without his torment, and, that place being filled up whence he had taken it, did not allow him to perceive the sense of what had been done." These things Chrysostom [says], manifestly demonstrating that he by no means understood by metaphor and parable those things in which he judged the danger of the sense of true pain, true torment, and true sadness to be imminent. But as for his warning — that Moses, speaking of the formation, must not be understood in a human and gross manner — he said this not to overthrow the truth of history, but to confute the madness of the **Anthropomorphites** and the **Arians**. Of these, the former thought God to be endowed with a body,⁴ and to have fashioned man from mud with fleshly hands and corporeal operation and motion, after the manner of a potter or a surgeon, and the woman from the man's rib. But the **Arians**, taking a handle for cavilling from these words, "And the Lord God sent [a deep sleep]," contended that the Father alone, without the Son, formed the man, and from the man the woman;⁵ because they said that in the divine Scriptures the Father alone is called "God" and "Lord," but the Son, as being less than the Father, is called only "God," not "Lord." Confuting both, therefore, Chrysostom warns [us] not to take these words either in a human and gross

manner with the Anthropomorphites, or, with the Arians, to place a distinction between "God" and "Lord": because, he says, of both [Father and Son] there is one essence, and Scripture uses those names indiscriminately. Look at the following Annotation.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The Anthropomorphites thought God to be endowed with a body.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** The Arians contended that the Father, without the Son, formed the man, and from the man the woman.

Annotation XLVII

"God sent a deep sleep upon Adam." — Genesis 2:21

Cajetan denies that a rib was truly taken from Adam.

Thomas Cajetan, in his commentaries on Genesis, when in narrating he had come to this point, wrote that both the sleep of Adam and the production of the woman from Adam's rib are to be taken not according to history, and as the letter itself sounds, but according to a *mystery* — not of allegory, but of *parable*. For if it be understood according to the letter, that a rib was truly taken from Adam, one of two absurdities will follow: either that Adam was a monster before the rib was taken away, or →

[...continues on folio 543 (PDF p. 360): the second absurdity, and Sixtus's reply to Cajetan (Annotatio XLVII).]

(printed folio 543 [PDF p. 360]. **Annot. XLVII–L** (Gen 2:21–3:15): *Cajetan's rib-as-parable branded heretical (Adam neither maimed nor a monster — Hugh of St. Victor, Aquinas); Chrysostom seeming to forbid all oaths; Origen on losing God's image (image vs likeness distinguished); and Augustine's seemingly-Pelagian "sins harm only their own nature."*)

(folio 543, left column → right column)

Annotation XLVII (continued)

[either that Adam was a monster before the rib was taken away,] or that he was maimed after the rib was taken from him. Both of which are most absurd: because either that rib was superfluous to the man, or necessary. If superfluous, then the man was monstrous; if necessary, then, it being taken away, the man was rendered maimed. **Alfonso de Castro**, in the second book *Against Heresies*, and **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, **Archbishop of Compsa**, in the commentaries on Genesis and in the second book of the *Annotations against Cajetan*, assail this position¹ as a novelty unheard-of by Catholics, and heretical, and one which subverts the very foundations of our faith: because, if the truth of the present history is destroyed, it must needs be that there falls that great sacrament which Paul said is in Christ and in the Church — that is, that just as Eve was built up from the bones and flesh of Adam, so the Church [is built] from the bones and flesh of Christ. But if you destroy the first thing, which was in the letter, you overthrow also that which is contained under it. Thus they.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Alfonso de Castro and Ambrose of Compsa [Catharinus] judge Cajetan's opinion to be heretical.

But **Hugh of St. Victor**, dissolving this very argument of Cajetan's — which of old was used by those who, long before Cajetan, had scattered the seeds of this error — wrote thus in the book of *Annotations on Genesis*:² "But as to what certain persons ask — whether Adam previously had more ribs in that side from which that rib was taken (because if so, then Adam had it as superfluous; but if not more, [but] only as many as he had in the other side, then he was diminished [by its loss]) — [the question] is frivolous: for neither are the teeth of boys, which are afterward changed, called superfluous, nor are they themselves, although they do not yet have the [full] increase of nature, judged to be diminished." Thus far Hugh. Subscribing to whom, **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the *Summa*, question 92, article 3, says that that rib was of the perfection of Adam³ — not as he was a certain individual, but as he was the *principle of the species*: just as seed is of the

perfection of the one generating, and yet is separated, for the procreation of children, by natural operation. Read the preceding annotation.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Hugh of St. Victor answers the argument which Cajetan earlier employed.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** The rib from which Eve was formed was of Adam's perfection, as he was the principle of the species.

Annotation XLVIII

"And they shall be two in one flesh." — Genesis 2:24

Whether it is lawful for Christians to swear.

Chrysostom, in the homily on Genesis, after the exposition of this passage, exhorting his hearers at the end of the sermon to the flight from oaths, seems to take away from Christians all faculty of swearing⁴ — even in just and necessary causes. For he writes thus: "Let him also who hears the sentence of Christ flee oaths in all ways: [Christ] who says, 'It was said to the ancients, THOU SHALT NOT FORSWEAR THYSELF. But I say to you, [thou shalt] not swear at all.' Therefore let no one say, 'I swear in a just matter' — for it is lawful to swear neither in a just matter nor in an unjust one." See Annotation 26 of the sixth book.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Matthew 5:34.

Annotation XLIX

"And when they knew themselves to be naked." — Genesis 3:7

Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God].

Origen, in the *Tomes* on the third chapter of Genesis, weighing these words, left it written that man, by sinning, lost the image of God according to which he had been created. This assertion Epiphanius, in the epistle to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, reckons among the chief errors of Origen. Yet it must be known that the name "image of God" in the sacred letters is taken in two ways,⁵ that is, according to *substance* and according to *likeness*. Now the image of God according to substance — as Eucherius says, in the first book of the commentaries on Genesis — is nothing other than the mind naturally conferred by God upon every human soul, of which privilege the other animals are devoid. But the image of God according to likeness is the conformity of a just and holy soul with God, procured from divine grace and the zeal of holy actions: concerning which St. Ambrose, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Colossians, expounding that [saying] of the Apostle — "Putting on the new man, who is renewed according to the image of him who created him"⁶ — speaks thus: "This image is to be understood in good conversation [and] life, as the first epistle to the Corinthians says: 'As we have borne the image of him who is of the earth, so let us also bear the image of him who is of heaven.'⁷ He, therefore, is the creator of man, whose image he commands us to bear in sanctity and good works." Thus Ambrose.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** The name "image of God" in Scripture is taken in two ways.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Colossians 3:10.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 15:49.

Since, therefore, the name "image" signifies these two things: if Origen understood "image" according to the first signification, he plainly erred, and Epiphanius accused him not undeservedly. For the natural [endowments], after the fall, remained entire — even in the demons — as to substance,⁸ as the great Dionysius attests. But he thought piously and rightly, if he used the name "image" in the second signification, that is, for the *original justice* lost by man in sinning. And that Origen had this [latter] sense, the third book of the *Peri Archon* easily persuades — in whose sixth chapter he himself wrote these things about the image of God, as still remaining in man: "Moses, narrating before all things the first condition of man, says, 'And God said, Let us make man to our image and likeness';⁹ then afterward he adds, 'And God made man to the image of God.' This, therefore — that he said, 'To the image of God he made him,' and was silent about the

likeness — indicates nothing other than that [man] received the *dignity of the image* in the first condition. But the perfection of the *likeness* was reserved for the consummation: namely, that he himself should procure it for himself by his own industry [and] zeal, from the imitation of God — since, the possibility of perfection being divinely given to him through the dignity of the image, he himself should at last, at the end, through the completion of works, consummate for himself the perfect likeness." From which words it is manifestly gathered that the image of God, received in the first condition, *remains* in man:¹⁰ because [Origen] shows the likeness of God — which the soul receives in the consummation, that is, in beatitude — to be nothing other than the absolute and consummate perfection of the image, or of the dignity received through the image. See what St. Augustine retracted concerning this opinion above, in Annotation 31.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** The natural [endowments], as to substance, remained entire even in the demons.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Genesis 1:26.

◇ 10. **Right margin:** The image of God, received in the first condition, remains in man.

Annotation L

"I will put enmities between thee and the woman," etc. — Genesis 3:15

No one's nature is harmed by another's sins.

Augustine, in the second book *On Genesis [against the Manichaeans]* [interpreted] allegorically, chapter 29, elucidating the sense of this passage, says: "Sins harm no one's nature but their own." Because this seems able to be drawn toward the dogma of the Pelagians — who say that another's sins have not harmed little children — Augustine, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 10, wishes it to be understood of *adult just persons*:¹¹ because to the just man, whom [another's sin] harms, not →

◇ 11. **Right margin:** St. Augustine explains himself.

[...continues on folio 544 (PDF p. 361): the rest of Augustine's self-explanation (Annotatio L).]

(printed folio 544 [PDF p. 361]. **Annot. L–LIV** (Gen 3:15–21): *harming a just man harms only oneself; Giorgio's five "paradoxes" on demons and giants (refuted by Augustine); Josephus and Kissamos on sin bringing only the soul's death (refuted); Origen's "tunics of skin" as real skins; and Giorgio's allegory of the tunics.*)

(folio 544, left column → right column)

Annotation L (continued)

[because to the just man, whom another's sin harms, it does] not truly harm him: since indeed it even increases his reward in the heavens; but by sinning [the sinner] truly harms himself,¹ because, on account of the very will of harming, he receives that which harms [him]. Augustine, in the same book and chapter, asserts that there is no natural evil; and because this seems to favor the Pelagian heresy, he — in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 10 — orders it to be referred to that nature which was founded utterly without any vice.²

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whoever harms a just man does not truly harm him.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** St. Augustine explains himself.

Annotation LI

"I will put enmities between thy seed and her seed," etc. — Genesis 3:15

Whether the giants sprang from the seed of the devil, as Francesco Giorgio thought.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first Tome of the *Problems*, problem 54, inquiring what the seed of the devil is — which here is called by Moses "the seed of the serpent" — decides, rather violently, that the seed of the devil, hostile to the whole human race, was the giants, begotten from the coupling of demons with women. For demons (as he himself explains in the sixth Tome, problem 330) are corporeal animals apt for generation, emitting seed: which, approaching women, condense their bodies, so that they may more easily unite with the women for the generation of giants; whom, in the first Tome, problems 74 and 75, he constantly asserts could in no way have been begotten from the intercourse of man and woman, but from the seed of demons — because it is not consonant that such huge monsters, of the kind the giants are read to have been in the sacred letters, could be produced by a natural way. And hence (he says in problem 331 of the sixth Tome) it came about that, after the coming of Christ, the giants entirely ceased to be: because, after the demons were conquered by the death of Christ, they no longer had power to enter into women and to sow giants in their wombs. You have here, excellent reader, five things foreign to the common opinions of the Theologians.³ The first is: that demons are corporeal animals endowed with the faculty of begetting. The second, that the giants were the sons of demons. The third, that giants cannot be begotten naturally from the human intercourse of man and woman. The fourth, that demons cannot, after the coming of Christ, be mingled with women. The fifth, that the giants were, after Christ, entirely done away. All these things St. Augustine refutes in order, in book 15 *On the City of God*, chapter 23. Consult Annotations 8, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, and 77 of this book.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Five paradoxes of Francesco Giorgio.

Annotation LII

"Thou shalt return into the earth from which thou wast taken, because dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return." — Genesis 3:19

Whether sin brought upon Adam the necessity of bodily death.

Josephus, in the first book of the *Jewish Antiquities*, explaining the sense of this sentence, indicates that the offense of the first parents did not bring upon them the necessity of dying, but the shortness of life, and the hastening of old age and death.⁴ For thus he introduces God speaking to them: "I had indeed provided for you, that you might live a happy life and free from all evil, all things which confer to use and pleasure coming to you of their own accord; enjoying which, neither would old age quickly oppress you, and [your] long life would be prolonged as far as possible. But you have held my judgment in mockery, my command being despised — wherefore both old age shall come the sooner, and your life shall be less long."

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Genesis 3:19.

To the prior part of this opinion **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, alludes, holding that Adam's sin brought upon man not the death of the body, but only [that] of the soul.⁵ Reproving their assertion, Augustine [of Hippo], in book 13 *On the City of God*, chapter 15, says:⁶ "It is agreed, among Christians truly holding the Catholic faith, that even this bodily death itself was inflicted on us not by the law of nature — by which God made no death for man — but deservedly for sin: since God, avenging sin, said to the man, in whom then we all were, 'Earth thou art, and into earth thou shalt go.'" There exists also a decree of this Catholic assertion in the Acts of the African Council, chapter 76,⁷ in these words: "Whosoever shall say that Adam, the first man, was made mortal, so that, whether he sinned or sinned not, he would die in body — that is, would depart from the body — not by the merit of sin, but by the necessity of nature: let him be anathema."

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, denies that sin brought bodily death upon Adam.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Genesis 3[:19].

◇ 7. **Right margin:** The opinion of Augustine of Kissamos is impious.

Annotation LIII

"God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the tunics of skin of the first parents were the skins of animals.

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Genesis, expounding these words, is reported to have said that the tunics of skin, with which God clothed the first parents, were not truly tunics of skin, but carnal and mortal bodies — with which, after the offense and the ejection from paradise, Adam and Eve were clothed. This error Methodius, in the *Aglaophon*, attributes to Origen. Epiphanius also, in the book *Anchoratus*, confirms the same, saying that [Origen] thought thus for this reason: because he reckoned it a thoroughly ridiculous thing that God should, from dead animals stripped of their hide, prepare skins and sew together tunics of skin, as if he were a tanner or a stitcher of hides.⁸ I suspect that this passage was corrupted by the rivals of Origen; for he, in this matter, opens his mind catholicly in the 6th homily on Leviticus, where he writes thus: "God made tunics of skin, and clothed Adam and his wife. Those tunics, therefore, were of skins taken from animals: for with such [tunics] it behooved the sinner to be clothed — with skin tunics, I say, which were a token of the mortality which he had received for sin, and of his frailty, which came from the corruption of the flesh." By which words he manifestly confesses that the tunics were truly of skin, prepared by God's command. See the following Annotation.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Why God clothed sinful man with tunics of skin.

Annotation LIV

"And God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the tunics of skin were true skins.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first Tome of the *Problems*, contends that this passage must be understood according to bare and naked allegory alone. For thus we read in him, problem 59: "God was not a butcher, that he should kill sheep or lambs: because, since he made the animals two by two, if he killed two or four to make the tunics, then he afterward created others — which is false, since God rested on the seventh day.⁹ But these things are said by allegory, that these tunics may be understood [to have been] made from the skin of that Lamb of whom it is written, 'The Lamb was slain from the origin of the world'¹⁰ — so that by his merits all sins may be covered," etc. With this same figment of Francesco, the Origenists — the first authors of this opinion — made use, more than a thousand two hundred years ago. Wishing to meet [refute] whom, **Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea**, and **Gennadius, Bishop of Constantinople**, said that "tunics of skin" in this place signify the barks of trees.¹¹ For just as [the hides] of animals →

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Genesis 2:2.

◇ 10. **Right margin:** Apocalypse [Revelation] 13:8.

◇ 11. **Right margin:** Some reckoned that the tunics of skin signify the barks of trees.

[...continues on folio 545 (PDF p. 362): the tree-bark gloss and Sixtus's reply (Annotatio LIV).]

(printed folio 545 [PDF p. 362]. **Annot. LIV–LVIII** (Gen 3:21–24): the "tree-bark" gloss for the tunics disapproved (Theodoret); how they could be made without slaughter; Theodoret's "Scripture sometimes says something false" softened; the LXX settling Adam before Paradise; and the Cherubim as mere terrifying specters (against all the Fathers).)

(folio 545, left column → right column)

Annotation LIV (continued)

[For just as the hides] of animals are called "skins," so also the barks of trees are called "skins." Therefore, from the barks of trees, fit for the composition of garments, the first parents — divine piety prompting —

made tunics for themselves, just as before they had made themselves girdles from fig-leaves, to cover the shame of their genitals. But **Theodoret**, in question 39 on Genesis, disapproving this solution, speaks in this manner: "Of those who pursue allegories, some say the skins are the mortal flesh; but certain others discuss that they were procured from the barks of trees. But I approve neither of these: for the one is too curious, the other indeed very fabulous. For since divine Scripture has said that the body was formed before the soul, how is it not fabulous to say that God gave them mortal flesh after the transgression of the commandment? But to inquire curiously whence God had the skins, and on that account to devise a new kind of clothing from the barks of trees, seems to me superfluous, since the Creator of all did not lack whence to prepare those tunics."¹ **Procopius of Gaza**, in the commentaries on Genesis, dissolving the adduced reasoning, says that those tunics could have been made in two ways without the killing of animals² — that is, either from the conversion of pre-existing matter into skins (for just as [God] converted the waters of the Nile into blood, so he could change the matter of the elements into skins), or from creation out of nothing. For since man, created at the beginning of the sixth day, sinned at the sixth hour of the same day,³ and was ejected from paradise, nothing prevents [us from holding] that God, on that same sixth day, created skins out of nothing — since the seventh day had not yet come, on which he rested from all the work of creation which he had accomplished. Read the preceding Annotation.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** The Creator did not lack a way of preparing the tunics of skin.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The tunics of skin could be made in two ways without the slaughter of animals.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Man was created at the beginning of the sixth day, and sinned at the sixth hour of the same day.

Annotation LV

"And God made for Adam tunics of skin." — Genesis 3:21

Whether the letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, in question 39 on Genesis, digressing upon this little clause, after many things which he said in passing, at last brought in a certain somewhat harsh opinion, in these plain words: "One must not adhere to the bare letter of holy Scripture as [if it were] true, but must seek the treasure hidden in the letter — for the reason that the very letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false." These words, indeed, are not so to be understood that we should think the letter of divine Scripture — which is truth itself — pronounces anything false; but that, to us who consider only the bare sound of the letter and do not look into the meaning hidden in it, it seems to say something false.⁴

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Scripture, to those who consider only the bare letter, seems to say something false.

Annotation LVI

"And he cast out Adam, and placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Whether Adam, cast out of paradise, was placed before the door of paradise.

The **Seventy Interpreters**, interpreting this saying, perverted the sense of the Hebrew truth, attributing that which is said of the Cherub to Adam himself — whom they write to have been placed before Paradise by God, in these words: καὶ ἐκάτωκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι παραδείσου τῆς τροφῆς [*and he settled him over against the Paradise of delight*], "And he settled him" — namely Adam — "before, or over against, the Paradise of delights." Which indeed is not in the Hebrew.

Annotation LVII

"He placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Whether the Cherubim are angels, or specters.

Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea, weighing this clause, thinks that the Cherubim, the guardians of Paradise, were not spirits endowed with reason, but certain specters, feigned for the sake of terrifying. See the following Annotation.

Annotation LVIII

"He placed before Paradise a Cherub." — Genesis 3:24

Theodoret denies that the Cherubim are spiritual and blessed minds.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, in the book of Questions on Genesis, question 40, inquiring what τὰ Χερουβίμ [*ta Cheroubim*] — that is, the Cherubim — placed to guard the tree of life, are, answers two things. **The first**: that it must not be believed that the Cherubim, the guardians of Paradise, are spiritual and invisible powers, as some think, but [rather] certain powerful and terrible visions, and forms of animals, which would keep Adam from the entrance of Paradise. **The second** is: that the Cherubim, of which frequent mention is made in the divine Scriptures, are neither animals, nor any substance of invisible nature; but divine Scripture calls "Cherubim" everything that is endowed with great power. Thus David says in the Psalm, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim"⁵ — that is, who reignest powerfully; and in another Psalm, "He ascended upon the Cherubim, and flew,"⁶ etc. — that is, he came with much and great power and virtue. These things Theodoret [says]; before whom **Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea**, and after whom **Procopius of Gaza**, explaining this same passage of Genesis, wrote the same opinion, and in almost the same words. At last, in our own times, there came forth out of Greece a certain new heresiarch, **James Chyus**, who, among many heresies of the ancient heretics recalled by himself, brought this error back into the light.⁷ He, when in an exposition of the Creed published by him he was making a discourse about the angels, wrote among other things these things about the Cherubim: "Cherubim, in the sacred letters, does not signify any spiritual substance, or some incorporeal animal, but a statue formed to the likeness of a boy: such as were those boyish golden statues placed upon the ark, and that statue with the fiery sword placed for the guarding of Paradise, which Moses called 'Cherubim.' For this was not an angelic spirit, but a certain manly image, of horrible form and covered about with a mask, which God had placed before the doors of Paradise to strike terror into the first parents — after the manner of farmers, who fix in their crops and gardens wooden stakes clothed with the torn rags of human garments, so that by that kind of scarecrow they may frighten off the birds from feeding on the seeds and crops. Whence, lest anyone should think the Cherubim to be living and spiritual substances, it was provided by the synodal laws of the Greeks that it should not be sung, in the Trisagion of the angels, 'Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim.'"⁸ Thus far James.

◇ **5. Right margin:** Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

◇ **6. Right margin:** Psalm 18:10 [Vulgate 17:11].

◇ **7. Right margin:** James Chyus renewed an ancient heresy.

◇ **8. Right margin:** Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

Against this error is the authority of all the Fathers,⁹ and especially of the Greeks, but chiefly of Dionysius the Areopagite: who, in chapter 7 of the *Celestial Hierarchy*, enumerates the Cherubim immediately after the Seraphim, in the second rank of the first and supreme hierarchy of the celestial spirits; and ascribes to these, according to the interpretation of the Hebrew name, [an] excel- →

◇ **9. Right margin:** It is the common opinion of the Fathers that the Cherubim are spiritual minds.

[...continues on folio 546 (PDF p. 363): *Dionysius on the Cherubim's excellence of knowledge — the rest of Annotatio LVIII.*]

(printed folio 546 [PDF p. 363]. *Annot. LVIII–LIX (Gen 3:24): the Cherubim vindicated as true celestial spirits (Dionysius, Athanasius, Nicaea II), with a digression on the **Trisagion** — its text, legendary origin,*

and heretical tamperings; then Catharinus holding Moses translated alive into Paradise.)

(folio 546, left column → right column)

Annotation LVIII (continued)

[ascribes to these, according to the interpretation of the Hebrew name, an] most excellent fullness of surpassing knowledge, drawn from the fount of divine wisdom. Consenting to whom, **Athanasius**, in the sermon upon that [text], "All things are delivered to me by my Father,"¹ says that the Cherubim are most ample living beings, than which nothing is nearer to God, who extol the majesty of God with lips never ceasing. **Chrysostom**, in the third sermon *On the Incomprehensible Nature of God*, says the Cherubim are powers superior to the seraphic spirits, and nearer to God — whose appellation signifies a full and heaped-up nature. And the same [Chrysostom], in his Liturgy, addresses God in these words: "To thee indeed stand by thousands of Archangels, and many thousands of Angels, Cherubim and Seraphim with six wings, with many eyes, sublime, feathered, singing the hymn of victory, crying aloud, clamoring and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth."² But even **Theodoret** himself, perhaps repenting of his error, in the book of the *Divine Decrees* placed the Cherubim among the angels by the testimony of divine Scripture, thus writing in chapter 7: "The ministry of the Angels is the praise of God and the chanting of hymns. For of the Seraphim blessed Isaiah said that they cry out, saying, 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth'; but of the Cherubim divine Ezekiel said that he heard from them, 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.'"³ Finally, in the Second Council of Nicaea, in the fourth session, the opinion of Athanasius is approved, expounding that saying from the Psalm, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim,"⁴ in these words: "The Cherubim, unknown by nature to all men, are spirit and fire, alien from all figuration of bodies and [bodily] nature; and the things which are said of them by the prophet as of corporeal beings have a symbolic sense."

◇ 1. Left margin: Luke 10:22.

◇ 2. Left margin: Isaiah 6:3.

◇ 3. Left margin: Ezekiel 3:12.

◇ 4. Left margin: Psalm 80:1 [Vulgate 79:2].

But that the Cherubim, whom Moses reports in this place, are celestial powers, not only Ambrose, Augustine, and all the Latin doctors, but also very many of the Greek doctors testify — among whom **Chrysostom**, expounding this passage, openly confesses it, saying: "God commanded that those powers, the Cherubim, should guard the way." And in the sermon *On the Ascension*, explaining this same thing more clearly, he says: "The Angels and Archangels grieved at our punishments; and when we were punished, they too were held by excessive sadness. And the Cherubim, although they guarded Paradise, yet were saddened at our punishments; and just as a good fellow-servant, when he has undertaken from his lord a fellow-servant to be guarded, satisfies indeed the lord's command, yet is worn down with excessive grief at the fellow-servant's penalty: so also the Cherubim deserved indeed to guard paradise, but grieved at the honor of the guardianship." **Gennadius**, expounding these same words of Moses, says, "Τὰ δὲ Χερουβίμ" — that is, [they] are invisible powers — "these he said received the guardianship of Paradise"; that is, the Cherubim are invisible powers, and he said that these same [powers] undertook the guardianship of Paradise.

But as to that which [James Chyus] adds about synods forbidding that there be sung in the Trisagion, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim," I confess that I have nowhere read [it] in the volumes of the councils which now exist.⁵ If, beyond their number, there be some other synod of received authority in which this is found prohibited, we shall say that it was not simply prohibited by that synod that "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim" should be uttered, but that there should not be sung "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim" with the particle added, "And [upon] the Seraphim" — just as of old certain unskilled persons used to sing in the public prayers, whom Jerome, in the commentaries on the sixth chapter of Isaiah, condemns in these words: "The Lord is plainly shown to sit upon the Cherubim after the manner of a charioteer; but [that he sits] upon

the Seraphim, I know not that I have read in the Canonical Scriptures. Therefore they err who are wont to say in [their] prayers, 'Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim and Seraphim,' which Scripture has not taught." Or it must be said that that synod sanctioned this not for the reason that the Cherubim should be believed to be inanimate things, lacking reason and life, but that every occasion of corrupting that angelic Trisagion might be taken away from the heretics: for also, in the fifth Council of Constantinople, for the same cause it was decreed that there should not be sung in the same Trisagion, "Thou who wast crucified for us," which Peter, Bishop of Antioch, had deceitfully added for the confirmation of his heresy.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Whether one ought to say, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim and Seraphim."

But the Trisagion — that you may also know this, kind reader — is a Greek Canticle so named because it contains "Hagion" [Holy] three times, to designate the three persons of the divine nature;⁶ which the Greeks express in these words: ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς — that is, "Holy God, Holy Strong [One], Holy Immortal [One], have mercy on us." Pope Felix, in the Epistle to the Emperor Zeno, relates that the origin of the song was of this kind.⁷ When the city of Constantinople was shaken by frequent earthquakes, and the people, praying in a field, cried out "Lord, have mercy": a little child, while the whole people, together with Proclus, Bishop of the city, looked on, was caught up into heaven for one hour; and there he learned a hymn of this kind, which, descending from heaven, he made known to the people; and the people, resounding that same thing with public voice, freed the city from danger; and the Church reckoned the hymn among the celebrated songs, and the Council of Chalcedon approved it. This hymn, therefore, when divers heretics had rashly tampered with it by adding various acclamations,⁸ it was provided by the synods that suspect sentences should not be added to it. Of the number of which I suspect that saying, "Thou who sittest upon the Cherubim," was then [reckoned]. Nor is it abhorrent from this suspicion, that John of Damascus writes, in the epistle on the Trisagion, indicating that there were certain followers of the aforesaid Peter who, from the testimony of St. Epiphanius wrongly expounded, asserted that this Trisagion hymn pertains to the Son of God alone, because he alone sits upon the Cherubim, and whom alone those four-formed animals glorified, saying, "Holy, holy, holy," etc. Which dogma seemed indeed to distinguish Christ from the Trinity, and to introduce a certain quaternity.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** What the Trisagion is.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** What the origin of the Trisagion was.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** The heretics tried to deprave the hymn of the Trisagion.

Annotation LIX

***"He placed before the Paradise of pleasure a Cherub."* — Genesis 3:24**

Whether Moses died.

Ambrose [Catharinus], Bishop of Compsa, in this passage relates that Moses, together with his body, was translated alive into the Paradise of pleasure, that he might live there, until the consummation of the age, with Enoch, Elijah, and John. He confirms the same opinion in the exposition of that Mosaic saying, "The Lord had planted a Paradise [in] Eden," Genesis 2.⁹ This same thing had, long before, been thought →

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Genesis 2:8.

[...continues on folio 547 (PDF p. 364): who, before Catharinus, held Moses translated alive — the rest of Annotatio LIX.]

(printed folio 547 [PDF p. 364]. **Annot. LIX–LXIII** (Gen 3:24–4:1): Moses translated alive (Ambrose held it before Catharinus); Procopius on incorporeal Cherubim; Ambrose on Moses "translated, not buried" (against the Hebrew); Ambrose misquoted to deny priestly absolution (vindicated); and Chrysostom on no generation without sin → folio 548.)

(folio 547, left column → right column)

Annotation LIX (continued)

[This same thing had, long before, been thought] before [Catharinus] by St. Ambrose, as you will be able to see below, in the sixty-first Annotation of this book, and in the ninety-first Annotation of the following book.

Annotation LX

"He placed before the paradise of pleasure a Cherubim." — Genesis 3:24

Whether the Cherubim are incorporeal substances.

Procopius of Gaza, in the exposition of this passage, teaches that the Cherubim are not any kind of spiritual and incorporeal substance. See above, Annotation 58.

Annotation LXI

"But Adam knew his wife, and she bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether Moses has yet died.

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in the first book *On Cain and Abel*, chapter 2, treating this passage, incidentally fell upon the exposition of a period from Deuteronomy: in which, according to the Septuagint edition, it is read, "AND MOSES died διὰ ῥήματος (*dia rhēmatos*)" — that is, "by the word of God," etc.¹ On the occasion of which word he asserted that Moses was not yet dead, but translated to a better life, like Elijah. For what Scripture said — that Moses died — he wished to be understood not of the destruction which happens through the separation of the soul from the body, but of the translation to a happy and blessed life. For thus he wrote: "We do not read of Moses, as of the rest, that failing he died; but that he died by the word of God. For God admits neither defect nor addition; whence Scripture also added that no one knows his burial — so that you may understand [it] rather of a translation than of a destruction. For death is a certain separation of soul and body. He died, therefore, by the word of God, says Scripture — not *according to* the word: that you may note [it was] not a message of death, but the gift of grace expressed; [he] who was translated rather than forsaken, whose burial no one has known. For who could detect anything among his earthly remains — [him] whom the Son of God, in the Gospel, showed to be with him? Finally, Elijah too was seen at the same time by certain persons — [he] who was translated in a chariot, and is read [to have been] neither buried nor dead: for he lives who is with the Son of God. But Moses indeed is read [to have] died, yet he died by the word of God, through which all things were made; through the word of God, therefore, he is not a falling-away of the work, but a firmament [support]. Not, therefore, as one fallen back into the earth is he detected by a dissolution of the body, but as one endowed, by the operation of the heavenly word, with a gift: so that his flesh received rest rather than a tomb." These things Ambrose [says]: to whom **Hilary of Poitiers** assents,² in canon 20 on Matthew, where these things are written:³ "The Lord, having taken Peter, and James, and John, appeared with the habit of his glory on the mountain, [Moses and Elijah] accompanying [him]; and these same two we understand [to be] the two Prophets preceding his coming, whom the Apocalypse of John says are to be slain by Antichrist⁴ — although the opinions of very many have arisen variously, whether concerning Enoch or concerning Jeremiah, [as to] whether one of them, like Elijah, must die: but we cannot corrupt the assurance of the truth — which the Lord revealed by the three witnesses above — by the opinion of our own perception, nor think that others are to come than those who were seen to have come for the pledge of the faith. And although it is not necessary to hold an opinion beyond the evangelical truth, yet, if anyone diligently considers the condition both of the death and of the sepulchre of Moses, he will understand that all things were so handled that Moses could [now] seem to be already dead." This opinion have followed, in our times, Ambrose [Catharinus], Bishop of Compsa, in the

commentaries on Genesis, and John Arboreus [Jean Arboreau], in the eleventh book of the *Theosophia* — though the truth of the Hebrew Scripture, and almost all the ecclesiastical writers, cry out against [it]. See *Annotation 59 of this book, and Annotation 91 of Book 6.*

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Deuteronomy 34:5. — and: St. Ambrose denies that Moses died by death.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Hilary thinks that Moses lives.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** Matthew 17:1.
- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** Revelation 11:3.

Annotation LXII

"But Adam knew his wife, and she bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether priests bind and loose.

The testimony of **Ambrose** from the work *On Cain and Abel* — published for the exposition of the present passage — the **Master of the Sentences** [Peter Lombard] brings forward, in the fourth book, distinction 39, where, being about to demonstrate that priests neither bind nor loose sinners, but only show and pronounce [them] bound or loosed by God alone, he cites, for the confirmation of this error of his,⁵ the authority of Ambrose from chapter 4 of the second book of the said work, running thus: "The Word of God remits sins; the priest is a judge: the priest indeed exhibits his office, but exercises the rights of no power." **Gratian**, in the first distinction *On Penance*, alleges the same passage in plainly the same words. It is probable that either the one [drew] from the other, or both, from some other Rhapsode [compiler] — as is the custom of the Sentence-writers — excerpted this passage without the Ambrosian codex having been inspected: in which these words are read in a sense wholly diverse, nay even contrary, in this manner:⁶ "Sins are remitted through the Word of God, of which the Levite is the interpreter and, as it were, the executor; they are remitted also through the office of the Priest and the sacred ministry." Which words Ambrose brought forth for this very purpose: to show that not only God, but priests also, remit sins.⁷ Just as he explained the same thing yet more openly in the first book *On Penance*, chapter 2, saying: "He who receives the Holy Spirit receives also the power of loosing sin, and of binding; for thus it is written: 'Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them; and whose you shall retain, they shall be retained.' Therefore he who cannot loose sin does not have the Holy Spirit. The office of the priest is the gift of the Holy Spirit; and the right of the Holy Spirit [is exercised] in the loosing and binding of sins." These things I judged must be noted, that I might vindicate Ambrose from this suspicion, and at the same time admonish those who delight overmuch in Rhapsodists, Compendiums, and Summists — lest they be loath sometimes to return from the streams to the fountains, and to seek out the very sentences of the Fathers in their own authors, and to weigh them diligently. For it usually happens that abbreviators and collectors — whether from carelessness, or from forgetfulness, or from too great a zeal for brevity — gather the sentences of others either mutilated or interrupted, often with the words transposed, often even so far altered that from them a new and plainly different sense arises. But these things have been said, not that I should condemn the labors of these [men], which I have so often commended in the preceding books, but that I may render studious readers much more diligent and skillful. See what pertains to this argument below, in *Annotation 71, and in Annotation 202 of the sixth book.*

- ◇ 5. **Right margin:** An error of Peter Lombard.
- ◇ 6. **Right margin:** John 20:[22–23].
- ◇ 7. **Right margin:** Priests remit sins.

Annotation LXIII

"But Adam knew his wife." — Genesis 4:1

If the first parents had not sinned, whether there would have been generation.

Chrysostom, in homily 18 on Genesis, when he wished to unravel this passage, asserted that, if the first parents had not sinned, there would have been no →

[...continues on folio 548 (PDF p. 365): the rest of Annotatio LXIII — whether there would have been generation and marriage in the state of innocence.]

*(printed folio 548 [PDF p. 365]. **Annot. LXIII–LXVI** (Gen 4:1–8): no coitus in paradise without the Fall (Chrysostom, Procopius); Ambrose seeming to make souls "uncertain of salvation" (defended); the LXX's mistranslation of Gen 4:7; and the LXX/Vulgate's added "let us go into the field," with the Targum's impious speech of Cain → folio 549.)*

(folio 548, left column → right column)

Annotation LXIII (continued)

[there would have been no] coitus in paradise: because before sin they were not subject to these bodily necessities; for the law of the venereal matter [sexual desire] entered only after sin. For then [after sin] God granted that the human race should be increased through coitus.

Procopius, following the same opinion, in the exposition of the same passage says more openly that, had there been no human transgression, there would have been neither matrimony, nor nuptials, nor coitus, nor propagation of offspring. *You have the antidote to this opinion above, in Annotations 20 and 21.*

Annotation LXIV

"She conceived, and bore Cain." — Genesis 4:1

Whether the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, enjoy the divine vision.

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, book 2 *On Cain and Abel*, narrating this, hints that the souls of the deceased are, until the day of judgment, uncertain of their salvation; for he says: "The soul is loosed from the body, even after the end of this life; yet it is still held in suspense, uncertain of the future judgment." More openly he has this in the book *On the Good of Death*, chapter 10, where he relates that the souls of the saints are contained under the earth in hidden receptacles, and there, until the day of judgment, await the glory of God — speaking thus: "Scripture calls the habitations of souls the storehouses of Esdras";¹ and, meeting the human complaint — that the just who have gone before seem, up to the day of judgment (that is, for a very great space of time), to be defrauded of the reward owed to them — he says, wonderfully, that the day of judgment is like a crown: for the crown[-day] is awaited by all, that within that day both the vanquished may blush and the victors obtain the palm of victory. Therefore, while the fullness of time is awaited, the souls await their due reward: for some, punishment remains; for others, glory. And in the same chapter he calls "the underworld" the place which is not seen, which all souls stripped of their bodies seek. Which words, indeed, one ought to refer to the *consummated* felicity — and misery — of soul and body [together]; for I would not believe that Ambrose held that opinion which these words at first sight present,² since he himself, in many places, asserts that the souls of the saints enjoy the divine sight even before the resurrection — as in epistle 59, to the Thessalonians, on the death of Acholius, where he says: "Acholius, then, is an inhabitant of those on high, a possessor of that eternal city of Jerusalem which is in heaven: he sees there the immense measure of its city, pure gold, precious stone, perpetual light without a Sun; and all these things, indeed, [were] known to him long since, but now [he sees them] face to face." And in the commentaries on the epistle to the Philippians,³ upon that saying "I desire to be dissolved," he says of Paul: "He has the desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ — esteeming it much better, that he might now be present with God [and] enjoy the longed-for promises." And in the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 13, he says: "The saints, going

forth from this world, will find [it] more necessary [i.e. will find far more] than they now suppose — as John the Apostle said of the Savior, "Then they shall see him as he is."⁴ *Seek the argument of this Annotation treated more fully below, in Annotation 163 of this book, and in Annotations 264 and 345 of the following book.*

◇ 1. **Left margin:** 4 Esdras 4.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** St. Ambrose asserts that the souls of the saints enjoy eternal beatitude before the day of judgment.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Philippians 1.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** 1 John 3:2] ("then they shall see him as he is").

Annotation LXV

"Is it not so that, if you do well, you shall receive?" — Genesis 4:7

A passage from the fourth chapter of Genesis, badly translated by the Seventy.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, in the interpretation of that sentence of God which **Jerome** translated — "Is it not so that, if you do well, you shall receive? but if [you do] ill, shall not your sin at once be present at the doors? but its appetite [shall be] under you, and you shall have dominion over it" — threw everything into confusion, and strayed vehemently from the truth of the Hebrew context, rendering thus: οὐκ ἐὼν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκης, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλης, ἡμαρτες· ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἢ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ — that is, "Hast thou not sinned, if thou hast rightly offered, but not rightly divided? Be still: to thee [is] its returning."⁵ Of which words there is nothing in the Hebrew, as Jerome testifies in the *Hebrew Questions*. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, indicating the cause of this error, brought forward the annotation written below: "Who would be of so keen a genius as to be able to dig out any sense from these words? What, I beseech, is 'to thee [is] its returning'? — of which [sin] it [the passage] had made no mention. For where in the Hebrew it is 'At the doors your sin lies down,' they rendered ἡσύχασον, that is, 'Be still.'" We see, therefore, how necessary Jerome's edition was. From this passage, certainly, it is also detected that the Septuagint did not so exquisitely understand Hebrew grammar; the cause, therefore, that they translated this passage so variously and so obscurely proceeded from [ignorance of] grammar.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** The Septuagint badly translated [it]. [This right-margin phrase is the completion of the dispute-title at [^6], which the column break splits: the left margin carries "Periodus ex 4. Gen. cap. à," finished here by "LXX malè translata."]

For what Jerome translated — "Is it not so, if you do well" (the comma being placed here) — "Is it not so, if you make a good offering" (namely זָאָה, *se'et*) — they rendered ὀρθῶς προσενέγκης [if you rightly offer]. The second part — "but if you do not rightly divide" (וְאִם לֹא תִיטֵב לְפָתַח, *ve-im lo theitiv la-pettach*) — these Hebrew words they understood in this manner: "And if you do not do well unto dividing." For this word *pettach* [פָּתַח], since it is a verbal noun signifying a "door," they thought to be the infinitive פָּתַח, *phata*, that is, "to open" — so that they translated, "And if you do not do well unto opening"; and it is a very great hallucination [blunder]. And that they render "you have sinned," and not "sin," happened on the same occasion: for חָטָאת, *chatath*, they thought to be the second person from חָטָה, *chata*, that is, "he sinned" — but *chatath* means "sin" [the noun], whereas *chatatha* is the second person, "you have sinned." And they easily fell into this error, since in their time the Hebrew codices did not have the little marks — that is, the vowels. And that they render "Be still," that is רְבֹז, *robetz* — which is a participle — they reckoned to be the imperative; whereas the imperative is formed thus, רְבֹז, *rebutz*, but the participle [is] *robetz*. But why did they not consider that there would be no sense to their words, if they were translated in that manner?

Annotation LXVI

"Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go forth abroad." — Genesis 4:8

The clause "let us go out into the field," superfluously added by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, to that which is here read, "And Cain said to Abel his brother," superfluously added of their own, **Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον** — that is, "Let us go forth into the field"; and the interpreter of our Vulgate edition, following them, said, "Let us go forth abroad" — neither of which is in the Hebrew reading: in which only this is read, "Cain said to Abel his brother"; nor is it added what he said, but it must be supplied (says Jerome) [with] those things which God himself had spoken to him. **Origen** asserts that these words, added here by the Septuagint, are had in the secret [apocryphal] scriptures of the Hebrews. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, says that the words which Cain spoke to Abel are found in the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition: in which he asserts these are read: "Cain said to Abel his brother, 'There is no justice, nor a judge, nor another world [age]; neither shall the just receive rewards, nor shall the wicked pay penalties'; and then he slew him. But in →

[...continues on folio 549 (PDF p. 366): the rest of Annotatio LXVI — the Chaldaic version and the fratricide.]

*(printed folio 549 [PDF p. 366], two columns above, comparative tables below. **Annot. LXVI–LXIX** (Gen 4:8–5:29): the uncertain "Chaldaic edition" of Cain's speech; the LXX's "groaning and trembling" for Cain; the LXX's corrupt antediluvian chronology (tabulated against the Hebrew, with the Greek Fathers' divergent computations); and the naming of Noah.)*

(folio 549, left column → right column, then the full-width tables)

Annotation LXVI (continued)

But it is uncertain of which edition Augustine speaks; for that Chaldaic translation which is now circulated, in the Complutensian copies, has none of these things.

Annotation LXVII

"A vagabond and a fugitive shalt thou be." — Genesis 4:12

The clause "vagabond and fugitive," badly rendered by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, for that which is had in Hebrew — נַבְנָד, *na va-nad*, that is, "A vagabond and a fugitive shalt thou be" — translated with little consonance [inaccurately], **Στένων καὶ τρέμων**, that is, "Groaning and trembling." Hence arose among the Greek expositors an opinion — namely, that Cain, after his brother was slain, never ceased from tears and groans, but was perpetually tormented with a trembling of the body, the frame of his limbs being dissolved, on account of the fratricide committed.

Annotation LXVIII

"And Seth lived, after he begot Enos." — Genesis 5:7

The years of the illustrious men wrongly reckoned by the Septuagint.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, since they are found corrupt in many places, are especially faulty in this fifth chapter, and most of all depraved concerning the reckoning of the years which the illustrious men lived from Adam up to the Flood: in which they entirely depart from the most true reckoning of the Hebrew context, as appears in the table set below. In it, in the first place, is set the reckoning of the years according to the Hebrew truth; in the second, the reckoning of the years of the Seventy interpreters; in the third, the difference of the years — according to the excess and defect of each reckoning.

*(In the difference column, "Desunt / Def." = the Septuagint falls **short** by that many years; "Superant / Super." = the Septuagint **exceeds** by that many.)*

Hebrew reckoning	Hebr.	LXX	Difference
Seth, after begetting Enos, lived	807	707	Desunt 100
Enos, before begetting Cainan, lived	90	190	Superant 100
Enos, after begetting Cainan	815	715	Desunt 100
Cainan, before begetting Mahalalel	70	170	Super. 100
Cainan, after begetting Mahalalel	840	740	Def. 100
Mahalalel, before begetting Jared	65	165	Super. 100
Mahalalel, after begetting Jared	830	730	Def. 100
Jared, before begetting Enoch	62	162	Super. 100
Enoch, before begetting Methuselah	65	165	Def. 100 <i>[sic]</i>
Enoch, after begetting Methuselah	300	200	Super. 100 <i>[sic]</i>
Methuselah, before begetting Lamech	187	167	Def. 20
Methuselah, after begetting Lamech	782	802	Super. 20
Lamech, before begetting Noah	182	188	Super. 6
Lamech, after begetting Noah	570	565	Def. 5
The whole life of Lamech	777	753	Def. 24

(In the two Enoch rows the original swaps the labels: the Septuagint in fact **exceeds** by 100 before Methuselah's birth (65 → 165) and **falls short** by 100 after it (300 → 200); the printed "Def." and "Super." are transposed.)

Two errors emerged from this depraved enumeration of the Seventy interpreters.¹ The former of these — as Jerome noted in the *Hebrew Questions* — is this: that from this reckoning it is manifestly proved that Methuselah lived fourteen years after the Flood,² whereas Moses writes that only eight souls (among whom he was not) were saved in the ark. Which matter gave birth to that question, famous among the ancients — "On the years of Methuselah" — and ventilated by the disputation of all the churches. The second error is the diversity — not to say the falsity — of the chronography of the Greek Fathers, namely of Julius Africanus, Origen, and Eusebius: who, in reckoning the years from the beginning of the world up to the birth of Abraham, count 3314 years; but, on the contrary, Philo and the rest of the Jews, according to the Hebrew truth of divine Scripture, compute from the founding of the world to the birth of Abraham 1955 years — so that the reckoning of the Greeks exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by one thousand two hundred and thirty-six years.³ Augustine, in book 15 of *The City of God*, chapter 13, judges that this depravation happened in the codices of the Septuagint by the fault of those who first copied them out from the Library of Ptolemy. But, that you may more clearly know how varied and manifold a diversity of reckonings the Greek corruption of the numbers has given birth to for us, it has pleased [me] here to add, from diverse chronographers, the

calculation of the years from the founding of the world up to the happy nativity of Christ, arranged according to the series of the numbers [in ascending order].⁴

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** From the reckoning of the Septuagint interpreters two errors emerged.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Methuselah did not live after the Flood.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** The Greek reckoning exceeds the Hebrew by 1236 years. — [*The two totals given in the text, 3314 and 1955, differ by 1359, not 1236; the discrepancy is in the original.*]
- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** From the founding of the world to the nativity of Christ the Lord, how many years have flowed — there is the greatest disagreement about the sum.

Years	Authority (creation → the Nativity of Christ)
3707	Rabbi Naasson, in the Paschal Cycle
3754	Rabbi Abraham, in the <i>Cabala</i>
1760	the common Chronicle of the Hebrews [<i>sic — read 3760, the Jewish era</i>]
3952	Jerome and Bede
3958	Giovanni Pico della Mirandola
3960	Ioannes Lucidus
3962	the Abbot of Ursperg (<i>whom Sixtus follows as the more exact, in book 1, in enumerating the times of the authors of divine Scripture</i>)
3974	Theophilus, <i>To Autolytus</i>
3989	Charles de Bovelles (Carolus Bovillus)
4103	Josephus, son of Matthias [Flavius Josephus]
4320	Odiaton the Astronomer
4697	Cassiodorus
4830	Origen, on Matthew
5029	Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis
5049	Paulus Orosius
5195	Philo the Jew
5196	Isidore of Seville
5199	Eusebius of Caesarea
5201	Johannes Nauclerus
5328	Albumasar the Astronomer
5353	Augustine
5500	Jordanes (Iornandes)
5600	Suidas
5800	Lactantius
5801	Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia
6984	Alfonso, King of Spain

Annotation LXIX

"He called his name Noah, saying: This one shall comfort us from the works and labors of our hands, in the land which the Lord hath cursed." — Genesis 5:29

[...the body of Annotatio LXIX begins on folio 550 (PDF p. 367).]

(printed folio 550 [PDF p. 367]. **Annot. LXIX–LXXIII** (Gen 5:29–6:2): *Giorgio on the curse lifted in Noah's day (refuted; Diodore: Noah invented the plough); the LXX "angels of God" for "sons of God," breeding the fallen-angel controversy; Philo's aerial souls and animate stars; Chrysostom denying angels are called "sons of God"; and whether wicked angels can couple with women* → folio 551.)

(folio 550, left column → right column)

Annotation LXIX (continued)

Francesco Giorgio, in the first volume, Problem 58, gathers from these words that the curse which God inflicted on the earth for Adam's sin lasted until the birth of Noah, and, he living, was entirely removed.¹ This he makes persuasive from the fact that God — who never before the times of Noah willed to accept the oblation of the fruits of the earth, as may be known from Cain's gifts — at length, from Noah himself and thereafter from his posterity, received most gratefully the oblations of the fruits of the earth. But it appears that an exposition of this kind is forced and violent: both because that old curse of the earth still remains² — which, unless it be cultivated by many and assiduous labors of men, denies sustenance to the human race — and because nowhere in the sacred letters is it read that Noah offered to God the fruits of the earth, but only cattle and birds.³ The true and genuine sense, therefore, of the proposed clause is that which **Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus**, brought forward — namely, that Noah, first of all, joined the beasts to the plough, and cut the earth with the ploughshare:⁴ by which salutary invention he wonderfully consoled the human race from the works and labors of [their] hands, because the hands of men it freed from the hard and heavy labors of digging the earth.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether the curse of the earth was removed under Noah, as Francesco Giorgio thought.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** The curse of the earth has not yet been removed.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** It is not written that Noah offered to God the fruits of the earth.
- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** Noah, first of all, cut the earth with the ploughshare.

Annotation LXX

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, in the older edition — which Philo the Jew and Eusebius of Caesarea followed — for that which is read in Hebrew, בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים; *Bene ha-elohim*, that is, "Sons of God," translated οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, "Angels of God"; which translation, as Jerome testifies, Aquila imitated, rendering "Sons of gods," understanding by "gods" the Angels. This [rendering] both very many of the Greeks (as Procopius reports) and many of the Latins — among whom Ambrose and Augustine — received and expounded. But this appellation of "Angels," wrongly set down, gave birth to the greatest questions, and drew the minds of men into various opinions, and even errors. For some thought that by the name of "Angels" are signified the holy Angels, who then first sinned with women, and on that account fell from heaven — as **Lactantius**. Some [understood] apostate Angels, or demons cast down from heaven immediately from the founding of the world, who, coupling with women, begot giants — as **Eusebius**. But of this we shall speak more fully below, in Annotations 73 and 77 of this book.

Annotation LXXI

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels are aerial souls, as Philo thought; or whether the stars are animate, as the same [Philo] reckoned.

Philo, in the book *On Giants*, explaining this, says that the sons of God — whom here Moses [calls] Angels, but the Philosophers call *Genii* [spirits] — are aerial souls which have descended into bodies. Concerning which opinion, see below. Philo in the same place asserts that the stars are animate, in these words: "Heaven has the stars; for these are wholly immortal and divine souls, and therefore are moved in a circle: because this motion is akin to mind; for the mind of each of these is most perfect." The same thing he holds in the book *On the Making of the Six Days* [*On the Creation*], and in the book *On Dreams*. On which matter, consult Annotation 108 of this book.

Annotation LXXII

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels are called "sons of God" in the sacred letters.

Chrysostom, in the twenty-second homily on Genesis, refuting those who said that by the "sons of God" whom Moses here mentions, not men but Angels must be understood, says that Angels were never in divine Scripture called "sons of God" — nay, not even "sons." Yet the contrary is found, once and again, in the book of Job: in whose second chapter it is read concerning the angels, "When on a certain day the sons of God had come, and stood before the Lord, Satan also was present among them";⁵ and in the same volume, chapter 38, concerning the Angels it is added, "When the morning stars praised me, and all the sons of God jubilated."⁶ It appears that Chrysostom was in this deceived by the Septuagint edition: in which, for that which we have according to the Hebrew truth — "When the sons of God had come" — it is written ἦλθον οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, "The angels of God came"; and where Jerome, from the Hebrew source, translated "And all the sons of God jubilated," the Septuagint rendered ὅτε ἤνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου, that is, "When all my angels praised me with a loud voice." Nor does that favor Chrysostom which Paul writes to the Hebrews, "To which of the angels did he ever say, Thou art my Son?"⁷ — since there he does not deny that the angels are called sons of God by grace, but only [denies it] by nature.⁸ For in this manner Christ alone is called, and is, [the] Son.

◇ 5. Right margin: Job 2:1.

◇ 6. Right margin: Job 38:7.

◇ 7. Right margin: Hebrews 1:5.

◇ 8. Right margin: The Apostle, Hebrews 1, denies that the Angels are sons of God by nature — for this is proper to Christ the Lord.

Annotation LXXIII

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men, took to themselves wives." — Genesis 6:2

Whether the angels can have intercourse with women.

Chrysostom, in the twenty-second homily on Genesis, elucidating this passage, seems to teach that it is not only absurd, but even impossible, that wicked angels should exercise coitus with women — writing thus: "It is full of madness to say that angels cast down from heaven had commerce with women, and that that incorporeal nature is coupled to bodies; for it is not possible that that incorporeal nature should ever have concupiscence." And a little after: "He would be very insane who should approve such words, full of madness — that an incorporeal and spiritual nature should bear the embrace of a body." **Cornelius Agrippa**, a follower of the Lutheran heresy,⁹ in that book which he published entitled *Against the Inquisitors of Witches*, twists this opinion of John [Chrysostom] against those who persecute and punish malefic women for this reason — that it has been discovered that they have venereal commerce with demons. Which matter he himself mocks as fabulous, and as sprung from the dreams and imaginations of raving old women: who,

since they are often deceived while sleeping through dreams, and sometimes also, while awake, are deluded by the imagination of vehement lust, nevertheless think that those things truly happened to them which were performed by imagination alone. This error the same author strives to establish, by adding some testimonies of ancient authors who seem to agree with Chrysostom. Among these the chief is **John Cassian**, a disciple of Chrysostom,¹⁰ in whose twelfth book of the *Conferences*, chapter 8, this is had: "In no way is it to be believed that spiritual natures →

◇ **9. Right margin:** Cornelius Agrippa, a Lutheran.

◇ **10. Right margin:** Cassian was a disciple of Chrysostom.

[...continues on folio 551 (PDF p. 368): the rest of Cassian's testimony and Sixtus's reply (Annotatio LXXIII).]

(printed folio 551 [PDF p. 368], the whole page on **Annot. LXXIII** (Gen 6:2, whether angels/demons couple with women). Cassian, Philastrius, Cyril, and the Canon Episcopi (the night-riding Diana delusion) are marshalled; Sixtus turns the tables on Agrippa (Augustine on incubi; Innocent VIII's bull) and gives the Church's teaching: demons transfer a man's seed, so any child is his → folio 552.)

(folio 551, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIII (continued)

[Cassian: "In no way is it to be believed that spiritual] natures can naturally couple with women; since, if at some time this could have happened according to the letter, how does it now also come to pass — whether frequently or rarely — that this same thing does not occur, and that some are born without seed or the coitus of a man? Similarly we should discern [some] conceived of women by [the agency of] demons."

A similar force have the things which **Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia**, in chapter 108 of his *Catalogue against Heresies*, recounts in this manner: "There is another heresy, which asserts concerning the Giants that Angels mingled themselves with women before the Flood, and that thence the giants were born. But if anyone shall think that the Angels so sinned, transformed into flesh, and remained in it — or shall believe them to have been made carnal in this way — he deceives the history by a violent reasoning, just as the lies of the pagans and poets also assert that gods and goddesses, transformed, committed nefarious marriages: for if it was ever done, it will not be doubtful that it is done now also; but what was never done, neither is it manifest that it is done now." Nor from these do those things dissent which **Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria**, discoursed to nearly the same opinion, in the second book of the *Allegories on the Pentateuch*, sermon 1. To these is added the authority of the **Council of Ancyra**, detesting the insane opinion of certain poisoning women, who assert that by night, through long spaces of lands, they are led by wicked spirits to certain places, where they indulge with demons in various pleasures, feasts, and lusts. The words of this council are related in the Decrees of the pontiffs, cause 26, question 5,¹ in this order: "This also must not be omitted — that certain wicked women, turned back after Satan, seduced by the illusions and phantasms of demons, believe and profess that in the nocturnal hours they ride with **Diana**, the goddess of the pagans, or with **Herodias**, or with an innumerable multitude of women, upon certain beasts, and pass over the spaces of many lands in the untimely silence of night, and obey her commands, and are summoned to her service on certain nights. Wherefore let the priests, through the churches committed to them, preach to the people of God that they may know all these things to be false, and that such phantasms are inflicted upon the minds of the faithful by the malignant spirit. For Satan himself transfigures himself into an Angel of light, and, when he has seized the mind of any woman and subjugated her to himself through unbelief, he immediately transfigures himself into the appearances and likenesses of diverse persons, and, deluding through dreams the mind which he holds captive — showing now glad, now sad things, now known, now unknown persons — leads it through byways; and since it is only the unbelieving spirit that suffers this, [the woman] thinks that

this happens not in the mind but in the body. For who, in dreams and nocturnal visions, is not led outside himself, and sees many things while sleeping which he had never seen while waking?"

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Read Augustine, book 18 of *The City of God*, chapter 18.

With these testimonies, therefore, **Agrippa** uses for the defense of the Witches. Whose error, indeed, **Augustine** most openly refutes, in book 15 of *The City of God*, chapter 23, in these words: "That Angels have appeared to men in such bodies that they could not only be seen but even touched, the sacred Scripture most truly testifies. And since it is a very frequent report — and many affirm that they have experienced, or have heard from those who had experienced (of whose credibility there is no doubting) — that **Sylvans and Fauns**, whom [people] commonly call *incubi*, have often been wicked toward women, and have desired and accomplished intercourse with them; and that certain demons, whom the Gauls name **Dusii**, assiduously attempt and accomplish this uncleanness: so many and such [persons] affirm it, that to deny it would seem impudence." There is also extant a decretal epistle of **Pope Innocent VIII** against the heresy of malefic women, in which these words are read: "Not without great trouble has it come to our hearing that very many persons of both sexes, unmindful of their own salvation and deviating from the catholic faith, abuse themselves with Demons, incubi, and succubi. Wherefore, lest the stain of this heretical depravity diffuse its poisons to the ruin of souls, wishing (as it lies upon our office) to provide with fitting remedies, we decree that the inquisitors deputed by us execute the due office of inquisition against persons of this kind."

This is the undoubted determination of Augustine, of Innocent, and of the whole catholic Church: from which the authorities adduced by Agrippa in no way dissent. For neither Chrysostom nor Philastrius deny that women can couple with demons,² but they only refute those who asserted that women were loved by the good and blessed Angels, and entered into with foul unions — since it is impossible that those incorporeal minds, the divine love being cast off (in which they had once been immovably confirmed through the grace of God), should have lowered themselves to the impure lust of women, the Angelic nature being changed into human form according to the fables of the poetic transformations. But as for what **Cassian** wrote — that it is in no way to be believed that spiritual natures couple with women — this is not to be so taken that we should understand that Demons can in no way at all mingle with women, but [only] not in the natural manner of animals,³ that is, by emitting seed of their own substance: as he himself openly indicated, by adding that word "Naturally." For demons can, as Augustine says, not only couple with women, but even generate from them true human sons — not by the power of their own seed (which they have none of from themselves), but by the aid of some seed which they, foully lying under [as succubi] to men, have received, and, lying upon [as incubi] women, have poured in the seed received; so that, as Augustine says in the third book *On the Trinity*, God so disposing, he who is born may not be the son of the demon, but the son of that man from whom the seed was taken.⁴ But to that which is brought forward from the Council of Ancyra, we respond: that the sect of women condemned by the command of the Synod is different from that which is defiled by intercourse with Demons. For that [former sect], as is said in that decree, thought that it was summoned by night — by beasts carrying [them] — to the cult of Herodias and Diana, and that the creatures of God could be transformed by another than by God the Creator into various forms of living things; but of intercourse with demons the synod makes no mention. Moreover, that Agrippa contends that that sect is the same with this one matters either little or nothing. This suffices: that that Synod does not decree that those carryings and transportations of women cannot happen corporeally, nor does it define that they happen always by imagination alone and never in the body; but it only affirms that those women are deceived by false imaginations — which we also do not deny, among →

◇ 2. **Right margin:** Chrysostom and Philastrius do not deny that women can couple with demons.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Demons cannot mingle with women so as to emit seed of their own substance.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** He who is born from the mingling of a woman and a demon is the son of that man from whom the seed was taken.

[...continues on folio 552 (PDF p. 369): the rest of Sixtus's reply on the witches' transportations (Annotatio LXXIII).]

(printed folio 552 [PDF p. 369]. **Annot. LXXIII–LXXVII** (Gen 6:3–4): the demon-intercourse question closed; the Hebrew of Gen 6:3 ("my spirit shall not judge... forever") as clemency; the "120 years" as a lifespan-cap (refuted); Origen's giants as merely impious men (Theodoret: truly huge); and Ambrose on giants begotten of angels and women → folio 553.)

(folio 552, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIII (continued)

[which we also do not deny] sometimes happens; nay, we assert that women of this kind have sometimes lain motionless at home, while they believed themselves carried off into remote regions.

Annotation LXXIV

"My spirit shall not remain in man." — Genesis 6:3

The clause "My spirit shall not remain," etc., badly rendered.

The **Latin** interpreter of our Vulgate edition, for that which is had in Hebrew — לא ידון רוחי; *Lo yadon ruchi* — translated, "My spirit shall not remain in man, because he is flesh"; which the **Septuagint** rendered, οὐ μὴ καταμείνη τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις [my spirit shall not abide among men]. Which version **Jerome**, in the *Hebrew Questions*, rejects in these words: "In the Hebrew it is written, 'My spirit shall not judge these men forever, because they are flesh.' That is: because the condition in man is fragile, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but will here repay them what they deserve. Therefore it sounds not of severity, as is read in our codices, but of the clemency of God — while the sinner is here visited [chastised] for his own crime; whence [God], angry, also speaks to certain ones: 'I will not visit your daughters when they have fornicated, and your spouses when they have committed adultery' [Hosea 4:14];¹ and in another place: 'I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes; nevertheless I will not scatter my mercy from them' [Psalm 88:33]."² These things Jerome [says]: with whom **Rabbi Salomon** [Rashi] agrees, who expounds this to mean "My spirit shall not dispute, shall not contend in judgment." But the Chaldaic [Aramaic] interpretation agrees with our edition, in which it is had: "This most wicked generation shall not persist before me."

◇ 1. Left margin: Hosea 4:14.

◇ 2. Left margin: Psalm 88:33 [Vulgate; = Psalm 89:32].

Annotation LXXV

"Their days shall be a hundred and twenty years." — Genesis 6:3

Whether God restricted the life of man to 120 years.

Josephus, in the first book of the *Antiquities*, explaining this passage, says that God, angry with the human race, circumscribed the life of men within a shorter span, and — the longevity of living which they had before the Flood being abrogated — restricted it within a hundred and twenty years. This same opinion, expounding this very [text], **Lactantius Firmianus** followed, in book 2 of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 14; and **Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus** — which opinion **Chrysostom**, in homily 20, disapproves, and **Jerome**, in the book of *Hebrew Questions*, refutes by the example of the many who lived far more years after the Flood, such as **Abraham**, whose life reached up to the hundred and seventy-fifth year.³

◇ 3. Left margin: Genesis 25:7.

Annotation LXXVI

"But there were giants upon the earth." — Genesis 6:4

Whether the giants were men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size.

Origen — as Gennadius, Bishop of Constantinople, reports in the Greek *Catena on the Octateuch* — weighing this passage in the *Tomes on Genesis*, judged that the Giants were not men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size, but certain wicked and impious men, despisers of God, and plainly atheists. This opinion, Origen's name being suppressed, **Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus**, disapproves, in question 48 on Genesis, in these plain words: "Some say that the Giants are haters of God, and men who are adversaries of God — [those] who have understood these things thus do not say that they had bodies larger than other men. But I, when I hear Scripture saying of **Og** that he was descended from the Giants, and that his bed was of iron, having a length of nine cubits and a breadth of four cubits [Deuteronomy 3:11];⁴ when I hear the explorers narrating that they were, in the sight of the Giants, as locusts [Numbers 13:33];⁵ and of **Goliath**, that he had a length of six cubits and a span [1 Samuel 17:4]⁶ — I judge that there were certain very-huge men, God wisely dispensing this: that they might know God, as omnipotent, to have distributed so great a measure to men. For it was very easy for him to create even larger men; but, that he might cut off pride and restrain arrogance, he did not give men the greatest bodies. For if, endowed with small bodies, they lift themselves up not only against one another but against God the Creator, what would they not have committed, if they had been allotted the greatest bodies?" These things Theodoret. We have written more fully on this matter in the volume of *Physical Questions* which we have gathered upon the divine scriptures.⁷

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Deuteronomy 3:11.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Numbers 13:33.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel 17:4.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** The author's book of *Physical Questions* has not yet come to light [been published].

Annotation LXXVII

"But there were giants upon the earth." — Genesis 6:4

Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women.

Ambrose, in the first book *On Noah and the Ark*, chapter 4, narrating this passage, seems to hand down that the Giants who preceded the Flood were procreated from the intercourse of Angels and women. Which opinion **St. Philastrius**, Bishop of Brescia, in chapter 108 of his *Catalogue*, reckons among the heresies. But these are Ambrose's words: "The founder of divine Scripture does not wish those Giants to be seen, in the manner of the poets, as sons of the earth; but asserts them to have been generated from Angels and women, etc." And elsewhere too Ambrose indicates that the cause of the Angelic ruin, and of the fall from the heavens, happened from this — that angels coupled foully with women — as in the first book *On Virgins*, not far from the end: in which place, comparing among themselves the merits of the continence of virgins and the incontinence of the Angels, he says: "Why should I pursue the praise of chastity with more [words]? For chastity made the Angels. He who kept it is an Angel; he who lost it is a Devil. How illustrious it is, moreover, that Angels, on account of their intemperance, fell from heaven into the world, [while] virgins, on account of their chastity, passed from the world into heaven." From this Ambrosian opinion **Chrysostom** does not much differ, in the homily delivered on the feast of the beheading of John the Baptist, when he says: "Woman laid low not only men, but even Angels from heaven." There are those to whom it seems that Ambrose took this from **Philo**, **Lactantius**, and **Eusebius** — of whom the first, in the book *On Giants*, has it thus: "'The Angels of God saw the daughters of men,' etc. — whom other philosophers [call] *genii*, Moses is wont to call Angels. These are souls flying through the air; nor is there [any reason] why anyone should think this fabulous: for it is necessary that the whole world, in all its parts, should have animate beings — the earth, terrestrial [ones]; the sea, aquatic [ones]; fire, [beings] born of fire, of which very many are reported to be

born in Macedonia; likewise heaven, the stars — for these are wholly immortal and divine souls. Accordingly it necessarily follows that the air too is full of its own living beings, which are invisible to us. Certain of these, therefore, descended into bodies." Thus Philo writes. But **Lactantius**, in the se[cond book] →

[...continues on folio 553 (PDF p. 370): *Lactantius and Eusebius on the angels-and-giants opinion (Annotatio LXXVII).*]

(printed folio 553 [PDF p. 370]. **Annot. LXXVII–LXXIX** (Gen 6:4–7:11): the "angels sinned with women" view (piled from many Fathers but recoiled from by Ambrose — the fall was pride, not lust; Sixtus resolves "sons of God" = the godly line of Seth); Chrysostom on the Cherubim not beholding God (abused by the Armenians); and the LXX's corrupt Flood date → folio 554.)

(folio 553, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXVII (continued)

[But **Lactantius**], in the second book of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 15, speaks of this matter thus: "When, therefore, the number of men had begun to increase, God — foreseeing lest the Devil (to whom from the beginning he had given power over the earth) should either corrupt or scatter the men whom he had made in the beginning — sent Angels for the protection and cultivation of the human race; to whom he enjoined, before all, that they should not, defiled by the contagion of the earth, lose the dignity of their heavenly substance. And so, while they dwelt among men, that most deceitful ruler of the earth, by very habit, gradually enticed them to vices, and polluted them with the embraces of women; then, not received back into heaven on account of the sins in which they had immersed themselves, they fell to the earth. Thus the Devil made them, from Angels of God, his own satellites and ministers." These things Lactantius: before whom, many years [earlier], the same had been held by **Justin Martyr**, in the Apology to the Roman Senate, and in the apology to Antoninus Pius; and by **Clement of Alexandria**, in the third and fifth volumes of the *Stromata* — writing most clearly that the angels sinned with women. To both subscribed **Tertullian the African** and **Methodius, Bishop of Olympus**. Of whom the former, in the book *On the Dress of Women*, says, "The Angels rushed from heaven to the daughters of men, and, after the exhausted moments of their lusts, sighed for heaven"; and here, in the sermon *On the Resurrection*, he says: "The Devil was made wicked concerning the administration of the things committed to him, and conceived envy against us — just as also those who afterward loved flesh, [and] on account of intercourse consorted in love with the daughters of men." Agreeing with these, **Eusebius of Caesarea**, in the fifth volume of the *Evangelical Preparation*, set down these words: "Which matter **Plutarch** the more confirms, saying that the fabulous discourses about the gods signify certain things done by Demons in most ancient times, and that the things sung of the Giants and Titans were operations of Demons. Whence a suspicion has sometimes fallen upon me, whether these be not the very things which, done before the Flood by the Giants, the divine scripture touched upon — concerning which it is said: 'But when the angels of God had seen the daughters of men, that they were beautiful, they chose for themselves wives out of them, from whom were procreated the most famous Giants of the age.' For someone will suspect that they, and their spirits, are those who were afterward called Gods by men, and that their conflicts, tumults, and wars are those which are fabulously written of the gods." Thus far Eusebius: from whose opinion I judge that **Ambrose** recoiled — because in many places, but most of all in the exposition of Psalm 118, sermon 7, in which, speaking of the cause of the Angelic fall, he demonstrates that it was not lust, but pride,¹ saying thus: "The devil himself, through pride, lost the grace of his nature; for when he says, 'I will place my throne above the clouds, and I will be like the Most High' [Isaiah 14:14],² he fell from the fellowship of the Angels." And in epistle 84, to Demetrias, showing that the devil fell through

pride before man's fall, he says: "Pride took its beginning from the devil, who — since he was pleased with his own power and dignity, which he had received from the Creator, and compared himself to the glory of his author — together with those Angels whom he had drawn into the consent of his impiety, was cast down from the heavenly sublimity. And therefore he was able to harm the first men, because he persuaded them, ill-believing, that they would become better if they leaped out into the liberty of their own will, than if they remained in the custody of the given law."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** The cause of the Angelic fall, in St. Ambrose's judgment, was pride.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Isaiah 14:14.

Accordingly, lest the aforesaid words of Ambrose move anyone, one must know that he understood, by "Angels," not spiritual and heavenly substances, but illustrious men and worshippers of the one God, descending from the holy stock of Seth³ — whom, because they had remained until that day in the faith and worship of the one God (as we have already said), Moses called בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים; *Bene elohim*, that is, "Sons of God"; [and] the older edition of the Seventy interpreters said τοὺς ἀγγέλους Θεοῦ [the angels of God]; the Italic edition — which Augustine expounded in the fifteenth book *On the City of God*, chapter 23 — called [them] "Angels of God"; and Ambrose, following this, called the parents of the Giants "angels." Which his own words also show, when, in the book *On Noah and the Ark*, in that place which we cited above, he added: "Scripture usually calls the sons of God, or faithful men, 'Angels,' because souls are generated from no man." To this exposition **Augustine** assents, in the *Questions on Genesis*, question 3, in this manner: "It is asked how the Angels could lie with the daughters of men, whence the Giants are reported to have been born — although some codices, both Latin and Greek, do not have 'Angels' but 'Sons of God': whom certain [interpreters], for solving this question, believed to have been just men, who could also be called by the name of 'Angels.' For of the man John it is written, 'Behold, I send my Angel,' etc.⁴ Whence it is more credible that just men — called either 'Angels' or 'sons of God,' [and] fallen through concupiscence — sinned with women, than that Angels, not having flesh, could have descended to that sin; although concerning certain Demons, who are troublesome to women, so many things are said by many, that it is not easy to define an opinion on this matter."

◇ 3. **Right margin:** St. Ambrose, by the name of "Angels," understood illustrious men and worshippers of the one God.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Malachi 3:[1].

Annotation LXXVIII

"Noah a just man, and perfect." — Genesis 6:9

Whether God can be seen by the angels.

Chrysostom, at the end of the 23rd homily on Genesis, explaining this, has this proposition: "The flashing majesty of the divine glory neither the Cherubim nor those incorporeal powers can see; but they cover their opposed faces, their wings being set against [it]." The **Armenian heretics**, who taught that God is not seen by the blessed, used this and very many other similar sentences of Chrysostom,⁵ the elucidation of which you have in Annotation 182 of the following book.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** The Armenians denied that God is seen by the blessed.

Annotation LXXIX

"In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life." — Genesis 7:11

The number of the years and the months of the Flood [is] corrupted.

The **Septuagint** interpreters — where we, according to the Hebrew truth, have "In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month," etc. — are faulty, and depraved in the number both of the years and of the months. For it has ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ἐν τῇ ζωῆ τοῦ Νῶε, τῷ

δευτέρῳ μηνί, ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός — that is, "In the six-hundred-and-first year in the life of Noah, in the second month, on the twenty-seventh of the month." There is therefore here a twofold error. For first there is made an addition of one year, whereas the sacred letters most openly attest that Noah entered the ark in the six-hundredth year of his life, and that in the same year the Flood inundated. Then [there] is an error in the number of the days of the month, an addition of ten days being made →

[...continues on folio 554 (PDF p. 371): the rest of the Septuagint's Flood-date error (Annotatio LXXIX).]

(printed folio 554 [PDF p. 371]. **Annot. LXXIX–LXXXIV** (Gen 7:11–8:11): the LXX's Flood-date errors; Procopius on an immovable heaven; the constellations as causes of the Flood (d'Ailly, William of Auvergne, the Jupiter–Saturn conjunction condemned as heretical); the LXX's ten-day error at the ark's resting; the raven's "did not return"; and the dove with the olive branch.)

(folio 554, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXIX (continued)

[an addition of ten days being made] above the seven and ten [seventeen] days which are reckoned in the Hebrew. The first error arises because, a little below, in chapter 8 — when now one year had been completed — it is said, ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ καὶ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει, etc., that is, "In the six-hundred-and-first year of Noah's life, in the first month, on the first day of that month, the water failed" [Genesis 8:13].¹ The second error similarly arises because, below in the same chapter 8, it is written, "In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dried" [Genesis 8:14].² Chrysostom, however, and Procopius follow the number of the Greek codices.

◇ 1. Left margin: Genesis 8:13.

◇ 2. Left margin: Genesis 8:14.

Annotation LXXX

"The floodgates of heaven were opened." — Genesis 7:11

Whether heaven is spherical and mobile.

Procopius of Gaza, explaining this, speaks thus: "Accordingly, those think wrongly who imagine heaven [to be] spherical and mobile; for heaven stands immovable, and it is the path of the stars running their course in it." See what we noted above on this, in the first chapter of Genesis, Annotation 14.

Annotation LXXXI

"The floodgates of heaven were opened." — Genesis 7:11

Whether the Noachic Flood could have been foreknown from observation of the stars, as Pierre d'Ailly thought.

Peter of Ailly [Pierre d'Ailly], Cardinal-Priest, disputing in the questions on Genesis upon this sentence, asserts that, although Noah foreknew the coming Flood by prophetic revelation, God announcing it, yet he could have foreseen this same thing long before it happened, from Astronomical rules — namely, from the knowledge of the constellations, which not only presignified that universal cataclysm, but even, by God's command, effected it — not as primary causes, but as handmaids and ministers, applying, in obedience to their omnipotent Lord, the powers and faculties which they had received from him for inundating and submerging the globe of the earth. These constellations, the producers of the inundations, Moses called "the floodgates of heaven," signifying, through their opening, that time in which God released all the inundating

powers and influences — enclosed in the aforesaid constellations — as if, the barriers being unlocked, to the flooding of the whole earth. This same assertion he confirms, in the volume *On Sects and Laws*, and in the book *On the Concordance of Astronomy and Theology*, by the example of the Rainbow: which, just as God willed to be a sign, for the security of men, of a universal Flood no more to come, so it is probable that God, from the prognostics and signs of the stars, foretold the Flood for the penitence of sinners.

In this very opinion had been, long before, **William [of Auvergne], Bishop of Paris**, who, in the first part of his work *On the Universe*, expounding this passage, wrote thus: "Moses, the Prophet of the Hebrews, called 'floodgates of heaven' those parts of heaven which are generative of rains and inundations of waters — such as are the watery signs, like Cancer and Pisces, the Pleiades, the Hyades, and Orion among the stars, and Mars, and Venus, and the Moon among the Planets. The floodgates of heaven, therefore, are understood [to be] then opened, when causes of this kind are loosed and confirmed, by the nod of the Creator, unto the operations of rains and inundations." These things William: with whom agreeing, **Henry of Mechlin**, a disciple of Albert the Great, in the commentaries which he published on the great *Conjunctions* of Albumasar, reports that he found, from Astronomical reckonings, that a certain conjunction of the stars preceded the Noachic Flood, inducing a general flooding of waters — namely [the conjunction] of Jupiter and Saturn at the end of Cancer, in the region of the Argive ship [the constellation Argo], by which also Noah's ark is signified. This opinion — proposed forty years ago by **Tiberio Calabro**, a philosopher, in public disputations, and also defended in writings — **Jerome Armellini**, a Dominican, confuted in a particular volume published against him, and condemned as heretical.³ See an annotation of nearly this same argument above, Annotation 15, and in book 6, Annotation 10.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** He who attributes the Noachic inundation to conjunctions of the stars is refuted by Jerome Armellini.

Annotation LXXXII

"The ark rested in the seventh month." — Genesis 8:4

The days of the ceasing Flood wrongly reckoned.

The **Septuagint** interpreters, for that which is had in Hebrew — "The ark rested in the seventh month," יום בְּשִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר [be-shiv'ah asar yom], that is, "on the seventeenth day" — rendered ἐβδόμη καὶ εἰκάδι, that is, "on the twenty-seventh day of the month," an addition of ten days being made. This error our interpreter too, in the Vulgate edition, followed: nor is it fitting to believe that the Hebrew codices are corrupt, since that number agrees with the hundred and fifty days in which the Flood devastated the lands, and the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition attests the same.

Annotation LXXXIII

"The raven, going forth, did not return." — Genesis 8:7

Whether the raven returned into the ark.

The **Septuagint**, translating that which is read affirmatively in the Hebrew concerning the raven sent out by Noah — וַיֵּצֵא יֵצוֹא וַיָּשׁוּב [va-yetze yatzo va-shov], that is, "And going forth it went forth and returned" — expressed [it] negatively, καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐκ ἀνέστρεψεν, that is, "And going forth it did not return" — which our Vulgate edition also follows. **Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos**, in his Annotations, writing against this interpretation, says: "This error caused expositors to weave in here most fabulous questions, asking in what place the raven was absent for so many days outside the ark, and where it settled when the waters were not yet dried up, and whether the raven returned to Noah into the ark after the drying of the waters: because Moses, according to the depraved Scripture, says, 'And it did not return until the water was dried up.' The negation, therefore, must be removed both from our and from the Greek codices; and, according to the Hebrew truth and Josephus's interpretation, it must be read that the raven returned into the ark." **Aloysius**

[Ludovico], Bishop of Verona, in the *Catena on Genesis*, harmonizes the Vulgate Septuagint edition and ours together with the Hebrew truth, in these words: "This passage is not badly translated, as some think; for, when it is said in the Hebrew or Chaldaic edition, 'The raven went forth, by going forth and returning, until the waters were thus wanting upon the earth,' this negative is included — that, after the waters were dried, it did not return: so that at its first going-out it flew about around the ark, as if it wished to return, until the waters should be dried; thence, having gone forth completely, it did not return — as our text sounds, with the Greek and with Josephus."

Annotation LXXXIV

"The dove returned, bearing a branch of olive." — Genesis 8:11

[...the body of Annotatio LXXXIV begins on folio 555 (PDF p. 372), with Chrysostom.]

(printed folio 555 [PDF p. 372]. **Annot. LXXXIV–LXXXVIII** (Gen 8:11–11:11): Chrysostom's "dry olive-leaf" (a translator's slip on *κάρφος*); Chrysostom on circumcision conferring nothing; Giorgio allegorizing Noah's drunkenness; Chrysostom's single primeval tongue before Babel; and the LXX's twofold error in Shem's genealogy → folio 556.)

(folio 555, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXXIV (continued)

"The dove returned, bearing a branch of olive." — Genesis 8:11

Chrysostom, in homily 26 on Genesis, seems to read and expound in a contrary sense that which our Vulgate edition has — "The dove RETURNED, bearing a branch of olive with green leaves" — saying, "The dove RETURNED, having a dry olive-leaf in its mouth."¹ But it appears that Chrysostom's translator was deceived,² no less by a tautology than by the ambiguity of the word, which in this place is found as much in Chrysostom as in the Septuagint interpreters and among the Hebrews. For the Hebrew codices have it thus: וְהִנֵּה אֵלֶיךָ עֵלֶה זַיִת תָּרַף בְּפִיָּהּ, [ve-hinneh aleh zayit taraf be-fiha], that is, "And behold, an olive-leaf, a branch, in its mouth." But **Aben Ezra** [Ibn Ezra] asserts that here there occurs an apposition and a certain *tautology*; for he says that "olive-leaf" and what is immediately subjoined, *Taraf*, that is, "branch," are the same — as, he says, often in the scriptures (as in "dust and ashes"). Therefore the Septuagint, changing nothing, translated καὶ εἶχε φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς, that is, "And it had an olive-leaf, a twig, in its mouth." Following these, Chrysostom too applied to "olive-leaf" the word *κάρφος*, which is ambiguous to the Greeks and signifies two things — namely "dry" and "a twig," or a little branch. His translator, therefore, not considering the repetition of the synonymous word, translated *κάρφος* — which in this place signifies "a twig" — as "dry," the sense of Chrysostom plainly protesting against it, who a little after adds words of this kind: "This tree is ever-green, and it is probable that, when the waters had receded, this tree still had a head of leaves." By which words he shows that he spoke not of a dry olive-leaf, but rather of a green one — although the Hebrew truth indicates that the olive-leaf was neither dry nor green. The Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition translated this passage more correctly than the Septuagint, saying: "And behold, an olive-leaf plucked with its mouth." For *תָּרַף*, *taraf* signifies to the Hebrews both "a twig" and "seized" or "plucked."

◇ 1. Left margin: What kind of branch the dove brought.

◇ 2. Left margin: Chrysostom's translator was deceived.

Annotation LXXXV

"The Lord smelled the odor of sweetness." — Genesis 8:21

Whether circumcision conferred anything to the soul's salvation.

Chrysostom, homily 27 on Genesis, expounding this, seems to assert that Circumcision, in the old law, conferred absolutely nothing to justice and the salvation of the soul — the opposite of which Augustine, with the rest of the theologians, holds. See below, in the centuries, chapter 17, Annotation 96.

Annotation LXXXVI

"Noah planted a vineyard, and drinking the wine was made drunk." — Genesis 9:20–21

Of what kind was Noah's drunkenness.

Francesco Giorgio, in the first volume, Problem 101, so explains these words that he seems to subvert the truth of the history, affirming that Noah was not made drunk from the wine of the vine which he had planted (as Moses seems to indicate) — because from a pure drunkenness of wine so many evils would not have followed. But he was drunk either from an excessive affection for his own [people], or from the wisdom of earthly things, which in very many places is designated by "wine." For those who pursue this [earthly wisdom] go so far away from God that they many times rush into scandal — as happened to **Balaam**, **Ahithophel**, and **Solomon**.

Annotation LXXXVII

"And the earth was of one lip [language]." — Genesis 11:1

There was only one language for all before the tower was built, as St. Chrysostom rightly held.

Chrysostom, in homily 30 on Genesis, narrating this, says that before the building of the tower of Babel there was one natural language of all men, and that all mortals used the same speech. Which opinion — the author's name being omitted, however — **Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia**, in the *Catalogue of Heresies*, chapter 106, rebukes as heretical,³ asserting that it must be firmly believed that even many ages before the building of Babel there were several varieties of speech and of languages, the knowledge of which all men had from God's gift up to the construction of the tower and the confusion of tongues; but that Moses says the earth was "of one lip," he thinks was said because, although there were several kinds of languages, yet all understood one another — and there was to all one language and the same speech, not according to the same use of words, but according to the same understanding of meanings. **Alphonsus [de Castro] of Zamora**, in book 9 *Against Heresies*, is so far from this censure of Philastrius that he judges *it* [Philastrius's view] to be heretical: because Moses most openly teaches that, before the times of Babel, there was only one language of all — when he says, "And the earth was of one lip, and of the same words"; and when, a little after, he adds that in the building of Babel the lip of the whole earth was then first confounded — that is, then first began to be divided, and various, and manifold, which before had been simple, undivided, and one. It must be held, therefore, according to the true explanation of Chrysostom, that there was only one speech of all mortals before the building of the tower; and Philastrius is, on this point, to be rejected — who, it appears, was deceived by a light consideration of the words of Moses: who, before he began, in chapter 11, to describe the building of the tower, had first, in chapter 10, narrated how the seven sons of Japheth divided the islands of the nations in their regions, each according to their languages and their kindreds. Which words, not noticing that they were said by *anticipation* [prolepsis], Philastrius thought that there were already then several languages before Babel was built. For it is, according to the rule of **Tyconius**, the custom of divine Scripture to narrate some things by anticipation — namely, that before they are done they should be somehow, and cursorily, narrated, so that afterward each thing done should be described more fully in its own order. And that this is the true interpretation of this passage, **Augustine** teaches, in book 16 *On the City of God*, chapter 4, writing thus: "When, therefore, those nations are reported to have been in their own languages, the narrator nevertheless returns to that time when there was one Language of all, and thence now expounds what happened, so that a diversity of languages should arise. 'And,' he says, 'all the earth was one lip, and one

voice to all."

◇ 3. **Right margin:** An error of Philastrius.

Annotation LXXXVIII

"And Shem lived, after he begot Arphaxad, etc." — Genesis 11:11

An error in the number and the years of the generations of Shem.

The **Septuagint**, in the present genealogy of Shem, have a twofold error: one in the number of the generations by which the genealogy is woven, the other in the number of the years by which the authors of these generations lived. →

[...continues on folio 556 (PDF p. 373): the two errors detailed (Annotatio LXXXVIII).]

*(printed folio 556 [PDF p. 373], with a comparative table. **Annot. LXXXVIII–LXXXIX** (Gen 11:11–12:13): the LXX's inserted second **Cainan** (which entered Luke 3's genealogy) and its ~280-year inflation of the patriarchs' ages (tabulated); then Chrysostom on Abraham's "sister" ruse, branding it a "fiction" or "lie" → folio 557.)*

(folio 556, left column → right column, with a full-width table between)

Annotation LXXXVIII (continued)

The first [error] is that, whereas Moses numbers only nine generations from Shem to Abraham, the Septuagint reckon ten,¹ a Cainan generation being added immediately after Arphaxad the son of Shem, in this manner: "Shem lived, after he begot for himself Arphaxad, thirty-five years, and begot sons and daughters, and died; and Arphaxad lived a hundred and thirty-five years, and begot Cainan; and Arphaxad lived, after he begot Cainan, 430 years, and begot sons and daughters, and died; and Cainan lived a hundred and thirty years and begot Shelah; and Cainan lived, after he begot Shelah, 330 years, and begot sons and daughters, and died" — all of which are redundant, and the Hebrew truth entirely ignores, setting down that Arphaxad himself begot Shelah, and not Cainan. And this same error crept into the genealogy of our Savior, described in the third chapter of the Gospel according to Luke: who, as in other things, so also in this, followed the Septuagint edition, in his times most received throughout the whole world. Which indeed **Jerome**, greatly wondering at, says: "I especially marvel, and — on account of the slowness of [my] understanding, struck with most vehement stupor — I do not know how to search out by what reasoning, whereas in the Hebrew, from the Flood (that is, from Noah) up to Abraham ten generations are found, Luke himself (who, the Holy Spirit guiding his pen, could in no way write anything false) preferred to set down in the Gospel eleven generations, according to the Septuagint interpreters, Cainan being added." **Aloysius [Ludovico], Bishop of Verona**, says it could have happened that the Holy Spirit, by some hidden reason, moved the mind of Moses to pass over the Cainan generation in the series of this genealogy — just as the Evangelist Matthew too wrapped up certain [names] in silence in the genealogy of the Savior.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Moses numbers only nine generations from Shem to Abraham, but the Septuagint ten.

The second error is in the enumeration of the years of the life of those contained in this genealogy: for the reckoning of the Seventy interpreters exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by nearly two hundred and eighty years,² as appears in the three little columns written below — of which the first contains the reckoning of the years according to the Hebrew truth, the second the reckoning of the Septuagint, the third the difference of each reckoning according to the excess and defect of each number.

◇ 2. **Right margin:** The reckoning of the Septuagint interpreters exceeds the Hebrew reckoning by nearly 280 years.

(In the third column, "Desunt" = the Septuagint falls *short* by that many years; "Redundant / Redund." = the Septuagint *exceeds* by that many.)

Hebrew reckoning	Hebr.	LXX	Difference
Shem, after begetting Arphaxad, lived	500	335	Desunt 165
Arphaxad, before begetting Shelah, lived	35	130	Redundant 95
Arphaxad, after begetting Shelah	403	330	Desunt 73
Shelah, before begetting Eber	30	130	Redund. 100
Shelah, after begetting Eber	403	330	Desunt 73
Eber, before begetting Peleg	34	134	Redund. 100
Eber, after begetting Peleg	430	370	Desunt 60
Peleg, before begetting Reu	30	130	Redund. 100
Reu, before begetting Serug	32	130	Redund. 98
Serug, before begetting Nahor	30	130	Redund. 100
Nahor, before begetting Terah	29	79	Redund. 50
Nahor, after begetting Terah	119	129	Redund. 10
Sum of the whole reckoning	2075	2357	difference 282

To these generations, if you add the 460 years of the life of Cainan superadded by the Septuagint interpreters, the difference of the years of each reckoning is increased up to the number of 742 years. See book 6, where we wrote concerning the superadded generation of Cainan, Annotation 143; and book 7, heresy 4.

Annotation LXXXIX

"Say therefore, I beseech you, that you are my sister." — *Genesis 12:13*

Whether Abraham lied.

Chrysostom, homily 32 on Genesis, upon these words, extols Sarah with many praises — that, her husband being brought into the danger of death, she consented to [him] persuading simulation and adultery, and promptly presented herself to both. For he writes thus: "Therefore the just man consents to the adultery of his wife, and, as it were, serves the adultery to the dishonor of the woman, that he may escape death. Have you seen the bond of the charity of the man and the woman? Have you seen the man — what things he dared to suggest to the woman; and what counsel the woman received, and did not refuse, nor bears it grievously, so that that fable and fiction is hidden?" And a little after: "Who would not be astonished at this readiness to obey? Who could sufficiently praise her, that — after so great continence, and at such an age — in order to keep the just man [safe], so far as it lay in her will, she exposed herself even to adultery, and bore the embrace of barbarians?" Thus far Chrysostom, who in this part seems to differ, in three ways, from the common opinion of the other Fathers. **First**, that he calls this consultation of Abraham and Sarah not only in this place a fable and a fiction, but in other places also a fabrication, a scene, a comedy, a tragedy, a deception, a hypocrisy, and a lie. In homily 45 on Genesis, expounding those words by which God accuses King Abimelech, who had taken away Sarah from Abraham her husband, he speaks in this manner: "But God said to Abimelech, I know that they themselves contrived this fable, and that, deceived, you did this by their

words"; and a little after he adds: "He too, fearing lest he be killed by you, contrived this comedy, and, as it were, cooperated in the dishonor of Sarah." And in the second book *On the Providence of God* he says: "Abraham then came into such great necessity that he even submitted to hypocrisy — than which, what more miserable [thing] can be said?" And in the epistle to Olympias he says: "Did not Abraham, on account of the fear of death, prefer to give his own wife to barbarian pleasures and to the Egyptian tyranny? For he himself composed the fable [with] injury, and asked his wife to simulate with him so horrendous a tragedy — does he not blush, bringing forward the cause of such a scene? 'For it will be,' he says, 'that when they see you beautiful of face, they will kill me and will keep you. Say therefore that you are my sister, that it may be well with me on account of you, and that my soul may live for your sake.' Do you see the fear? do you see the trembling agitating that lofty and philoso[phical soul]" →

[...continues on folio 557 (PDF p. 374): the rest of Chrysostom's censure, and the second and third ways he differs from the Fathers (Annotatio LXXXIX).]

(printed folio 557 [PDF p. 374]. **Annot. LXXXIX–XC** (Gen 12:13–14:18): Chrysostom on Abraham's ruse — praising licit "frauds" for others' good (verging on Priscillianism) and Sarah's self-exposure (Augustine rejects both; the stricter view: die rather than betray chastity); then the famous question over Melchisedech's person (Angel, Son of God, Holy Spirit, a higher power, or Shem) → folio 558.)

(folio 557, left column → right column)

Annotation LXXXIX (continued)

— [do you see the fear? do you see the trembling agitating] that lofty and philosophical soul? — and he lied about the very kind [of relationship], bringing forward one person in place of another."

The **SECOND** [way in which Chrysostom seems to differ] is that he judges this fiction and dissimulation of Sarah and Abraham to be worthy of praise, admiration, and imitation, departing in nothing from that opinion which he most openly professes in all his writings — namely, that it is licit, indeed even fitting, for a perfect man to use frauds, wiles, and impostures, not only in his own necessities but also for the advantages of others, for the purpose not of harming but of helping,¹ as you will be able to see clearly below, chapter 27, Annotation 106. These two assertions — just as (Augustine being witness, in the book *Against Lying*, chapter 2) they seem to incline toward the heresy of the Priscillianists — so are they opposed to Augustine himself, and to the rest of the theologians, especially the Scholastics, who assert that all dissimulation, whether harmful or officious [well-meant], and every fraud, is a vice contrary to truth and belonging to the crime of lying. For whether by speech, or by any deed whatever, out of a zeal either to harm or to help, someone lies, he is a liar; and every lie is either a sin, or is not without sin. Accordingly **Augustine**, in book 22 *Against Faustus*, chapter 24, denies that Abraham lied: since, being asked what Sarah was to him, he declared her a sister, he did not deny her a wife — keeping silent about something true, not saying anything false; for she was truly his sister on his father's side, though not on his mother's. **Chrysostom** himself acknowledges this same thing, in homily 45 on Genesis, where he openly confesses that Abraham's fiction had in it nothing of a lie, when he says: "See how diligently the just man acts, to show *that not even in this did he lie*." But concerning Chrysostom's opinion on the assertion of officious fraud we have written more fully below, in Annotation 107 of this book.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether it is lawful to lie in order to help [another].

There **REMAINS** the **THIRD** [point], which is contained as asserted in the aforesaid words of Chrysostom — namely, that Sarah is chiefly to be praised and imitated in this, that for the sake of saving her husband she exposed herself to the adultery of barbarians, the husband nevertheless consenting to her adultery, indeed

even persuading it.² From this opinion **Augustine** dissents, denying that Abraham either persuaded or conceded adultery to his wife, writing thus in book 22, chapter 33, against Faustus: "*For Abraham did not consent to the disgrace of his wife, but committed to God the chastity of his spouse — about whose mind he had no doubt — being sure of his God, that he would not allow anything so base and disgraceful to be suffered. Nor did his faith deceive him: to whom first Pharaoh, terrified by portents, and then Abimelech, warned by a dream, both restored his wife unharmed and with honor.*" Thus Augustine.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Whether a wife ought, in order to save her husband, to expose herself to adultery.

There are also those who affirm that neither to the husband nor to the wife is the remedy of adultery lawful for the sake of avoiding the death of either; but that they ought to await death — indeed, rather to seek death of their own accord — than to betray chastity, for the preservation of which many most chaste women not only endured to be killed by others, but even laid hands upon themselves:³ as **Sophonra**, wife of the prefect of the city of Rome, who — as Eusebius relates in book 8 of the *History* — noticing that her husband, terrified by fear of death, had betrayed her chastity to the tyrant Maxentius, when she had first prayed to God on bended knees, as though about to immolate her chastity to Christ, transfixing her breast with a seized sword. Following whose example, several holy virgins, whose martyrdom the Church celebrates, slew themselves lest they take on a stain upon their chastity.⁴ But concerning these we have written more at length in the censures upon the expositors of Jonah, Annotation 253.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it is lawful to perish by one's own hand.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The Church celebrates the martyrdoms of certain virgins who brought death upon themselves lest they lose their chastity.

Augustine, in book 22, chapter 37, against Faustus, and in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 29, calls into doubt whether Sarah's chastity could have been subjected to the lust of the barbarians without any crime of adultery⁵ — as if, for the husband's life, it were lawful, with his consent, to lie with another man; as once, in the time of the Emperor Constantius, was done at Antioch, where, when the prefect **Acindynus** was keeping a certain man in prison to be put to death — because he did not have a pound of gold which he owed to the treasury, whence he might pay it — the wife, moved by love of her husband, sold (the husband himself consenting) one night's intercourse to a certain rich man who anxiously demanded it and promised a pound of gold as the price, that at that price she might redeem her husband's life from the prefect. And this deed of Acindynus having been set forth at length, [Augustine] leaves it free for each to judge as he will — although he seems more inclined to that side, that this may by no means be done.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** St. Augustine doubts whether Sarah's chastity could be exposed to peril without the crime of adultery.

Annotation XC

"But Melchisedech, king of Salem [brought forth bread and wine]." — Genesis 14:18

Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held.

Origen, discoursing about Melchisedech the priest, asserted that he was not a man but an Angel. This error Jerome attributes to him in the Epistle to Evagrius, writing thus: "*Straightway, at the very front of Genesis, in the first homily of Origen, I found [something] written concerning Melchisedech; in which, disputing with manifold discourse, he slid down to this — that he called him an Angel; and with almost the same arguments by which your author (who makes Melchisedech the Holy Spirit) [argues], I passed over to Didymus, his follower, and I saw that the man went on foot into the opinion of the master.*" Thus Jerome — understanding, perhaps, by "the first homily" the first tome; for in the first homily of Origen, which is now had on Genesis, there is no mention of Melchisedech. Origen can be excused by the diversity of opinions which existed on this matter among the ancients — among whom, as Jerome, writing to Evagrius, is witness, there was a most famous question concerning the person of the priest Melchisedech. For indeed, as **Epiphanius** relates in book 2 against heresies, heresy 55, certain unnamed heretics said that Melchisedech was the Only-begotten

himself, and the natural Son of God, who appeared in human form to Abraham.⁶ **Hierax the Egyptian**, who composed learned but heretical commentaries, in Greek and in Egyptian [Coptic], on the *Hexaemeron*, thought him to be the Holy Spirit. The **Melchisedechian** heretics, whose author was **Theodorus the money-changer [Argentarius]**, reckoned him to be a certain great power superior to Christ, from which Christ himself received the order of his eternal Priesthood.

◇ **6. Right margin:** Some heretics thought Melchisedech was the natural Son of God; others said he was the Holy Spirit.

The **Samaritans** judged him to be the same as **Shem**, the firstborn son of Noah,⁷ and [held] that at the time when Abraham was born he had three hundred and ninety years of age, and that to Abraham, his own great-great-grandson [*abnepos*], he →

◇ **7. Right margin:** The Samaritans thought Melchisedech was Shem, the firstborn of Noah.

[...continues on folio 558 (PDF p. 375): the rest of the opinions on Melchisedech's person (Annotatio XC).]

(printed folio 558 [PDF p. 375]. **Annot. XC–XCIV** (Gen 14:18–16:3): the Melchisedech survey closed (Shem; a just priest; Jerome's Salim); pseudo-Augustine making him the Holy Spirit incarnate (refuted); booty in a just war (Aquinas); Philo's hell-as-conscience; and whether Abraham's union with Hagar was legitimate matrimony (yes) → folio 559.)

(folio 558, left column → right column)

Annotation XC (continued)

survived by forty years — [Abraham,] his own great-great-grandson [*abnepos*] of the tenth degree.

The **Jews** handed down that he was indeed a just man, and priest of God Most High (as the divine Scripture has it), but begotten of an impure harlot and a fornicating man, and that on this account his parents are not mentioned in the sacred letters.¹ **Irenaeus** and **Hippolytus** wrote that he was king of Jerusalem — which was first called Salem, then Jebus, and at last named Jerusalem.² Leaving their opinions aside, **Jerome**, in the aforesaid epistle to Evagrius, affirms that Melchisedech was not king of the Salem which was afterward called Jerusalem, but that he reigned in the town of Salim near Scythopolis, in the region of Shechem, in the tribe of Ephraim: where that Melchisedech's palace was magnificent is gathered from the magnitude of its ruins.³

◇ **1. Left margin:** The opinion of the Jews concerning Melchisedech.

◇ **2. Left margin:** The opinion of Irenaeus and Hippolytus concerning the same.

◇ **3. Left margin:** What Jerome thought concerning Melchisedech.

Annotation XCI

"But Melchisedech, king of Salem." — Genesis 14:18

Whether Melchisedech was the Holy Spirit.

Augustine, in the book of *Questions of the Old and New Testament*, question 109, strives with many arguments to prove that Melchisedech was not a mere man, but a certain Power of God — namely the Holy Spirit — who then appeared in human form, just as afterward the Son of God appeared in the flesh. Weighing this error, **Alphonsus de Castro**, in the 10th book *Against Heresies*, denies that the book which is entitled *On the Question of the Old and New Testament* is Augustine's, although it is circulated under his name.⁴ And besides the other arguments which he brings to prove this, he judges this one most effective: that Augustine, in the book *On Heresies* to Quodvultdeus, sets down this very opinion in the thirty-fourth place, attributing it to the heretics whom he calls Melchisedechians. It is not likely that Augustine was so stupid as to teach a

heretical assertion, and one condemned by himself; and had he ever taught it, he ought to have recanted the same in the books of the *Retractions* — which, however, is nowhere found done by him in the whole course of that work.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** The book *On the Questions of the Old and New Testament* is not St. Augustine's.

Annotation XCII

"I will not take anything of all that is thine." — Genesis 14:23

Whether it is lawful for soldiers to take booty.

Ambrose, in the first book *On Abraham*, chapter 3, explaining this, makes booty licit to soldiers in these words: "*When booty is in the power of the victor, military discipline requires that all things be kept for the king.*" This passage **St. Thomas** annotated, as opposing the opinion of Augustine, who in the book *On the Words of the Lord according to Matthew*, sermon 19, forbids booty to soldiers, saying: "*To be a soldier is not a sin; but to be a soldier for the sake of booty is a sin.*"⁵ Removing this dissonance, the same author [Aquinas], in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 66, article 8, says that Ambrose's opinion is true when the war has been just — in which whatever is acquired by arms becomes [the victor's] by the best right; yet the victors can, in this just acquisition of booty, sin through greed for booty and a depraved intention of mind — namely when they fight principally not for the sake of justice, but for the sake of certain [gains]. In which sense Augustine judged it a sin to serve as a soldier for the sake of booty.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Whether to serve as a soldier for the sake of booty is a sin.

Annotation XCIII

"Go in to my handmaid, that perhaps I may have children by her." — Genesis 16:2

Whether hell is only the conscience of sinners, as Philo held.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On the Meeting for the Sake of Seeking Erudition* [*De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia*], expounding this passage, seems to insinuate that the place and punishment of hell is nothing else than the conscience of a wicked man, saying thus: "*God scatters the unjust and impious soul, put to flight from himself, most far off into the place of lusts and of crimes — which place is more aptly called the [place] of the impious than that fabled one among the infernal regions. For in truth hell is nothing else than the life of a wretched, wicked, and execrable man.*" This same error is attributed to Origen, as you will be able to see below, Annotation 229 of this book.

Annotation XCIV

"She took Hagar the Egyptian, her handmaid, and gave her to her husband." — Genesis 16:3

Whether Abraham's intercourse with Hagar was adultery.

Ambrose, in book 1 *On Abraham the Patriarch*, chapter 4, excusing Abraham's intercourse with the handmaid Hagar, seems to hint at two things beyond the common opinion of the theologians: first, that that intercourse was adultery; second, that adultery in Abraham's times was not illicit, because the Law had not yet forbidden and condemned it. His words are these: "*But perhaps someone will say: How does Abraham propose himself to us for imitation, since he took a son from a handmaid? Or, what is the meaning of this, that so great a man was liable to this error? But let us first consider that Abraham was before the Law of Moses and before the Gospel, when adultery did not yet seem forbidden. The penalty of a crime is from the time of the law which prohibited the crime, nor before the law is there any condemnation of the matter. Therefore Abraham did not offend against the Law, but anticipated the Law. God, though in paradise he praised marriage, did not [there] condemn adultery.*"⁶ **Chrysostom**, **Augustine**, and the rest of the theologians think otherwise, and assert in the first place that Abraham's intercourse was neither adultery nor

fornication, but legitimate matrimony, free from all suspicion of baseness: because Abraham did not sleep with the handmaid except after he had received her from Sarah as a wife — as Moses too openly manifests, saying, "*And Sarah gave her to her husband as a wife.*" They add, then, that adultery and fornication were licit at no times;⁷ whence **St. Thomas** too, from their general assent — rejecting the opinion of Rabbi Moses the Egyptian [Maimonides], who says that fornications and adulteries before the promulgation of the Law were not sins — decrees that both fornication and adultery are against the law of nature, and at no time, neither of themselves nor by dispensation, were licit: because both are contrary to the first precepts of the law of nature, which do not admit dispensation. These things being considered, there are those who think that Ambrose brought forward the solution of the aforesaid doubt not from his own mind, but from the mind of others, and that on this account he at once subjoined the second and third solution of his question as though from his own opinion. →

◇ **6. Right margin:** Whether before the Law was given adultery was a crime.

◇ **7. Right margin:** Adultery and fornication were always sins.

[...continues on folio 559 (PDF p. 376): the next Annotatio.]

(printed folio 559 [PDF p. 376]. **Annot. XCV–XCVII** (Gen 16:11–17:12): Philo making the rational soul God's work but the sensible soul the angels'; Chrysostom seeming to make circumcision a bare sign conferring no grace (refuted); and Giorgio's astrological reasons for eighth-day circumcision. (The source misprints XCV as "XCI"; corrected here.) → folio 560.)

(folio 559, left column → right column)

Annotation XCV

Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held.

(The printed text misprints this annotation XCI; corrected here to XCV, its proper place in the sequence.)

"Thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael." — Genesis 16:11

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Fugitives* [*De profugis*], which he published on the sixteenth chapter of Genesis, incidentally explaining that saying, "Let us make man to our image," etc., wrongly asserts that only the rational soul of the first parent was created by God, but that its sensible and vegetable soul was made by the angels. His words run thus: "*Moses, when he philosophizes about the fashioning of the world, after he had said that God created all other things, taught that man alone was formed with others also cooperating. 'God said,' he says, 'Let us make man to our image'* — by this word 'Let us make' signifying a multitude. Therefore that Father of things addresses his own powers, to which he gave this mortal part of our soul to be fashioned, imitating his art, when he was forming the rational [part] in us; deeming it just that the principal part should be fabricated by the Prince of things, but the subordinate part by the subordinate powers. And he used these powers not only for the reason just mentioned, but because man's soul alone was going to possess an understanding of goods and evils, and to choose one or the other, when it cannot [have] both. He judged it necessary, therefore, that the making of evils be attributed to other makers, but of goods to himself alone. Wherefore, when he had first said 'Let us make man,' as of many, soon he speaks as of one: 'God made man.' For of the true man — who is a most pure mind — God alone is the maker; but of him who is vulgarly so called, mixed and tempered out of the senses, [the makers are] many. For which reason that excellent man is indicated by the article: for it is read, 'God made THAT man' — that [man] lacking, in kind, the mixture of the [sensible] intellect. But the vulgar man is set down without such an addition. For when he says 'Let us make man,' he signifies [one] woven together out of the brute and the rational soul." This same, already-reprobated opinion Philo repeats in the book *On the Fashioning of the Six Days*, as you have above,

Annotation 17.

◇ 1. Left margin: Genesis 1:26.

Annotation XCVI

"Let every male among you be circumcised." — Genesis 17:10

Whether circumcision conferred grace on infants.

Chrysostom, homily 29 on Genesis, discussing this passage, seems to indicate that Circumcision, in the old Law, conferred nothing of virtue, or of justice, or of grace on the circumcised infants, but was merely a sign by which the infants of the Jews might be distinguished from the other nations. For thus he speaks: *"That you may clearly learn, beloved, that Circumcision confers nothing to the soul's virtue, can be seen from these things which are done. For why is an eight-day-old infant circumcised? For two causes, I think: one, that at an immature age he may more easily bear the trouble of Circumcision in the flesh; the other, that from the facts themselves we may learn that it confers nothing to the soul, but that this is done only for the sake of the sign. For immature children, since they are ignorant of the things done and have no perception of them, what utility can they thence receive in their soul? For those things are truly the good of the soul which are done by choice; but to receive a sign in the flesh — what sort of good work would that be?"* And in homily 27 on Genesis, confirming the same opinion, he says: *"Attend how God willed Circumcision to be established as a law — not that it could effect anything for the soul's salvation, but that the children of the Jews might carry this about [as] a mark of gratitude, as it were a sign and a seal, and that it might not be lawful for them to be mingled by the minglings of the [other] nations."* Hence blessed Paul calls this a sign, saying, *"And he gave the seal of circumcision"*² — for to justice Circumcision itself confers nothing. Likewise homily 40 on Genesis, chapter 17: *"There was no other utility from Circumcision,"* he says, *"than this alone: that by this sign they might be recognizable, and set apart from the other nations — the Jews."*

◇ 2. Right margin: Romans 4:11.

To this assertion all the theologians, as many ancient as more recent, are opposed; and they say that Circumcision — except for entrance into the kingdom of heaven — conferred all the effects of grace, both privative and positive, which baptism now furnishes: not indeed by its own power, but by the power of faith in Christ.³ For Augustine, in the second book *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, the last chapter, says: *"Circumcision, in the people of God — which was a seal of the faith of the justice of God — availed, for great and little ones, unto the sanctification of the purgation of original and old sin, just as baptism began to avail from the time at which it was instituted."* Bede too, in the commentaries on the second chapter of Luke, says: *"The same [help of the healthful cure] Circumcision in the Law wrought against the wound of original sin which baptism has been wont to work in the time of revealed grace — except that they could not yet enter the gate of the heavenly kingdom, but, consoled after death by a blessed rest in Abraham's bosom, awaited with happy hope the entrance of the supernal peace."* These are their [words]; against which it is no obstacle that Chrysostom above infers that Circumcision profits infants nothing, because in them there is neither knowledge nor choice: for, as Bernard says, just as now Baptism, without any use of will, confers salvation on infants, so then Circumcision, without any choice of judgment, brought salvation to infants. St. Thomas has this same [teaching] in the third part, question 62, article 6. Perhaps it can be said that Chrysostom's words are to be referred to the highest increment of perfect justice, and to the ultimate consummation of eternal salvation — which indeed Circumcision could not furnish, since Christ was not yet dead and the heavenly kingdom was not yet opened.⁴ Or it must be said that Chrysostom perhaps spoke of Circumcision apart from faith in Christ to come, which of itself furnished no help. For Circumcision did not confer grace by its own power, but by the power of faith, which the ancients professed in the seal of the received circumcision. Read Annotation 232 of the sixth book.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Circumcision, by virtue of faith in Christ — except for entrance into the kingdom of heaven — conferred all the effects of grace which Baptism now furnishes.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** St. Thomas piously explains St. Chrysostom.

Annotation XCVII

"The infant of eight days shall be circumcised." — *Genesis 17:12*

Why circumcision was given on the eighth day.

Francesco Giorgio, in the sixth Tome, Problem 337, inquiring into the reason of this precept, assigns certain superstitious causes drawn from Talmudic fables and from the ravings of the nativity-casters [astrologers], saying that the mandate of circumcision was given for this reason: that by that effusion of blood the "northern powers" — which demand blood for offense — might be appeased. And the Law commanded this effusion of blood to be made especially on the eighth day, so that the infant's little body, through the space of seven days, might be able to receive favor from each of the seven planets — each one, namely →

[...continues on folio 560 (PDF p. 377): the rest of Francesco Giorgio's astrological reasons, and Sixtus's refutation (Annotatio XCVII).]

(printed folio 560 [PDF p. 377]. **Annot. XCVII-C** (Gen 17:12–18:3): Giorgio's planetary rationale for the eighth day (one of his many "planetary divinations," refuted); Chrysostom on Abraham's laughter as doubt (defended — it was joyful thanks); Procopius on OT theophany-bodies as unreal; and Cajetan on "Lord/my lords" (defended) → folio 561.)

(folio 560, left column → right column)

Annotation XCVII (continued)

each one, namely, on its [own] day, from one of the planets [that is] lord of that day — until, the seven-day course being completed, the infant returned to the same planet which had presided over the day on which the infant had been brought forth. To planetary divinations of this kind the same author turns aside in almost innumerable places.¹ For in the first tome, Problem 150, he asserts that Abraham foresaw the sterility of his wife Sarah from astrological prognostications. In Problem 240 of the same tome he affirms that the Israelite family grew quickly, because, when it had arranged its encampments according to the aspect of the twelve signs of heaven, it received the sidereal influences most copiously from all twelve signs. Likewise in Problem 335 of the same tome he asserts that Aries, the first of the signs, predominates over Egypt, and that all the power of that province depends on the star of Aries. We have confuted trifles of this kind above, Annotation 15.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Francesco Giorgio is much given to planetary divinations.

Annotation XCVIII

"Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed in his heart, saying: Shall a son, thinkest thou, be born to him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old bring forth?" — *Genesis 17:17*

Whether Abraham sinned by unbelief.

Chrysostom, homily 40 on Genesis, for the explanation of this passage [writes]: "*Abraham, seeing the excellent promise, and considering the greatness of him who had promised, fell upon his face and laughed.*" A Greek codex of Chrysostom — a most ancient one, which we saw at Lyon in the library of Santes Pagnino — had, immediately after this passage, certain words which are not read in the other common volumes.

These are they: "God, that he alone might be without sin, sometimes permitted the just, according to their own choice, to fall into sin: whence holy Abraham too sinned by unbelief, and received punishments from God, so that his seed should serve four hundred years. Moses also, when he did not glorify God — who bestowed on him water from the rock — was ungrateful, and God said to him, 'You shall see the land of promise, and you shall not enter into it.'"² Thus far the Greek copy: whose words, since they by no means cohere with the following narration — in which [the author] testifies that Abraham burst out into those thoughts and words not from unbelief but from immense joy, not knowing what he said — I suspect that the aforesaid words were taken elsewhere out of Chrysostom by some studious [reader], and set in the margin of the present passage, and at last (as often happens) by the carelessness of copyists carried over into the text. For at the end of the sixth homily *On Penance* a passage not unlike the aforesaid is found, in plainly the same sense and the same words, in this manner: "*But, since God was the same, and alone without sin, he permitted the just to be bent by human errors according to their own choice — not himself now impelling to sin, but by [their] choice permitting [them] to walk according to their own inclination. And so holy Abraham sinned by unbelief; on that account he did not escape punishment from God, so that his seed should serve for four hundred years. And again Moses, not glorifying God when he gave water from the rock, was ungrateful, and therefore God said to him, 'You shall see the land of promise, and you shall not enter into it.'*" The same opinion Jerome embraces, book 3 *Against Pelagius*, in these words: "*Abraham did not believe what God promised, but laughed in his heart, thinking to conceal it from God, and not daring to laugh openly. Finally, expounding the causes of his incredulity, he says in his heart: How can it be that a hundred-year-old should beget a son from a ninety-year-old? 'Let Ishmael live,' he says, 'in your sight, whom you once gave: I do not seek difficult things; I am content with the benefit I have received.' Whom God, rebuking with a hidden response, says: 'Let even that be done which you think will not be; and from your error, by which you laughed, your son Isaac shall receive the name "laughter."*"

◇ 2. Left margin: Deuteronomy 32:52.

Paul seems altogether opposed to this assertion, since, writing to the Romans, he says: "*And he was not weakened in faith, neither did he consider his own body now dead, when he was almost a hundred years old, nor the dead womb of Sarah; in the promise also of God he did not hesitate through distrust, but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God, most fully knowing that whatsoever God has promised he is able to perform: therefore it was reputed to him also unto justice.*"³ Expounding this sentence, **Ambrose** and **Theophylact** hold that Abraham did not hesitate at all, but rather, against hope, believed most fully in hope. Moreover **Augustine**, book 16 *On the City of God*, chapter 26, writes that Abraham's laughter was the exultation of one giving thanks, not the derision of one distrusting; and he says that those words too — "Shall a son be born to one a hundred years old, and shall Sarah at ninety bring forth?" — were the words not of one doubting, but of one wondering. **John Arboreus**, in the first book of his *Theosophia* (Θεοσοφία), settling a controversy of this kind, says that Abraham somewhat doubted, and hesitated in mind at the beginning, when he laughed in his heart, saying, "Shall a son be born to a hundred-year-old?"; but that the words of the promise which God subjoined raised up his mind — engaged as it was in a doubtful judgment — and thus freed it from all doubt, so that thereafter he leaned upon the divine promises with a most certain and immovable faith.

◇ 3. Right margin: Romans 4:19–22.

Annotation XCIX

"There appeared to him three men." — Genesis 18:2

The dove descending upon Christ — whether it was truly an animal.

Procopius of Gaza, examining the apparition of the Angels to Abraham, seems to assert that the dove in which the Holy Spirit appeared at Christ's baptism was not truly a dove, saying thus: "*God, in the old*

testament, was seen in a bodily form; yet that body did not have the property of a mortal body, for it consisted neither of flesh nor of blood. In the same manner the Holy Spirit came into our sight in the appearance of a dove — yet it was not a dove, because it did not have the property which a dove has." See Annotation 13 of book 6.

Annotation C

"Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight." — Genesis 18:3

Whether this passage pertains to the Trinity.

Thomas Cajetan is gravely reprehended by **Ambrose [Catharinus], Archbishop of Compsa**, because he took away from the present chapter an excellent passage from which — according to the doctrine of the saints, and the very voice of the whole Church — the mystery of the Trinity is elicited: namely, when Abraham in the valley of Mamre saw three, and adoring one said, "Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight," [Cajetan] himself, changing the singular voice into the plural, translated and expounded it, "My lords, if I have found favor in your sight." But it appears that Ambrose is — as the adage runs — seeking a knot in a bulrush, and deliberately hunting occasions for calumny: for Cajetan, by this change of number, in no way derogates from the Trinity of the divine [Persons]; nay rather he establishes [it]... →

[...continues on folio 561 (PDF p. 378): Sixtus's defense of Cajetan (Annotatio C).]

*(printed folio 561 [PDF p. 378]. **Annot. C–CII** (Gen 18:3–22:12): Cajetan on Adonai establishing the Trinity's unity (Kimhi); Chrysostom praising Abraham's virtue before grace (seized by Oecolampadius; answered as concerning habitual, not prevenient, grace); and Origen on the Angel who spoke to Abraham as the Son of God → folio 562.)*

(folio 561, left column → right column)

Annotation C (continued)

— nay rather he established the unity of the Trinity: he shows that the name **Adonai**, which contains a number of multitude, is [here] to be referred to the number of unity. Thus you will say: "*Although Adonai is of plural number, signifying 'my Lords,' yet that it is here used for the singular the pronoun 'thy' makes manifest.*" Thus he [Cajetan]. **Rabbi David [Kimhi]** says that the name אֲדֹנָי *Adonai*, which is of plural number, whenever it is written with qametz [*cameza*], is attributed to God the Creator for the sake of honor and excellence.

Annotation CI

"When therefore the men rose up from thence." — Genesis 18:16

Whether divine grace comes before us, or is preceded by us.

Chrysostom, homily 42 on Genesis, commending Abraham because he possessed all virtues most absolutely, has certain words near the beginning of the sermon on account of which — and many others like these, expressed in various places — **John Oecolampadius**, professor of the Lutheran heresy, turns it to his fault that he is excessive in the assertion of Free Will (drawn from the schools of worldly philosophy), and quite violent in exacting the powers of human nature, which are nothing, together with the preparation of our will. These are Chrysostom's words: "*What excuse, therefore, is left to us after these things, when one man possesses all virtues in himself, but we are so devoid of them that we do not strive to perfect even one? For that we are estranged from all good things not because we cannot, but because we will not, this very thing*

plainly indicates: that the Patriarch — who was before the time of grace and before the Law — by himself, and by the knowledge which is implanted by nature, reached so high a summit of virtue that it suffices to confute all our excuses. But perhaps some will say that that man obtained much grace from God, and that the Lord of all had a singular care of him. I too confess that it is so: but unless he had first himself done what was his own, he would not have obtained so much from the Lord. Attend, therefore, how he first exhibited in all things the token of his virtue, and so merited divine protection — he who neither received the seed of faith from his forefathers, and yet of himself offered a most religious and pious mind." And a little after he adds: "You have seen how from the beginning he brought forward the things that were from himself, and therefore daily received divine [gifts] abundantly?" This same opinion he inculcates in very many places, especially in homily 17 on the second chapter of John, where he speaks thus: "Hence we can be admonished that [God] does not anticipate our wills by his benefits toward us, but that the beginning must be from us; and when he has seen us with a prompt and ready mind to receive grace, then he offers us many occasions of salvation." By which words indeed Chrysostom seems to hint that the beginning of our salvation is so placed in us that, without the help of prevenient grace, by the proper powers of nature we can merit the divine gift of justifying grace — which is the error of the Pelagians.

But it appears that Chrysostom did not wish, by these words, to derogate from prevenient grace (which he so often extols), but to reprove the laziness of his hearers, and to render our sloth inexcusable¹ — which the very opening of the aforesaid oration openly manifests, when he says: "What excuse, therefore, is left to us after these things?" etc. For this is Chrysostom's fixed and everywhere immovable opinion: namely, that we, whatever good we have, we have from the kindness of prevenient, calling, and ever-beginning grace, and that there is no merit of ours which is not a gift of God — whose goodness is so great that he wills those to be our merits which are his own gifts. And lest anyone, moved by the unjust calumny of Oecolampadius, suspect that Chrysostom did not think as we say, let it suffice to adduce two or three passages out of so many of his, in which he himself speaks thus for the defense of divine grace. Homily 12 on the fourth chapter of First Corinthians: "*What you have, this you have received*" — and not only this, but also that, '*But whatever you have*' — for these are not your merits, but the grace of God. Though you bring forward faith, you received it from [your] calling; though you bring forward pardon of sins, though thanksgivings, though virtues, all came to you thence. What, therefore, do you have that you have not received? Have you yourself, by yourself, done rightly? Not indeed, but you received [it]; for that gift is not yours, but the giver's. For if you have received, you received from him; if from him, you received what is not yours; if not yours, why do you grow insolent, as though you had what is your own?" And homily 38 to the people of Antioch, which is entitled On Humility and Quiet: "Let us not be exalted, but let us call ourselves useless, that we may be made useful. For if you call yourself worthy, though you be worthy, being made [presumptuous] you are rendered useless. On that account it is necessary to forget one's merits; for the safe treasury of merits is the forgetting of merits." And a little after he adds: "Do not, therefore, reckon yourself worthy of reward, that you may receive reward; confess that you are saved by grace, that he himself may confess himself your debtor. For we too, having servants, hold them most acceptable then, when — after they have ministered everything benevolently — they judge themselves to have done nothing great. And so, if you too greatly wish to render your merits [great], provided you do not think them great, then they will indeed be great." Thus Chrysostom: who, if he sometimes seems to say something different, is to be interpreted thus — that we refer his aforesaid words, and others like them, not to that motion of prevenient and exciting grace, which always so anticipates us that it cannot be anticipated by us, but to that gift of subsequent grace which in the schools of the theologians is called habitual* grace. For this no one — as Chrysostom piously and holily judges — obtains, unless he has offered a mind rightly prepared for the reception of so great a gift.² Or it must be said — as Anianus too noted in the preface of the commentaries of Chrysostom on Matthew — that Chrysostom sometimes extolled the powers of our nature more than is fair, out of the heat of disputing with the Manichees and the Gentiles, who asserted that man is compelled to sin either by nature [being] evil or by the violence of fate. See

Annotations 184, 194, and 257 of book 6.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** St. Chrysostom does not derogate from prevenient grace, but reproves the sloth of his hearers.
- ◇ 2. **Right margin:** The adult obtains habitual grace [only when] he prepares his mind for the reception of it.

Annotation CII

"Now I know that thou fearest God." — Genesis 22:12

Whether the Son of God was an angel.

Origen, in the eighth homily on Genesis, is accused of having thought that the Angel speaking to Abraham was the Son of God himself, who had first been made an angel before he became man. For thus he wrote: "*It must be considered that this Angel is reported to have spoken to Abraham, and that in what follows this Angel is evidently shown [to be] the Lord. Whence I think that, just as among men*" →

[...continues on folio 562 (PDF p. 379): the rest of Origen's opinion on the Angel/Son of God (Annotatio CII).]

*(printed folio 562 [PDF p. 379]. **Annot. CII–CV** (Gen 22:12–26:18): Origen's "angel" read as office, not nature (the Son as "Angel of great counsel"); Eusebius's "he-goat" for the LXX's Sabek; Chrysostom seeming to charge the Virgin with unbelief (defended); and Philo's "music of the spheres" → folio 563.)*

(folio 562, left column → right column)

Annotation CII (continued)

[just as among] men he was found in habit as a man, so among the Angels he was found in habit as an angel." I think that Origen in this place wished, by "the habit of an Angel," to signify not the nature of an Angel, but the office — so that the sense of his words is that the Son of God, before he was found in habit as a man (that is, before he assumed the nature of our humanity), was in the habit of an Angel (that is, in [angelic] ministry), when he appeared to the ancient fathers in manifold ways and spoke in many manners. According to which understanding, St. Augustine (Tome 6, in the tractate on "I am who I am"¹) judges that it can safely be believed and said that the Son of God not only appeared to Abraham and to Moses, but that he can also rightly be called an Angel — whom the prophet named the "Angel of great counsel"² — by office, namely, not by nature.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Exodus 3:14.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Isaiah 9[:6].

Annotation CIII

"He saw behind his back a ram amongst the briers sticking fast by the horns." — Genesis 22:13

That "Sabek" is wrongly expounded as "a he-goat."

The error of **Eusebius of Emesa** — though a slight one — Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*, thought should be pointed out: namely, that while he was expounding the present passage according to the Septuagint edition (in which is read, "A ram was held fast in the thicket *Sabek* by its horns"), he wrote a ridiculous thing, saying that "*Sabek*" means "a he-goat," which is lifted up on high by its straight horns to crop the foliage of the tree. Occasion for this error was given him by the Septuagint interpreters, who left in their edition the noun סֶבֶק *Sabek* — which signifies "entanglement" [perplexity] — as if it were the proper name of some place, or animal, or plant: Ἴδὸν κριὸς εἶς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ σαβὲκ τῶν κεράτων, that is, "Behold, one ram caught at the tree *Sabek* by its horns." Therefore Eusebius, placing a mark of distinction [a stop] before the word *Sabek*, thought it should be read appositively, σαβὲκ τῶν κεράτων — that is, "a *he-goat* of horns," or "the

horned one." To which he was perhaps also led by the likeness of the word, which some among the Syrians report signifies "he-goat," and which the Italians too call *Becco*, and the Germans *Steinbock*.

Annotation CIV

"Isaac besought the Lord for his wife." — Genesis 25:21

Whether the Virgin Mary ever labored under unbelief.

Chrysostom, homily 49, after the narration of this sentence, seems to brand the Virgin Mary with a mark of incredulity, because she did not believe the announcing angel that the conception of Christ in her womb would come to pass without human intercourse. For thus he introduces the angel speaking to Mary: "*And because you are so incredulous, believe through this.*"³ And after a few [words] he adds: "*Plainly, through everything, he led her by the hand to believe the annunciation; and see how great skill Gabriel uses: for he does not recall to her memory Sarah or Rebecca, who were barren and old, because these were ancient narrations, but he leads her to that which recently happened in Elizabeth, to provoke her mind to believe.*" This same defect of faith Chrysostom seems to ascribe to her at the death of her Son, when in [the homily on] Psalm 13 he speaks thus: "*When Christ was crucified, there was none who did good; all the disciples fled; John withdrew naked; Peter denied; the sword of doubt passed through the very soul of Mary his mother.*"⁴ Not unlike this opinion is what others write concerning the doubt of Mary — Origen (homily 17 on Luke), Theophylact (on Luke 2), and Augustine (in the Questions on Luke) — as you will be able to see below in the censures on the Gospel of Luke. There are those who wrongly judge that Chrysostom's temperament — by its own nature hostile to feminine ways — could not restrain itself from attributing something womanish even to Mary, whom elsewhere too, in the commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John, he censures as importunate and ambitious. But since Chrysostom, among Mary's other virtues, everywhere celebrates also her faith with wondrous praises,⁵ it is necessary to refer his words not to any kind of doubt or incredulity of hers (which would be placed under the crime of unbelief), but to a certain hesitation arising from vehement admiration and astonishment — such as [arises] whenever unusual appearances of events, beyond the measure and order of nature, first present themselves to us. Which he himself indicates clearly enough, when in that place he describes Mary as struck with amazement, in the highest admiration, at the words of the angel. Read Annotations 58, 138, 139, 140, and 185 of book 6.

◇ 3. Left margin: Luke 1[:34].

◇ 4. Left margin: Luke 2[:35].

◇ 5. Right margin: St. Chrysostom everywhere celebrates Mary's faith with wondrous praises.

Annotation CV

"Again he dug other wells, which the servants of his father Abraham had dug." — Genesis 26:18

Whether the heavens emit a vocal sound by their motion.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Dreams*, allegorically treating the history of the wells found by [the patriarch], when he had incidentally fallen upon a discourse of those things which praise God, asserted that the celestial spheres — by the sound of the vocal harmony which is produced from their revolution — continually celebrate God. His words are of this kind: "*Heaven, by the perpetual concord of its motions, renders a most sweet harmony, which, if it could reach our ears, would excite in us uncontrollable loves and an insane desire, by which, being stimulated, we should forget the things necessary for [our] sustenance — not fed by food and drink sent down through the throat, but as the candidates of immortality [are fed], by divine and consummate musical songs. Such [songs], when Moses, rapt out of the body, had heard them, he is reported [to have passed] forty days and as many nights, and to have tasted neither bread nor water. And so heaven, the archetypal instrument of music, seems to me to have been so elaborated for no other [reason] than that the hymns of the Parent of things might be sung skillfully and musically.*" To the same opinion there is no

doubt that St. Ambrose alluded, in the preface of the commentaries on the Psalms, in these words: "*The Angels praise the Lord, the Powers of the heavens sing psalms to him, and before the beginning of the world the Cherubim and Seraphim, with the sweetness of the singing of their voice, say, 'Holy, holy, holy.'* A more express discourse relates that the very axis of heaven turns with a certain sweetness of perpetual concord, so that its sound may be heard in the farthest parts of the earth, where there are certain secrets of nature; nor does this seem foreign to the use of nature." **Licentius**, speaking to Augustine his teacher about God, briefly comprised this very thing in most elegant verses, saying:

He fitted numbers to the heavens, and bade [them] ply sonorous measures, and lead equal dances.

St. Anselm, in the first book *On the Image of the World*, approving the exposition of these, declares it in plainer speech in this manner: "*The orbs of the seven heavens are turned with a sweet-sounding harmony, and by the most sweet concord of their revolution*" →

[...continues on folio 563 (PDF p. 380): the rest of Anselm's exposition, and Sixtus's judgment (Annotatio CV).]

(printed folio 563 [PDF p. 380]. Annot. CV–CVII (Gen 26:18–27:19): the spheres' harmony (beyond our hearing, but listed among Marcosian errors and despised by Basil and Ambrose); the LXX's reversed "we have not found water"; and Origen and Chrysostom holding the "official lie" sometimes lawful → folio 564.)

(folio 563, left column → right column)

Annotation CV (continued)

[the orbs of the seven heavens are turned with a sweet-sounding harmony, and] by the most sweet concord of their revolution are [sounds] produced; which sound, for this reason, does not reach our ears, because it is beyond the air, and its magnitude exceeds our narrow hearing. For no sound is perceived by us except that which is produced in the air; but from the earth up to the firmament the celestial music is measured, to the exemplar of which our music was invented." But to these things it seems to stand in the way that **Epiphanius** (in the first book of the *Panarion*) and **Irenaeus** (in the book *Against Heresies*) place this assertion among the condemned dogmas of the Marcosians; and **Basil** (on the *Hexaemeron*, homily 2) and **Ambrose** himself (on the *Hexaemeron*) despise the same as, so to speak, cavilling, and resting on a most feeble foundation — unless perhaps we should say that these most grave men reject not the very assertion of celestial sounds, but the ridiculous reasonings by which certain inept philosophers strove to defend it, or certain prodigious fictions which the heretics (especially the Marcosians) deduced from it. We have written more fully on this matter in the book *On Physical Questions upon the divine Scriptures*.¹

◇ 1. **Left margin:** This book has not hitherto been published.

Annotation CVI

"The servants of Isaac came the same day, telling him of the well, saying: We have found water." — Genesis 26:32

The Septuagint wrongly translated, "We have not found water."

The **Septuagint**, for what is read in the Hebrew — "The servants of Isaac came the same day, telling him of the well which they had dug, saying, *We have found water*; whence its name was called *Abundance*" — translated entirely the opposite: "The servants of Isaac came and told him of the well which they had dug, saying, *We have NOT found water*; whence its name was called *Oath*." Which interpretation **Jerome**, in the book *On Hebrew Traditions*, condemns as corrupt, saying: "*For what etymology is it, that it should be called 'Oath' because they had not found water? — since the contrary is in the Hebrew, and Aquila and Symmachus*

agree that they DID find water, and that on that account the well itself was called Abundance, or Satiety."

Annotation CVII

"I am Esau thy firstborn." — Genesis 27:19

Whether it is lawful for a good man to lie.

Origen, in the sixth book of the *Stromateis*, incidentally touching this passage, taught that simulations and lies are sometimes profitable to Christians, and that a prudent and wise man can use an officious lie no otherwise than a medicine, when it is necessary. For thus Origen, when comparing our dogmas with the dogmas of Plato, left written in that place: "*Plato, in the third book On the Republic, says: 'Truth is greatly to be pursued; for if — as we were most rightly saying a little before — a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, [but] sometimes useful to men, so that they use it as a kind of condiment and medicine, there is no doubt that license of this kind is to be given to physicians and to be removed from the imprudent: therefore also the rulers of cities, if it is granted to any others, ought sometimes to lie, either against enemies or for the fatherland and the citizens; but from the rest, who do not know how to use a lie, all lying must be taken away.' Thus far we have reviewed the words of Plato. We too, therefore, mindful of that precept, 'Let each one speak the truth with his neighbor,'² ought not to say, 'Who is my neighbor?' but to consider how the philosopher cautiously said that a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, [yet] not always unuseful to men — and that God is not to be thought to lie sometimes, even for [the sake of] a dispensation. But if the advantage of the hearer requires it, [the wise man] speaks in ambiguous words, and utters through enigmas what he wishes, so that the dignity of truth may be preserved with him, and that what could be harmful, if uttered nakedly, may be put forth to the multitude under a certain covering. But let the man on whom the necessity of lying lies diligently attend, so to use a lie sometimes — as a condiment and a medicine — that he keep its measure, and not exceed the bounds which Judith used against Holofernes,³ when she conquered him by a prudent simulation. Let him imitate Esther, who long corrected the sentence of Artaxerxes, the truth of her nation being kept silent;⁴ and above all the patriarch Jacob, whom we read to have obtained the blessings of his father by an artful lie. From which it is evident that, unless we have so lied that some great good is sought by us thereby, we are to be judged as, so to speak, enemies of him who says, 'I am the truth.'⁵ These things Origen [wrote] in the sixth book of the *Stromateis*. But in the tenth book of the same work, confirming this very thing by an apostolic example, he said that Peter and Paul, the princes of the Apostles, contended with each other at Antioch not in a true but in a feigned dispute,⁶ so that by that kind of simulation they might recall the Jews and the Gentiles — at variance among themselves about the legal observances — to concord.*

◇ 2. Left margin: Ephesians 4:25.

◇ 3. Right margin: Judith 11[:5–19].

◇ 4. Right margin: Esther 5.

◇ 5. Right margin: John 14:6.

◇ 6. Right margin: Galatians 2[:11–14].

Into the same opinion **Chrysostom** seems to go, at the end of the first book *On the Priesthood*, where he most openly teaches that frauds, wiles, deceptions, and impostures — which are done not with the zeal of harming, but for the sake of some great good, and from a right judgment of the mind — are so far necessary that very many have oftentimes undergone punishments for this very thing, that they did not employ frauds. Which he confirms with many examples adduced: first of Emperors, for whom it is more honorable to have conquered enemies by fraud than to have vanquished them in open battle; then of physicians, who circumvent by frauds the sick who either refuse medicines or flee the cutting of the knife, and — remedies being administered by guile — lead them back to health; finally by the example of holy men: among whom Jacob craftily claimed for himself the right of the firstborn;⁷ Moses, by deception, transferred the wealth of the Egyptians into the camps of the Israelites;⁸ Michal, her father being circumvented and deceived, delivered from death her husband David,⁹ whom a little after his kinsman Jonathan preserved from the wrath

of Saul by the same arts;¹⁰ Paul, as a salutary medicine, often employed impostures — as when, for the favor of the Jews (whom he desired to allure to Christ), he circumcised Timothy,¹¹ and submitted himself to many other ceremonies of the Law, which, after faith had been given to Christ, he knew to be deadly. Again, in homily 53 on Genesis, expounding that, "I am Esau thy firstborn," he asserts that Jacob, in saying these things, did lie — but that a lie of this kind is not to be blamed, because he lied not for the sake of temporal advantage or avarice, but that he might procure for himself the father's blessing. Likewise in homily 32 on Genesis, upon those words, "Say that you are my sister," and in the epistle to Olympias, he pronounces the simulation of Abraham and Sarah — by which (as he himself says) "they lied about the kind [of relationship], and brought forward one person in place of another" — worthy of praise and of imitation. →

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Genesis 27:19.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Exodus 12:35.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 19.

◇ 10. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 20; 28.

◇ 11. **Right margin:** Acts 16:3.

[...continues on folio 564 (PDF p. 381): John [of Damascus?] and Sixtus's own response on the officious lie (Annotatio CVII).]

(printed folio 564 [PDF p. 381]. **Annot. CVII–CVIII** (Gen 27:19–28:12): the "officious lie" debate closed — Cassian and Jerome allow pious "hypocrisy," but Augustine, Innocent III, and the Scholastics condemn every lie (Sixtus sorts the biblical cases into those who only seemed to lie and those who did); then Philo on the stars as rational beings → folio 565.)

(folio 564, left column → right column)

Annotation CVII (continued)

John Cassian, deacon and disciple of Chrysostom, drawing the metaphor of the medicine and the lie — borrowed from Plato by Origen — to the confirmation of the same opinion, says that a holy man is so to use a lie as if there were in it by nature [something] of hellebore. For just as hellebore, if it be taken when a deadly disease is imminent, is wholesome, but if it be drunk without the necessity of the greatest peril, is deadly: so too a lie is profitable when danger is imminent from the confession of the truth, but deadly when no necessity of concealing the truth presses. This necessity he reduces to two occasions: namely, either when some great loss is to be avoided and some excellent gain to be obtained, or when one must lie for the sake of humility — that is, that one may hide his virtues, under [the guise of] a lie, to avoid vainglory. The former part of this assertion he builds up in book 17 of the *Conferences*, from chapter 17 to 21, by the examples of: Jacob, invading the paternal inheritance by fraud and lie;¹ Joseph, deterring his brothers with lying words;² Rahab, lying for the safety of the spies;³ David, speaking falsely before the priest Ahimelech;⁴ [and] James, Peter, and Paul, descending to the fictions of simulation for the peace of the Church.⁵ The latter part of the same assertion he proves from chapter 21 to 25, several testimonies of Scripture being adduced.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Genesis 27.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Genesis 42:9.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Joshua 2:4–5.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Galatians 2.

Jerome too seems to have acceded to this Origenic dogma, in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians; where, when he treated of Peter (reproved by Paul), he judged that hypocrisy is to be assumed by good men in [due] season, in imitation of many illustrious men — of whose number [is] Jehu, king of Israel,

who under the false promise of worshipping Baal slew the priests of that same Baal;⁶ David, who by feigned madness fled the danger of Achish, king of Gath;⁷ [and] Paul, who by a simulated rebuke reprov'd Peter (guilty of no fault) for the correction of the Judaizers,⁸ and — that he might gain the Jews for Christ — circumcised Timothy, and himself shaved his head at Cenchreae, and, the tonsure being made, offered an offering in Jerusalem.⁹

◇ 6. **Left margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 10.

◇ 7. **Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.

◇ 8. **Left margin:** Galatians 2.

◇ 9. **Left margin:** Acts 16:3; 21:26.

This assertion Augustine condemns, in chapter 2 of the book *On Lying to Consentius*, among the Priscillianist heresies; and in the epistle to Jerome he grieves that it was once defended by Jerome, writing thus: "*I have read certain writings, said to be yours, on the epistles of Paul; and when you wished to unravel one of them — [that] to the Galatians — that passage came into [my] hands where the Apostle Peter is recalled from a pernicious simulation. That a patronage of lying was there undertaken by you — such a man — I confess I grieve not moderately. For it seems to me most destructive to believe that those men, through whom the divine Scripture was ministered and written for us, lied in anything.*" Thus Augustine. There is also an open determination of the Church against this opinion in the Decretals, under the title *On Usury*, chapter *Super eo*, where Pope Innocent, the third of that name, constantly affirms that it is forbidden by the precept of the divine word that anyone should lie even to save another's life¹⁰ — which determination all the Scholastic theologians follow, most plainly decreeing that not only is every lie a sin, but also that every simulation and fraud, whether harmful or officious, is a vice contrary to truth and pertaining to the crime of lying; for whether by speech, or by any deed whatever — out of a zeal either to harm or to help — someone lies, he is a liar, and every lie is either a sin, or is not without sin.¹¹

◇ 10. **Left margin:** To lie is on no account lawful.

◇ 11. **Right margin:** Every lie is either a sin, or not without sin.

But to those things which are objected by the defenders of the contrary opinion, they easily respond from the doctrine of Augustine, distributing into two classes the multitude of those who are produced as an example of profitable simulation and officious lying. In the **first** they place those who, though they lied in nothing, nevertheless seem to have been liars. Of these, some are thought to have lied because they spoke figuratively and mystically — like Jacob, who, though in those words, "I am Esau thy firstborn," he seemed to lie, nevertheless spoke true things: because, according to the divine providence (which had chosen him for Esau's birthright), he truly was the firstborn. But others fell into the suspicion of deceit and lying because, the counsels of their mind being concealed, they were unwilling to open the truth — as Abraham, answering the one who asked about his wife that she was [his] sister, seemed to have uttered a lie and denied the truth, when nevertheless he in no way lied, but only concealed the truth: keeping silent that she was his wife, and indicating what was true, that she was his sister; for she was truly his sister on the father's side, but not on the mother's. To this rule of *concealing* the truth the theologians refer all warlike stratagems and military ambushes, and the other simulations of governors, judges, and physicians, which — every crime of falsity being removed — consist in the sole concealment of truth. Among these can be reckoned the fictions of: Moses, despoiling Egypt;¹² Judith, beheading Holofernes;¹³ David, feigning madness;¹⁴ Peter, dissembling that he ate; and Paul, chiding Peter by a feigned rebuke¹⁵ — which fictions indeed, since they are wholly devoid of any lie, are brought forward in vain for the patronage of lying. But in the **second** class the Scholastics place those who, without doubt, are agreed to have lied: such as David before the priest Ahimelech;¹⁶ Jonathan before Saul;¹⁷ Jehu the king with the priests of Baal;¹⁸ Rahab, for the spies of the Jews;¹⁹ [and] Michal, for David's safety.²⁰ But these, they assert, are not to be alleged in favor of falsity and lying, since their lies were nowhere approved by God. For although we read that some of these were, after these lies, praised in the sacred letters, and even rewarded by God with temporal goods, nevertheless it is not

to be thought that in them the deceit and lie was praised and rewarded, but the piety and charity and faith with which they embraced those for whom they did not fear to lie.

- ◇ 12. **Right margin:** Exodus 12:35.
- ◇ 13. **Right margin:** Judith 11:8–10, etc.
- ◇ 14. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:13.
- ◇ 15. **Right margin:** Galatians 2.
- ◇ 16. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 21:2.
- ◇ 17. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 20:28.
- ◇ 18. **Right margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 10:18.
- ◇ 19. **Right margin:** Joshua 2:4–5.
- ◇ 20. **Right margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 19:14.

Annotation CVIII

"And Jacob saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth." — Genesis 28:12

Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held.

Philo the Jew, in the book *On Dreams*, intent on the elucidation of this vision, says: "*In heaven there are stars, which severally are not only living beings [but rational]*" →

[...continues on folio 565 (PDF p. 382): the rest of Philo on the stars and the ladder (Annotatio CVIII).]

(printed folio 565 [PDF p. 382]. **Annot. CVIII–CIX** (Gen 28:12–30:14): whether the stars are animate — Philo and Origen affirm rational, vice-capable minds (Jerome and Cajetan lean so, Augustine doubts), Basil and Damascene deny; Aquinas distinguishes an informing from an assisting soul, and the Fifth Synod anathematizes animate heavens; then Giorgio faulting Jerome's "mandrakes" → folio 566.)

(folio 565, left column → right column)

Annotation CVIII (continued)

[the stars] are not only called living beings, but are also most pure minds." Explaining which opinion more clearly in the book *On the Making of the Six Days*, he wrote this: "*Of the things which are in nature, some are considered participant neither of virtue nor of vice, as plants and brutes; others, likewise endowed with virtue alone, have nothing at all of vice, as the star: for these are living beings, and indeed intelligences — or rather singular minds — wholly good, and not capable of any vice; again, others [are] mixed of both, as man, who is capable of contraries.*" And lower in the same book he adds: "*The stars are rational, and of a divine nature, partly intelligible and incorporeal, partly indeed corporeal.*"

Origen followed Philo, dissenting from him in this one [point]: that [Philo] believes the nature of the stars devoid of all vice, but [Origen] judges the same [nature] capable of no less vice than virtue. For thus he spoke of the stars in the first Tome of the commentaries on John: "*For it is absurd to say that Christ died only for human sins, and not also for something else besides man which was in sin — as, for instance, for the stars; since not even the stars are wholly clean before God, as we read in Job: 'The stars are not clean in his sight.'*"¹ Again, disputing more fully about the animation of the stars in the first [book] *περὶ ἀρχῶν* [*On First Principles*], chapter 7, he shows that the stars are living beings endowed with reason, which advance and fall short in virtues; and that a spirit was infused into them from without by God, so that within the body of the stars they may exercise the ministry of illuminating, for the utility of men, until the end of the world — in which, when the saints of God shall have attained [their] consummated glory, then these too shall be freed from the servitude of this ministry. And this very thing he frequently inculcates in the last homily on the

[book of] Numbers, and in very many other places.

◇ 1. Left margin: Job 25:5.

To the same opinion Jerome seemed to allude, in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes, where, weighing that which is read at the beginning of that book — "The spirit goeth circling round about"² — he brought forward these things: "*That he says, 'The spirit goeth circling round about, and returneth in its circuits,' [means] either that he named the Sun itself 'spirit,' because it animates, and breathes, and is vigorous, and completes the yearly courses of the orb, as the poet says: 'Meanwhile the Sun rolls round the great year'; and elsewhere: 'And the year rolls round in its own footsteps'; or because: 'The shining globe of the Moon, and the Titanian stars, a Spirit within nourishes, and, infused through all the members, Mind moves the mass and mingles itself with the great body'*" — he speaks not of the annual course of the Sun, but of its daily paths.

◇ 2. Left margin: Ecclesiastes 1:6.

Not far from these seems to stand **Cardinal Cajetan**, who, expounding on Psalm 135 that [saying], "He made the heavens in understanding," says: "*In understanding — that is, [made them] intellectual: which is true either as to the substance of the heavens, if they are animate (as many philosophers reasonably think), or as to [their] motion, because their motion is doubtless intellectual, that is, from an intellect.*" And in another place, incidentally expounding what is sung in the preface of the divine sacrifice — "The heavens, and the Powers of the heavens, celebrate together in fellowship of exultation" — he judged that this can be understood of the heavens which, since they are animate, they too, together with the other angels, praise God. Nor did **Augustine** altogether shrink from this opinion, who — not daring to disapprove it — left it in doubt,³ thus writing in the second book *On Genesis to the Letter*, chapter 18: "*It is also wont to be asked whether the luminaries of the heavens are only conspicuous bodies, or whether they have certain governing spirits of their own; and if they have [them], whether they are vitally animated by them (as the flesh is animated by the souls of animals), or [are present] alone, without any mixture. Which, though it cannot easily be comprehended at present, I judge nevertheless that, in the course of treating the Scriptures, more opportune places may occur, where it will be permitted us — concerning this matter, according to the letters of holy authority — even if not to show anything certain, yet to believe [something].*" And in the *Enchiridion* to Laurentius, [chapter] 58, repeating the same, he adds: "*But neither do I hold this as certain: whether to the same society of the Angels there pertain the Sun, and the Moon, and all the stars — although to some they seem to be luminous bodies, [but] not with sense and intelligence.*"

◇ 3. Left margin: St. Augustine doubts whether the stars are animate.

On the opposite side, **Basil**, surnamed the Great, in the third homily on the *Hexaemeron*, refuting this opinion, says: "*For neither are the heavens animate [merely] because they declare the glory of God, nor is the firmament a sentient animal [merely] because it announces the works of his hands. For thus also dew, and frost, and cold would be a spiritual and rational nature, because in Daniel they seem to praise God,*" etc. Agreeing with whom, **John Damascene**, book 2 *On the Orthodox Faith*, chapter 6, says: "*Let no one think the heavens or the luminaries animate; for they are inanimate and insensible. Wherefore, if Scripture says, 'Let the heavens rejoice,' it calls the Angels who are in heaven to joy. Scripture also knows how to employ prosopopoeia and the fiction of persons, and to speak of inanimate things as of animate: as, 'The sea saw and fled.'*" **Jerome** likewise, in the epistle to Avitus, among the heresies which he warns must be guarded against in Origen's books *On First Principles*, enumerates also the assertion about stars endowed with a rational soul.

But **St. Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 70, article 3, settles this controversy by adducing a distinction of this kind:⁴ "*That the stars and the other celestial bodies are animate, or living beings, can be understood in two ways: either univocally — that is, by an informing soul, which is the form of the body (such as are the souls of plants and animals); or equivocally — that is, by an assisting soul, which is united to the body not as a form, but as a mover to a movable thing.*" And so Basil, and Damascene, and Jerome in the epistle to Avitus, do not reprehend those who, according to the latter understanding,

believe the stars to be animate or living beings — as it is likely that Philo thought, and Jerome himself in the book on Ecclesiastes, and perhaps even Origen; but they refute only those who taught the stars [to be] animate and the heavenly bodies [to be] living beings according to the *former* mode of understanding. Whether Philo and Origen are to be reckoned among these is not sufficiently clear — although Nicephorus, book 17 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, among the anathematisms hurled against Origen in the Fifth Synod, sets down this one too: "*If anyone says that heaven, and the Sun, and the Moon, and the stars are certain animate and mobile powers, let him be anathema.*"

◇ 4. **Right margin:** In what sense the stars are called animate, St. Thomas explains.

Annotation CIX

"Rachel said: Give me part of thy [son's] mandrakes." — Genesis 30:14

Mandrakes [rendered] for lilies.

Francesco Giorgio reprehends **Jerome**, in the first Tome, Problem 215, because →

[...continues on folio 566 (PDF p. 383): the charge against Jerome's rendering of the mandrakes (Annotatio CIX).]

(printed folio 566 [PDF p. 383]. **Annot. CIX–CXIII** (Gen 30:14–37:2): Giorgio's "Dudaim = lilies, not mandrakes"; an LXX flock-marking error; Jacob's wrestling as bodily (Theodore) vs spiritual (Jerome, Origen); the true etymology of Israel ("Prince of God," not "man seeing God"); and Aquila's reversed reading of Joseph and his brothers → folio 567.)

(folio 566, left column → right column)

Annotation CIX (continued)

because, for the word which in this place is read in Hebrew דודאים *Dudaim*, he translated "Mandrakes," when he ought to have expounded [it as] "Lilies." For how can it be that Rachel, being barren, should so greatly have desired mandrakes out of a longing to conceive¹ — [mandrakes] which are most cold, and especially hostile to conceptions, indeed even lethal to those who take them, as Dioscorides sets forth in a long discourse? Hence the mandrake itself is also called *Andraclon*, because it kills a man — although others would have it called *Andricelon*, from a man's image; which experience proves false. Unless perhaps the translator understood [it] of another kind of mandrake, which they call *Circaea* [Circe's herb], whose root serves for love-charms; yet the root of this, as Dioscorides himself relates, brings heaviness of head to shepherds who chew it, and induces stupor. Likewise of another kind of mandrake, which is called *Morion*, the same author narrates that a dram of it, taken in drink, induces madness. Therefore the *Dudaim* are lilies, which are warm and very proper for conception. An error of this kind is also found in the Song of Songs, where it is said, "The MANDRAKES gave their odor,"² whereas the mandrake is wholly odorless, and emits no odor at all.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Mandrakes are hostile to conceptions.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Canticles 7:13.

Annotation CX

"The beasts that were of the later coming became Laban's." — Genesis 30:42

An error of the Septuagint interpreters.

The **Septuagint**, for what is in the Hebrew — "The beasts that were of the later [season] became Laban's, but those of the first time [season], Jacob's" — translated in a different sense: "But the beasts that were not marked became Laban's, and the marked ones, Jacob's." [So] Jerome, in the *Hebrew Questions*.

Annotation CXI

"And behold, a man wrestled with him until morning." — Genesis 32:24

Whether Jacob contended with the Angel in a bodily wrestling.

Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea — as appears from the Greek Catena of Oecumenius — elucidating the present passage, asserts that Jacob fought against the angel in the embrace of a true and bodily wrestling, [an angel] who, a manly form being assumed for the time, provoked the patriarch himself to the wrestling. Although almost all the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin expositors follow this opinion, **Jerome** nevertheless seems to have disapproved [it] in the third book of the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, where, explaining that [saying], "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places,"³ he indicated that Jacob did not fight bodily against him who appeared to him in [the form of] a man, but rather contended spiritually with the help of him who appeared to him in a man — not against human temptations, but against the greatest and superhuman temptations of the wicked demon, which Paul called "wrestlings not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places." And he expressed this sense in these words: "*These things we have brought forward, that we may beat back the opinion of those who think that all vices are of flesh and blood, and that the demons have no power to incite us to sin. Such a wrestling we think Jacob's also to have been — namely, that he contended not against flesh and blood, when he remained alone, and a man wrestled with him, helping and strengthening him against another struggling with excessive sweat. And at the same time see, lest perhaps those be ridiculous who think that Jacob wrestled the whole night in the manner of wrestlers. For what is there great, if — as they say — while wrestling he either overcame or was overcome? But according to a reasonable wrestling befitting the patriarch, it must be believed that his struggle was such as they have who can say, 'Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places.'*"

◇ 3. Left margin: Ephesians 6:12.

Thus far the words of Jerome, who in this part follows the judgment of **Origen** — who earlier had written thus on the same matter in the third [book] *On First Principles*: "*Whence also the Angel is said to have wrestled with Jacob. Which we do not so understand, as that it be the same [to say] that the Angel wrestled with Jacob and [that it was] against Jacob; but that he who was present to him for the sake of [his] salvation, and imposed on him the name Israel, that same one wrestles with him — that is, is with him in the contest, and helps him in the struggle — since without doubt there was another against whom he fought, and against whom the contest was waged for him. And indeed Paul too did not say that we have a wrestling with the principalities and powers, but against the principalities and powers. Whence, if Jacob wrestled, without doubt he wrestled against some of these powers, which Paul declares to be especially adverse to the human race and to the saints, and to stir up contests. Therefore Scripture finally says of Jacob that he wrestled with the Angel and prevailed unto God — so that, if there be indeed a contest of the struggle, [Scripture], sustained by the Angel's help, may lead the victor, by the palm of perfection, unto God.*" **Procopius of Gaza**, in the commentaries on this chapter, says: "*Some — as we have received from a certain learned man — profess that the Devil, in the appearance of Esau, contended with Jacob, wishing to overcome him; but that an auxiliary Angel stood by Jacob, by whose help the Devil could effect nothing. Therefore, lest Jacob should think that he had vanquished the adversary by his own strength — [rather than] helped by the Angel's strength — the sinew was touched for him, and lameness followed.*"

Annotation CXII

"Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel." — Genesis 32:28

Many have not rightly interpreted the word "Israel."

Philo (in the book on Abraham), and — in the book *On the Interpretation of Hebrew Names* — **Eusebius**, **Chrysostom**, and **Hilary**, wrongly interpreting the name "Israel" imposed on the patriarch Jacob, **Jerome** censures in the book of *Hebrew Questions* in these words: "But that which in the book of Names is interpreted 'Israel, a man seeing God,' worn threadbare by the speech of almost all, seems to be interpreted not so much truly as forcibly. For here 'Israel' is written by these letters ישראל, which is interpreted 'Prince of God' or 'Upright of God'; but 'a man seeing God' is written by these letters אישראל, of which אי signifies 'man,' ראה 'seeing,' אל 'God.' Although, therefore, they be of great authority and eloquence, and their shadow oppress us — [they] who translated Israel 'a man' or 'a mind seeing God' — we are led rather by the authority of Scripture, and of the Angel (or of God) who called him Israel, than by any secular eloquence whatever."

Annotation CXIII

"But Joseph accused his brothers to his father of a most wicked crime." — Genesis 37:2

Whether Joseph's brothers accused him of a most wicked crime.

Aquila, the second interpreter of the divine volumes, where we — according to the Hebrew truth — read that Joseph accused his brothers to his father [of a most wicked crime], →

[...continues on folio 567 (PDF p. 384): Aquila's variant reading and Sixtus's discussion (Annotatio CXIII).]

(printed folio 567 [PDF p. 384]. **Annot. CXIII–CXVI** (Gen 37:2 → Exodus): the brothers' slander of Joseph; Chrysostom self-contradicting on Judah and Tamar (acquittal vs condemnation); Philo allegorizing the high priest's vestment as the world, God's "most perfect Son"; and Jerome's "horned" face of Moses → folio 568.)

(folio 567, left column → right column)

Annotation CXIII (continued)

of a most wicked crime — [Aquila] translated [it], as Procopius testifies, in a contrary sense: κατήνεγκαν δὲ κατὰ Ἰωσήφ ψόγον πονηρὸν Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν, that is, "The brothers, namely, brought a wicked reproach concerning Joseph to their father." In the same way, before Aquila, the Seventy interpreters too translated this very [passage]; following which version, Chrysostom, according to the same sense, expounded these words in homily 61 on Genesis, saying: "Seeing the father's benevolence toward him, they were stirred to envy against him; for they brought [an accusation] against Joseph of a most wicked crime, before Israel their father. See the eminence of [their] malice: they attempted even to disturb the father's charity; and things which were not, they feign — accomplishing so great an evil against him, only that they might satisfy their envy." Agreeing with this same edition are the explanations of Theodore of Heraclea, Isidore of Pelusium, and Theodoret.

Annotation CXIV

"Judah, going in to her, said: Suffer me to lie with thee." — Genesis 38:16

Whether Tamar, in lying with Judah, perpetrated a crime.

Chrysostom, examining the intercourse of Judah and Tamar — namely, of a father-in-law with [his] daughter-in-law, described in the present chapter — seems to think diverse and plainly contrary things to his

own words. For in homily 62 on Genesis, freeing both the father-in-law and the daughter-in-law from all crime, he writes thus: "*Tamar wished to steal intercourse with her father-in-law, and from that to procreate children — not desiring to satisfy lust (far be this!), but it was a dispensation, what was done.*" And after a few [words], adducing three reasons for this opinion, he says: "*Let no one, hearing these things, condemn Tamar: for, as I said, she ministered to a dispensation; and therefore she neither merits any reprehension thence, nor was Judah liable to crimes. For behold, proceeding by this way, you will find that from the children born to Judah, Christ, according to the flesh, draws [his] lineage. Moreover, these two sons born through him were a figure of two peoples, and a certain prediction of the Jewish and the spiritual life.*" By these three reasons Chrysostom in this place defends Judah and Tamar, whom in other places he openly condemns — her indeed as incestuous, him as a fornicator. For, in the first homily on Matthew, making mention of the intercourse of that same Tamar, he says thus: "*Why did Matthew, in the generation of Christ, bring forward only those women who were noted for some vice¹ — that is, if any was an adulteress, or a harlot, if any was also not legitimately coupled in marriage, if any was foreign or barbarian? For the Evangelist commemorates not only the wife of Uriah, but also Tamar and Ruth: of whom one indeed was foreign, as Ruth; another a prostitute, as Tamar, who had dealings with a kinsman — not only not joined to him by the law of marriage, but [having] stolen the intercourse, and concealed under the habit of a harlot.*" To which question the same [Chrysostom], satisfying [it] in the third homily on Matthew, assigns three causes of this deed: the first, that he might show that Christ — who had come to extinguish our reproaches — deigned to have sinners as ancestors,² blushing at nothing on account of our evils; the second, to demonstrate to us that we are not to [glory] in [our] parents, even in the foul filth of the disgrace of fornication and adultery, if we are adorned by our own virtue (which is not discolored by the reproaches of a parent); the third, to repress the arrogance of the Jews, who gloried too insolently in the virtues of [their] ancestors — teaching that their own patriarch Judah, from whom the Jews take [their] name, committed no small offense in the fornication with Tamar.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Matthew 1:3, 5.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Christ, who was to extinguish our reproaches, deigned to have sinners as ancestors.

Thus far Chrysostom: whose former opinion Ambrose follows (book 3 of the commentary on Luke), and Theodoret (question 94 on Genesis); but the latter assertion of the same [Chrysostom] Jerome embraces (in the *Hebrew Questions*), and St. Augustine — who, meeting the reasons adduced for Chrysostom's first assertion, says, in book 22 against Faustus, that not all the deeds of men are to be approved by us,³ [even those] from which certain good things, according to the dispensation of divine providence, either follow or are signified. For divine providence, everywhere preserving its own goodness, and drawing good as much from the evil as from the good works of men, willed — from the lust of Judah, who, overcome by concupiscence, went in to Tamar — not only to effect something of good, but to signify prophetically certain future goods. For to signify certain goods, it matters nothing whether those deeds, by which they are signified, be good or evil. **Aloysius [Ludovico], Bishop of Verona**, in the *Catena* of explanations on Genesis, says: "*Judah is not to be excused from the sin of fornication, nor is the fornication to be approved, as [that] of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman: for he sinned in manifold ways — and in others, by lying, by betrayal, and by hatred.*" **Rabbi Simeon [bar Yohai]**, in the commentaries on the Pentateuch which bear the title *Zohar*, frees her from all crime, because she did this not for the sake of satisfying lust, but by a certain pious instinct — namely, that she might conceive from Judah the awaited Messiah.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Not all the deeds of men — even those from which good things follow or are signified — are to be approved by us.

Annotation CXV

"And these shall be the vestments which they shall make." — Exodus 28:4

Whether the world is the Son of God, as Philo held.

Philo the Jew, book 3 *On the Life of Moses*, opening the allegory of the priestly vestment — in which the whole world was represented — says that the world is the most perfect Son of God, in these words: "*In this manner the high priest, [thus] adorned, is sent to the sacred [rites], so that, whenever he is about to make vows according to the ancestral rite, he may bring in the whole world under the figures which he bears upon [his] garments. For it was necessary that the priest, about to supplicate the omnipotent Father, should employ as advocate the world — his [the Father's] most perfect Son — to obtain pardon for [our] errors, and abundant grace for the time to come.*" I suspect that these words are to be understood metaphorically, according to the common usage of speaking, by which we are sometimes wont to call the artificial works of craftsmen [their] "offspring" and "births."

Annotation CXVI

"He knew not that his face was horned." — Exodus 34:29

Whether Moses's face was horned.

Augustine, **Bishop of Kissamos**, marvels at Jerome, because — against the Hebrew truth and the Septuagint edition — he put in his translation that Moses's face was "horned." For thus that bishop writes in the Annotations on Exodus: "*For the ambiguous word made an error in the edition — although there is also a difference between*" →

[...continues on folio 568 (PDF p. 385): the ambiguity of qaran/qeren and the defense of Jerome (Annotatio CXVI).]

*(printed folio 568 [PDF p. 385]. **Annot. CXVI–CXVIII** (Exod 34:29 → Lev 8:4): the Hebrew קרן — Moses's face "radiant," not "horned"; Origen on Christ suffering for the angels too (a "double victim"); and Origen seeming to have bishops elected by the people (Bodius's use of it answered) → folio 569.)*

(folio 568, left column → right column)

Annotation CXVI (continued)

between the noun "Horn" and that which signifies "Radiant." For "horn" is called קרן *Kerren* with a double segol; but "radiant," קרן *Karran*. Therefore it is not had in the Hebrew context that Moses's face was horned, but radiant. Which is most clearly understood from the words themselves, which in Hebrew have this form — ומשה לא ידע כי קרן עור פניו בדברו אתו — *Mosche lo iadacha chi Karan or panaiu bedabero ito* — that is, "And Moses knew not that the skin of his face was radiant." It is not written, therefore, that his face was horned, but that his skin was radiant. From this, then, the depraved custom of the common people can be corrected, who paint Moses with two horns: for horns did not come forth from [his] forehead, but [his] forehead, and nose, and mouth, and chin were radiant. And it is a wonder that Jerome, not having considered the Hebrew truth, did not even notice what the Septuagint had translated — who rendered this passage well: καὶ Μωϋσῆς οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, "And Moses knew not that the appearance of the skin of his face had been glorified." And so the Jews laugh at us and execrate us, whenever they see Moses depicted in our temples with a horned face — as if we (as they foolishly interpret) thought him to be some Devil. From this passage of the Septuagint edition it is known that that ancient edition which the Church used before Jerome was that of the Septuagint themselves. For in the office of the Transfiguration of the Savior is sung, "The face of Moses was glorified" — which is taken from the Septuagint edition, which the Latins used, and whence they also took [their] Antiphons.

Annotation CXVII

"They shall pour the blood round about the altar, which is before the door of the tabernacle." — Leviticus 1:5

Whether Christ suffered for the Angels, as Origen taught.

Origen, in the first homily on Leviticus, narrating this passage, indicates that Christ suffered not only for the sins of men, but also of the Angels, writing in this manner: *"The blood of Jesus was poured out not only in Jerusalem, where the altar was, but also upon that altar which is in the heavens, where is the Church of the firstborn; there the same blood was sprinkled — just as the Apostle also says, 'Making peace through the blood of his cross, whether the things that are on earth, or the things that are in heaven.'*¹ *For Jesus was offered as a victim not only for earthly [beings], but also for heavenly ones: and here, indeed, for men, he shed the very corporeal matter of his blood; but in the heavens he immolated the vital power of his body, as a certain spiritual sacrifice. Do you wish to know that there was in him a double victim — suitable for earthly [beings], and apt for heavenly ones? The Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says 'through the veil, that is, his flesh';² and again, the inner veil is interpreted [as] heaven, which Jesus penetrated, that he might now stand before the face of God for us. If, therefore, two veils are understood, which Jesus — as a high priest — entered, consequently a double sacrifice too must be understood, by which both earthly and heavenly things are reconciled."* To the same opinion he alludes in homily 2 on Leviticus, where, explaining that [passage] from Leviticus chapter 4, "The high priest shall offer a calf for his own sin,"³ he says thus: *"See, therefore, lest perhaps Jesus — whom Paul says to have made peace through his blood, not only [for] the things which are on earth, but [for] those which are in heaven — be himself that calf, which in the heavens was offered not for sin, but as a gift; but on earth, where sin reigned from Adam to Moses, he suffered for sin."* This same thing he expresses more openly in the first Tome of the commentaries on John, saying thus: *"Our great high priest offered himself as a victim — a victim not for men alone, but also for every [being] which is participant of reason. For, except God, he tasted death for all: not only for men, but also for the rest which use reason did he endure death. For it is absurd to say that he died for human sins, and not for some other [being] besides man which was in sin — as, for instance, for the stars, since not even the stars are wholly clean before God, as we read in Job."⁴ He has a similar assertion also in the first book of the commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, where, explaining that [saying] from the first chapter of the same epistle, "He subjected all things under his feet," he speaks thus: *"In that he says 'all things,' he seems to raise a question. For as to that which is said, 'He must reign until he put [his] enemies under his feet,' you do not greatly seek an interpreter: because those things which are hostile, when they have been overcome, will be subjected under his feet, and will come into the power of the victor. But how all things — that is, angels, thrones, dominations, powers, and the other virtues, which were never contrary to God — will be subjected to his feet, seems obscure. It can therefore be answered that no one is without sin, and that the stars themselves are not clean before God, and that every creature dreads the coming of the Creator; whence also the cross of the Savior is reported to have purged not only those things which were on earth, but also those which were in heaven."* **Rufinus**, in the first book of the *Invectives*, imputes this very dogma to Jerome — by a conjecture plainly invalid — because he [Jerome], in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, inserted Origen's aforesaid words, without the author's name, into his own explanation, no confutation of them being added. See Annotations 170 and 292 of the following book.*

◇ 1. Left margin: Colossians 1:20.

◇ 2. Left margin: Hebrews 10:20.

◇ 3. Left margin: Leviticus 4:3.

◇ 4. Right margin: Job 25:5.

Annotation CXVIII

"Moses, all the multitude being gathered together before the door of the tabernacle, said," etc. — Leviticus 8:4

Whether bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people.

Origen, in homily 6 on Leviticus, seems to deduce from this passage that Bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people. For thus he writes: "*Although, therefore, the Lord had given command about constituting a high priest, and the Lord had chosen [him], nevertheless the multitude is convoked. For in ordaining a priest the presence of the people too is required, that all may know and be certain — because he who is more excellent out of all the people, who [is] holier, who more learned, who more eminent in every virtue, that one is chosen for the priesthood; and this with the people standing by, lest afterward any retraction remain to anyone, lest any scruple remain.*" **Hermann Bodius**, in his *Collectanea*, uses this testimony against us; to which he subjoins the words from the fifth epistle of Cyprian to the people and clergy, saying: "*In ordaining clerics, dearest brothers, we are accustomed to consult you beforehand, and to weigh the character and merits of individuals by common counsel.*" He confirms Cyprian's authority also by the example of Matthias, who was chosen not by the Apostles alone, but by the whole assembly of Christians; and as is said to have been done in the times of Pope Leo.

But if the words of each Doctor are rightly weighed, neither of them attributes to the people the right of electing a Bishop;⁵ rather they indicate only that this was granted to the people by the rulers of the Church — namely, that [the candidates], in the presence of the people, might be chosen under the eyes of all, so that, as worthy and fit, they might be approved by public judgment, lest any [scruple] after the ordination →

◇ **5. Right margin:** The Doctors do not attribute to the people the right of electing a bishop, as the heretics trifle.

[...continues on folio 569 (PDF p. 386): *Sixtus's full answer on the election of bishops (Annotatio CXVIII).*]

(printed folio 569 [PDF p. 386]. Annot. CXVIII–CXX (Lev 8:4–10:14): bishop-election reserved to the metropolitan and clergy (the people only approve); Origen's "Christ still mourns our sins" (recalled to a pious sense); and Origen making Christ's flesh and blood mere "word and doctrine" (used by Bodius against the Eucharist) → folio 570.)

(folio 569, left column → right column)

Annotation CXVIII (continued)

lest, after the ordination, any occasion of retracting [it] should remain. Whence also **Lampridius**, a writer foreign to our religion, in the Life of Alexander [Severus] Augustus relates that it was the custom for the names of those who were to be set over the Church to be first proposed publicly, so that, if the people had anything against him, they might bring it forward.¹ And this same custom is preserved in our times — not entirely, yet in some part. For first, [the candidate] to be elected is wont to be examined concerning [his] faith and morals by the most approved men; then, when excellent testimonies have been received about him, before he is placed in the government of the Church the people are wont to be called, and in their presence [the election] is declared — so that the election may be approved by the people's favor, and the multitude may much more willingly obey him whom it knows to have been raised to that dignity by its own consent also. But the election of a Bishop itself is forbidden to the people by the decrees of the ancient Councils,² as appears from the Council of Laodicea, in whose twelfth canon it is forbidden that the election of a Bishop take place except by the metropolitan Bishop, together with the comprovincial bishops, or the college of priests. To no one, therefore, is it lawful to elect Bishops, except to those who hold the helm of the Church — and especially to the supreme vicar of Christ — and only to those princes and peoples to whom, by a certain peculiar prerogative, it has been granted by the Supreme Pontiff himself to nominate the Bishops whom they have judged fit for governing (as now some peoples do by his authority, and did once in the time of Pope Leo, and in the times³ of the Apostles in the election of Matthias³). For then this was easily [granted] to the

multitude of the faithful, [when] the people was moderate, grave, and most zealous for the public utility; but now, since the common people is a beast of many heads, always intent on factions and seditious, this very thing could not be granted except with the greatest disturbance of the Church. St. Cyprian too, in the same epistle cited by the heretics, openly asserts that it is not necessary that [the one] to be elected be inquired of the people concerning [his] merits, where the divine suffrages, brought forth through the bishops, go before.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** See Thomas Stapleton, in the *Demonstration of Doctrinal Principles*, Controversy 2, book 5, chapters 12 and 13.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** The election of bishops is forbidden to the people.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** Acts 1.

Annotation CXIX

"You shall not drink wine, nor anything that may make drunk, when you enter into the tabernacle of the testimony." — Leviticus 10:9

Whether Christ still mourns our sins.

Origen, homily 7 on Leviticus, expounding the sense of this passage, writes this: "*My Savior even now mourns my sins, and my Savior cannot rejoice, so long as I remain in iniquity. For how can he be in joy, to whom the grief of my sins always ascends? For if the Apostle mourns certain of his own who have sinned before, what shall I say of him who is called the Son of charity? For, since the Lord is merciful and compassionate, he himself, with greater affection than the Apostle, weeps [for] his own, and much more mourns those who have sinned and have not done penance. For it is not to be thought that Paul mourns for sinners, but that my Lord Jesus abstains from weeping, when he approaches the Father and offers propitiation for us.*" **St. Bernard**, in the sermon which is entitled *On the Words of Origen*, most copiously confuted this passage.⁴ Yet we can easily recall Origen's words to a pious understanding, if we say that Christ mourns our sins — not that he himself, who is devoid of all grief and weeping, mourns in any way or can mourn, but because he still mourns our sins in his members,⁵ when he infuses into his elect weeping and compassion for another's iniquity. In which sense the Apostle said that "the Spirit of God prays for us with unspeakable groanings,"⁶ because he provokes us to groans and tearful prayers. Nor do the following words of Origen — which discuss most amply concerning the Church and the spiritual members of the body of Christ — differ from this understanding.

- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** St. Bernard confuted Origen.
- ◇ 5. **Right margin:** Christ mourns our sins in his members.
- ◇ 6. **Right margin:** Romans 8:26.

Origen also has certain things in this homily which seem to allude to the opinion of those who hold that the souls of the saints do not enjoy the beatitude of the divine vision until the final resurrection of the flesh.⁷ These you will be able to see on the second page of the present homily, in those words: "*For the saints have not yet received their joy, nor even the Apostles: but they too await, that I may become a partaker of their joy,*" etc. — which are to be interpreted of the full consummation of completed felicity, which the saints have not yet received in [their] bodies. But of these [we treat] more copiously in Annotation 345 of the following book.

- ◇ 7. **Right margin:** Whether the souls of the saints enjoy the glory of God [before the resurrection].

Annotation CXX

"The breast also that is offered, you shall eat in a most clean place." — Leviticus 10:14

Whether the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than his doctrine.

Origen, in the seventh homily on Leviticus, running out into an allegory of this passage, pronounces two things which **Hermann Bodius**, in his *Collectanea*, brings forward to undermine the truth of the Eucharist.

The first is, that the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than the discourse and doctrine of Christ. The next to this is, that that sentence of the Savior — "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you," etc.⁸ — is to be understood figuratively of the doctrine of Christ, and not according to the letter, of the real body and blood of Christ. For these are Origen's words: "*Our Lord and Savior says, 'Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall not have life in yourselves: my flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink.' Jesus, therefore — because he is wholly clean from the whole — his whole flesh is food, and his whole blood is drink: because every work of his is holy, and every word of his is true; therefore his flesh too is truly food, and his blood is truly drink. For with the flesh and blood of his Word, as with clean food and drink, he gives drink and refreshes the whole race of men.*" And a little after he adds: "*Recognize that the things which are written in the divine volumes are figures; and therefore examine them as spiritual, and not as carnal, and understand the things which are said. For if you follow according to the letter that which was said, 'Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood' — this letter kills.*" To the same [sense] he seems to allude in homily 9 on Leviticus, where, discussing that [passage], "And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord," etc., he says: "*You, who have come to Christ, the true high priest — who by his blood made God propitious to you and reconciled you to the Father — do not cling to the blood of the flesh, but learn rather the blood of the Word, and hear him saying to you, 'For this is my blood, which shall be shed for you unto the remission [of sins].'*" →

◇ 8. Right margin: John 6:53.

[...continues on folio 570 (PDF p. 387): *Sixtus's answer to Badius on Origen and the Eucharist (Annotatio CXX).*]

(printed folio 570 [PDF p. 387], a dense page of short textual notes, *Leviticus into Numbers. Annot. CXX–CXXVI* (Lev 16:13 → Num 25:4): *Origen and the Sacramentarians on the Eucharist; clerics and temporal goods; Moses's "Ethiopian" wife (= Zipporah); Aaron's rod; Balaam's "open" eye; and Origen on our guardian angels being judged with us at the Last Day. (The source misprints CXXVI as "CXXVII," skipping CXXVI; corrected here.)* → folio 571.)

(folio 570, left column → right column)

Annotation CXX (continued)

of sins: he knows [this], who is imbued with the mysteries, and [knows] the flesh and blood of the Word of God. Let us not, therefore, dwell on these things, which are both known to those who know, and cannot lie open to the ignorant." To this opinion Augustine has [something] not unlike, on the third Psalm, and in book 3 *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 16 — with whom **Thomas Cajetan** agrees, in the commentaries on the sixth [chapter] of John. The right understanding of these propositions you will be able to attain in Annotation 196 of book 6.

Annotation CXXI

"And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord." — Leviticus 16:13

The words of **Origen** from homily 9 on Leviticus, brought forward for the exposition of this passage, are cited by the Sacramentarians in confirmation of the heresy which denies that the true body of Christ is in the sacrament of the altar. Read Annotation 196 in the following volume.

Annotation CXXII

"The houses of the Levites, which are in the cities, may always be redeemed." — Leviticus 25:32

Whether it is lawful for priests to possess temporal goods.

Origen, near the beginning of homily 15 on Leviticus, seems to think that Christ forbade to clerics the possession of temporal things, saying thus: "*The law of Christ, if we follow it, permits us to have neither possessions on earth, nor houses in the cities. And why do I say houses? It grants [us] not even several tunics, nor to possess much money. For 'having food and clothing,' he says, 'let us be content with these.'*"¹ Consult Annotation 106 of book 6.

◇ 1. Left margin: 1 Timothy 6:8.

Annotation CXXIII

"Miriam spoke against Moses, because of his wife the Ethiopian." — Numbers 12:1

Concerning Moses's wife.

Josephus, in the second book of the *Antiquities*, describing this history, is refuted in the Annotations of Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, in these words: "*Josephus reports that Moses married this Ethiopian woman on this occasion: that, while he was being brought up in Pharaoh's court, he was chosen general against the Ethiopians, and thence carried off the woman as a captive, and made her his wife — the daughter of the king of the Ethiopians — and that Moses had two wives, this one and Zipporah; which I judge to be most fabulous. Apollinaris also lies, that Moses had two wives. For who does not see that these things are invented by them? For it is clear that this [woman] is Zipporah, the daughter of the priest of Midian — not that Midian is [that] Ethiopia which is beyond Egypt, but that Ethiopia which is joined to Arabia. For the sons of Israel fought against the Midianites, coming into Palestine; and the Midianites came down from those places into Egypt.*"

Annotation CXXIV

"And there were twelve rods, besides the rod of Aaron." — Numbers 17:6

Whether the rods brought to Moses were more than twelve.

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, refutes Jerome's translation in this passage, writing this in the Annotations on the Pentateuch: "*Here is omitted what was most necessary — namely, בַּתְּנֵךְ מִטְּוֹתָם; ve-mattheh Aharon betoch mattotam, that is, 'And the rod of Aaron was placed in the midst of their rods' — inasmuch as he had been chosen priest by God, and held the principate among the rest. This is omitted by the Septuagint, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἀναμέσον τῶν ῥάβδων αὐτῶν, that is, 'And the rod of Aaron in the midst of their rods.' But in the place where Jerome substituted for this sentence 'Besides the rod of Aaron,' I know not whether it is truly said — since it is neither had in the Hebrew context, nor is it even true that there were twelve rods besides the rod of Aaron, but rather [twelve] together with the rod of Aaron: for each rod represented a tribe, and there were twelve tribes; wherefore the rods could not be more than twelve. Therefore 'besides the rod of Aaron' is superfluous; but in its place must be put, 'And in the midst [was] Aaron's rod, the rod of Aaron.' For neither among the Septuagint is there that exception.*"

Annotation CXXV

"The man said, whose eye is stopped up." — Numbers 24:3

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos, weighing Jerome's version in this part, thus admonishes in his Annotations: "*'The man said, whose eye is stopped up.' הגבר שתם העין, ha-gever shetum ha-ayin — that is, 'The man whose eye is open,' as the Hebrews interpret, and as the Chaldaic [Aramaic] edition translates; wherefore it was taken in the contrary [sense] by Jerome. And I wonder why the Septuagint did not follow the Hebrew — [the Seventy] who translated according to the Hebrew, Φησὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀληθινός, that is, 'The true man said.' Whence it comes about that I suspect Jerome did not render it in that way [deliberately], but that a negation is missing in our codices: so that it must read, 'The man said, whose eye is not stopped up.' For otherwise Balaam would be saying things contrary to himself, who a little after protests that he is a hearer of*

the words of God."

Annotation CXXVI

Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment.

(The printed text misnumbers this annotation CXXVII, skipping CXXVI; it is corrected here to CXXVI, its proper place in the sequence — the following annotation on folio 571 is correctly numbered CXXVII in the source.)

"And the Lord being angry, said to Moses: Take all the princes of the people, and hang them up against the sun." — Numbers 25:4

Origen, in homily 20 on Numbers, applying an allegorical interpretation to this passage, teaches that the angels, our guardians, are to be judged by God on the day of judgment — whether they have guarded us with accurate diligence or not — and will receive, for the care expended toward us (well or ill), either punishments or rewards, which now they themselves, anxious about their own salvation, await between hope and fear. His words are these: *"The angels will come to judgment with us, and will stand for us before the Sun of justice — lest perhaps something also of that which we do amiss be from them, lest perhaps they have expended less of work and labor toward us to recall us from the stain of sins. For unless there were also something in them which might seem blameworthy in our cause, Scripture would never say to the angel of this or that Church, 'You who have, for example, certain [persons] holding the doctrine of Balaam';² or, 'Because you have forsaken your first charity,'³ or 'your patience,' or other things of this kind, for which, in the Apocalypse, the angels of each single Church are blamed. For if an Angel — for example, he who received me, sealed, from God, for the things which I have done well — hopes for a reward, it is certain that he will also fear to be blamed for the things which have been done ill by me; and therefore they are said to be 'hung up against the Sun,' that it may appear, without doubt, whether [these things] were committed through my disobedience, or through his negligence."* And in homily 24 on Numbers, expounding that [passage] from the 20th chapter of the same book, "The woman, if she shall know anything," etc., repeating the same, he says: →

◇ 2. Right margin: Revelation 2:14.

◇ 3. Right margin: Revelation 2:4.

[...continues on folio 571 (PDF p. 388): the rest of Origen on the angels' judgment (Annotatio CXXVI).]

*(printed folio 571 [PDF p. 388]. **Annot. CXXVI–CXXVIII** (Num 25:4–33:1): the guardian-angels-judged teaching completed (Origen on Luke, Jerome on Micah, Aquinas: angels as witnesses, not defendants); a twofold order of the blessed; and Origen's staged ascent of souls to God's vision after the resurrection → folio 572.)*

(folio 571, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXVI (continued)

says: *"We have often said that a care and administration is had, through the Angels, of the souls which are in the Church of God; and we have shown that these [Angels] too come to judgment together with men, so that by that divine examination it may be established whether men have sinned by their own sloth, or by the negligence of their monitors and guardians,"* etc. Again, in homily 13 on Luke, narrating that [passage] from chapter 2, "There was made a multitude of the heavenly host,"¹ etc., he treats the same thing more fully, writing thus: *"If it is expedient to speak boldly, following the sense of the Scriptures, for each single Church there are two bishops: the one visible, namely a man; the other invisible, who is an Angel — the former*

manifest to the sight of the flesh, the latter to the [inward] sense. And in what manner [the man], if he has well administered the stewardship committed to him, is praised by the Lord, [and] if ill, is subject to fault and blame — so also the Angel. For it is written in the Apocalypse of John: but you have there a few names [of those] who have defiled this or that; and again you have there [those] who teach the doctrine of the Nicolaitans; and then you have those [others] committing this or that sin. And the Angels are accused, whose Churches have opposed [them]. But if the Angels have [such] solicitude how the Churches are governed, what need is there to speak of men — how great a fear they must have, that, laboring together with the laboring Angels, they may obtain salvation? I think that both an Angel and a man, [both] good, can be found together [as] Bishops of the Churches, and in a certain manner participants of one work: which since it is so, let us ask the omnipotent God that the Angels and the men [who are] bishops of the Churches may be a help to us; and let us know that both are judged by the Lord on our behalf. For if they be judged, and the fault and the sin be found not in their neglect but in our negligence, we shall be accused and punished; for when they do all things and strive for our salvation, we shall nonetheless not be free from our sins. Moreover it frequently happens that, while we labor, they do not fulfill their office, and are in fault." Again in homily 35 on Luke, upon that [passage] of chapter 12, "When thou goest with thy adversary,"² etc., he speaks these things more openly to the same sense, saying: "It is written elsewhere that double Angels attend a man, whether unto the good or unto the evil part. For of the good ones the Savior makes mention, saying, 'Their Angels always see the face of the Father.'³ At the same time inquire whether the Angels of the little ones in the Church always see the face of the Father, and the Angels of the others have not liberty to attend upon the countenance of the Father: for neither is it to be hoped that the Angels of all see the face of the Father, who is in heaven. If I be of the Church — however least I may be — my Angel has liberty, and confidence, of always seeing the face of my Father; but if [I be] outside, and not of that Church which has not spot nor wrinkle, or any such thing, and I am reprobate [and] alien from such a congregation, my Angel has not confidence of looking upon the countenance of my Father, who is in heaven. For which cause the Angels are solicitous for the good, knowing that, if they govern us well and lead [us] through unto salvation, they too may have confidence of seeing the face of the Father. In what manner also, if through their care and industry salvation is procured for men, they always attend the face of the Father — so, if through their negligence a man falls, they are not ignorant that there is peril to themselves also. And as a good Bishop and the best steward knows it to be of his own merit and virtue if the sheep of the flock committed to him have been kept, so understand also concerning the Angels: it is a disgrace to an Angel if a just man committed to him has [nevertheless] sinned; as, on the contrary, it is a glory to an Angel if [even] the least [man] committed to him be [kept] in the Church. For they shall see the face of the Father, who is in heaven — not sometime, but always — while others shall never see [it]: for according to the merit of those whose Angels they are, the Angels shall contemplate the face of God either always, or never, or less, or more."

◇ 1. Left margin: Luke 2:13.

◇ 2. Left margin: Luke 12:58.

◇ 3. Left margin: Matthew 18:10.

Thus far Origen: to whose opinion Jerome seems to subscribe, in book 2 of the commentary on Micah, where, expounding those words of the 6th chapter of the same prophet,⁴ "Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc., he left this written: "By the mountains he signifies, I think, none other than the angels, to whom the administration of human affairs has been committed — the Canticle of Deuteronomy agreeing to the very same [point]:⁵ 'When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he appointed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God.' And contend in judgment, that — whether they be reckoned mountains or hills — it may appear that they have not worthily administered the peoples; or that it may seem to be my [charge], who have set forth such [rulers]; or that the fault may be taken away from the people and referred to the Angels. We read the Apocalypse of John, in which the Angels of the Churches are praised and accused for the virtues and vices of those over whom they

are said to preside. For just as sometimes it is the Bishop's fault, sometimes the people's; and often the master sins, often the disciple; and sometimes it is the father's fault, sometimes the son's, that they are well or ill instructed — so in the judgment of God the crime is either referred to the Angels, if they have not done all the things which pertained to their office, or to the people, if — [the Angels] doing all things — they themselves have scorned to hear [them]." These things Jerome [spoke], more (as I judge) from another's opinion than from his own.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Micah 6:1.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Deuteronomy 32:8.

Divus Thomas, in the first part of the Theological Summa, question 113,⁶ kindly and benevolently — as he is always wont — excusing the errors of the Fathers, says that Origen wished to infer nothing else from the aforesaid words, except that the Angels were to be brought into judgment for the sins of men — not indeed as defendants, but as witnesses,⁷ to convict the sloth of those who have neglected to acquiesce in the admonitions of the angels. Nor does that seem to be discordant from this pious interpretation of Thomas which Origen brought forth in homily 11 on Numbers, in these words: "*Therefore each single one of the Angels will be present at the judgment in the consummation of the age, bringing forth with him those over whom he presided. And I think there will be an inquiry there also — not indeed whether the Angel was wanting to the care of the men, but whether the Angelic care met with no worthy response from human sloth.*"

◇ 6. **Right margin:** St. Thomas, part 1, question 113, article [8], to the 4th [objection].

◇ 7. **Right margin:** The Angels are brought into judgment not as defendants, but as witnesses.

Annotation CXXVII

"To these shall the land be divided for a possession, according to the number of the names." — Numbers 26:53

Whether all the blessed shall see God.

Origen, in homily 21 on Numbers, upon these words, says that there is a twofold kind of the blessed: one higher and more perfect, which shall see God face to face; the other lower, which shall only inherit the land of the living — that is, [shall possess] only immortality, sublimity, and power. Origen has an opinion alluding to this in homily 35 on Luke. See Annotation 345 of the following volume.

Annotation CXXVIII

"These are the mansions of the children of Israel." — Numbers 33:1

Whether the saints, immediately after the judgment, are raised to the contemplation of God.

Origen, in homily 27 on Numbers, expounding these things, indicates that souls after the resurrection are not immediately raised to the vision of God, but are led step by step to the contemplation of God through the ascents of many illuminations. For he says: "*It is treated, therefore, of the ascent from Egypt to the land of promise, through which →*

[...continues on folio 572 (PDF p. 389): Origen on the soul's gradual ascent through its many "mansions" to the vision of God (Annotatio CXXVIII).]

(printed folio 572 [PDF p. 389]. Annot. CXXVIII–CXXX (Num 33:1 → Deut 6:4): Origen's "mansions" as the soul's staged ascent (Sixtus objects with 1 Thess 4 — souls see God at once); Jerome's promised land as heavenly allegory; and the Trinity elicited from "the Lord our God is one God" (Kissamos dissenting, with Maimonides' mockery) → folio 573.)

(folio 572, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXVIII (continued)

through which — as I said — we are taught, by mystical descriptions, the ascent of the soul to heaven by the sacrament of the resurrection from the dead. And the names of the mansions too are set down." And a little after: "*Such, therefore, shall be the ascent of the blessed soul, when all Egypt, and the Amalekites, and all who assailed it, shall have been submerged; and, departing through each single mansion — those many, namely, which are said to be with the Father*¹ — *it is illumined more and more, coming from one to another, and always acquires greater increases of illumination, until it be made accustomed to the very true Light itself (which illumines every man), [able] to endure its gaze, and to bear the splendor of [its] wondrous majesty.*" These things Origen: to whom it is objected, that Paul says, "*The DEAD, who are in Christ, shall rise first: then we, who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them to meet Christ in the air; and so shall we be always with the Lord.*"² By which words he shows that the souls of the saints are to be caught up to the gaze of God, without any delay, immediately after the resurrection.³ But the mansions which Origen says are in the Father's house are to be referred not to diverse times of ascent, but to diverse grades of rewards.

◇ 1. Left margin: John 14:2.

◇ 2. Left margin: 1 Thessalonians 4:16–17.

◇ 3. Left margin: The souls of the saints are caught up to the contemplation of God immediately after the resurrection.

Annotation CXXIX

"When you shall have entered into the land of Canaan, it shall be bounded by these limits." — Numbers 34:2

Whether the land of promise is to be understood according to the letter.

Jerome, in the epistle to Dardanus, explaining the bounds of the holy land comprehended in the present chapter, indicates that he was unjustly condemned by a certain inept heretic, [on the charge] that he took away the historical truth of the promised land — teaching that those things which God promised concerning the land of promise in the sacred letters pertain most especially to the naked allegory, that is, are to be referred to that land of the living only, which is in heaven; since the whole region of the Jews is so narrow in circuit⁴ that it scarcely has a length of a hundred and sixty thousand paces, and a breadth of forty [thousand]; and in these [bounds] too — though the regions, places, cities, and towns are very many — [they were] never occupied by the Jews, but only held out by the divine promise. And in book 13 [of the commentary] on Isaiah, writing things consonant to these, upon that [passage] of Isaiah 49, "And Sion said, The Lord hath forsaken me,"⁵ etc., he says: "*From which we learn that Jerusalem is by no means to be sought in the region of Palestine — which is the worst of the whole province, and is roughened with rocky mountains, and suffers a penury of water, so that it uses the rains of heaven, and consoles the scarcity of springs by the building of cisterns — but in the hands of God, to whom it is said, 'Thy builders have made haste,'*" etc. To this calumny Jerome, at the close of that same epistle, meets [the accuser] with these words: "*Neither do I say this in disparagement of the land of Judea, as the heretic sycophant lies, nor that I take away the truth of the history — which is the foundation of the spiritual understanding — but that I may strike down the haughtiness of the Jews, who prefer the straitnesses of the Synagogue to the breadth of the Church. For if they follow only the killing letter, and not the life-giving spirit, let them show [me] the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey.*"

◇ 4. Left margin: How great is the length and breadth of the region of the Jews.

◇ 5. Left margin: Isaiah 49:14.

Annotation CXXX

"The Lord our God is one God." — Deuteronomy 6:4

Whether from this passage the mystery of the Trinity ought to be elicited.

Anselm of Laon, author of the interlinear Gloss, hints that Moses therefore called the one God by three names, that he might signify that God is one in majesty, and three in persons — having neither division, nor admitting solitude. This exposition seems taken either from **Augustine**, who expounds this passage concerning the unity of the Trinity in the third book against Maximinus, bishop of the Arians, chapter 23; or from the first epistle of **Alexander, Pope and martyr**, who — from a divine sentence similar to this one, showing the mystery of the Trinity in unity — argues in this manner: "*If there is no Trinity, why in Deuteronomy did he say, 'The Lord our God, this is God'? If there is no unity, why did he say 'This is,' and not 'These are,' designating [it] by the plural number? If there is no Trinity, why in the same book is it said, 'The Lord thy God is a great and mighty God'? If there is no Unity, why is he not named 'great and mighty' in the plural?*" These things Alexander. I pass over — for brevity's sake — **Idacius Clarus**, an ancient author, repeating these same words of Alexander in the book which he wrote against Varimandus. But **Gregory, bishop of Nyssa**, too, in the book *On the Knowledge of God, against the Jews*, adducing this same testimony for the unity of the Trinity, says: "*Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God.*" That [word] "LORD, and GOD, and GOD," shows three persons; but that [word] "is one," [shows] one divinity and one nature. **Theodoret**, in the second book *On the Cure of Greek Affections*, expounding to the same effect, says: "*Moses, when he says, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is one,' both teaches unity and signifies trinity. For, the Lord being once set forth, and twice repeated with 'Lord,' he intimates the Trinity; and when he added, 'is one,' he brought forward a doctrine congruent to the Jews, and taught that there is one and the same divinity and substance in three.*"

Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos — perhaps ignorant that this is the explanation of the great fathers of the Church — reproves it in his Annotations as insipid. His words are these: "*It is not to be passed over in silence in this place, that Rabbi Moses the Egyptian, the foremost writer of the Hebrews, carps at the Christians and derides them with a long mockery. 'The Christians,' he says, 'gather the Trinity from this passage: for first three persons are expressed, when it is said, "Lord, God, God" — for there the divine name is thrice repeated; afterwards the Trinity is intimated, when it is said, "is one."* Having produced these words, he inveighs against us with many reproaches. It could indeed be that someone more insipid than [certain] of ours — of whom very many are found — said this to that Jew. Now many, unskilled in the divine letters, gather the Trinity from these passages, from which it cannot be gathered; and again, where that divine matter is most clearly expressed, nothing of it penetrates into their minds. This happens chiefly from the preachers, who often wrest the divine letters, while they will have this [word] to be a figure of one thing, and that of another; and it has come to pass that we are made a laughing-stock to the sharp-eyed Jews. A middle [course] must at all events be held: that those things which bear a figure be interpreted figuratively; but those which look to no other [meaning] be not wrested thereto; and it must be diligently searched out, so that where [Scripture] speaks of the Messiah we may attentively recognize [it], but where nothing of this kind is foretold we may not violently drag [it]. For it comes about, from this cause, that we infect the divine letters with most foul fables — a thing which Gregory Nazianzen greatly censures. For there was among the Greeks a race of men, such as [there is] among ours, and which flourished many days before, who →

[...continues on folio 573 (PDF p. 390): Augustine of Kissamos on the Greek allegorizers, and his objection to eliciting the Trinity from this passage (Annotatio CXXX).]

(printed folio 573 [PDF p. 390]. Annot. CXXX–CXXXI (Deut 6:4 → Josh 8:28): the Trinity-from-Deut debate closed (Kissamos on the Greek allegorizers; the ELOHIM/YHWH grammar); then Origen's

apokatastasis — *the restoration of demons and the damned* — *detested by many Fathers, but defended by Merlinus's Apology as an interpolation* → folio 574.)

(folio 573, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXX (continued)

[a race of men, such as there is among ours,] who heaped up a certain infinite pile of figures, and use it to show that all things — not so much the greatest as the least — were foreshown by figures. I certainly would say that this is not only most foolish, but also most impious. For neither do we say this, imitating the impudence of certain Germans, who have usurped to themselves the license of maligning all things — both gods and men, both human and divine matters — but [we speak so] that we may censure the things worthy of censure, and praise the things worthy of praise. For as he is a Christian who follows neither the Arian division nor the Sabellian conjunction, so [he is] truly a Christian who neither follows the impudence of those men, nor yet fails to reprehend the things which are worthy of reprehension. It could therefore be that some Christian said those things to Rabbi Moses. But this too is not to be ignored: that the Hebrews are wont, for the most part, to fabricate false charges against us, and to accommodate our affairs to [their] vituperation; and we find many things among them which they falsely assert to be ours; and by that nation this has been done throughout — that they might contaminate our dogmas with most impious lies, and [so] are the slower to take up the faith of Christ: for they have their own writers, to whom they give credence, and they find among them our [teachings] mangled with the utmost vituperations, and corrupted with most wicked lies. It is said, therefore, in this passage, 'The Lord God,' because in the divine letters God is wont to be named by these two names joined together at once — namely ELOHIM and IHVH [YHWH] — of which the second is the Tetragrammaton name, that is, signifying the divine essence; but the first is that divine name by which his might is signified, for I think EL and ELOHA to be almost the same. But where it is said, 'God is one,' it is plain that a repetition of [the name] God is made, [and] that [this 'God'] is not co-numbered with those two." But others also may interpret [this] better than we.

Annotation CXXXI

***"Joshua burned the city of Hai, and made it an everlasting heap."* — Joshua 8:28**

Whether the demons and hell shall suffer everlasting punishments.

Origen, composing an allegory of the present passage, seemed to assert that after the day of resurrection neither the demons, nor hell — the place of the demons — shall be forever, but that after certain spaces of time the Demons, together with the rest of the damned who are detained in hell, shall come to celestial beatitude. For thus he wrote in homily 8 on Joshua: "*There is in this also a mystery of the future resurrection; for even then, thereafter, there shall be no Devil at all, because there shall then be no death. For, speaking of the Devil, the Apostle says: ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος, that is, 'The last enemy, death, is destroyed.'*¹ But let us see what things follow in what comes after. 'And Jesus,' he says, 'burned the city of Hai, and the city was made [one] which shall not be inhabited forever.' You see that these things which follow pertain more to the truth of the mystery than of the history. For that place of the earth is not uninhabitable forever in the [same] way as the place of the Demons shall be uninhabitable — then, namely, when now no one shall sin, nor shall sin reign in anyone, when the Devil and his Angels shall be delivered to the eternal fire, Christ saying to those who have conquered, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father,' etc., but to the others, 'Go into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his Angels'² — until he provide by remedies for every soul which he himself has harmed, and all Israel be made safe." Into the same opinion he speaks in the first book περὶ ἀρχῶν [*On First Principles*], chapter 6, where, treating from the beginning of the wicked spirits who have sinned, he brings forth these things: "*These [beings] indeed, [fallen] from the state of the first beatitude, are moved, yet not moved irremediably; [but] to those whom we have described*

above they are subjected, to be governed by the holy and blessed orders; and, using their assistance, and reformed by salutary institutions and disciplines, they can return and be restored to the state of beatitude." Again, in Tome 18 on John, expounding that [passage] of John 8, "Whither I go, you cannot come,"³ he says: "If anyone shall have spoken blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be remitted to him, neither in this world nor in the [world] to come — [yet] not [absolutely] so; but if in the future age it is not remitted, [it does not follow that] therefore neither in the [still later] future ages shall it be remitted."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 15:26.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Matthew 25:34, 41.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** John 8:21.

That Origen betrayed this same [error] more openly in the exposition of the first and second chapters of the epistle to the Ephesians, Jerome is a witness, in the commentaries on that same epistle. Theophilus also, bishop of Alexandria, in the 2nd Paschal book; Augustine, in the book *On Heresies*; and Jerome, in the epistle to Avitus, and in very many other places of this kind, detest this error in Origen. Rufinus, however, in book 1 of the *Invectives*, had asserted that Jerome, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians, approved this dogma; to which [view] Erasmus also, in the *Origenic Annotations*, indicates that Ambrose subscribed, in the exposition of the third chapter of the same epistle. But of this we shall speak below, in Annotation 298 of the sixth book.

Now it is pleasing to append certain testimonies of Origen, diametrically opposed to the higher [preceding] passages — from which **Jacobus Merlinus**, in the *Apology for Origen*, contends that the aforesaid opinions were inserted into the Origenic works not by Origen himself, but by rivals of Origen, with a malicious mind — in these words: "*The dogma concerning the reparation of the demons and of the damned, into which they think Origen declined, is refuted by many of his [own] sayings. For upon Ezekiel, homily 14, he says: 'The Angels, not keeping their principality, but deserting their own habitation, [God] will keep in the judgment of the great day, under darkness, in everlasting chains.'* In homily 14 upon Joshua, expounding how many kings were gathered together against Joshua — to whom the Lord says, 'Fear not before their face, for tomorrow, at this hour, I will deliver them into thy hands' — [Origen writes]: 'I see,' he says, 'that today we cannot oppress them, nor slay them all, but tomorrow they shall be destroyed' — that is, after the consummation of this age. For then every contrary power shall be destroyed, and then it shall be utterly conquered, when it shall be said to those who are on the left hand, 'Go into the eternal fire, which God has prepared for the Devil and his angels.'⁴ The same [Origen] asserts [it] in homily 14 on Numbers, expounding that [passage], 'They were beseeching the Lord that he would not torment them before the time.' The same, in the fifth book, in the explanation of the epistle to the Romans, asserts [it], alleging the epistle of Jude. But if he asserts that they are to be punished for eternity, and afflicted with perpetual fire, then he does not assert that they are at length liberated. Moreover, he uses these words in book 5 of the aforesaid explanation, expounding that [passage] of Paul, 'Death shall no more have dominion over him,'⁵ etc.: 'Whence I wonder that certain [persons], against this most evident sentence of Paul, will assert that in future ages either the same or similar things must be suffered by Christ [again], so that even those may be liberated whom, in the present life, the medicine of his dispensation could not heal. For they say: Can there be any age in the future, wherein neither anything of good nor of evil is done, but the matter stands amazed, and a profound silence remains?' Again, expounding that [passage] of Paul, 'Have they so stumbled that they should fall?,'⁶ he says: 'Israel shall be saved; but of this [Israel] →

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Matthew 25:41.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Romans 6:9.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Romans 11:11.

[...continues on folio 574 (PDF p. 391): the rest of Merlinus's *Apology*, and Origen on the salvation of "all Israel" (Annotatio CXXXI).]

(printed folio 574 [PDF p. 391]. **Annot. CXXXI–CXXXV** (Josh 8:28 → Job 1:17): Merlinus's anti-restoration Origen texts; Augustine's over-generous free will (self-corrected); the Queen of Sheba as Arabian, not Ethiopian (אֲרָבָא vs אֲפְרָיִם); the pseudo-Origen Job commentary's Arianizing and "unbelievers' virtues are sins" (Luther); and its "three troops" allegory of the Homoousians → folio 575.)

(folio 574, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXI (continued)

[of this Israel] which is said to have fallen from heaven; nor, at the end of the age, shall there be any turning back. Concerning the damned he thinks the same, upon Isaiah, where, expounding those words, 'They shall rise again, they who are in the sepulchres,' etc., he says: 'It is therefore better to say that we shall all indeed rise again, so that the impious too may come into that place where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth, and [the just to that place] where each one shall receive, in his own order, according to the merit of his good deeds, when the body of their humility shall be transformed.' Likewise in homily 18 on Numbers he says thus: 'If the soul have not virtues, the flesh shall not come [into the inheritance], nor the soul unto the inheritance, but only unto the judgment of him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.' Likewise in homily 4 upon Ezekiel, expounding that [passage], 'Sodom shall be restored,' etc. — understanding by Sodom the sin of the soul — he blames some of the Hebrews who assert that Sodom shall at some time be restored. Likewise in the exposition of Psalm 37, he exhorts the sinner to prepare himself in this age against the scourges, lest he be consumed [re-wrought] with eternal fires: from which it is known that, according to his opinion, the fire shall be eternal. Finally, if anyone should desire to know how scrupulously Origen spoke concerning Gehenna, let him read the book of Joshua, where — comparing it in diverse places — he brings in, concerning the land of promise, [the wish]: 'Would that, in the things which we have said, we might not seem to have spoken rashly and perilously.' And in the book *Periarchon* [*On First Principles*], where he speaks concerning the consummation, he says: 'These things indeed are said by us even with great fear and caution — as by those discussing and treating [them], rather than establishing [them] for certain and definite.'" Whence, how manifest it is that Origen affirmed the restoration of the lost creatures never to be made, the sagacious reader (I think) sufficiently understands.

Annotation CXXXII

"And the spirit of the Lord came upon Saul." — 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:6

Concerning free will.

Augustine, in the book of *Questions to Simplician*, question 1, expounding these things, seemed to attribute to free will more than is fair, when he said: "*Although it be in each one's power what he wishes, yet it is not in each one's power what he can do to anyone, or suffer from anyone.*" This opinion Augustine himself, revising [it] in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 1, [says]: "*This,*" he says, "*was said by us because we do not say that a thing is in [our] power except what we do when we will [it], where first and chiefly is that very willing itself. For without any interval of time the will itself is present, when we will; but this power too — of living well — we receive from above, when the will is prepared by the Lord.*"

Annotation CXXXIII

"The Queen of Sheba, having heard the fame of Solomon, came," etc. — 3 Kings [1 Kings] 10:1

Concerning Seba and Sceba.

Josephus, in the eighth volume of the *Antiquities*, illustrating this passage paraphrastically, says that the Queen of Sheba had her kingdom in Ethiopia, and thence came to Solomon. Which thing **Augustine, Bishop**

of **Kissamos**, noting, left this written in the Annotations on Genesis: "*There are two regions which by the same name are called Saba, by us and by the Greeks; among the Hebrews, however, there is a notable distinction: the one is in Ethiopia, the other in Arabia. That which is [in] Ethiopia is written among the Hebrews with the thin s — that is, סְבָא, Seba; but that which is in Arabia, with the thick s — thus שְׁבָא, Sceba.*" Which is also noted by Jerome in the *Hebrew Questions*. The Queen of Sheba, therefore, was not an Ethiopian, but an Arabian Sheba queen. But Josephus is deceived (in my judgment), who writes that the Queen of Sheba [came] from that [Saba] which is written in the books of Kings — [holding] that it was not that which is in Arabia, but that which is in Ethiopia, since at that time she ruled Egypt and Ethiopia. But from all the passages it is certainly gathered that she was a queen of Arabia. And therefore, by Isaiah, in that same passage where he said, "All shall come from Saba,"¹ is placed, "Every flock of Cedar shall be gathered to thee, the rams of Nabaioth shall minister to thee"; and all among the Hebrews know Cedar to be a part of Arabia. The Nabaioth, too, are peoples of Arabia, who by the Greeks and Latins — the name a little loosened — are called Nabataeans. So also David sings: "The kings of the Arabians and of Saba,"² etc.; and there the neighboring regions are placed together. In Arabia, moreover, aromatics are reported to be, which she brought to the king. Furthermore, when we shall have said that "Seba" with the thick s signifies that which is in Arabia, it is plain that this woman was a queen of that [region]; because in the third [book] of Kings it is written וַיָּבֹא מַלְכַּת שְׁבָא; *ve-malchath Sceba* — that is, "And the queen of Saba" — which name is written with the thick s. Wherefore we cannot approve the opinion of Josephus; nor let it move us that in the Gospel she is called "the queen of the South,"³ for the Sabaeans, in respect to Judea, are placed toward the South, and that region is sometimes named "the Southern." These things have therefore been noted, because very many among us and among the Greeks have been deceived by the amphibology of these names. But in the same verse both Sabas are, in this place, commemorated.

◇ 1. Right margin: Isaiah 60:6.

◇ 2. Right margin: Psalm 71:10 [72:10].

◇ 3. Right margin: Matthew 12:42.

Annotation CXXXIV

"And [that] man was simple and upright." — Job 1:1

Concerning the Trinity.

The commentaries wrongly ascribed to **Origen**, in the exposition of this passage, have two propositions, the former of which Erasmus judges to savour of something Arian, on this account, that its words run thus: "*All things whatsoever men do, they do in vain, if they have not done [them] in faith; they act without cause, save in the acknowledgment of the one unbegotten God the Father, and in the confession of the one only-begotten Son of him, our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the glorious and venerable Paraclete,*" etc. In these words the name of God is added to the Father alone, and he alone is called unbegotten, because he alone had no beginning; the Son is called Lord, not God; but the Spirit [is called] neither God nor Lord, but the venerable Paraclete: for by these expressions the Arians were wont to signify, in the Trinity, that the Holy Spirit is great, the Son greater, but the Father greatest.

The **second** proposition Luther took up in the articles disputed by him, when he asserted that all the virtues of unbelievers are sins.⁴ The words of this proposition are these: "*That I may say [it] briefly and boldly: All things whatsoever men do — whether in virginity, or in abstinence, or in chastity of body, or in the distribution of their goods — they do all in vain, if they have failed in faith. For all the sanctity, and all the justice, which anyone does outside the true faith of God, he does in vain, he does unto perdition; it profits him not, it aids him not in the day of wrath: to which Paul is witness, saying, 'Everything which is not of faith is sin.'*"⁵ Of the same opinion seem to be Ambrose, Augustine, and Anselm — whose mind, catholically expressed, you have in Annotation 255 of the book which next follows this.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Whether the virtues of unbelievers are sins, as Luther held.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Romans 14:23.

Annotation CXXXV

"The Chaldeans made three troops, and fell upon the camels." — Job 1:17

Impious dogmas concerning the Trinity are falsely ascribed to Origen.

Origen — in book 1 of the commentaries on Job, forging an allegory with these words — [treats of] the Homoousians, that is, those who rightly [hold] concerning the consubstan- →

[...continues on folio 575 (PDF p. 392): the pseudo-Origen allegory of the "three troops" and the consubstantiality of the Trinity (Annotatio CXXXV).]

*(printed folio 575 [PDF p. 392]. **Annot. CXXXV–CXXXVII** (Job 1:17–9:17): the Arian forger slandering the orthodox "Homoousians"; a one-line pointer on Walafrid Strabo's gloss; and the long crux on unbaptized infants — Gregory and Augustine hold real (though lightest) torment, which Aquinas mitigates to the mere privation of the divine vision → folio 576.)*

(folio 575, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXV (continued)

[those who rightly hold concerning the con]substantiality [of the Father and the Son], he assails with these words: *"Three horns, or three troops, the Devil made as a type, and equal to that three-named sect of his, and to the heresy of the three Gods, which filled the whole globe of the earth in the manner of darkness — [the heresy] which sometimes worships the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit as three [gods], sometimes adores [them as] one, in the manner in which the language of the Greeks commemorates the Triad and the Homoousion. Therefore that most crafty Devil, designating from afar, long ago, this sect and heresy of the Trinity, and its wickedness, sent three horns to plunder Job. For thus also the aforesaid three-named heresy — now especially — plunders and storms the Church."* Thus far the author of these commentaries, which we have already shown to be falsely inscribed with the title of Origen, when in the preceding volume we set out the catalogue of Origen's works.

Annotation CXXXVI

"As it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done." — Job 1:21

Strabus [Walafrid Strabo], author of the Gloss which is called the *Ordinary* — what kind of gloss he applied to this passage — you will see below, in the exposition of the words of Jerome, in Annotation 227 of this book.

Annotation CXXXVII

"He hath multiplied my wounds, even without cause." — Job 9:17

Whether infants are punished with the punishments of the damned.

Gregory, in book 9 of the Explanations on Job, chapter 16, from these words seems to gather — against the common consensus of Theologians — that infants dying without baptism are punished, sensibly, with the perpetual torments of the damned. For there he left this written: *"Some are withdrawn from the present life before they attain to the bringing forth of good or evil active merits of life; whom — because the sacraments of salvation do not free [them] from the fault of [their] origin, and here they did nothing of their own — [yet] they come thither also, unto torments: and because after this death an eternal death also follows, by a hidden*

yet just judgment upon them, even without cause the wounds are multiplied. For they suffer perpetual torments, who sinned nothing of their own will. Job says, therefore, 'In a whirlwind he shall break me, and shall multiply my wounds, even without cause,' as if, openly considering the losses of the human race, he should say: The strict Judge — with what aversion he slays those whom he condemns by the fault of their own action, so also he smites in eternity those whom the guilt of [free] choice does not condemn."

This Gregory [holds], following, no doubt, the decree of Augustine, who in the book *On Faith, to Peter*, chapter 27, decreed concerning this matter in these words: "Most firmly hold, and by no means doubt, that not only men now using reason, but also little ones — who, whether they begin to live in the wombs of their mothers and there die, or, born of their mothers, pass out of this world without the sacrament of holy baptism, which is given in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit — are to be punished with the everlasting punishment of eternal fire: because, although they had no sin of their own action properly [committed], they nevertheless drew the damnation of original sin by carnal conception and nativity." And in the same book, chapter 3, he more openly expresses that infants of this kind are smitten with the same quality of punishment as the Demons and the rest of the damned, saying: "The evil quality of life begins from unbelief, which takes its beginning from original sin; in which [life] whosoever begins so to live, that he ends [it] before his life be loosed by his [Christ's] obligation — if that soul lived in the body for the space of one age or of one hour, it is necessary that it sustain, with that same body, the interminable punishments of Gehenna, where the Devil with his Angels shall burn forever; where, together with him, [there shall be] also the fornicators who serve idols, the adulterers, the effeminate, the thieves, the avaricious, and all who do the works of the flesh — [all these], if before the end of this life they have not been converted, shall be burned with eternal fires." Again, in the sermon *On the Baptism of little ones*, confirming this his opinion by the argument of Gospel authority, he says: "Since the Gospel speaks [off] two parts, Christ made a right hand and a left; being about to say to those on the left, 'Go, ye cursed, into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his Angels,' [and] about to say to those on the right, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom' — no middle place is here left, where you might set the infants; and in the final sentence he says, 'These shall go into eternal burning, but the just into life eternal.' Behold, he has expounded to you what the kingdom is, and what the eternal fire: so that, when you confess the little one [is] not to be in the kingdom, you may confess [he is] to be in the eternal fire."¹ And this same thing he repeats — in fuller words, but plainly in the same sense — in the fifth book of the *Hypognosticon*, showing that by the same kind of punishment the little ones not baptized, and adults, and demons, are afflicted.

◇ 1. Right margin: Matthew 25:34, 41.

But as to what pertains to the *quantity* of the punishment, everywhere he teaches that the torments of infants are the lightest² — but especially in the fifth book against Julian the Pelagian, speaking thus: "But I do not say that the little ones dying without the baptism of Christ are to be smitten with so great a punishment that it were rather expedient for them not to be born — since the Lord said this not of any sinners whatsoever, but of the most wicked and most impious. For if — as [is plain] because he says it of the Sodomites, and surely willed [it] to be understood not of them alone — one shall be punished more tolerably than another in the day of judgment, who would doubt that the little ones not baptized, who had only original sin and are not aggravated by their own vices, shall be, in the damnation of all, the most lightly [punished]?" This same thing he has also in book 1 *On the Merits and Remission of sins*, chapter 16, and in the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 93, where he speaks thus: "Most mild, surely, of all, shall be the punishment of those who, besides the sin which they drew as original, added none in addition; and, among the rest who added [sins of their own], each one shall have there a damnation the more tolerable, the less iniquity he had here." **Gennadius**, priest of Marseille, thinks that Augustine in this part erred through much-speaking. For in the *Catalogue of Illustrious Men* [he says]: "Augustine, although he treated the doubt concerning aborted [infants] with less capacity, yet his error — exaggerated (as I said above) by much discourse, [and] by the

struggle with enemies — has not yet given [material for] a heresy-question." These things Gennadius.

- ◇ 2. **Right margin:** Of what sort the future punishment of little ones dying without baptism shall be, in the judgment of St. Augustine.

St. Thomas, in the *Disputed Questions*, in the question *On the Punishment of Original Sin*, article 2, mitigating the propositions of Gregory and Augustine, said that they wished to signify, by "fire," "Gehenna," and "torments," nothing else than the privation of the divine vision — which alone the infants not yet reborn lack; but this privation those fathers called by such harsh names, through a certain excess of speaking, that they might render much more execrable the error of the Pelagians, who preached that in little ones there is no sin at all. But Gregory [of Rimini] →

[...continues on folio 576 (PDF p. 393): Gregory of Rimini and the other scholastics on the punishment of unbaptized infants (Annotatio CXXXVII).]

(printed folio 576 [PDF p. 393]. Annot. CXXXVII–CXLI (Job 9:17–20:26): Gregory of Rimini's literal severity on infants; Luther on "sinning in every work" (answered by Fisher); whether the blessed see earthly things (Gregory vs Augustine); souls blessed at once (Bunderius on purgatory); and whether hell-fire is incorporeal (Gregory's text shown corrupt — "corporeus") → folio 577.)

(folio 576, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXXVII (continued)

But Gregory of **Rimini**, in the second [book] of the Sentences, distinction 31, question 3, tenaciously holding the sayings of each doctor, judges that they are to be understood according to that rigidity which the severity of the words conveys.¹

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** The Pelagians taught that in little ones, even before baptism, there is no sin.

Annotation CXXXVIII

"I feared all my works." — Job 9:28

Whether the just man sins in every work [he does].

Gregory, in book 9 of the Explanations on Job, explaining this, says: "*By the holy man Job it is rightly said, 'I feared all my works,' as if it were said, with humble confession: What I have done openly, I see; but what may lie hidden in these [works], I know not.*" Luther, in the compendium of the Articles of his perfidy, article 35, uses these words for the confirmation of his perverse dogma, whereby he teaches that no just man is certain that he does not always sin mortally in every work [he does]. **John [Fisher], Bishop of Rochester**, writing against Luther, demonstrates that he adduced these words truncatedly and beside the point; by which [words] indeed we are admonished to fear concerning good works — not that those good and holy works are (as Luther affirms) evil, and annexed to sins, but lest, from the consideration of them, we be either lifted up into pride, or slip into sloth and torpor.² And that this was Gregory's meaning, the preceding words of his — craftily omitted by Luther — most openly indicate.

- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Concerning good works we must fear, lest from their consideration we be either lifted up into pride, or slip into sloth and torpor.

Annotation CXXXIX

"Whether his sons be noble, or ignoble, he shall not understand [it]." — Job 14:21

Whether the souls of the blessed see all things which are done here.

Gregory, in book 12 of the commentaries on Job, chapter 13, speaking concerning the knowledge of the blessed, seems to disagree from the opinion of Augustine, saying that the souls of the saints, seeing God, behold all things which are done here among us. For thus he speaks: "*The dead know not how the life in the flesh, [lived] after them, is disposed — because the life of the spirit is far from the life of the flesh; and as corporeal and incorporeal things are diverse in kind, so also [they are] distinct in cognition. Yet concerning the holy souls this is not to be thought; because those who within behold all things by the charity of the omnipotent God, it is in no way to be believed that outwardly there is anything of which they are ignorant.*" But **Augustine**, in the book *On the care to be had for the dead*, chapter 13, writes diversely, affirming that the dead — even the saints — know not what the living do, even their own children, as among Isaiah the Israelites complain, saying, "*Abraham hath not known us, and Israel hath been ignorant of us.*"³ Which he confirms also by the example of his own mother Monica, saying: "*If the souls of the dead were present in the affairs of the living — to say nothing of others — my own pious mother would in no way desert me, [she] who followed me by land and sea, that she might live with me; for far be it that she has been made, by a happier life, cruel. But if parents are not present, who are those other of the dead who [might] know what we do, [or] what we suffer?*" **St. Thomas**, in the first part of the Summa of Theology, question 89, article 8, judges that Augustine brought these things forth by way of doubting, not of asserting — which Augustine himself also indicated, when he said, "*Let each one take, as he will, what I [shall] say.*"

◇ 3. Left margin: Isaiah 63:16.

Annotation CXL

"After darkness I hope for light." — Job 17:12

Whether the souls of Christians are blessed immediately after this life.

Gregory, in book 13 of the Explanations on Job, chapter 20, writes these things: "*Because by the grace of our Author we have been redeemed, this we now have as of a heavenly gift: that, when we are withdrawn from the inhabitation of our flesh, we may at once be led to the heavenly rewards; because, while our Creator and Redeemer, penetrating the bars of hell, leads forth thence the souls of the elect, he does not suffer us to go thither — whence he has already, by descending, freed others.*" That this passage has been distorted by the Lutherans to overthrow the faith of purgatory, **John Bunderius** is a witness, in title 18 of his *Concertations*, where, refuting these same heretics, he says: "*Gregory did not wish, by these words, to deny Purgatory — which in the fourth [book] of the Dialogues, and elsewhere, he so diligently confirmed through the Scriptures and histories; but he wished to insinuate this: that we are not now excluded from the kingdom of heaven, when migrating from life, as the Fathers of the Old Testament were excluded before Christ's passion. For they, however much purged, were nevertheless still excluded; but this is now not so. And that this was his intention is plain from what follows: for he adds, 'Those who, before his coming into this world, departed — however much justice-virtue they had — being led out of [their] bodies, could in no way at once be received into the bosom of the heavenly fatherland, because he had not yet come who by his descent should loose the bars of hell, and place the souls of the just in [their] perpetual seat.'*"

Annotation CXLI

"A fire that is not kindled shall devour him." — Job 20:26

Whether the fire of hell is incorporeal.

Gregory, in book 15 of the *Morals*, seems from these words to deduce that the fire of hell is incorporeal, and diverse in kind from this fire of ours — which indeed Jerome, writing to Avitus, reckons among the condemned assertions of Origen. The words from chapter 15 of the *Morals* run thus: "*'A fire that is not kindled shall devour him': in a very wonderful manner, in few words, is the fire of gehenna expressed. For our fire is corporeal, and, that it may avail to be fire, needs corporeal fuel; and, when it must be maintained,*

is without doubt nourished by heaped-up wood — nor can it be [fire] unless kindled, nor subsist unless refreshed. But, on the contrary, the fire of gehenna, since it is incorporeal, and burns corporeally the reprobates cast into it, is neither kindled by human effort, nor nourished by wood, but, once created, endures inextinguishable; and needs no kindling, and lacks no heat." Of this opinion of Gregory's seem to have been **Augustine**, in book 12 *On Genesis to the letter*, where he taught that the place to which souls are borne after death is not corporeal but spiritual; and **John Damascene**, who concluded the end of book 4 *On the Orthodox Faith* with these words: "And the Devil shall be delivered, and his Demons, and his man — that is, Antichrist — and the impious, and sinners, into the eternal fire: not material, such as is with us, but such as God knoweth."

But that Gregory did not think so is clearly demonstrated in book 4 of the *Dialogues*, chapter 29, where, to Peter asking whether he would confess the fire of gehenna to be incorporeal or corporeal, he answers: "That the fire of gehenna is corporeal I do not doubt, in which it is certain that bodies are tormented." Wherefore it is to be known that these words of Gregory, in all the Lyons codices of Hugh à Porta, and in some manuscript exemplars, are read corruptly:⁴ for where in these is had, "The fire of gehenna, since it is incorporeal," the syllable "In" ought to have been deleted, so that, in place of the word "Incorporeus," might be read "Corporeus"⁵ — for the following words of Gregory openly show this; and in this manner St. Thomas cites them, in the fourth volume of the *Sentences*, distinction 44, question 3, saying: →

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The passage of St. Gregory is corrupt.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** The fire of Gehenna is corporeal.

[...continues on folio 577 (PDF p. 394): Aquinas's citation of Gregory, and the corporeal nature of hell-fire (Annotatio CXXI).]

(printed folio 577 [PDF p. 394]. **Annot. CXXI–CXXV** (Job 20:26–42:16): hell-fire shown corporeal (Aquinas softening Damascene; Durandus blunter); whether Angels and souls are corporeal (Faustus abusing Jerome, refuted by Claudianus Mamertus); whether the Son is "always born" (Gregory vs Origen, reconciled by Peter Lombard); the pseudo-Origen Job commentary again censuring the orthodox; and whether anyone can be sure he does not always sin (Gregory) → folio 578.)

(folio 577, left column → right column)

Annotation CXXI (continued)

saying that from this passage it cannot be deduced that the fire of hell is of another nature and species than this [our fire] is: "for although in these fires certain diverse properties may be found, yet of both the nature, form, and substance is the same." But as to that which was brought forward from Damascene, **Durandus of Saint-Pourçain**, in the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, freely pronounces that that author erred, thinking wrongly in this part.

But **St. Thomas**, as is his custom, treating Damascene urbanely and benignly, says that his mind can be interpreted in a twofold manner: first, that we understand him not simply to have denied the material fire of Hell, but [to have denied] that it is material in the same way as ours, which is distinguished from that fire by several properties. Secondly, that we understand him not to have denied the fire of Hell to be material as to substance, but as to the effect of punishment: for it punishes bodies by a certain spiritual action,¹ which it neither dissolves nor consumes, and torments the souls themselves much more spiritually. What is to be answered to Augustine's opinion, you have above, Annotation 40.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** In what manner the fire of Hell punishes bodies.

Annotation CXLII

"The stars are not clean in his sight." — Job 25:5

Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal.

Jerome, in the commentaries inscribed with his name, treating this passage, says: "*For if the Angels, and even the bodies of the heavens, are said to be unclean in comparison to God, what do you think man is to be esteemed, since he himself is rottenness?*" **Faustus**, a bishop in Gaul around the year of the Lord 430, elicits from these words that Jerome was of the opinion of those who taught that the nature of Souls and Angels is corporeal. For thus he wrote at the beginning of his book *On [the nature of] creatures*: "*The most learned of the Fathers define that whatever is created is a body, and assert that the nature of Souls and Angels is corporeal, for the reason that in its beginning it is circumscribed by [place] and space. For, as we read in a certain treatise of St. Jerome: 'They think,' he says, 'that the globes of the stars are embodied spirits.'* And likewise, *'If the angels — the heavenly bodies too — in comparison to God are said to be unclean, what do you think man is to be esteemed?'"* **Claudianus [Mamertus]**, bishop of Vienne in Gaul, in the second book *On the State of the Soul*, refuting Faustus (who asserted all created things to be corporeal), shows that this testimony was rashly and wrongly usurped by him — inasmuch as it makes nothing to the point, nor serves Faustus's aim. But what the Fathers thought concerning this matter, you have below, Annotation 35 of book 6.

Annotation CXLIII

"Didst thou, after thy rising, command the daybreak?" — Job 38:12

Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born.

Gregory, at the beginning of book 29 on Job, undertaking the explanation of this passage, indicates that it cannot rightly be said that the Son of God is always begotten by the Father and always being born, writing thus: "*The Lord God Jesus, in that which he is the virtue and wisdom of God, was born of the Father before the ages — or rather, because he neither began to be born nor ceased, let us say more truly: [he is] always born; but we cannot say [he is] always being born, lest he seem to be imperfect. Yet, that he may be able to be designated eternal, let us say [he is] both perfect and always born — inasmuch as 'born' pertains to perfection, and 'always' to eternity. Although, by this very [word] which we say, 'perfect,' we deviate much from the expression of that truth — because what is not made cannot properly be called perfect; but, stammering as we can, let us echo the excellencies of God, [seeing that] the Lord, condescending to the words of our infirmity, says, 'Be perfect, as your heavenly Father also is perfect.'*"²

◇ 2. Right margin: Matthew 5:48.

These things Gregory: against whom **Origen** seems to cry out, in the second homily on Jeremiah, showing that the Son of God is perpetually born, in these words: "*Our Savior is the wisdom of God; the wisdom is the splendor of eternal light; our Savior therefore is the splendor of charity. But the splendor is not born once and ceases: rather, as often as the light from which the splendor arises has arisen, so often does the splendor of charity also arise. So therefore the Savior is always born. Whence he says in the book of Wisdom, 'Before all the hills the Lord begets me' — not, as some read badly, 'he begot me.'*"³

◇ 3. Right margin: Proverbs 8:25.

Peter Lombard, in the first book of the Sentences, distinction 9, settles a controversy of this kind, speaking in this manner: "*But, lest such great authors seem to contradict themselves in so great a matter, let us interpret those words of Gregory benignly. 'The Lord Jesus,' he says, 'was born of the Father before the ages — or rather, because he neither began to be born nor ceases, let us say more truly: he is always born.'* But how is this said more truly — namely, that the Son is always born — than that [other], that he was born of the Father before the ages? For the sincere and catholic faith holds and preaches that [latter], as [it does]

this. Why then does he say 'let us say more truly,' since both are equally true, unless because he wished this to be understood as said unto a greater evidence and expression of the truth than that? For by these words all approach is barred to heretics of every calumnious turn, by which [words] Christ, according to [his] deity, is shown to be a generation without beginning and without end, and perfect; whereas the truth is not so openly manifested when it is said, 'The Son was begotten of the Father before the ages,' or 'The Son is always born of the Father.' And therefore Gregory said that we cannot say 'he is always being born' — not, I say, so conveniently, not so congruously to the explanation of the truth. Yet it can be said, if it be soundly understood: for the Son is always born of the Father, as Origen says — not that that generation is repeated daily, but because it always is; therefore he is always born, that is, his nativity is eternal."

Annotation CXLIV

"Out of whose womb came the ice? and the frost from heaven who hath begotten it?" — Job 38:29

The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

The explanation falsely inscribed under Origen's name, expounding this sentence (under pretense of elucidating it), seems to censure the Homoousians — that is, those who believe the Son consubstantial with the Father — in very ambiguous and obscure words, saying: "Read these things thou, with judgment, among the Homousiasts," etc.: read, and weigh what it means.

Annotation CXLV

"He died an old man, and full of days." — Job 42:16

Whether anyone may be certain that he does not always sin.

Gregory, at the end of book 35 of the *Morals*, says: "What place of safety remains among these things, when even our evils are more evil [than we suppose], and our good things — which we believe ourselves to have — can by no means be pure goods?" →

[...continues on folio 578 (PDF p. 395): the rest of Gregory on whether anyone can be certain he does not sin (Annotatio CXLV).]

(printed folio 578 [PDF p. 395]. Annot. CXLV–CXLVIII (Job 42:16–Ps 1:5): Luther on whether one always sins (vs. Fisher); Origen's γενητόν/γεννητόν Trinity slip (Epiphanius); Ambrose on angels before the world; and Origen making the risen body rise only in the same species → folio 579.)

(folio 578, left column → right column)

Annotation CXLV (continued)

Martin Luther, in the book of his Articles, article 35, strives by this testimony to show that no one is certain that he does not always sin mortally: because no pure good is ever done by us, nor can it be done. **John [Fisher], Bishop of Rochester**, in the confutation of that same article, says that Gregory does not speak of all our good works, but only of those which we ourselves approve as good, and in which we take complacency; and for this reason (he says) [Gregory] said that the goods which we believe ourselves to have cannot be pure goods, because in them we applaud ourselves, and vainly glory in their goodness.

Annotation CXLVI

"Blessed is the man who hath not walked [in the counsel of the ungodly]." — Psalm 1:1

Origen seems to have thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

Origen, about to expound this Psalm, when in the very preface he implored God as the helper of the future work, says: "*Since nothing can be good without God — and especially the divinely-inspired Scripture of understanding — let us ask the Father of all, the God, through our Savior and high priest the begotten [γεννητόν] God, that it be given us first that we may rightly seek,*" etc. **Epiphanius**, in the second book against heresies, charges Origen that, whereas he could and ought to have called Christ God γεννητόν [*begotten*] with a double *n* (for that signifies "begotten"), he preferred to name him γενητόν [*made*] with a single *n* — which indeed sounds "made": namely, so that from this one word he might maliciously alienate Christ from the essence of the paternal deity, and declare him to be a fashioning and a creature. Epiphanius's censure I myself, for the present, neither approve nor disapprove; but concerning this very error — which others also, men of great name, attribute to Origen — I shall more conveniently write below.

Annotation CXLVII

"Blessed is the man who hath not walked." — Psalm 1:1

Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound.

Ambrose, at the beginning of the preface on the Psalms, says that the Angels existed before this visible world — which most of the Fathers do not approve. He asserts also that the heavens, by their rotation, produce a perpetual sound — which Basil and Epiphanius reject as a fabulous thing, and worthy of laughter. We have written on both assertions in the Censures on the book of Genesis, Annotation 5 and Annotation 105.

Annotation CXLVIII

"The wicked shall not rise again in judgment." — Psalm 1:5

Whether the future resurrection will be in the [self-same] individual.

Origen, in the commentaries on the Psalms — as Methodius, bishop of Olympus in Lycia, in the dialogue whose title is *Aglaophon*, and Epiphanius in the second book of the *Panarion* report — examining this little verse, taught that the resurrection of our body will be not in the [self-same] individual, but only in the same species; and this he tried to establish by the testimony of Paul, who, in the epistle to the Corinthians, depicted the image of the body to rise again by the example of a sown grain, saying: "*Thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain — as, for instance, of wheat; but God gives it a body as he wills.*" By which likeness the Apostle wished to signify that, just as the ear of corn, rising from the grain, differs from it in magnitude, figure, and reality, although it partakes the same species with it: so the body in the resurrection shall rise as another from that which is sown in death — although the same species remains in it. To this testimony of Paul he added also a reasoning of this kind: "*Since in the present life we do not carry about the same body even for the space of two days, how can it be that in the future life we should rise again with this very body?*" And that not even for a brief time does the same body remain in us — and that the same material substance of the body [does not remain] — the proof (he says) is mortal living beings, which, as the lost flesh and humors of the body decay, restore [them] with new food daily taken in, and, the old being changed into new flesh, replace and renew the body. Wherefore the animal body was not undeservedly called by the Greeks *ῥεῖθος*,¹ that is, a river or stream, because — just as in a river, the prior waves departing, others succeed continually one after another — so in our body, in place of that substance of flesh and humor which is perpetually separated off and flows away, new material of flesh and blood is superinduced, though the same species always remains. But also, in the commentaries on Psalm 65,² weighing that sentence, "We have passed through water and fire," etc., he expressed this very change of the body by the example of a wineskin: which, if anyone gradually empty and gradually fill — always adding as much water as is poured out — it is necessary that the water contained in the skin never be the very same, but always vary, although the same

figure and species of the skin always remains. These things of Origen [report] Methodius and Epiphanius. But since the blessed martyr **Pamphilus**, in the *Apology* which he published for Origen, in the seventh proposition most copiously shows that Origen, in very many places — and chiefly in the exposition of this Psalm and verse — openly and magnificently preached the resurrection of our body in the same individual, it will be credible that these [contrary] things were either furtively intruded into this passage by the malevolent, or were written by the author himself not from his own person, but from that of an adversary.

◇ 1. **Right margin:** Why the animal body is called ῥεῖθος [a stream] by the Greeks.

◇ 2. **Right margin:** Psalm 65:12.

To that [argument], therefore, which is set forth against the right faith of the resurrection, **Methodius**, in the *Aglaophon*, briefly responds: that the likeness of Paul is not to be accommodated to the resurrection of bodies in every way, but only in this part — that, just as wheat is not reborn, nor rises into a new life, unless first, cast into the earth, it be corrupted (Christ saying, "*Unless the grain of wheat, cast into the ground, die, it beareth no fruit,*" etc.),³ so also our bodies, unless they first have died and been dissolved into the earth, do not rise again, nor revive unto an easier life. But when, from the assiduous transmutation of nourishment into the body, a change of the [self-same] individual body is inferred, Methodius judges this to be wrongly concluded: because, although the nutriments daily taken are turned into new flesh, which fill the place of the lost flesh, nevertheless the man does not cease [to be] the same →

◇ 3. **Right margin:** John 12:24.

[...continues on folio 579 (PDF p. 396): the rest of Methodius's answer, and the identity of the risen body (Annotatio CXLVIII).]

(printed folio 579 [PDF p. 396]. **Annot. CXLVIII–CLIII** (Ps 1:5–4:2): Methodius defends the identity of the risen body; Hilary vs. Jerome on "In the beginning" (Bereshith); "Kiss the Son"; Bodius against the Eucharist and the Lutherans against invoking the saints → folio 580.)

(folio 579, left column → right column)

Annotation CXLVIII (continued)

the same [man] in number who he was before. For it suffices, for the preserving of the [self-same] individual identity of the same man, that his more powerful and more excellent parts persist without any vicissitude of change,¹ and that the other fluxible parts, which continually flow into the body, preserve the figure, site, order, and other qualities of the departing parts. Wherefore, since the soul — the nobler and better portion of man — always remains the same, and the other parts, coming in as reinforcements to the body, retain the site, figure, order, and pristine qualities of the passing parts (indeed, even the very scars of wounds, and the traces of ulcers, and the mutilations of members, endure in bodies through every age): it follows that the [self-same] individual subsistence of man is the same in number up to the end of mortal life — after which the soul, again, in the consummation of the age, shall by divine power return to the body [that is] the same in number, beyond every law and order of nature, resuming its own proper body.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** For the preserving of the same man's individual identity, it is enough that his more excellent parts be not changed.

Annotation CXLIX

"Why have the nations raged," etc. — Psalm 2:1

Concerning the beginning of Genesis.

Jerome censures **Hilary**, at the beginning of the book *On the Hebrew Traditions*, because, in the exposition of this little verse, he asserted that, for that which we have at the exordium of Genesis, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth,"² there is had in the Hebrew "In the Son God made," etc. — which indeed to be false the truth of the matter itself proves: for in the Hebrew it is not written בבר *Babar*, which signifies "In the Son," but בראשית *Berescith*, which signifies "In the beginning." Hilary seems to have been deceived in this by the authority of **Tertullian**, who asserted this very thing in the book against Praxeas.

◇ 2. Left margin: Genesis 1:1.

Annotation CL

"I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession." — Psalm 2:8

Hilary, in the elucidation of this little verse, among other things wrote these: "*Christ received the possession of the ends of the earth — that is, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of the heavenly, the earthly, and the infernal,*³ etc.: *not the earthly [things] alone, but the supernal and the infernal also are given [him], and those things by which the earth is enclosed. And in the glory of God the Father he is today begotten, being born — that is, remaining before in the form of God, the servile form is honored through the reward of the death-form.*" **Erasmus**, in the Annotations which he appended to the margins of Hilary's commentaries, asserted that these words of Hilary savour of something Origenist; but since he himself brings no reason for his suspicion, nor can any such thing be deduced from Hilary's words, let others more learned than I see how much Erasmus's judgment is to be valued.

◇ 3. Left margin: Philippians 2:10.

Annotation CLI

"Embrace discipline, lest at any time the Lord be angry," etc. — Psalm 2:12

Whether this passage was well rendered by Jerome.

Rufinus, priest of Aquileia, reprehends **Jerome** in the interpretation and exposition of the present little verse; to whom Jerome, responding in the first Apology against the same man, wrote these things to Pammachius: "*Rufinus is also said to carp at this: that, interpreting the second Psalm, for that which we read in the Latin, 'Embrace discipline,' and in the Hebrew volume is written נשקו בר Nashku bar, I said in my little commentaries, 'Adore [kiss] the Son'; and again, turning the whole Psalter into the Roman [Latin] sound, as if forgetful of the ancient exposition, I put 'Adore purely' — which [two renderings] to be contrary to each other is plain to all. And truly he is to be pardoned, if he be ignorant of the truth of the Hebrew tongue, who sometimes hesitates even in the Latin. נשקו Nasku, that I may render it word for word, [is] κατεφιλήσατε — that is, 'kiss ye' [adore ye]; which I, unwilling to translate coarsely, followed rather the sense, so as to say 'Adore': for those who adore are wont to kiss the hand and bow the head — which the blessed Job denies that he did to the elements and to idols, saying, 'If I saw the Sun when it shone, and the Moon walking in brightness, and my heart rejoiced in secret, and I kissed my hand with my mouth'⁴ — which is the greatest iniquity, and a denial against the most high God.'* And the Hebrews, according to the property of their language, put 'kissing' for 'veneration': this I translated as they themselves understand it, whose word is בר Bar. But Bar among them signifies diverse things: for it is said [to mean] 'son' — as in that, 'Bar-Jona,' 'son of the dove,' and 'Bartholomew,' 'son of Ptolemy'; 'Bartimaeus,' and 'Barchisui,' and 'Barabbas'; [Bar] also [means] 'wheat,' and 'a sheaf of ears,' and 'chosen,' and 'pure.' What, therefore, have I sinned, if I turned an ambiguous word by a diverse interpretation? And I who, in the little commentaries — where there is liberty of discussing — had said 'Adore the Son,' in the [body] itself, lest I should seem too violent an interpreter and give place to Jewish calumny, said 'Adore purely,' or 'electly' — which Aquila also and Symmachus translated. What, therefore, does it harm ecclesiastical faith, if the reader be taught in how many ways a

single little verse is explained among the Hebrews?"

◇ 4. Right margin: Job 31:26–27.

Annotation CLII

"Lord, how are they multiplied that afflict me," etc. — Psalm 3:2

Concerning the Eucharist.

Augustine, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this verse, says: "*In the history of the New Testament, so great and so wonderful was the patience of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he admitted Judas to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to the disciples the figure of his body and blood.*" **Hermann Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, gathered from these words that the sacrament of the Eucharist is nothing else than a figure and type of the body of Christ. See what we have noted against this man, Annotation 146 of the following book.

Annotation CLIII

"When I called upon him, the God of my justice heard me," etc. — Psalm 4:2

Concerning the invocation of the saints.

Chrysostom, in the preface of the exposition on this psalm, has some things which are brought forward by the Lutherans against the invocation of the saints. These are they: "*Thou canst not say, 'I fear to approach and to pray to God'; but thou canst always and assiduously call upon him, and no difficulty is present: for there is no need of doorkeepers to introduce thee, nor of stewards, procurators, guards, or friends; but when thou thyself, through thyself, hast approached, then most of all will he hear thee — then, when thou hast asked no one [to intercede]. For we do not so appease him when entreated through others, as [when] through ourselves; because, when he shall have seen us doing this through ourselves, then most of all does he assent. So he does also in [the case of] the Canaanite woman;⁵ and when Peter indeed and James approached, he did not assent — but when she herself persevered in that which was asked, he gave [it].*" Chrysostom repeats these same things in many other places also →

◇ 5. Right margin: Matthew 15:23.

[...continues on folio 580 (PDF p. 397): Sixtus's answer to the Lutheran misuse of Chrysostom on the invocation of the saints (Annotatio CLIII).]

(printed folio 580 [PDF p. 397]. **Annot. CLIII–CLIX** (Ps 4:2–15:7): the eight verses inserted into Psalm 13; Arnobius on Mary's cleansing; Cajetan's David/Christ rule; Eusebius of Caesarea's Arian-leaning subordinationism; and Origen opens Ps 15:7 → folio 581.)

(folio 580, left column → right column)

Annotation CLIII (continued)

the same [things], whose meaning piously explained you have in Annotation 310 of the book which follows next to this.

Annotation CLIV

"There is none that doth good, no not [even] one." — Psalm 13:3

Whether Mary hesitated at the death of Christ.

Chrysostom — or someone else, whose exposition on Psalm 13 is inserted in Chrysostom's commentaries — narrating this sentence, indicates that the Virgin Mary, at the death of Christ, hesitated in faith. For these are his very words: *"There was none who did good, when the disciples, all abandoning him, fled; John withdraws naked; Peter denies; the disciples flee; and the sword of doubt passed through the soul of Mary his mother."* You have the interpretation of this sentence above, Annotation 104, and below, Annotations 138, 139, 140, and 185 of book 6.

Annotation CLV

***"Their throat is an open sepulchre."* — Psalm 13:3**

Concerning the eight little verses added to Psalm 13.

Jerome, in the commentaries on the Psalter which are believed to be his, admonishes that those eight verses — which [go] from this passage up to that, "There is no fear of God before their eyes" — are had in the vulgate edition, but are not in the Hebrew exemplars; rather [they were] collected by Paul from various passages of divine Scripture, and, in that epistle which is to the Romans, taken up in testimony of his own opinion.¹ The same [Jerome], in the preface of the sixteenth [book] of the commentary on Isaiah, responding to Eustochium — who asked whence Paul had borrowed the aforesaid little verses — says that he took the two first verses ("Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they dealt deceitfully") from the fifth Psalm; the third ("Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness") from the ninth Psalm; the fourth ("The venom of asps is under their lips") from Psalm 139; the fifth, sixth, and seventh ("Their feet are swift to shed blood") from the fifty-ninth chapter of Isaiah; the eighth ("There is no fear of God before their eyes") from the fifth Psalm. Finally he adds that these eight little verses were inserted into the thirteenth Psalm by an unknown author, because he could not find a fit place to which to refer this testimony of Paul, since in these Hebrew codices it is not had. **John Cochlaeus**, in the book *On Canonical Scripture and the authority of the Catholic Church*, disapproving this opinion of Jerome, thinks the Hebrew exemplars to be in this passage mutilated and diminished. For thus he speaks: *"In the epistle to the Romans, chapter 3, Paul alleges many little verses [that are seen among the Hebrews to be omitted]: but we rather think that the Apostle Paul is to be believed than the Bibles of the Jews. I know indeed that St. Jerome, in the prologue of the sixteenth commentary on Isaiah, responded to the sacred virgin Eustochium about the passage cited from the epistle to the Romans; but I have shown elsewhere that — saving his glory and honor — he did not [fully] satisfy this question."*

◇ 1. Left margin: Romans 3:11, 12, etc.

Annotation CLVI

***"He that walketh without blemish," etc.* — Psalm 14:2**

In what manner the Blessed Virgin was sanctified by the entrance of Christ.

Erasmus cautiously admonished that **Arnobius**, explaining these words in the commentaries on the Psalter, is to be read [warily], as though he seems to hint that Mary, when Christ entered her womb, was cleansed from the stains with which she had been infected before Christ's conception — when he says: *"Every stained one enters the tabernacle of the Lord, and there is made immaculate; but Jesus alone, immaculate, entering the virginal hall, freed that very tabernacle from its carnal stains, and gave it sanctification."* And yet it is manifest from the following words that he does not speak of the stains which had been in Mary before Christ's entrance, but of those which are wont to be in other women — from which Christ preserved his mother immune. And that which he adds — "[the tabernacle] sanctified by the entrance of Christ" — is not so to be understood as though it then first began to be sanctified when it conceived Christ, but that Christ, entering into her, brought her greater increments of sanctity. Read Annotations 136 and 137 of the book which follows next to this.

Annotation CLVII

"Preserve me, O Lord, for I have hoped in thee." — Psalm 15:1

Whether the Psalms speaking literally of David can be expounded literally of Christ.

Thomas Cajetan, when in his commentaries he prefaced [an introduction] to this psalm, wrote these things: "From this Psalm we gather a general rule of understanding the Psalms: that every Psalm which cannot be expounded literally of David is to be expounded of Christ — as the Apostle [expounds] the words of this psalm, 'Thou shalt not give thy holy one to see corruption,' which he adduced [as] written of Christ, because they could not agree to David; and another rule can also hence be had, by the opposite: namely, that every Psalm which can be expounded literally of David is not to be expounded literally of Christ." **Ambrose, Bishop of Compsa**, in the second book of the Annotations on Cajetan, weighing these words, writes in this manner: "The first rule is altogether true, but the second false, and received (unto the extinction of the spiritual sense) from the doctrine of the Jews, and against all the catholic Doctors whom I have read, who did not know that rule; nor is the second elicited from the first, as he himself thought — [it is] false, [drawn] by a fallacy which the Logicians call 'the Consequent.' And these things are premised to the reader, that he may know my judgment concerning [Cajetan's] commentaries which he published upon the psalms, in which I scarcely anywhere see Christ, unless when he is so compelled by the authority of Scripture that he cannot, without manifest perfidy, tergiversate. But how many errors, and how great, he has incurred on account of that given rule, it was not worth the leisure to gather: for in those commentaries upon the Psalms there is this perpetual error; some grave ones, however, [there are] in these [Psalms] which I have embraced in this second book, and which I have marked with annotations."

Annotation CLVIII

"I said: [O Lord,] thou art my God." — Psalm 15:2

Eusebius of Caesarea thought wrongly concerning the Trinity.

Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, in the commentaries on the Psalms, brought forward, for the interpreting of these words, certain things favoring the Arian dogma concerning the inequality of the Father and the Son; and these are they: "By the law of nature, the father of any son whatsoever is also his lord; on that account, of the only-begotten Son of God, he who begot him is also his father, and Lord, and God, and Father." This opinion the same Eusebius, repeated in a prolix discourse, explains in the epistle to Alexander, the preceptor of Athanasius, whose beginning is, "With how great labor and diligence I have entered upon these letters." Epiphanius the Deacon noted this in the sixth action [session] of the Second Synod of Nicaea.

Annotation CLIX

"Moreover, even till night my reins have corrected me." — Psalm 15:7

Origen →

[...continues on folio 581 (PDF p. 398): Origen on Psalm 15:7 (Annotatio CLIX).]

*(printed folio 581 [PDF p. 398]. **Annot. CLIX–CLXII** (Ps 15:7–21:3): Origen's impassible holy men (root of Pelagian impeccability); his allegory of Christ's body in the sun's globe; whether Christ's prayer on the cross was heard; and whether he truly feared and grieved → folio 582.)*

(folio 581, left column → right column)

Annotation CLIX (continued)

Origen, when he had come thus far in explaining, asserted that holy men, when they have come to the summit of the virtues, do not — not even at night — suffer those things which are of men [human passions], nor are tickled by any thought of vices. Jerome, in the epistle to Ctesiphon (which begins "Not boldly"), says that this passage is one of the fountains whence the Pelagians drew their error, teaching that a man can be made ἀναμάρτητον — that is, *impeccable*,¹ or able to be without any sin. See Annotation 232 of this book.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether a man can be made impeccable.

Annotation CLX

"He hath set his tabernacle in the sun." — Psalm 18:5

Whether the body of Christ was placed in the Sun.

Origen is accused by Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis (writing against the Manichees), [on the ground] that in the allegorical elucidation of this little verse he taught that Christ, when he ascended into heaven, left his body in the globe of the Sun, but thence carried up his soul alone with himself above all the heavens to the right hand of the Father; and hence [Serapion] says that the Manichees were persuaded to adore the Sun as the tabernacle and perpetual domicile of the body of Christ.² Augustine, in book 20 against Faustus — no mention being made of the Origenic name — reports that the Manichees, from this psalm-testimony wrongly understood, fell into the adoration of the Sun. Whence it can easily be believed that Origen's commentaries were in this passage falsified by the heretics — and this especially because Pamphilus the martyr, in the *Apology*, demonstrates that this opinion was, by set purpose, attacked by Origen, in this very explanation of the present psalm and verse, in these words plainly taken from Origen's own commentary: "*What is it that David said, 'He hath set his tabernacle in the sun'? Some indeed were saying that our Savior, ascending from the earth to heaven and assuming his body, came up as far as that circle which is called the Zone of the Sun; and there, they say, he set the tabernacle of his body — for it was not possible to advance beyond. But they think these things thus because they will not receive allegory in the divine Scripture; and therefore, describing [it] as pure history, they compose fables and figments of this kind. But we pray the omnipotence of God, that he may deign to hear us, and to open to us the secret things of spiritual understanding. What, therefore, is understood by us in this passage is this: 'In the sun he hath set his tabernacle.' I ask, what is the tabernacle of Christ, and what is the habitation in which the tabernacle of Christ is placed? The habitation of the tabernacle is said to be the Sun. But the tabernacle of Christ I understand [to be] the Church. And the Sun — whom else must I understand, unless that true light which enlightens every man coming into this world?*³ *I see the Sun himself, of whom it is said, 'To you that fear my name the Sun of justice shall arise.'*⁴ *Therefore 'in the sun he hath set his tabernacle' — that is, 'In the Sun of justice he hath placed his Church.'*"

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The Manichees adored the Sun as the tabernacle of the body of Christ.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** John 1:9.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Malachi 4:2.

Annotation CLXI

"My God, I shall cry by day, and thou wilt not hear." — Psalm 21:3

Whether the prayer of Christ was heard.

Jerome, in the commentaries on the Psalms which are said to be his, treating this verse, says: "*Christ cried on the cross, and prayed for his own: he was heard, and he was not heard. He was heard for the predestined — as in the eight thousands, or for those hundred and twenty and five hundred brethren; and he was not heard — that is, for those who were not predestined, concerning whom the Evangelist said, 'His blood [be] upon us and upon our children.'*"⁵ **St. Thomas**, in the third volume of the theological Summa, question 21, article 4, judges that it is wrongly said or believed that Christ — who says of himself, "Father, I knew that thou always hearest me,"⁶ etc. — was at some time not heard, and especially crying out on the cross; since of

him, crying on the cross, Paul says, "With a strong cry and tears offering [prayers], he was heard for his reverence."⁷ Accordingly he judges that Christ prayed neither for all the crucifiers, nor even for all who were going to believe in him, but for those only who were predestined to eternal life,⁸ and that for these he was heard. But as to what the psalm says, "I shall cry, and thou wilt not hear," he thinks it is to be understood not in respect to the desire of reason (which was always heard), but in respect to the affection of the flesh, refusing death. **Thomas Cajetan**, to the solution of St. Thomas, adds this also: that every prayer of Christ — both according to reason and according to the will of the flesh — was heard; because what the flesh sought, it demanded not with a fixed determination, but on this condition, "if it should so seem to the Father": so that, if [it seemed] otherwise to him, then at last it asked to fulfil the Father's will, saying, "Thy will be done."⁹ Therefore, according to this last condition proposed by the flesh, Christ's prayer was most fully heard.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Matthew 27:25.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** John 11:42.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Hebrews 5:7.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Christ did not pray for all the crucifiers, nor for all who were going to believe in him, but only for the predestined.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Matthew 26:42.

Annotation CLXII

"Far from my salvation are the words of my sins." — Psalm 21:3

Whether Christ truly feared and grieved.

Augustine, in the commentaries on the Psalms, in the second exposition of this psalm, seems to think that Christ did not truly fear, nor had true sadness. For the Master of the Sentences, in book 3, distinction 15, reports his explanation — with some words permuted and transposed, for a clearer understanding of the sense — in this manner: "*How does he say this, 'Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth'?*¹⁰ *Concerning us — his body — he says this: for he bore the person of his body, that is, the Church; as also elsewhere, when he said, 'Let this chalice pass from me,'*¹¹ *he speaks for us — unless perhaps he be thought to have feared to die. But he did not truly fear to suffer, [he] who was to rise on the third day, when Paul burned to be dissolved and to be with Christ.*¹² *For a soldier is not braver than the emperor: for the soldier, about to be crowned, rejoices to die — and would the Lord, about to be crowned, fear death? But, representing our infirmity, he said this for his own weak ones, who fear to die: for it was the voice of those [members]."* He has a similar opinion in the epistle to Proba, *On the grace of the New Testament*, chapters 6 and 7; likewise in the exposition of Psalm 103. But it is clear that Augustine did not think thus, from those things which he brought against this opinion in the exposition of Psalm 93, in these words: "*Be unwilling to think that the Lord was not sad; for if we should say this — that he was not sad, whereas the Gospel says, 'My soul is sad even unto death'*¹³ *— then, when the Gospel says 'Jesus slept,' [we might say] 'Jesus did not sleep'; 'Jesus ate,' 'he did not eat'; and thus nothing sincere is left, so that it be said, 'And now the body was not real, and he did not have true flesh.' Whatever, therefore, is written of him is done, is true: therefore he was sad — altogether sad — but taking on sadness by [his] will, just as [he took on] flesh by [his] will."* →

◇ 10. **Right margin:** 1 Peter 2:22.

◇ 11. **Right margin:** Matthew 26:39.

◇ 12. **Right margin:** Philippians 1:23.

◇ 13. **Right margin:** Matthew 26:38.

[...continues on folio 582 (PDF p. 399): the Master of the Sentences and the resolution on Christ's true sadness (Annotatio CLXII).]

(printed folio 582 [PDF p. 399]. **Annot. CLXII–CLXVII** (Ps 21:3–31:1): Christ's fear as mere "propassion"; denying the Eucharist to sinners (public, not secret); a "table = figure" text abused by Oecolampadius; Cusa on Christ bearing hell's pain; and Augustine on lawful vs. superstitious lots → folio 583.)

(folio 582, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXII (continued)

The **Master of the Sentences**, in book 3, distinction 15, says that Augustine — in [the exposition of] Psalm 3 — signified that Christ did not truly fear according to [his] passion, but in Psalm 93 showed that Christ, according to fore-passion [propassion], truly feared. You will see below the things which pertain to this argument, Annotation 186 of this book.

Annotation CLXIII

Whether the Eucharist is to be denied to sinners.

(The printed text misnumbers this annotation CLVIII; it is corrected here to CLXIII, its proper place in the sequence — it stands between CLXII above and CLXVIII below.)

"All the fat ones of the earth have eaten and adored." — Psalm 21:30

Strabus [Walafrid Strabo], in the gloss to the exposition of this little verse, brings a sentence under the title of Augustine, thus: "Let not the dispenser prohibit the fat ones of the earth to eat at the table of the Lord, but let him warn [them] to fear the exactor." **Gratian**, *De consecratione*, distinction 2, cites these same words from an unnamed and uncertain passage of Augustine, and from these gathers that sinners are not [to be excluded] from the communion of the Lord's table. **St. Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 80, indicates that this sentence is not to be understood of public sinners, living in open crime, but of hidden and latent ones. For to those [public sinners], however earnestly demanding, he judges the sacrament of the Eucharist is not to be granted;¹ but to these [secret ones] he indicates it is not to be denied in public. Yet he desires that the minister of the Sacrament, if perhaps he be conscious of their crime, should dissuade them — by some hidden kind of admonition — from the reception of the Lord's body.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** The sacrament of the Eucharist is to be denied to public sinners.

Annotation CLXVIII

"Thou hast prepared a table before me." — Psalm 22:5

Concerning the Eucharist, the heretics feign that St. Chrysostom thought wrongly.

Chrysostom, in a certain homily on Psalm 22 (which, however, is not believed to be his), has these words: "The table is the consecration of the altar of the Lord; and because the divine wisdom prepared that table for his men-servants and maid-servants in their sight, so that daily, in the likeness of the body and blood of Christ, he might show us bread and wine according to the order of Melchisedech in the sacrament: therefore he says, 'Thou hast prepared a table in my sight.'" John Oecolampadius brought forward this passage against the truth of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, so that, under the name of Chrysostom, he might build up the faith of his own heresy. But since the phrase and the character of the explanation openly prove that the homily is not [the work] of him under whose title it is prefixed, there is no need that we answer anything to Oecolampadius for the defense of Chrysostom — whom it is agreed to be the keenest defender of this sacrament. Yet whosoever these words may be, they do not render the sense which Oecolampadius falsely gathered from them. For nothing prohibits — indeed it is necessary — that, together with the true body and blood of Christ, there be in the sacrament of the altar the accidents of bread and wine,² which here are called "bread and wine." And these bear the likeness and figure of the mystical body of Christ, which is the Church

— Paul saying: "*We, being many, are one bread, one body, all we who partake of the one bread and of the one cup.*"³

◇ 2. **Left margin:** In the Eucharist, together with the body and blood of Christ, are the accidents of bread and wine.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** 1 Corinthians 10:17.

Annotation CLXV

"For my life is spent in sorrow," etc. — Psalm 30:11

Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell.

Nicholas of Cusa, in a sermon which he published on the present little verse, both on account of those things which in this passage are said by the Prophet, and on account of many other things, believed that Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell. Augustine, Bishop of Nebbio, noted this opinion, in the scholia on the Octapla appended to this psalm, asserting that the opinion of this most learned man — and most eminent in all knowledge — is neither to be embraced nor to be spurned.

Annotation CLXVI

"My lots are in thy hands," etc. — Psalm 30:16

Whether it is lawful to use lots.

Augustine, in the second exposition on this psalm, when he discoursed concerning the lots here commemorated by David, seemed to approve the use of lots, when he says: "*A lot is not something evil, but a thing which, in human doubt, indicates the divine will: for the Apostles too cast lots, when Judas, having betrayed the Lord, perished, and the lot fell upon Matthias.*"⁴ To the same opinion he subscribes in the epistle to Honoratus, thus speaking: "*If among the ministers of God there be a dispute — [as to] which of them should remain in the time of persecution, lest by the flight of all the Church be deserted, and which should flee — if this dispute cannot otherwise be terminated, as far as it seems to me, which should remain and which should flee are to be chosen by lot.*" And in the first book *On Christian Doctrine*, confirming this same thing, he says: "*If something abounded which ought to be given to those who did not have [it], and it could not be given to two, if perhaps two occur to thee of whom neither excelled the other either in indigence or in some urgent necessity, thou wouldst do nothing more just than to choose by lot to whom must be given that which cannot be given to both.*"

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Acts 1:26.

There are those who think that a decree of Pope Leo III is opposed to these sayings of Augustine — [namely] that which, in the epistle to the bishops of Britain, is written in the Decrees of the pontiffs, cause 26, question 5: "*Lots, by which you decide all things in your provinces — which the Fathers condemned — we decree to be nothing other than divinations and sorceries. Wherefore we wish them altogether to be condemned, and no longer to be named among Christians; and, lest they be practised, we forbid [them] by the interdict of anathema.*" **St. Thomas**, in the Second [part] of the Second, question 95, article 8, settling a controversy of this kind, shows that by Leo's decree those lots are not forbidden which Augustine approved — namely, those which are treated piously and religiously⁵ — but those which are wont to be exercised superstitiously and impiously, those five conditions being spurned which the pious exercise of lots requires.⁶ Of these, the first is, that the division or consultation of the proposed matter be looked for from God alone, the director of lots. The second, that lots be not sought except when necessity compels. The third, that they be not attempted except when prayers to God have first been sent up. The fourth, that we abuse not divine oracles for the inquisition of lots. The fifth, that we use not lots in ecclesiastical elections, which ought to be done by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit alone. For although once Matthias was chosen by lots,⁷ now — the fullness of the Spirit being poured out — it ought no longer to be permitted; because what was permitted before the effusion of the Holy Spirit was [done] while the splendor of the evangelical light had not yet flashed forth.

- ◇ 5. **Right margin:** Lots which are treated piously and religiously are not forbidden.
- ◇ 6. **Right margin:** The exercise of lots requires five conditions.
- ◇ 7. **Right margin:** Acts 1:26.

Annotation CLXVII

"Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," etc. — Psalm 31:1

Augustine →

[...continues on folio 583 (PDF p. 400): Augustine on Psalm 31:1 (Annotatio CLXVII).]

(printed folio 583 [PDF p. 400]. **Annot. CLXVII–CLXIX** (Ps 31:1–36:10): Calvin's "all works are sins" drawn from Augustine (answered); Catharinus vs. Cajetan on the Trinity from Ps 32:6; and Augustine's ambiguous texts on whether the saints see God before the resurrection → folio 584.)

(folio 583, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXVII (continued)

Augustine, in the preface of this psalm, seems to favor the Lutherans, asserting that all works preceding faith are evil, and that all the actions and thoughts of unbelievers are sins.¹ For thus he reasons: "Let no one reckon his good works before faith: because where faith was not, the good was not; for the intention makes the good work, but faith directs the intention." And again below he adds: "Believe in him who justifies the impious, that thy good works may be [truly] good works: for I would not call those [works] good which do not proceed from a good root." And again, after a few [words], he subjoins: "Before the grace of faith thou didst nothing of good, and remission of sins shall be given to thee. Let thy works be attended to, and all shall be found evil; if God gave to those works what is due to them, he would surely damn [them]. For the wages of sin is death: but thou wast found in evil works." Finally, concluding at the end of the preface, he says: "And if thou seem to do good things — yet, because thou doest [them] without faith, they are not even to be called good." Thus far Augustine's words, cited by John Calvin in the tenth chapter of the Institutes, for the confirmation of his impious doctrine, by which he teaches that all works, however good, are sins. The **Master of the Sentences**, book 2, distinction 41, noticing this passage, says that Augustine here called that an "evil work" which is invalid and useless for the merit of eternal life.² For although, before faith, all the virtues of unbelievers — measured according to the rule of right reason — are good for living well in the present life, yet for obtaining the beatitude of the future life, without faith (which directs the intention), they are so unfit that they ought rather to be called evil than good. Consult Annotation 235 of book 6.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether all the works of unbelievers are sins.
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** That is called an evil work by which a man does not merit eternal life.

Annotation CLXVIII

"By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their power by the spirit of his mouth." — Psalm 32:6

Whether this passage pertains to the Holy Spirit.

Ambrose, Bishop of Compsa, in book 4 of the Annotations on the same [Cajetan], condemns **Thomas Cardinal Cajetan**, [on the ground] that he alone of all denies that this passage pertains to the person of the Holy Spirit — from which all catholic expositors gather the mystery of the divine Triad, saying that by "the Lord" is to be understood the Father, by "the Word" the Son, and by "the Spirit of his mouth" the Holy Spirit the Paraclete. But if you attentively read Cajetan's commentaries, you will recognize that an explanation of

this kind is neither impugned, nor rejected, nor denied, but only passed over in silence. And it is far another thing to deny and to be silent, than to impugn and to omit. Nor is it to be wondered at, if Cajetan — who in the commentaries on the Psalms professes only the elucidation of the letter — omitted the exposition of the Trinity (which almost all confess to be mystical); or if, expounding according to the bare letter, he said that "the Spirit of the Lord's mouth" is called the very Word of God, and the command [of God] named after the human manner. For the Greek interpreter **Euthymius** also — who illustrated this passage from the various and diverse interpretations of the Greek Fathers — before he touched the mystical sense, expressed the historical understanding (which Cajetan followed) in these words: "*These expressions seem to signify the same: 'By the word of the Lord' and 'by the spirit of his mouth.'* For God said, 'Let it be,' and it was made; and it was done. Moreover, the word of the mouth is the breath [spirit] beating the air; and such as is the breath of the mouth, beating the air, such is the word itself." Then, subjoining the mystical sense, he says: "*But, according to a higher sense — whereby we may say that blessed David here philosophizes concerning the holy Trinity — by 'the Lord' understand the Father, and the Son by 'the Word,' and by 'the Spirit of his mouth' the Holy Spirit.*"

Annotation CLXIX

"Yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be." — Psalm 36:10

Whether the souls of the saints are in heaven before the resurrection.

Augustine, in the exposition of the proposed little verse, seems somewhat to decline toward the error of the Armenians, the Greeks, and the Anabaptists, who assert that the souls of the saints are confined, until the day of judgment, in hidden receptacles, far from the gaze of the divine vision; writing in this manner: "*After this life thou shalt not yet be there where the saints shall be, to whom it shall be said, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom which is prepared for you from the origin of the world.'*³ *Thou shalt not yet be there — who knows [it] not? But now thou canst be there where that once-ulcerous poor man [reposed], whom the proud rich man, in the midst of torments, saw far off reposing:*⁴ *in that repose, certainly, secure, thou shalt await the day of judgment — when thou shalt receive [thy] body, when thou shalt be sent in, that thou mayest be equalled to the Angels.*" To this opinion the same [Augustine] seems to allude in the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 108, where he says: "*The time which is interposed between the death of man and the final resurrection holds souls in hidden receptacles, according as each is worthy of repose or of affliction, for that which it obtained in the flesh while it lived.*" And in book 12 *On the City of God*, chapter 9: "*That part of the city of God which is to be joined to the immortal Angels is gathered out of mortal men; [and] now [it] either sojourns mortally on earth, or, in those who have died by death, rests in the secret receptacles and seats of souls.*" And again, in book 12 [of the commentary] *On Genesis to the letter*, chapter 35, he seems to indicate that the souls of the saints, before the resumption of the body, cannot enjoy the divine vision, in these words: "*If anyone show what need there is for spirits to receive their bodies in the resurrection, if that highest beatitude can be furnished to them even without bodies — it is by no means to be doubted that the mind of man, snatched from the senses of the flesh, and (after death, the flesh being laid aside) cannot so see the incommutable good as the holy Angels see [it].*" And in book 1 of the *Retractions*, chapter 14, when he had treated this question professedly, he left it undiscussed and in doubt, writing thus: "*That [saying] makes us most blessed which the Apostle says, 'But then face to face; and then I shall know, as also I am known.'*⁵ *Those who have found this are to be said to consist in the possession of beatitude. But who those most blessed are, who are now in that possession, is a great question. And that the holy Angels are there, is no question; but concerning holy men already dead, whether they too may be said to consist already in that possession, is deservedly asked. For now they are stripped of the body, by which the soul is weighed down; but they still themselves await also the redemption of their body, and their flesh rests in hope, [and] does not yet shine in future incorruption. But whether they have anything the less on this account for contemplating the truth with the eyes of the heart, face to face — it is not [the place] here, by disputing, to*

inquire." These passages, and others similar to these — often repeated in the diverse writings of Augustine — must be interpreted charitably, especially since among Augustine himself certain testi- →

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Matthew 25:34.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Luke 16:22–23.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 13:12.

[...continues on folio 584 (PDF p. 401): Augustine's opposite testimonies, that the saints do enjoy the vision of God before the resurrection (Annotatio CLXIX).]

(printed folio 584 [PDF p. 401]. **Annot. CLXIX–CLXX** (Ps 36:10–36:14): Augustine's counter-texts prove the saints do behold God before the judgment (his doubt was only of place and grade); then Origen's teaching that all pass through a purging fire after death (confuted, City of God XXI) → folio 585.)

(folio 584, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXIX (continued)

testimonies which establish that the souls of the saints, even before the day of judgment, behold God face to face — of which number one is had in the fourth sermon on the solemnity of the saints, where, expounding those words from the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse, "I saw under the altar of God the souls of the slain, and there were given to them each a white robe,"¹ etc., he speaks thus: "*By the white robes we ought to understand the reward of baptism, the prize of martyrdom, the reward of the eternal [goods], and the joy of the heavenly fatherland. For the saints have, before the resurrection, single robes, because they enjoy as yet, in the soul alone, the eternal beatitudes; but afterward they are to receive double [robes], when — [their] bodies being received — they shall be immutable in soul and incorruptible in body.*" And a little after: "*Whence John says, 'They stood before the throne, in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands';² [they] stand, then, even now before the throne of God, crowned — [each] stands in the sight of the Lamb, in no way to be there separated from contemplating his glory.*"

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Revelation 6:9, 11.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Revelation 7:9.

There are, therefore, the passages cited a little before — [which are] in appearance conflicting with the present passage and those similar to it — to be interpreted in this sense: that we say Augustine did not doubt concerning the glory of souls before the judgment,³ but concerning the place of glory, and concerning the grades (or the quantity, or the consummation) of glory before the judgment. For since souls, wheresoever they behold the glory of God, are there blessed, Augustine was sometimes uncertain in what places, and seats, or receptacles, the souls might see God. Similarly, concerning the quantity of glory, Augustine often asked whether the Souls of the Saints, before the judgment, were equal to the Angels in the vision of God, or saw something less. Which the words of the aforesaid passages plainly indicate — especially from the testimony of the first [book] of the Retractations, where it is said, "Souls stripped of their bodies do not so see God as the Angels see [him]," that is, [not] with a consummated and perfect vision; and from book 12 on Genesis, where it is read: "*Whether Souls have anything the less on this account for contemplating, with the eyes of the heart, the truth — it is not [the place] here, by disputing, to inquire.*" Read Annotation 345 of the sixth book.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** St. Augustine did not doubt concerning the glory of souls before the judgment, but concerning the place and grades of glory.

Annotation CLXX

"The sinners have drawn out the sword." — Psalm 36:14

Whether after this life all, both good and evil, shall enter the fire of gehenna.

Origen, in the third homily on Psalm 36, seems to think that all — both good and evil — are, after this life, to enter the fire of gehenna: from which the good and holy shall escape unharmed, and without any injury; but the evil, [in order] that they may fulfil the purgation of their crimes, shall remain immersed in it. His words are these: *"If, placed in this life, we make sin to perish in us — so that in no way at all, neither by thought, nor by work, nor by word, the sword of sin be brought forth from us — we shall not need the punishment of eternal fire; we shall not be condemned to the exterior darkness, nor shall we be subject to those punishments which threaten sinners. But if in this life we contemn the words of divine Scripture admonishing us, and are unwilling to be cured or amended by its corrections, it is certain that a fire remains for us which is prepared for sinners; and we shall come to that fire, in which the work of each one — of what sort it is — the fire shall prove. And, as I judge, it is necessary that we all come to that fire: even if [one] be some Paul, or Peter, yet he comes to that fire. But such [persons] hear [this]: 'Even if thou pass through, the flame shall not burn thee.' But if anyone be some sinner like me, he will indeed come to that fire, as [did] Peter and Paul; but he will not pass through, as Peter and Paul passed through. And in what manner the Hebrews came to the Red Sea, the Egyptians also came; but the Hebrews indeed passed through the Red Sea, whereas the Egyptians were drowned in it. In this manner also we — if we are Egyptians, and follow Pharaoh the devil, obeying his precepts — shall be drowned in that river or lake of fire, when sins shall be found in us. But if we are Hebrews, and are redeemed by the blood of the immaculate Lamb — if we carry not with us the leaven of wickedness — we do indeed enter the river of fire; but, as to the Hebrews the water was a wall on the right hand and on the left, so also the fire shall be a wall to us, if we do that which is said of them: 'Because they believed God and Moses his servant'⁴ — that is, his law and commandments — and if we so follow the pillar of fire and the pillar of cloud." He explains this opinion more clearly at the end of book 8 of the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, where he has these things word for word: "All indeed who are blessed — whether they be of Israel or of the gentiles — the Evangelical word of the present time purifies, that they may be such as those were to whom the Lord said, 'Behold, now you are clean because of the word which I have spoken to you.' But whoever shall have spurned the purifications of the word of God and of the Evangelical doctrine reserves himself for the sad and penal purifications, that the fire of gehenna may purge [him] in torments — [him] whom neither the apostolic doctrine nor the Evangelical discourse purged; according to that which is written: 'And I will purify thee by fire unto purification.'⁵ But this very purgation, which is applied through the punishment of fire — for how great times, or for how many ages, it exacts torment from sinners — he alone can know to whom the Father delivered all judgment; who so loves his creature, that for it he emptied himself of the form of God, and took the form of a servant, humbling himself unto death, willing that all men be saved and come to the acknowledgment of the truth. But nevertheless it behoves [us] to remember that the Apostle wished to have the present passage as, so to say, a mystery — namely, that the faithful and perfect, each within themselves, cover such senses, as it were a mystery of God, with silence, and bring [them] not everywhere forth to the imperfect and less capable." And again, repeating the same in homily 13 on Jeremiah, he thus speaks: "If thou hast sinned, and art polluted with the filth of sins, the Lord will wash the filth of the sons and daughters of Sion; but if it be a mortal sin, we cannot be cleansed by nitre and soap, but by the spirit of judgment, [and] by the spirit of burning, and by punishment. Perhaps Jesus also baptizes with the Holy Spirit and with fire⁶ — not because he baptizes the same [person] in the Holy Spirit and in fire, but that the holy [person] is baptized with the Holy Spirit, while he who, after faith and the teaching of God, is again turned to crimes, is purged by the torment of burning. Blessed [is he] who received the laver, and needs not the laver of the Holy Spirit and of fire; but miserable, and worthy of all weeping, [is he] who, after the laver of the Holy Spirit, must be baptized with fire. Blessed [is he] who has part in the first resurrection: if anyone has kept the laver of the Holy Spirit, that one has part in the first [portion] of the resurrection; but if anyone is [only] saved in the second resurrection, that one is a sinner, who needs the baptism of fire, [and] who is purged by burning,*

so that whatsoever he had of wood, hay, and stubble, the fire may consume."⁷

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Exodus 14:28–29.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Malachi 3:3.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Luke 3:16.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Revelation 20:6.

Augustine, in book 21 *On the City of God*, chapters 26 and 27, confutes this dogma; do thou see whether Origen[']s →

[...continues on folio 585 (PDF p. 402): Augustine's refutation, and how far Origen's purgatorial fire may be reconciled with Catholic teaching (Annotatio CLXX).]

(printed folio 585 [PDF p. 402]. Annot. CLXX–CLXXI (Ps 36:14–36:15): Origen's universal fire closes; then a chain of Fathers (Ambrose, Hilary, Basil, Jerome, Lactantius) who seem to hold that all souls but Christ's are tried by fire after death → folio 586.)

(folio 585, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXX (continued)

[do thou see whether] Origen's words can be interpreted of the fire of the final conflagration, which on the day of judgment shall purge certain elect not yet purged, and shall sweep up [enfold] all the reprobate. See the following Annotation.

Annotation CLXXI

"Let their sword enter into their own hearts." — Psalm 36:15

Whether all Souls, after this life, are to be tried by fire.

Ambrose, in the commentaries on the Psalter, disclosing the understanding of this clause, is believed to consent to Origen — saying that all who are, who have been, and who shall be men (one Christ excepted) are to be examined, proved, and in some manner burned by the fire of the world's conflagration on the day of judgment. For he transferred from Origen's explanation into this psalm almost all the following words: "*By fire thou hast examined us, David says:¹ therefore we shall all be examined by fire. And Malachi says, 'Behold the omnipotent Lord comes: and who shall endure the day of his entrance? For he himself shall enter in, like a refining fire; and he shall sit refining and purging, like gold and silver, and he shall purge the sons of Levi.² By fire, therefore, shall the sons of Levi be purged; by fire Ezekiel, by fire Daniel. But even if they shall be examined by fire, yet they shall say, 'We have passed through fire and water';³ others shall remain in the fire. To these the fire shall be as dew — as [it was] to the Hebrew boys, who were cast into the burning of the fiery furnace; but the avenging fire shall burn up the ministers of impiety. Woe is me, if my work shall have burned, and I suffer the loss of this labor! And if the Lord shall save his servants, we shall be saved by [our] faith — yet so saved, as if by fire; and if we be not burned up, yet we shall be burned. But in what manner some remain in the fire, and others pass through, the divine Scripture teaches us: namely, in the Red Sea the people of the Egyptians was drowned, [while] the people of the Hebrews passed through before, [and] Moses passed through; Pharaoh was cast down, because, when heavy sins drowned [them], in that manner the sacrilegious are cast down into the lake of burning fire. Let us, therefore, placed here, follow the pillar of fire, which may illumine us in this body, and show [us] the way, that in the future the cloud may cool us, so that we may be able to relieve [ourselves from] the savage burnings of the night.*" Again, in the exposition of Psalm 118, upon that [verse], "See my humiliation, and deliver me," etc., he says: "*All, [as many] as desire to return to paradise, must be proved by fire: for not idly is it written that — Adam and Eve*

being cast out of the seat of paradise — God placed at the exit of paradise a fiery turning sword; all must pass through the flames, even if [one] be that John the Evangelist, whom the Lord so loved that he said of him to Peter, 'So I will [him] to remain: what is that to thee? follow thou me.' Concerning his death some have doubted; concerning [his] passing through the fire we cannot doubt. Even if [one] be Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he must say, 'We have passed through the fire.' But for John the fiery sword shall be quickly turned aside, because iniquity is not found in him whom equity loved: if there was anything of vice in him, divine charity burned it away. He shall be examined as silver; I shall be examined as lead — until the lead melt away, I shall burn. If nothing of silver shall be found in me, woe is me! I shall be thrust down into the lowest [part] of hell; or, as stubble, I shall be wholly burned up. If anything of gold or of silver shall be found in me — not through my [own] acts, but through the mercy and grace of Christ — [I shall say], perhaps, 'For they who hope in thee shall not be confounded.' One [alone] could not feel that fire — [he] who is the justice of God, Christ, who did no sin: for nothing of the fire found in him anything which it could burn up. Therefore, since we are to be examined, let us so act, that in the judgment we may deserve to be proved by the divine [examination]. Let us hold, placed here, humility — so that, when each one of us shall come to the judgment of God, to those fires which we are to pass through, he may say, 'See my humiliation, and deliver me,' etc."

◇ 1. Left margin: Psalm 16:3.

◇ 2. Left margin: Malachi 3:1–2.

◇ 3. Left margin: Psalm 65:12.

Hilary, together with Ambrose, following his own Origen, in the commentaries on Psalm 118, upon that verse, "My soul hath coveted to desire thy judgments,"⁴ etc., thus wrote: "*The prophet remembers that it is arduous to desire the judgment; for since no living [man] is clean in his sight, how can the judgment be desirable, in which that unwearied fire must be undergone by us — in which those grave punishments, [needing] to be expiated from sins, must be undergone by the soul? The sword passed through the soul of the blessed Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed. If, therefore, that Virgin of God — subject [to it] — is to come to the severity in the judgment, who shall dare to desire to be judged by God?*" And in the canon on Matthew 3, explaining that [passage], "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire":⁵ "*Baptized in the Holy Spirit, it remains that we be consummated in the fire of judgment.*"

◇ 4. Right margin: Psalm 118:20.

◇ 5. Right margin: Matthew 3:11.

To the same [purpose] seem to pertain those things which **Basil** noted on the fourth chapter of Isaiah, in those words of the prophet, "He shall purge Jerusalem in the spirit of judgment and in the spirit of burning," etc., saying: "*But this — 'In the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning' — is referred to that probation, or examination, which shall be made through fire in the future age.*" And a little after: "*Those who, after having received the knowledge of life, deliberately and by [their own] zeal render themselves obnoxious to blood — such surely need to be purged by fire; and these are to be purged by the spirit of burning, or of examination.*" And again, in the same commentaries, weighing that [passage] of Isaiah 9, "In the indignation of the wrath of the Lord the earth is burnt up,"⁶ etc., he says: "*The prophet declares that the earthly [region] itself is delivered to be consumed by a punitive fire, unto the grace and benefit of the soul; for he threatens not an utter destruction and extermination, but hints at a purgation according to the sentence of the Apostle: 'Because, as any man's work shall have burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'*"⁷

◇ 6. Right margin: Isaiah 9:19.

◇ 7. Right margin: 1 Corinthians 3:15.

To the same opinion **Jerome** appears to have alluded, in the third book on Amos, where, expounding that [passage] from the seventh chapter, "And behold he shall call for fire to judgment, and it shall devour the abyss, and it shall eat up at the same time a part,"⁸ etc., he thus speaks: "*The calling of fire to judgment first*

devours the abyss — that is, all kinds of sinners: wood, hay, stubble;⁹ and afterward it eats up at the same time a part — that is, it comes to those saints who are in the peculium of the Lord, and are reckoned in his part. For it is the time that judgment begin from the house of the Lord; and in Ezekiel it is commanded to those who are to bring the punishments, 'Begin ye from my sanctuary.'¹⁰ And in the Apostle we read, 'If any man's work shall have burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'¹¹ And when we shall all have been in sin, and shall have lain against the truth of the sentence, the Lord will have mercy on us, and will raise us up in the time of the resurrection."

◇ 8. Right margin: Amos 7:4.

◇ 9. Right margin: 1 Corinthians 3.

◇ 10. Right margin: Ezekiel 9:6.

◇ 11. Right margin: 1 Corinthians 3:15.

Lactantius Firmianus, speaking of this fire long before Jerome and Hilary, in the seventh [book] of the *Divine Institutes*, chapter 21, left this written: "The same divine fire, therefore, by one and the same force and power, shall both burn the impious and shall renew them; and as much as it shall consume from the bodies, so much shall it restore, and shall furnish for itself eternal fuel. But when God shall have judged the just, he will also examine them by fire: then those whose sins shall have prevailed, either by weight or by number, shall be singed by the fire, and shall be scorched; but those whom full justice and the ripeness of virtue has thoroughly seasoned" →

[...continues on folio 586 (PDF p. 403): the rest of Lactantius, and Sixtus's Catholic resolution of these Fathers on the fire (Annotatio CLXXI).]

(printed folio 586 [PDF p. 403]. **Annot. CLXXI–CLXXIV** (Ps 36:15–50:3): the fire-trial resolved (the living at judgment pass through it, not the dead saints); Cassiodorus on praying "with understanding"; and Chrysostom's "a thousand times repent" (vs. the Novatians) and on mercy → folio 587.)

(folio 586, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXI (continued)

shall not feel that fire; for they have something of God in themselves which repels and casts back the force of the flame. So great is the force of innocence, that from it that fire flees away harmless — [the fire] which receives from God this power, that it may burn the impious [and] obey the just."

From the opinions of these authors, those things appear to be sufficiently diverse which all the Scholastic Theologians teach concerning the fire of the final conflagration: who, although they confess that all mortals whom the time of judgment shall find living shall enter this fire¹ — and that certain elect, needing expiation, are to be purged in it with pain, but certain [others], in whom there will be nothing to be purged, shall escape from it without any torment, [while] the reprobate, together with that very fire, are rolled down and drowned into hell — yet they refuse [to hold] that the saints who died before the judgment are to be purged by that fire; especially the Apostles, purified by the Holy Spirit, and Mary the Mother of God, sanctified in the womb and assumed into heaven with a most pure body: both because the dead do not rise again until after that fire shall have ceased from the office of purgation, the faculty of purging being laid aside; and because the bodies of the saints after the resurrection shall be so spiritual and impassible that they are no longer capable of the fiery purgation. Nor does Augustine much dissent from the Scholastics, in book 20 *On the City of God*, chapter 8, where he says that the future saints [shall be] in the higher parts of the world, into which the flame of that burning shall not ascend — just as neither of old [did] the wave of the flood; for such bodies shall be theirs, that they may be there where they shall have willed to be. But, made immortal and incorruptible, they shall not dread the fire of that conflagration — just as the corruptible and mortal bodies of

the three men were able to live unharmed in the burning furnace. See the preceding Annotation.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** All mortals whom the time of judgment shall find living shall enter the fire of the final conflagration.

Annotation CLXXII

"For God is the king of all the earth: sing ye wisely." — Psalm 46:3, 8

Whether one ought to pray in an unknown tongue.

Cassiodorus, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this little verse, says: "*Not only must we sing, but [sing] understanding: for no one does anything wisely which he does not understand.*" The heretics use this testimony against those who sing or pray Psalms and prayers not understood before God, asserting that those prayers are of no fruit which — in a foreign and unknown tongue — are offered by the simple and unlearned to the divine majesty: because no one obtains the benefits of prayer unless first, with attentive thought, he has diligently considered what he prays; and he will not be able to consider [it] unless he first has understood it; nor will he be able to understand those things which must be uttered in a tongue foreign and unknown to him. To these [heretics] it must be answered, that there is a twofold attention of praying:² one, peculiar and proper to those who understand only, which looks to the words and the sense of the words, lest anything be erred on either side; but the other far more excellent, and accessible to those who understand as [well as] to those who do not understand, which directs the point of the mind unto the end and scope of prayer — namely, unto God, whom [one] prays, and then unto the very thing which [one] prays for. And it happens that an attention of this kind is sometimes stretched so far that the mind, lifted up in the meditation of God, forgets sometimes the words, and the meanings, and itself. Nor is it doubtful that David and Cassiodorus looked to this attention, when they admonished that one should sing wisely and understandingly. For he undoubtedly sings wisely, and prays, who tastes the savor and fruit of divine contemplation in prayer; and he truly prays understandingly, who contemplates, with intent mind, God whom he prays.³ You have some things pertaining hither in book 6, Annotation 263.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The attention of praying is twofold.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** An excellent teaching.

Annotation CLXXIII

"Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy great mercy." — Psalm 50:3

Whether penance is to be repeated.

Chrysostom, in homily 2 on Psalm 50, when from the words of this little verse he encouraged every most desperate sinner to penance, burst forth into that voice — repeated by him very often, also in many homilies: "*Thou hast sinned? Repent. A thousand times [hast thou sinned]? A thousand times repent — nay, repent even still.*" Which voice there were not lacking of old [some] who condemned, as a certain seed-plot of intemperance and unbridled license. But among others, **Socrates** of Constantinople, in the sixth book of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 21, writes of it in this manner: "*It comes upon me to wonder how John [Chrysostom], since he exercised so great a zeal for temperance, taught in his homilies to condemn temperance. For since there was but a single penance given by the synod of bishops to the lapsed,⁴ he dared to say, 'Thou too, who hast done penance a thousand times, approach': on account of which doctrine he was condemned also by [his] friends, especially by Sisinnius, bishop of the Novatians, who wrote a book against this saying, and on account of it strongly resisted him.*" These things Socrates: whom there is no doubt to have been a Novatian,⁵ and on that account offended, together with his own bishop, at Chrysostom's sayings. Yet Chrysostom, saying these things, did not look to that solemn and public penance which the synodical decrees granted but once to the lapsed, but to the private, singular, and secret penance, which is necessary before God — or before a particular priest — to everyone sinning: this [penance], to [him who has sinned] a thousand times, Chrysostom offers a thousand times as a remedy — not that he might furnish them the matter

of intemperate license, but that he might free them from all occasion of despairing. Which he himself also, in the same homily, after the aforesaid words, plainly declares, thus adding: "*These things I say, not that I may make you negligent, but that I may lead you to the faith of a salutary expectation: lest you ever despair of yourselves, but always trust in the mercy of God — for one must despair only of that [man] who has despaired of himself.*"

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Public penance was granted to the lapsed only once.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Socrates was a Novatian.

Annotation CLXXIV

"And according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my iniquity." — Psalm 50:3

Concerning satisfaction.

Chrysostom, in homily 2 on the fiftieth Psalm, interpreting this clause, among other things inserts these words: "*Where mercy is implored, interrogation ceases; where mercy is sought, judgment rages not; where mercy is asked, there is no place for punishment; where [there is] mercy, [there is] no inquiry; where [there is] mercy, the answer is [one] of pardon.*" →

[...continues on folio 587 (PDF p. 404): the rest of Chrysostom on mercy and satisfaction (Annotatio CLXXIV).]

(printed folio 587 [PDF p. 404]. **Annot. CLXXIV–CLXXV** (Ps 50:3–50:5): Calvin abusing Chrysostom against satisfaction (closed); then the long crux on **sacramental confession** — Chrysostom and Cassian texts marshaled against private confession, answered as touching only public/theatrical confession (abolished by Nectarius) → folio 588.)

(folio 587, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXIV (continued)

John Calvin, in the ninth chapter of his Institutes, abuses this sentence to overthrow the satisfactory penalties, which the theologians teach are most especially necessary to penitents.¹ Reread Annotation 16 of this book.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Satisfactory penalties are necessary to penitents.

Annotation CLXXV

"My sin is always before me." — Psalm 50:5

Whether sacramental confession is necessary.

Chrysostom, in the second homily on this Psalm, to the exposition of the present little verse inserted some things concerning confession, which John Calvin, in the ninth chapter of his Institutes, and the rest of the Lutherans bring forward (together with very many other sentences of the same Author) against sacramental confession. They run in this manner: "*Say thy sins, that thou mayest blot them out. If thou art ashamed to say to anyone that thou hast sinned, say [them] within. [I do] not [say] that thou confess to thy fellow-servant, who may reproach thee; but say [them] to God, who heals them.*" A similar sentence, and in almost the same words, Chrysostom inculcates in very many places; of which I shall bring hither some of the more notable, that at one glance I may set before your eyes whatsoever he has said on this subject, and lest it be needful for me again to repeat passages of this kind of argument.

In the fourth **homily on Lazarus**, on Luke chapter 16: "*Why, therefore, art thou ashamed and dost thou blush to confess thy sins? Dost thou tell [them] to a man, that he may reproach thee? Not so; for [thou fearest] to confess to thy fellow-servant, lest he bring [it] forth into public. But thou showest thy wounds to*

him who is Lord, to him who is physician; for neither is he ignorant [of them], even if thou tell him not — [he] who knew [them] even before thou didst perpetrate [them]. Why, therefore, is there care, that thou tell [them] the less? Not, he says, do I compel thee to come forth into the midst as into a theatre, and to employ many witnesses: to me alone tell thy sin privately, that I may heal the ulcer, and free thee from grief."

In the **homily on the Publican**, on Luke 18, he left this written: "I admonish thee that thou confess assiduously. For neither do I lead thee to the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor do I compel thee to enunciate thy sins to men: unfold thy conscience to God; to him show thy deeds and wounds, and from him seek medicine; show thyself to him who reproaches not, but heals. For though thou be silent, yet he knows all. Tell [them], therefore, to him, that thou mayest depart thence free and loosed from sins, and be freed from that intolerable publication of sins."

In **homily 31 on the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews**: "Not only, he says, let us say that we are sinners, but let us also compute the sins themselves specially, one by one. I do not say to thee, that thou betray thyself in public, nor that thou accuse thyself before others; but I would have thee obey the prophet, saying, 'Reveal to the Lord thy way.'² Before God, therefore, confess thy sins; at the true judge pronounce thy offenses with prayer — not with the tongue, but with the memory of thy conscience: and then at last hope that thou canst obtain mercy."

◇ 2. Left margin: Psalm 36:5.

In the **homily On penance and confession** he says: "Thou art confounded, and blushest to utter thy sins? And yet it behoved [thee] most of all to say them, and to divulge [them] among men: for to sin is confusion; it is not confusion to confess sins. But now it is not even necessary to confess in the presence of witnesses: let the inquisition of offenses be made by thought; without a witness let this judgment be; let God alone see thee confessing — God, who reproaches not thy sins, but looses the sins on account of [thy] confusion," etc.

In the **eighth homily among those which are titled On penance**: "Reveal not, he says, thy sores; do not produce accusation in the common theatre; do not set up witnesses of [thy] offenses: within, in [thy] conscience, no one standing by except him who sees all — God, who both searches and judges concerning [thy] sins, and weighs the judgment of the sins of all, as it were, by a certain balance. Reform that in which thou hast offended; and so, with a pure conscience, approach the sacred table, and be a partaker of the holy sacrifice."

In the **fifth homily On the incomprehensible nature of God** he says: "How greatly I exhort and beseech and pray you, dearest brethren, that ye more frequently confess to the immortal God, and — your offenses being enumerated — seek pardon, and [seek] the deity propitious! I lead thee not into the theatre of thy fellow-servants; I do not compel [thee] to detect thy sins to men: unfold thy conscience before God, and explain [it]; show to God, the most excellent physician, thy wounds, and ask from him the medicine; show [them] to him who reproaches not, but heals most humanely. Say to him, that — thy stains being wiped off — thou mayest depart thence clean, and without any disgrace, [and] be freed from that intolerable promulgation of thy offenses."

John Cassian, consenting to the same opinion of his own preceptor Chrysostom, in book 20 of the Collations, chapter 8, wrote these things: "There is none who cannot say suppliantly to God, 'My sin I have made known to thee,'³ that, through this confession, he may deserve to subjoin also that, 'And thou hast remitted the impiety of my sin.' Because, if — shame drawing [thee] back — thou blushest to reveal thy sins before men, cease not to confess them, by continual supplication, to him from whom they cannot lie hidden, and to say: 'My iniquity I acknowledge, and my sin is always before me. To thee only have I sinned, and done evil before thee'⁴ — who is wont both to heal without any publication of shame, and to pardon without reproach."

◇ 3. Right margin: Psalm 31:5.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Psalm 50:5.

The **Master of the Sentences**, book 4, distinction 17, says that these sayings of Chrysostom are not so to be understood, as though it be lawful to anyone — if he has had the opportunity — not to confess to a priest; but that it suffices, where the crime is secret, to tell [it] to God alone [rather than] in secret through a confessor. But I judge that Chrysostom said these things not concerning secret confession — which is a part of sacramental penance — but concerning that theatrical and public confession, which is a part of public penance, which of old the penitents were wont to make, for enormous crimes, as in a theatre, before the bishop, the presbyters, and the multitude of the people. For to this [public confession] Chrysostom would not compel those who had secretly offended: both because those things which are secret he judged ought not to be published before all; and also because, even in his own times, public confession had been abrogated (through fear of the raging people) by **Nectarius**, bishop of Constantinople, his predecessor⁵ — on account of a matron [who had been] violated by a deacon in the temple, under the pretext of confession: as Sozomen indicates in book 9 of the *Tripartite History*, chapter 35. From which [chapter] it pleases [me] to relate the ancient rite of public confession and penance, that the aforementioned passages of Chrysostom may be better understood. These, therefore, are the words of Sozomen from that chapter: "*Since it is known that altogether not to sin is divine, and beyond human nature — but that God commanded pardon to be given to sinners, and to those doing penance; while those who refuse to confess acquire a greater burden of sins — therefore it seemed [good] to the ancient*" →

◇ 5. **Right margin:** For what cause public confession was abrogated at Constantinople.

[...continues on folio 588 (PDF p. 405): Sozomen on the ancient office of the penitentiary priest and its abolition (Annotatio CLXXV).]

(printed folio 588 [PDF p. 405]. **Annot. CLXXV–CLXXIX** (Ps 50:5–50:7): the public-penance rite and its abolition by Nectarius (Sozomen); royal versus priestly power; and three annotations on “conceived in iniquities” — Arnobius, Chrysostom (accused by Faber), and Theodoret → folio 589.)

(folio 588, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXV (continued)

certain wise men to appoint over the people certain Pontiffs, that — as it were in a theatre, under the testimony of the ecclesiastical people — offenses might be laid open; and for this matter they appointed a presbyter of good conversation, discreet and wise: to whom, coming, those who had offended confessed their own offenses. But he, according to each one's fault, appointed also the penalty [the satisfaction to be paid]: which even hitherto is diligently observed in the Western Churches, and especially at Rome — where also there is a fixed place for the penitents. For the guilty stand, and are set as it were amid lamentations. For when the sacred celebration [of the Mass] has been completed, they — not partaking of the communion — with groaning and lamentation prostrate themselves upon the ground; to whom the Bishop, hastening together, himself also prostrates himself with tears and spiritual groaning, and the whole people of the Church is flooded with weeping. But after these things the Bishop first rises, and lifts up those lying on the ground; then, a fitting prayer being made over the penitents, he dismisses them all. But they, of their own accord giving themselves to mortifications — whether by fastings, or by abstinence from the bath, or by the withholding of foods, or by other things which are enjoined — await the common time which the Bishop decrees; and when the appointed time has come, as though discharging a certain debt, [and being] cured of the sin by the affliction, they partake of the communion with the people. These things, therefore, the Roman Pontiffs have observed from antiquity even unto our time. But further, at Constantinople there was a presbyter set over the penitents, until that time in which a certain most noble woman, when she had

confessed her sins, and it had been enjoined her by the presbyter that she should fast and supplicate God with [good] works — while she was observing this, confessed that she had more than once lain with a deacon in the church. When the people had come to know this, they raged against the priests, as though through them an injury had been done to the Church. Then Nectarius the Bishop removed the wicked deacon; and, certain persons persuading [him] that he should leave each one to the judgment of his own conscience as to communicating, he ordained that there should by no means [any longer] be a presbyter set over the penitents. And from that [time] the custom of antiquity was taken away — since, as I judge, the lesser sins were being ventured [more boldly], on account of the shame of confession and the [over-]nicety of those who examined [them]." These things Sozomen.

Annotation CLXXVI

"To thee only have I sinned." — Psalm 50:6

Whether the royal power is to be preferred to the sacerdotal.

Cassiodorus, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this verse has these things: "*If anyone of the people has erred, he sins both against God and against the king; but when the king offends, he is guilty to God alone, because he has no man who may judge his deeds. Rightly, therefore, does the king say that he has sinned to God only: because [God] was the only one who could sift what [the king] had committed.*" **John of Torquemada**, cardinal-presbyter, in book 1 *On Ecclesiastical Power*, chapter 91, places this passage among the arguments of those who prefer the Caesarean power to the Pontifical. The heretics of our times — who strive to vindicate the first grade of ecclesiastical dignity to the secular magistrate — cite this very passage, and annex to it another sentence out of the third commentary of **Jerome** on Jeremiah, where, in the explanation of chapter 13, it is thus read: "*Not only the ignoble common crowd and the vile populace, but [also] the Kings of the Churches, who sit upon the throne — the priests themselves too, the second grade in ecclesiastical honor — are filled up with the variety of sins.*"

The words of these authors must be referred to the kingdom and the priesthood of the Jews and of the Gentiles: among whom, since all the sacerdotal worship was instituted for the obtaining of the earthly and temporal goods of the present life — the care of which looks to the king — justly were the priests and pontiffs both of the Jews and of the Gentiles made subject to Kings and Emperors. But in the Evangelical law — in which Christ, the assisting Pontiff of the good things to come, instituted a priesthood far more excellent, in that it confers on us spiritual and heavenly goods, over which the royal power has no right¹ — it is fair that kings be made subject to the rule of the pontiffs, and obey the word of the priests. Yet it is to be observed here that **Philo** the Jew, in the book *On Fugitives* [*De profugis*], and in the third book *On the Life of Moses*, admonishes that, although the high priest of the Jews was inferior to the king, nevertheless, for so long as he was discharging his ministry — entering the temple, clothed with the sacerdotal vestment, bearing on his head the tiara [*cidaris*] in place of the royal diadem, and the golden plate marked with the name of God — he was superior to the king himself. Nay more, in the book *On the Legation to Gaius* [Caligula] he testifies that the Maccabean princes, his own ancestors, by the best right preferred the Priesthood in every respect to the kingdom, saying thus: "*I, who had both ancestors [that were] kings, and, of these, several who were also high Pontiffs — they valued that [priestly] dignity more than the royal: judging that, by how much God stands before man, by so much the pontificate is more excellent than the kingdom; for to the care of the one [the priesthood] pertain divine things, to that of the other [the kingship], human.*" You have [something] on this matter in St. **Thomas**, book 1 *On the Governance of Princes* [*De regimine principum*], chapter 14; likewise you shall read more of these things below, in the book which next follows this [one], in the seventy-second Annotation.

◇ 1. **Right margin:** The royal power has no right over spiritual goods.

Annotation CLXXVII

"For behold, in iniquities [was I conceived]." — Psalm 50:7

Whether Adam's sin transmitted to posterity only the death of the body.

Arnobius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, opening the sense of this little verse, seems to signify that Adam, by sinning, transmitted to his heirs only the punishment of bodily death, but not the sin and the vice of origin. For he speaks in these words: "*David did not say, 'With iniquities,' or 'With sins did my mother beget me': but, 'In iniquities was I conceived, and in sins did my mother beget me.' For by saying [this] he signified that his mother bore him amid the sins of the world, because every sin is conceived in the heart and consummated by the mouth. But this [child] who is born has the sentence [condemnation] of Adam — yet Adam's sin itself he has not.*" Read Annotation 236 of the sixth book.

Annotation CLXXVIII

"For behold, in iniquities [was I conceived]." — Psalm 50:7

Concerning original sin.

Chrysostom is brought under suspicion by **John Faber** [Johann Fabri], bishop of Vienna, because in his exposition of Psalm 50 — which he expounded splendidly — he purposely left the present little verse untouched, lest he fall into discourse of original sin, which he himself thought to be nothing [non-existent], and in many places also demonstrated to be nothing. These things Faber [says] in the Apology of his commentaries on Paul: whose error we have confuted in [our] censures upon the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. Read Annotation 236 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXIX

"For behold, in iniquities was I conceived." — Psalm 50:7

Whether the sin contracted from Adam is only the occasion of sin, and not sin [itself].

Theodoret, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon the little verse of this Psalm, is believed to have been in the opinion of those who assert that the sin of origin, contracted from Adam, is simply →

[...continues on folio 589 (PDF p. 406): the rest of Theodoret on whether the sin contracted from Adam is sin properly or only the occasion of sin (Annotatio CLXXIX).]

(printed folio 589 [PDF p. 406]. Annot. CLXXIX–CLXXXIV (Ps 50:7–65:12): Theodoret on original sin; Euthymius on marriage without the Fall; Hilary on Peter's denial, Christ's assumed passions, and merit vs. election; and Origen on whether men rise in the numerically same body → folio 590.)

(folio 589, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXIX (continued)

and in itself is not sin, but only the occasion and incitement of sin: which [occasion], if anyone repels it by the judgment of reason, he will be free from all sin; but if he consents to it, he will fall into sin, and be condemned to the punishment of sin. For his words written below hint at this in a certain manner — translated by us from the Greek exemplar: "*David, therefore, does not accuse marriage, nor does he call the nuptial communion a transgression, as certain persons have imprudently presumed, thus understanding that [text], 'In iniquities was I conceived, and in sins did my mother conceive me': but he brings forth into the midst the transgression once dared of old by the first men, and says that this begot the fountain of these defluxions. For unless they had sinned, they would not have received death, which is the penalty of sin; but,*

being free from mortality, they would have been more powerful to conquer sin — for with incorruption there would have been also all impassibility; and, impassibility governing, there would have been no place for sin. But since they sinned, they were delivered to corruption; and, being made corruptible, they begot sons very like themselves — whom desires, fears, pleasures, griefs, anger, and envy pursued; and with these [passions], and with the things born from them, reason contends: which reason, if it shall have conquered, is honored, and is crowned with victorious crowns; but if conquered, it is punished with confusion and torn with penalties." These things Theodoret repeats more openly in the exposition of the fifth chapter to the Romans; in the censures of which — [as to] what is said there — thou shalt see Annotation 236 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXX

"For behold, in iniquities was I conceived." — Psalm 50:7

If the first parents had not sinned, whether [there would have been] conception and generation.

Euthymius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this sentence, affirms that Adam's sin was the cause of human conception and generation; for unless he had sinned, there would have been no carnal union, nor the joining of male and female. For he thus writes: *"If Adam had not sinned, it would never have behooved Eve to be joined to him; sin, therefore, begot the union, and the union in turn produced those who were born of Adam and Eve; and so thereafter others, down to David. And although marriage be now held in honor, yet [things] of nature come forth from sin: 'from sin, therefore,' says David, 'was I conceived and begotten."* In the same manner the Author of the *Imperfect Work on Matthew* expounds the present passage, in the first homily. We have confuted this opinion above, in Annotations 20 and 21.

There are [some] who think that Euthymius applied this exposition to this little verse of set purpose, lest he be compelled to confess that sin which the royal Prophet in this place chiefly deploras — that is, original sin, which we constantly believe to have been transfused from the first parent into all [his] posterity. That this opinion did not altogether please Euthymius, those things testify which were written by him in the second volume of the *Panoplia*, title twenty-two, where — the words of Gregory Nazianzen being also borrowed — he thus speaks of Adam's sin: *"Therefore, for the transgression of the precept, and for the sin of the first parent, are appointed diseases, and death, which the transgression and sin brought about; which death indeed indicates the benignity of God — for it is the cause that, sin being cut short, the evil be not perpetual, as Gregory the Theologian says. But the eternal punishments are not appointed for the first transgression, but for the individual men who bind themselves with sins — or who, from the first parent even unto the consummation [of the world], applied no cure to [their] sins."* Some attribute this opinion of Euthymius to Chrysostom, but wrongly and unjustly, as one may see in Annotation 236 of the sixth book.

Annotation CLXXXI

"There is none that doeth good, [there is] not even one." — Psalm 52:4

Whether Peter, in the denial of Christ, lost [his] faith.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, expounding this little verse, so excuses Peter's denial that he says he did not lose the firmness of [his] faith: because, although from the trepidation of the flesh — which he could not restrain — his tongue burst forth into the denial of Christ,¹ yet the firm faith of confessing Christ even unto martyrdom did not depart from his mind. **Prudentius**, in the hymn to the cock-crow, subscribes to Hilary in these verses: *"The denier wept, at last, for the wickedness slipped from his mouth, while his mind remained innocent, and his soul preserved the faith."* By another way also [Hilary] strives to wrest this same denial of Peter to a pious sense, in the commentaries on Matthew. St. Jerome reprehends him in this matter, as thou shalt be able to see in Annotation 160 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXXII

"Because strangers have risen up against me." — Psalm 53:5

Whether hunger, thirst, grief, and death were natural to Christ.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, seems to hint that thirst, hunger, sleep, sadness, grief, weariness, and other passions of this kind were not natural to the humanity of Christ, but assumed [voluntarily taken on]; for thus he speaks to the exposition of the proposed verse: *"Hence that [fact], that he hungered, thirsted, slept, was wearied, and wept, and suffered, and died. And that he might be understood to be subject to all these things not by nature, but by [voluntary] assumption, having gone through them all, he rose again."* Read Annotation 186 of this book.

Annotation CLXXXIII

"Blessed [is he] whom thou hast chosen and taken up." — Psalm 64:5

Whether our merits are the cause of the eternal election.

Hilary, in the explanation of the Psalter, illustrating this passage, seems to incline to the opinion of those who lay down that our merits are the cause of the divine and eternal election, saying: *"Blessed is whosoever shall have been elected: for many, according to the Gospel, are called, but few [are] chosen; and the elect are conspicuous in the nuptial garment, splendid with the pure and whole body of the new nativity. And so election is not a matter of undiscerning judgment, but a discrimination made out of the choice of merit: blessed, therefore, [is he] whom God has chosen — blessed for this, that he is worthy by [his] election."* Augustine condemns this opinion in [his books] against the Pelagians, as thou hast below in Annotation 251 of the following book.

Annotation CLXXXIV

"We have passed through fire and water, and thou hast brought us out into a refreshment." — Psalm 65:12

Whether men shall rise again in the same individual [body].

Origen's commentaries on the Psalms have here some things which **Methodius**, bishop of Olympos, thinks were written against the resurrection of the flesh in the same individual [body]; and these the same bishop recounts in [his dialogue] the *Aglaophon* in these words: *"Thou hast indeed surely seen the skin of an animal, or some other such thing, filled with water: in what manner, if it be gradually emptied, and gradually filled, it always shows the same appearance. For of whatever sort that which contains [the skin] shall be, it is necessary that to it also that which is within [the water] be conformed" →*

[...continues on folio 590 (PDF p. 407): the rest of Origen's simile (as reported by Methodius) on the flux of the body and the resurrection (Annotatio CLXXXIV).]

(printed folio 590 [PDF p. 407]. Annot. CLXXXIV–CLXXXV (Ps 65:12, 65:11): Origen's water-skin simile on the risen body closes; then his error that souls are thrust into bodies for sins committed in heaven, with Cyril of Alexandria's reasons against it (1–5, the sixth begins) → folio 591.)

(folio 590, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXIV (continued)

conformed: for if the water flows away beneath, [and] if one adds as much as is poured out, not suffering the skin[-bottle] to be emptied of its water all at once, it is necessary that what is added appear such as the whole [was], because that which contains [it] is the same. And truly, if anyone should wish to liken the body to these things, he will be confounded by no shame: for in the same manner also those things which are introduced from nourishment, in place of the flesh expelled, are transmuted into the figure of the appearance [*species*] of the very thing containing them; and inasmuch as [the flesh] is spread out to the eyes, it is like the eyes; inasmuch as [it pertains] to the face, [like] the face; inasmuch as to the other parts, [like] those same — so that each one appears the same, not because there are [the same] fleshes as the first substrate in the same [man], but [the same] appearance, according to which the things that accrue are specified. Accordingly, if we are not the same even for a few days in [respect of] body, but [the same] of the appearance in the body — for this alone stands firm in [our] nativity — much more, therefore, neither then [at the resurrection] shall we be the same according to the same flesh, but according to the appearance, which even now is always conserved in us and remains. For what there [in the simile] is the skin, this here is the appearance; and what there is the water in the likeness, this here is that which accrues and departs. As, therefore, now — although the body be not the same — yet the character is preserved the same according to the same form: so, the body not remaining the same, the appearance, increased into greater glory, shall be shown no more in a corruptible, but in an impassible and spiritual body. See above, Annotation 148.

Annotation CLXXXV

"Thou hast led us into a snare." — Psalm 65:11

Whether Souls, on account of sins committed in heaven, are thrust down into bodies.

Methodius, bishop of Olympus, imputes it as a fault to **Origen** that, interpreting this verse in the commentaries on the Psalter, he said that Souls were brought into bodies in order that in these — as in a snare, and a chain, and a prison — they might pay the penalties of the crimes which, while dwelling in heaven, they had committed. This same error in Origen was condemned by **Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis, in book 2 of the *Panarion*; by **Theophilus**, bishop of Alexandria, in his first Paschal [letter]; by **Jerome**, in the epistle to Pammachius; and especially by **Cyril**, bishop of Alexandria — who, in the first book of the commentaries on John, confuted this very dogma with many reasons of no small moment brought forward: which, because thou wilt find them in no one of the school of theologians, it has pleased [me] to append here, for the favor of the studious reader.

First: if the Souls existed before the bodies of men, and — by a certain inclination to evil, as [Origen] himself says — are joined to bodies in place of punishment, how are they said to be *illuminated* when coming into this world?¹ For illumination seems to bring greater grace, and is certainly [a thing] of honor, not of punishment; but he who is honored is not punished, nor is he vexed with torments who partakes of the divine light. Wherefore it is certain that the Soul, which in the body itself is honored, is not punished by [its] conjunction with the body.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** The reason against Origen asserting that they [souls] are thrust into bodies on account of sins committed.

John 1:9. [The margin flags each successive argument (the second through sixth) simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."]

Secondly, it is added, that it would be altogether false that the Soul is illuminated [when] coming into this world — if indeed it was already a mind and an entire intellect beforehand: for if, while it comes into the body, it is illuminated, it is necessary that, before it comes, it lack light. How, therefore, will the intellect be entire and pure, if it then at last began to be illuminated, when it descended into this world and into the mass of the flesh?

Thirdly, if the Soul existed before the body, and — as a pure mind and an entire intellect — was more closely joined to the good itself, but by the depravity and desire of worse things was pressed down to earthly things: how is not a great injury done to it, which — now pressed down in this body — is bidden to live

rightly and not to sin? Whereas it would rather have behooved [it to do so] then, when — not yet bound to a body — it was farther from all perturbation. One certainly could not say either that the fitting occasion for admonishing the soul was unknown to God, or that [the soul] was injuriously handled by him who cannot sin. Fittingly, therefore, and justly, are we bidden not to sin in this flesh, since we began to be at that time in which, together with the body, we came into this world, and, as it were, arrived from a certain [nothingness] out of nothing unto being.

Fourthly, I would gladly ask of him what likelihood the reasoning has, when he says that, on account of the offenses which the Soul had previously committed, it is thrust into a body, that by the experience of things it may learn the baseness of its own concupiscence: how does he not blush to say these things? For it seems rather that [the soul] ought to be freed from depraved thoughts, than to be thrust down into the depth of the basest pleasures — for not thus, but that [other] manner, could have healed it. But if it was thrust into a body in order that it might enjoy the pleasures of the body, and in that manner be the more sickened, then the physician can rightly be accused of the crime as much of ignorance as of injury — [the physician] who thought that the sick [soul] could be healed by that method, if she were driven by injury into greater and more numerous offenses. But if [it was done] that he might make an end of her sinning: how did he think she would rather emerge from the utmost depth of misery and of desire, than [that], at the very beginning of evils — when she lacked the tinder of sin, that is, the body — she would retain her state with a small chastisement?

Fifthly, besides these things: if the Soul offended before the body, and was joined to a body in order to pay the penalties, it would certainly behoove that believers, who by faith are freed from sins, should straightway be freed from the punishment — that is, from the body. For how, tell me, I pray, would the Soul be understood to have thoroughly obtained the remission of sins, when it is still held enclosed in the body on account of sin? But we see it happen far otherwise: for not only do the faithful not straightway fly forth from [their] bodies, but even, by the profession of the resurrection and by faith, they believe that they shall live immortally with [their] bodies. Not, therefore, is the body joined to the Soul for torment — especially since it has been so divinely honored that it both attests the omnipotence of the Savior who is to raise it again, and is destined to have an immortal life.

Sixthly, add that, according to the law, the greater offenses are punished with death, while those who have sinned more lightly are permitted to live; but those who seem altogether innocent are even affected with rewards, as it were with certain enticements to living. But it would have behooved, if the Soul was joined to the body in order to pay the penalties of things committed, that wicked men should rather be invited to live, so that they might be the more vexed by the mass of the body; and that the innocent, on the contrary, should the sooner [be freed] from this body — that is, from the punishment —² →

◇ **2. Right margin:** The sixth reason.

[...continues on folio 591 (PDF p. 408): the rest of Cyril's sixth reason and his remaining arguments against Origen (Annotatio CLXXXV).]

*(printed folio 591 [PDF p. 408]. **Annot. CLXXXV** (Ps 65:11): Cyril of Alexandria's reasons 6–17 against Origen's pre-existence of souls — the body is a divine gift, not a punishment (Abraham, Moses, Hannah, Hezekiah, Daniel, and Paul as witnesses) → folio 592.)*

(folio 591, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXV (continued)

that is, from the punishment.¹ But the law would justly have ordered the homicide, and others of this kind, to die, and the just to be adorned with honors. Falsely, therefore, is it said that Souls are attached to bodies for the sake of punishment.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Each of Cyril's successive arguments is flagged in the margin simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."

Seventhly, let him say, I pray: if the body is attached to the Soul for punishment, what good has the Savior conferred on us — death being destroyed, and immortality bestowed on the body through the resurrection? We ought rather to give thanks to the perpetual corruption of the body, [as the thing] setting an end to the punishment, than to our Lord Jesus Christ (whom we believe to have bestowed resurrection on [our] bodies): but the Church does not do so; rather it gives thanks to Christ, esteeming him Savior in very deed, because he freed us from death. Not, therefore, were bodies given to Souls for punishment; for, if it were so, the resurrection would bring greater evils upon us, enclosing the wretched Souls in bodies perpetually, and driving [them] back thither whence they had escaped through death. But [the body] was given by Christ as nothing evil, but for the renovation of nature, as a singular gift: not for a penalty were bodies given to souls.

Eighthly, a certain prophet, announcing to us a singular joy, cried out: "*The dead shall rise, and they shall be raised up who are in the tombs; and all who are in the earth shall exult.*"² [But if the body were a punishment,] it ought rather to have been said that they would be affected with great sadness, returning again into bodies; or, if he truly wished to affect the human race with joy, he would have affirmed that the dead were not to rise, but that the nature of the flesh was given over to perpetual corruption. But since, breathed upon by the divine Spirit, he announces the resurrection of the flesh unto joy — we are not annexed to the body for punishment, in whose immortality we are bidden to rejoice and exult.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Daniel 12:2.

Ninthly, it is added, that God, when he blessed the blessed Abraham, promised that his [offspring] would be innumerable, like the stars of heaven.³ Wherefore, if the Soul is introduced into the body as into a punishment, then [God] promises a throng of souls divinely damned, and, as it were, of fugitives from the good, and slaves of malignity, and rather a seed of malediction than of benediction: but in very deed Abraham was blessed by God; therefore the conjunction of body and Soul is free from all fault.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Genesis 15:5.

Tenthly, similarly, that divine man Moses, when not without cause he had marveled at the multitude of the Jews, said: "*For behold, ye are this day as a multitude, like the stars of heaven*"; and, praying, he added: "*May the Lord God of your fathers add to this number many thousands.*"⁴ Which thing, if souls fallen into bodies are [thereby] punished, ought not to have been desired by Moses, but rather repelled by [his] prayer and intercession to God; yet it was a thing to be desired (for we do not say that Moses was some empty [foolish] man). Falsely, therefore, and out of themselves — not out of the Scriptures — do wicked men devise falsities of this kind.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Deuteronomy 1:10–11.

Eleventhly, we are not ignorant that nothing is granted by God to those who ask amiss: "*For ye ask,*" he says, "*and receive not, because ye ask amiss.*"⁵ If, therefore, incarnation is given to the Soul for the paying of penalties, as [Origen] says, then Hannah, the daughter of Phanuel, sinned not a little, demanding a son from God by long prayer;⁶ for she was asking first the fall of a soul, then [its] punishment. And if the woman, as a human [being], erred, how did she prevail upon God? For the woman could not conceive in the womb unless a Soul had offended in the heavens — so that, on account of [its] offense, entering the womb of the woman, it might assume a body. But God had been [successfully] entreated, because she asked well. Not, therefore, are [souls] joined to flesh because we sinned beforehand — inasmuch as we did not exist before the body.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** James 4:3.

◇ 6. **Left margin:** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 1:11.

Twelfthly, if we are attached to the body for the sake of punishment: why did Hezekiah, a holy and upright man, ask for the prolongation of this life?⁷ Or how did God, moved by his piety and tears, add to him fifteen years in the place of a benefit? For [God] would seem to have conferred on him rather a calamity and a torment than a gift and a grace — if these trifles [of Origen] have anything of truth. But certainly the prolongation of life was a gift and a grace: not, therefore, are bodies given to Souls for punishment.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Isaiah 38.

Thirteenthly, if the body was given to the Soul for punishment: God repaid an empty grace, who led Jeremiah out of the pit — [Jeremiah] whom he promises would escape the assault of the Chaldeans and would live longer⁸ — whereas he ought rather, if he wished to honor him, to have freed him as soon as possible from the vexation of the body. Nor, besides, did he impart any good to those three young men, whom he saved from the Babylonian flame,⁹ nor to Daniel, whom he snatched from the ferocity of the lions.¹⁰ But this is altogether false: for [God] is praised, and thanks are given to him, because he conferred on them a chief benefit; false, therefore, is also that [premise] from which this follows.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Jeremiah 37:20.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Daniel 3:94.

◇ 10. **Right margin:** Daniel [in the lions' den].

Fourteenthly, add that, before the tribunal of the Lord, all our works shall lie open, that each one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he has done, whether good or evil.¹¹ If, therefore, retribution shall be made for the works which we have done, wrongly or otherwise, with the body — and there shall be no mention of those things which we did, well or ill, before the body — how do they dare to say that the Soul existed before the body, if only those things are inquired into which it did with the body?

◇ 11. **Right margin:** 2 Corinthians 5:10.

Fifteenthly, how does the same Paul say: "*Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God*"?¹² For if bodies are given to Souls for punishment, how do we offer to God, for an odor of sweetness, that through which we are punished? Or how shall that possess virtue which, born for punishing, has driven great roots in sin?

◇ 12. **Right margin:** Romans 12:1.

Sixteenthly, on account of the transgression of the first man, corruption invaded our race, as Paul says: "*But death reigned from Adam unto Moses*"; and he affirms that death reigned even over those who had not sinned.¹³ If a mortal body is attached to us because of ancient offenses, how did they "not sin," if on account of sins they fell into a body?

◇ 13. **Right margin:** Romans 5:14.

Seventeenthly, concerning a certain man blind from his mother's womb, the disciples asked the Savior, saying: "*Rabbi, who sinned — this man, or his parents — that he should be born blind?*"¹⁴ For, since it is written in the prophetic books that God repays the sins of the parents upon the children,¹⁵ the Apostles thought for this cause that that man had been born blind. What, then, [says] Christ? "*Neither did this man sin,*" he says, "*nor his parents; but that the works of God might be made manifest in him.*"¹⁶ But how does he assert that they did not sin — who, since they were men, undoubtedly could not but have erred? It is manifest
→

◇ 14. **Right margin:** John 9:2.

◇ 15. **Right margin:** Exodus 20:5.

◇ 16. **Right margin:** John 9:3.

[...continues on folio 592 (PDF p. 409): the close of Cyril's seventeenth reason and the remainder of his confutation of Origen (Annotatio CLXXXV).]

(printed folio 592 [PDF p. 409]. *Annot. CLXXXV–CLXXXVI* (Ps 65:11–68:2): Cyril's confutation of Origen closes (reasons 18–23); then Hilary of Poitiers on whether Christ's humanity could grieve and fear, or took hunger, sorrow, and fear only voluntarily → folio 593.)

(folio 592, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXV (continued)

that is, of Christ.¹ For in this manner the integrity of truth will be discerned in the words of the Truth.

◇ 1. **Left/right margin:** Cyril's successive arguments are each flagged in the margin simply with "Ratio" — "a reason."

Eighteenthly, it is added, that Isaiah, showing for what cause the earth was made, says: "*It was not created in vain, but that it might be inhabited*";² and it can fittingly be inhabited not by bare spirits, nor by incorporeal souls, but by ensouled bodies. From which it follows: if we grant that Souls pre-existed and, offending, glide down into bodies, [then we grant] that they offend by the very will of God — namely, that there might be men by whom the world might be inhabited: but this is altogether false; the other [alternative], therefore, is true.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Isaiah 45:18 [printed "Isa. 62, 4"].

Nineteenthly, add, that Wisdom, the artificer of all things, is introduced in the book of Proverbs saying words of this kind concerning herself: "*I was [that] in whom [he] rejoiced*" — namely, the creator of all things — "*daily I was delighted before him at all times, when, the world being finished, he rejoiced, and was delighted over the sons of men.*"³ If, therefore, God the creator rejoiced over man, how are they not mad who think that Souls are thrust into bodies for [their] sins? For if he rejoices because they pay penalties through bodies, he will not be good, who triumphs in the punishment of others; but he himself is good by nature, and the producer of good creatures: not, therefore, are bodies an instrument of punishing, as many falsely proclaim.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Proverbs 8:30–31.

Twentiethly, if the Souls which had offended before the bodies are punished by being annexed to bodies, why was the flood sent against the impious, and Noah the just saved in the retribution of [his] faith?⁴ For the contrary ought to have happened — that the just should the sooner be loosed from the body, but the wicked be tormented a longer time by the mass of the body. But the just Lord punished the impious with death, [and] honored the just [man] with longer spaces of this life: false, therefore, is the opinion, and to be cast utterly out of our minds.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Genesis 6; Genesis 6:9.

Twenty-first, why did the Savior raise up Lazarus, whom he loved, and lead back into punishments the friend [who had been] freed from punishments?⁵ But he raised him up, honoring [the one] whom he loved. Against the truth, therefore, is it said that Souls offended before the bodies.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** [Lazarus:] John 11.

Twenty-second, add, that if it were so, this rational animal, man, and the nature of man, would seem to have been produced through sin; but through sin, again, death entered into the world — wherefore sin would seem repugnant to itself, since it dissolves the former by the latter. Satan also would be divided against himself: how, then, would his kingdom stand?⁶ But these things are false: true, therefore, are those which are opposed to them.

◇ 6. **Left margin:** Luke 11:18.

Lastly, the Church denies that death was produced by God;⁷ for the Scripture confirms that it came into the world by the envy of the Devil.⁸ But if the body is joined to the soul in order to punish the soul, why is the Devil blamed, who by death dissolves the punishment of the soul? And why do we give thanks to the Savior,

who by the resurrection restores [our] bodies to us again? But rightly do we both give, and owe, thanks to the Savior, who freed us by his own blood from the corruption which the envy of the Devil brought upon us. Not, therefore, are bodies an instrument of punishment, nor could Souls sin before bodies, when they did not [yet] exist.

◇ 7. **Left margin:** Wisdom 1:13.

◇ 8. **Left margin:** Wisdom 2:24.

Annotation CLXXXVI

"Save me, O God, for the waters have come in even unto my soul." — Psalm 68:2

Whether Christ's humanity was, by its own nature, capable of grief and misery.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, inserted into the explanation of this Psalm several sentences by which he seems to hint that the humanity of Christ was, by its own nature, free from grief and misery — and that hunger, thirst, sorrow, fear, and the other infirmities of soul and body were not natural to him, but voluntarily assumed for our sake. For in the preface of the Psalm he thus speaks: *"Having thus gone through the lot of all human passions, he speaks and grieves according to our infirmities [which he] took upon [him] — himself indeed placed outside the necessity of fear and of grief, yet accommodating himself to these things which he assumed: that he who was born a man of our flesh might speak out of the complaints of our griefs and the prayer of [our] infirmity."* And after these things, expounding that [verse], *"In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink,"*⁹ he added: *"But he said, prophetically, that he thirsted — because all our [passions] which were in him are infirmities not natural, but assumed."* This matter he pursues far more copiously and clearly in book 10 *On the Trinity*, where he strives to show that there was in Christ no fear of death — taking his argument from this: that if Christ had dreaded death, he would have feared either on account of the spirit or of the body, neither of which could happen. For, according to the spirit, he desired death with so great an ardor of mind that he could not fear it; and, according to the flesh, he likewise could not fear — inasmuch as he knew that he had flesh by nature impassible, which, although enemies could cut and pierce with blows, strokes, and wounds, yet they were not able to affect with pain. His words are these: *"Perhaps there will be [some] who think that Christ feared death: let them determine for what thing they judge death was terrible [to him] — for the spirit, or for the body? If death is terrible to the spirit, [then] Christ would fear the infernal chaos, while Lazarus was rejoicing in the bosom of Abraham — [but] these things are foolish and ridiculous: [to think] that he — having power to lay down the Soul and to resume [it] — should fear to die, [he who was] to die, for the sacrament of human life, under the liberty of his own will. There is no fear of death in the will of one dying and having power; nor, in the hand of death, does [it] long remain: because both the will of dying and the power of reviving are outside the nature of fear, since death cannot be feared, [being] both in the will of dying and in the power of living. But perhaps the pain of the body hanging on the cross, and the violent bonds of the binding cords, and the wounds of the driven-in nails, are [matter] for fear: let us see, therefore, of what body Christ is — into which, although a blow might fall, or a wound descend, or the knots press together, or the suspension lift [him] up, these things would indeed bring the assault of suffering, yet would not inflict the pain of suffering — as some dart, or [something] piercing water, or pricking fire, or wounding the air. All these [agents] their nature inflicts, that it may pierce, prick, and wound; but the suffering inflicted does not retain its nature in this [case], since it is not in the nature [of things] for water to be bored, or fire to be pricked, or the air to be wounded — although it be the nature of the dart to wound, and" →*

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Psalm 68:22.

[...continues on folio 593 (PDF p. 410): the rest of Hilary's argument that Christ's flesh, of its own nature, could receive the assault but not the pain of the passion (Annotatio CLXXXVI).]

(printed folio 593 [PDF p. 410]. **Annot. CLXXXVI–CLXXXVII** (Ps 68:2–70:15): Hilary on Christ's impassible flesh (defended and faulted; Justinian's incorruptibility edict; the Escharodocite heresy); then whether commerce is sinful — Cassiodorus: the trader's vice, not trade, is condemned → folio 594.)

(folio 593, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXVI (continued)

to prick, and to bore. The Lord Jesus indeed suffered — while he is struck, while he is hung up, while he is crucified, while he dies; but the suffering, rushing upon the body of the Lord, did not exercise the nature of suffering: for although it raged with a penal ministry, yet the power of the body, without the sensation of pain, received into itself the force of the pain raging [against it]. That body of the Lord would indeed have had the nature of our grief, if our body has this of nature: to tread the waves, and walk upon the floods, and not be weighed down by [its] entrance [into water], nor yield with the footsteps of one standing on the water — [and] to penetrate even solid things, nor be barred by the walls of a closed house. But truly, if this alone be the nature of the Lord's body — that it is borne by its own power upon moist things, and stands upon liquids, and runs through structures — how is the flesh, conceived of the Holy Spirit, judged [to act] according to the nature of a human body? That flesh is from the heavens, and that man is from God, having indeed a body for suffering (and he suffered), but not having a nature for grieving; for that body is of its own proper nature — [the body] which is transformed into heavenly glory on the mountain, which by its touch puts fevers to flight, which from its own spittle forms eyes," etc.

In the commentaries on Matthew also there are certain sayings of this author, not abhorrent from the sense of the proposed narration, which — studying brevity — I omit. I pass over, too, several sentences of Jerome and Augustine that lend color to this dogma, which thou wilt more conveniently inspect above, in Annotation 162, and below, in Annotation 115 of the following book.

Peter [Lombard], bishop of Paris, in book 3 of the Sentences, distinction 15, interpreting Hilary's discourse amicably and benevolently,¹ says that he took away from Christ neither the true sense of fear, grief, and suffering, nor the natural necessity of fearing, grieving, and suffering, but [only] the *cause* and *merit* [desert] of suffering, grieving, and fearing, which is in us. For in us there is a natural necessity of suffering, brought in on account of Adam's sin; but in Christ there is truly a natural necessity of suffering — not inflicted by a defect of human conception, but voluntarily assumed of his own free will.

◇ 1. Left margin: Hilary excused.

Claudianus [Mamertus], bishop of Vienne in Gaul, who preceded Peter by nearly seven hundred years, in the second book *On the State of the Soul*, so excuses Hilary that he pronounces him plainly to have erred, in these words: "*Hilary of Poitiers, among the many [excellent things] of his lofty disputations, thinking in a certain [matter] otherwise [than truly], disputed these two things contrary to the truth: one, that he said nothing incorporeal is created; the other, that Christ felt nothing of grief in the passion. But since he abolished the defect of this opinion by the virtue of [his] confession, he so sustains the pen of reprehension that he suffers no loss of merit. Wherefore it is fitting to give faith to the expounders of the divine Scriptures [only] so far as they accord with the tenor of the same truth.*"

Justinian Augustus, a man in other respects Catholic, so adhered to the Hilarian dogma that he commanded by an imperial edict that it be publicly taught in the church by the priests, and received by all the people, and firmly believed.² A witness of this thing is Evagrius, in book 4 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 39, writing thus: "*Justinian the Emperor put forth an edict in which he decreed the body of the Lord [to be] incorruptible, and said that it was by no means capable of the natural and blameless passions, but that the Lord ate before the passion in the same manner as he ate after the resurrection; and that his most sacred body [received] no mutation or alteration from the very [moment] in which it was formed in the womb,*

neither in the voluntary nor in the natural passions, nor even after the resurrection: to which opinion he compelled the priests everywhere to assent. Against him wrote **Anastasius**, bishop of Antioch,³ and demonstrated to him, with great wisdom and eloquence, that the divine Apostles and the holy Fathers both knew and handed down that the body of Christ was corruptible [and subject] to the natural and blameless passions." These things Evagrius.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The Emperor Justinian denied that the body of Christ was capable of grief, or of any mutation.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Anastasius, bishop of Antioch, refuted the error of the Emperor Justinian.

John Damascene, in the book *On the Hundred Heresies*, chapter 84, reports that this error was peculiar to the Escharodocite heretics,⁴ in these words: "*The Escharodocitae, who are also called Gaianitae, venerate the body of the Lord [as] incorruptible from its very formation; and they confess indeed that the Lord sustained suffering — I mean hunger, and famine, and thirst, and toil — but they say that he sustained [them] not according to the manner which is in us, nor as [one] serving the laws of nature.*" I suspect that Damascene imposed on those heretics the surname *Escharodocitae* for this reason: that they ascribed to Christ a certain insensible and impassible hardness of flesh, which — however much bruised by blows and wounds — would suffer nothing of pain. For among the Greeks ἐσχάρτα signifies the callous hardness of flesh drawn over by inveterate wounds, which has no sense of pain; and δοκητής [means] "an approver [one who holds an opinion]": so that *Escharodocita* sounds nothing else than "an approver [maintainer] of a hard and impassible flesh."

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The Escharodocite heretics.

Annotation CLXXXVII

"Because I have not known letters [learning]." — Psalm 70:15

Whether trading [commerce] is condemned.

The explanation of **Cassiodorus** on this little verse St. **Thomas**, in the Second Part of the Second Part, question 77, article 4, brings forward in [his] argumentation, as [something] at first sight favoring the error of those who assert that traders — selling dearer than they buy — are to be altogether cast out of the Church. He cites the author's [Cassiodorus's] words, alluding to this, in this manner: "*For I have not known letters' — or 'trading,' according to another reading: what,*" he says, "*is trading, other than to procure more cheaply, and to sell more dearly?*"; and he adds: "*Such traders the Lord cast out of the temple; but no one is cast out of the temple except on account of some sin: therefore such trading is a sin.*" But if the words themselves, as they are in Cassiodorus, be diligently inspected, they bring their own interpretation with them — since the author himself interprets his own opinion clearly enough, speaking thus: "*For I have known tradings': this part of the verse, unless it be well examined, is recognized to admit a question. For if every trader is to be altogether condemned, then neither do those escape this penalty who are known to exercise the remaining crafts. For what else is trading, than to wish to sell more dearly the things that can be procured more cheaply? Then, in the Lives of the Fathers, we read that Paphnutius, that most holy man, was by a revelation compared to a trader; and we find even today, in the Church of God, [some] who indeed handle merchandise, yet are strong in the highest faith: for the worst act, not the honest thing, is condemned — just as we read that the rich man does not enter into the kingdom of heaven, although the patriarchs Job, Abraham, Isaac, [and] Jacob were abounding also in riches. Those traders, therefore, are esteemed abominable, who — least of all considering the justice of the Lord — through immoderate" →*

[...continues on folio 594 (PDF p. 411): the rest of Cassiodorus distinguishing lawful commerce from the covetous trader's sin (Annotatio CLXXXVII).]

(printed folio 594 [PDF p. 411]. **Annot. CLXXXVII–CXC** (Ps 70:15–89:4): *commerce closes; whether Hell's penalty exceeds the sin (only in duration); Jerome's punctuation against Origen; and whether the world lasts only six thousand years (Jerome, Justin, Irenaeus, Lactantius) → folio 595.*)

(folio 594, left column → right column)

Annotation CLXXXVII (continued)

gain are polluted, loading their merchandise more with perjuries than with prices — such the Lord cast out of the temple, saying: "*Make not the house of my Father a house of trading, and a den of thieves,*" etc.¹ On this subject, read Annotation 95 of book 6.

◇ 1. Left margin: John 2:16.

Annotation CLXXXVIII

"From usuries and iniquity he shall redeem their souls." — Psalm 71:14

Whether the punishment of Hell exceeds the gravity of the sin.

Strabo [Walafrid Strabo], in his Ordinary Gloss, weighing what the usuries are which David here mentions, says that the usuries are the sins, which bring forth for us punishments with much and great interest: "For God exacts more in punishments than has been committed in faults." But these words are taken from the commentaries of Augustine, expounding this little verse. St. **Thomas**, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 46, question 2, article 2, noted this sentence as [being] misappropriated by those who think that God punishes the sins of men beyond [their] desert; and he says it must be understood not according to an excess of the punishment beyond the fault in the intensity and gravity of the penalty, but according to the duration of time: because for a momentary delectation an eternal punishment is inflicted. For it is established that the duration of the punishment be not proportioned to the duration of the fault, but that the intensity of the punishment correspond to the enormity of the fault² — as has been shown elsewhere.

◇ 2. Left margin: The intensity of the punishment corresponds to the gravity of the fault.

Annotation CLXXXIX

"Lord, thou hast been made our refuge from generation to generation; before the mountains were made, or the earth and the world were formed, from everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God." — Psalm 89:1–2

Whether the Soul was created before bodies.

The Interpretation of **Origen** — the author's name being suppressed — **Jerome** reprehends, writing thus in his explanation of this psalm to Cyprian: "*This passage certain [men] subvert by a depraved punctuation — especially those who wish that souls existed before man was created in the number of the sixth day. For thus they read and punctuate: 'Lord, thou art made a refuge for us, from generation unto generation. Before the mountains were established, and the earth and the world were formed.' 'From everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God' — for thus they expound it: If the Lord was a refuge of men before the mountains were established and the earth and the world were formed, then Souls existed in the heavens before the bodies of men were formed. But we, as we have set forth the reading, ought so to punctuate: 'Before the mountains were established, and the earth and the world were formed, from everlasting and unto everlasting thou art God' — so that our refuge was not before the foundation of the world (we who did not yet exist), but [the sense is] that God, from eternity unto eternity, is always God.*"

Annotation CXC

"For a thousand years in thy sight are as yesterday, which is past." — Psalm 89:4

Whether the age of the world consists of only six thousand years.

Jerome, in the epistolary exposition of the eighty-ninth Psalm to Cyprian, deduces from the present little verse that all the duration of the present age — from the founding of the world unto the day of judgment — is concluded within the space of six thousand years, writing thus: *"I judge, from this passage and from the epistle which is inscribed with the name of Peter, that a thousand years are wont to be called [as] one day: so that, namely, since the world was fabricated in six days, it is believed to subsist only six thousand years; and afterward comes the sevenfold and eightfold number, in which the true sabbatism is kept, and the purity of circumcision is restored — whence also by the eight beatitudes the rewards of good works are promised. But Peter writes in this manner: 'Let this one thing not escape you, dearly beloved: that one day with God is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.'³ To the same sentence he alludes in the commentary on Micah, chapter 4, where he shows that the sixth and last hour of the sixth millennium is the time of the faith of the gentiles, in these words: 'In the consummation of the ages our Savior appeared, and came at the eleventh hour to hire laborers; and, his passion being completed, John says: "Little children, it is the last hour."⁴ For if, in the six thousand years, five hundred years be divided among the single hours of the day, the last hour, consequently, is the time of the faith of the gentiles."*

◇ 3. Right margin: 2 Peter 3:8.

◇ 4. Right margin: 1 John 2:18.

This was of old the opinion of many Fathers of great name — chiefly of **Justin**, philosopher and martyr, in the book of Questions to the Gentiles, question 17, writing thus: *"From very many words it may be understood that those speak truly who hand down that there are now six thousand years [of] time from the founding of the world. For sometimes Paul says: 'In these last times he has spoken to us through the Son';⁵ but elsewhere, 'Upon whom the ends of the ages have come';⁶ and sometimes also, 'When the fulfilment of the times came.'⁷ But all these things were said in the six-thousandth year."*

◇ 5. Right margin: (a) Hebrews 1:2.

◇ 6. Right margin: (b) 1 Corinthians 10:11.

◇ 7. Right margin: (c) Galatians 4:4.

Irenaeus, after him, in the fifth book *Against Heresies*, the last chapter, speaks to the same sentence thus: *"In however many days this world was made, in so many thousand years is it consummated; and for this cause the scripture of Genesis says: 'And the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the ornament of them. And God finished on the sixth day all his works which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his works which he had made.'⁸ But this is both a narration of things done — in what manner they were made — and a prophecy of things to come: for the day of the Lord is as a thousand years; and in six days were consummated the things that were made. It is manifest, therefore, that the consummation of these is the six-thousandth year."*

◇ 8. Right margin: Genesis 2:1–2.

Lactantius, in book 7 of the *Institutions*, chapter 7, subscribes to Irenaeus in these words: *"Let the philosophers know, therefore, who enumerate thousands of ages from the beginning of the world, that the six-thousandth year is not yet concluded; which number being completed, the consummation must needs come, and the state of human things be reformed for the better: the argument of which is, that God consummated the world — this admirable work of nature — as is contained in the secret [pages] of holy Scripture, in the space of six days; and he sanctioned the seventh day, in which he rested from [his] works. But this is the day of the Sabbath, which in the tongue of the Hebrews took its name from the number [seven] — whence the sevenfold number is legitimate and full: for there are also seven days, by whose alternating revolution the cycles of years are completed; and [there are] seven stars, which are called Wandering [planets], whose unequal courses and unequal motion are believed to effect the varieties of things and of*

times. Therefore, since all the works of God were perfected in six days, it is necessary that [the world] remain in this state through six ages — that is, six thousand years; for a great day of God is bounded by a circle of a thousand years, as the prophet indicates, saying, 'Before thy eyes, O Lord, a thousand years are as one day.'⁹ And as God labored in the making of so great things, so also his religion and truth must needs labor in these six thousand years, malice prevailing and dominating; and again, since" →

◇ 9. Right margin: Psalm 89:4.

[...continues on folio 595 (PDF p. 412): the rest of Lactantius on the seventh millennial rest and the world's renewal (Annotatio CXC).]

(printed folio 595 [PDF p. 412]. **Annot. CXC–CXCI** (Ps 89:4–98:5): the six-thousand-year age of the world closes (the millennial Sabbath; the Hebrew "tradition of Elias"; Sixtus's 5528-year reckoning, refusing to affirm rashly); Jerome on Ps 90 vs. Giustiniani; and Calvin on Bernard and Augustine on merit (both → Annot. 195).)

(folio 595, left column → right column)

Annotation CXC (continued)

since, his works being perfected, God rested on the seventh day, and blessed it: it is necessary that, at the end of the six-thousandth year, all malice be abolished from the earth, and that justice reign for a thousand years, and there be tranquillity and rest from the labors which the world so long endures." These things Lactantius.

Hilary, in the seventeenth canon on Matthew, expounding that [verse], "And after six days he was transfigured," says:¹ "When, after six days, the Lord's glory is shown in [his] appearance, there is prefigured — the times, namely, of six thousand years being rolled out — the honor of the heavenly kingdom."

◇ 1. Left margin: Matthew 17:1–2.

Augustine, in book 20 *On the City of God*, chapter 7, explaining the thousand years during which John foresaw that Satan would be bound, wrote thus: "The 'thousand years' can, as far as occurs to me, be understood in two ways: either because this thing is done in the last thousand years — that is, in the sixth millennium of years, as [on] the sixth day, whose later spaces are now unrolling, the Sabbath being thereafter to follow, which has no evening (namely, the rest of the saints, which has no end) — so that he called this millennium, as it were the last part of the day (which will remain unto the end of the age), 'a thousand years,' by that manner of speaking whereby the part is signified by the whole; or else he certainly put 'a thousand years' for all the years of this age, that by a perfect number the very fulness of time might be denoted."

Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, added to this number five hundred years, on the authority of illustrious Fathers of Greece. For he, when in the book which he entitled *On the Theory of Ecclesiastical Things* he inquired the cause why the pontiff, blessing the people, raises [his] fingers fitted to the computation of the number six thousand five hundred, speaks thus: "That the pontiff signs the people, hints at this: that the future coming of Christ will be in the six-thousand-five-hundredth year — from the computation of the fingers, signifying six thousand five hundred." This also **Hippolytus** of Rome and Saint **Cyril** say in their books on Antichrist — that in the six-thousand-five-hundredth year the [second] coming will be; and likewise **Chrysostom**.

These things the Christian authors have handed down concerning the duration of the world. But among the Gentiles, that Hydaspes, Mercurius Trismegistus, and the Sibyls handed down the same, Lactantius is witness. And among the Hebrews there is had a most ancient tradition of the prophet Elias, in the Talmudic volumes, in the fourth order, in the fourth tractate whose title is *Sanhedrin* — that is, *Judgment* — in these

words:

ב אלפים ימות המשיח: ב אלפים תורה: ב אלפים תהו: שתא אלפי שני להוי עלמא וחד חרב

that is (*scitta alphe sene lehene alma, vechad chareb, be alaphim tohu, be alaphim tora, be alaphim iemot Hamasciach*): "Six thousand years shall the world be, and then it shall be destroyed: two thousand [of] emptiness, two thousand [of the] Law, two thousand [of the] days of the Messiah."

Ambrose, in the seventh book of the commentaries on Luke, expounding that [saying] of Matthew, "After six days he was transfigured,"² indicates that he does not accept such a period of the world's age: because in his own times more than six thousand years were already reckoned — by a reasoning, as I judge, entered upon from a certain computation of the years of the world peculiar to himself. For, according to the calculation of the Hebrew verity, in Ambrose's time there had not yet passed four thousand four hundred years.³ For the Hebrews reckon, from the founding of the world unto Christ, 3962 years; and from Christ unto the present year 1566, in which we write these things, 5528 years. Whence, if these things be true, at this time we are distant from the consummation of the world by 476 years — whether it be so, posterity itself shall see. We affirm nothing rashly, lest we fall into the error of Judas and of Lactantius:⁴ of whom the former wrote that the fall of the world would be present in his own time — that is, in the two-hundredth year from the nativity of Christ; and the latter judged that from his own age unto the destruction of the world there would be not more than two hundred years — deceived by the false computations of the Greeks, which then almost all the ecclesiastical writers followed.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Matthew 17:1–2.

◇ 3. **Left/right margin:** The Hebrews reckon, from the founding of the world unto Christ, 3962 years.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** The errors of Judas and Lactantius concerning the end of the world.

Augustine, in the exposition of the present Psalm, refutes those who wrested the proposed little verse to an opinion of this kind, in these words: "*Men have dared to presume the knowledge of the times — which, to the disciples desiring to know it, the Lord [refused], saying, 'It is not yours to know the times which the Father hath put in his own power';⁵ and they have determined that this age can be finished in six thousand years, as [in] six days: nor have they attended to what is said, 'As one day, which is past.' For it was not, when this was said, [that] only a thousand years had passed; and that which ought most of all to have admonished them — lest they be deluded by the uncertainty of the times — is that [phrase], 'As a watch in the night.' For, just as they seem to have opined something plausible concerning the six days (on account of the first six days in which God perfected his works), [not] so also can the six watches — that is, eighteen hours — be adapted to that opinion.*"

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Acts 1:7.

Annotation CXCI

"He that dwelleth in the help of the Most High." — Psalm 90:1

On the theme of Psalm 90.

The commentaries on the Psalms inscribed to **Jerome** have, under this little verse, these words: "*'Help' [adiutorium] is interpreted 'Ezra'; hence Ezra is called βοηθός [helper] — this is he who led back the people from the Babylonian captivity, and brought them into the land of promise.*" **Augustine** [Giustiniani], bishop of Nebbio, in his *Octaplum*, refutes Jerome, [alleging] that by these words he denied this Psalm to have been said of Christ, [affirming it said] rather of Ezra. But I do not see whence Augustine could rightly elicit a sense of this kind⁶ — especially since, in the very beginning of the explanation, Jerome most evidently pronounces that the present psalm regards Christ, thus beginning: "*This psalm has no title, because it is sung of [Christ] the head and of his members. The head is in heaven, the members on earth. And it is properly understood of the fast, and of that temptation of the desert: for the prophet foresaw that Christ was to come*

in the flesh, to be tempted by the Devil in the desert."

◇ 6. Right margin: St. Jerome is defended.

Annotation CXCII

"Because he hoped in me, I will deliver him." — Psalm 90:14

On the merit of good works.

A testimony of **Bernard**, from the fifteenth sermon on the ninetieth Psalm, John Calvin the heretic wrests against the merits of good works: the right interpretation of which thou hast below, in Annotation 195.

Annotation CXCIII

"Exalt ye the Lord our God." — Psalm 98:5

On the merit of good works.

Augustine, expounding this, seems to bring forward certain words against the merits of good works: concerning which, see below, Annotation 195 of this book.

(printed folio 596 [PDF p. 413]. *Annot. CXCIV–CXC V (Ps 98:5–102:4): Augustine's "the flesh profits nothing, understand it spiritually" abused by the Sacramentarians (vindicated by Peter Lombard); then the great crux, whether good works are meritorious (the "Annot. 195" cross-referenced above) — Bodius turns Augustine's "God crowns his own gifts" against merit, but Sixtus shows Augustine defends the merits of the faithful and crushes only Pelagian pride.)*

(folio 596, left column → right column)

Annotation CXCIV

"Adore ye the footstool of his feet." — Psalm 98:5

On the Eucharist.

The words of **Augustine** expounding this passage, the Sacramentarians of our times usurp; and of old the heretics usurped [them] who excluded the body of Christ from the sacrament of the Eucharist. The text of the words is this: "*When thou adorest the footstool of his feet, remain not in the flesh by [thy] thought, and be not left un-quickened by the Spirit; for the Spirit quickens, but the flesh profits nothing. But at that time, when the Lord commended this, he had spoken of his flesh, and had said, 'Unless one shall have eaten my flesh, he shall not have life eternal in himself';¹ certain disciples were scandalized, and said, 'This is a hard saying.' They took it foolishly, they thought it carnally, and supposed that the Lord was about to cut off certain little pieces from his body and give them to them; and they said, 'This is a hard saying.' They themselves were hard, not the saying. But he instructed them, and said to them: 'It is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.' Understand spiritually that which I have spoken: it is not this body which ye see that ye are to eat, nor are ye to drink that blood which they will shed who will crucify me. I have commended to you some sacrament; understood spiritually, it will quicken you. And although it is necessary that it be visibly celebrated, yet it must be understood invisibly.*" **Peter** [Lombard], bishop of Paris, vindicated this passage from the wrenching of the heretics, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 10. See below, Annotation 196 of book 6.

◇ 1. Left margin: John 6:53.

Annotation CXC V

"Who crowneth thee in mercy and compassions." — Psalm 102:4

Whether good works are meritorious.

The sentence of **Augustine** from the exposition of this little verse, **Hermann Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, reckons among those by which the Lutherans impugn the merits of good works. It is of this kind: "[We] who in ourselves are conquered, in him have conquered; therefore he crowns thee, because he crowns his own gifts, not thy merits. 'I have labored more than all,' says the Apostle; but see what he added: 'Yet not I, but the grace of God with me.'"² And in the exposition of Psalm 98, upon that [verse], "Exalt the Lord our God," he says: "God, who is about to crown in us not our merits, but his own gifts — how much ought he to be exalted by us? Exalt, therefore, the Lord our God." And in the exposition of Psalm 88 he says: "When a man shall have seen that whatsoever good he has, he has not of himself, but of his God, he sees that all which is praised in him is not of his own merits, but of the mercy of God." And on Psalm 139 he says: "The saints attribute nothing to their own merits: they attribute the whole to nothing but thy mercy, O God." And on Psalm 144, expounding those words, "The Lord is merciful and compassionate," etc., he says:³ "'By grace ye are made safe' — where thou hearest 'grace,' understand 'freely' [gratis]; if therefore freely, thou hast brought nothing, thou hast merited nothing: for if anything is rendered to merits, it is a wage, not grace";⁴ and a little after: "The whole is of mercy; nowhere boast thy merits, because thy very merits are his gifts." And in epistle 105, to Sixtus the presbyter: "When God crowns our merits, he crowns nothing else than his own gifts." And on John, tractate 3: "When, therefore, God bestows the reward of immortality, he crowns his own gifts, not thy merits." And in the fifth book of the Fifty Homilies, homily 14: "We know nothing of thine, prepared by thyself for thyself, except evils; when, therefore, God crowns thy merits, he crowns nothing but his own gifts."

◇ 2. Left margin: 1 Corinthians 15:10.

◇ 3. Left margin: Psalm 144:8.

◇ 4. Left margin: Ephesians 2[:8].

Augustine repeats this same sentence in almost innumerable places, which — lest I be troublesome to the reader — I pass over. Yet not by these words, as the Lutheran heretics falsely pretend, does he condemn the merits of the faithful and of good men (for these he everywhere teaches, establishes, and defends,⁵ always carrying about that [saying] which he uttered in the sermon "On the Season" 162, saying: "God, for the merits of faith and of good works, will give to his faithful the kingdom of heaven"); but by these sayings he casts down the pride of the Pelagians, who boasted that by their own powers and labors — even without the aid of divine grace — they could merit and obtain the crown of eternal felicity. Against so insolent an arrogance, Augustine pronounces that God crowns in us not our merits, but his own gifts — so that by this manner of speaking he hints that human merits are to be considered in two ways:⁶ either inasmuch as they arise from the destitute powers of our nature, with none preceding and none accompanying [them] of the aid of divine grace — and these indeed are worthy of no crown, nor are they crowned in us by God, but enjoy only the empty name of merit; or inasmuch as they arise from the favor of the divine benignity and prevenient grace (we consenting), and are increased (we cooperating) — and these indeed are they which he esteems worthy of eternal rewards, and crowns in us. And that this is his own definition, he himself explains in epistle 105 to Sixtus the presbyter, in these words: "There is no merit of man before grace, whereby he might receive grace; since all our merit is wrought in us by nothing but grace, and since, when God crowns our merits, he crowns nothing else than his own gifts. For as, from the beginning of faith, we obtained mercy — not because we were faithful, but that we might be [so] — so in the end, which will be in life eternal, he will crown us, as it is written: 'In mercy and compassions.' Not in vain, therefore, is it sung to God: 'And his mercy shall follow me.'⁷⁸ Whence also that very eternal life — which surely will be had at the end, without end, and is therefore rendered to preceding merits — nevertheless, because those same merits, to which it is rendered, are not prepared by us through our own sufficiency, but wrought in us through grace, is itself also called grace: for no other reason than that it is given freely — not because it is not given to merits, but

because the very merits, to which it is given, are themselves also [given]." He expresses this same thing more lucidly in the book *On Grace and Free Will*, chapters 6 and 7, saying: "When the Pelagians say that this alone is the grace [given] not according to our merits — that by which sins are remitted to man — but that the [grace] which is given at the end, that is, eternal life, is rendered to our preceding merits: it must be answered to them: If, indeed, they so understood our merits as to acknowledge that these too are gifts of God, that opinion would not be to be reprov'd; but since they so preach human merits as to say that man has them of his own self, the Apostle most rightly answers: 'For who distinguisheth thee? And what hast thou which thou hast not received?'⁹ To one thinking such things, it is most truly said: 'God crowns his own gifts, not thy merits — if thy merits are of thyself; but if [they be] of God, [thy] good merits are [his] gifts: [and so] God crowns thy merits not as thy merits, but as his own gifts.'"

◇ 5. **Right margin:** St. Augustine defends the merits of the faithful.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Human merits are to be considered in two ways.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Psalm 58:11.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Psalm 22:6.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 4:7.

(printed folio 597 [PDF p. 414]. **Annot. CXCVI–CCIII** (Ps 103:30–118:57): eight short annotations — Cajetan on "send forth thy Spirit"; Arnobius on cursing/blessing; Chrysostom on God's "oath" as metaphor; Basil and Chrysostom on grace and the merit of vocation; the count of alphabetic Psalms; Hilary that all the saints pass through the fire; and whether clergy may hold secular possessions → folio 598.)

(folio 597, left column → right column)

Annotation CXCVI

"Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created." — Psalm 103:30

On the Holy Spirit.

Thomas Cajetan is censured by **Ambrose** [Catharinus], bishop of Conza, because in his commentaries on the Psalms he did not interpret this little verse of the Holy Spirit, as most of the saints [Fathers] do, but of the spirit [breath] of animals, or of the soul itself, which is a likeness of the divine Spirit.

Annotation CXCVII

"He loved cursing, and it shall come to him; and he would not [have] blessing, and it shall be put far from him." — Psalm 108:18

On predestination and reprobation.

Arnobius, in the commentaries on the Psalms, brought forward these things to the exposition of this little verse: "He loved the cursing of Adam, which is taken away through Christ — 'and it shall come to him'; he would not [have] the blessing which is brought through Christ — 'and it shall surely be put far from him.' Note that it happened from [free] choice that he would not [have it]" — on account of the heresy which says that God predestined some to blessing, others to cursing; for here [the man] is proved to have the cursing from his own choice [love], and by [his own] unwillingness not to have the reward of his blessing. There are [some] who think that these [words] in a certain manner censure the opinion of Augustine, and of all the schoolmen theologians, concerning eternal predestination and reprobation. See below, Annotation 251 of book 6.

Annotation CXCVIII

"The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent." — Psalm 109:4

On God swearing.

Chrysostom, expounding these words, says that an oath in God is to be understood no otherwise than by a metaphor — just as we also say that there is anger in God. These [words] allude to Chrysostom's teaching concerning the Oath, [as] altogether forbidden to all Christians. See Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CXCIX

"Turn, O my soul, into thy rest." — Psalm 114:7

On the merit of works.

Basil, in the commentaries on the Psalms, upon this passage says: "*Eternal rest is set forth for those who have lawfully striven in this life; which [rest] indeed is rendered not according to the debt and merit of works, but is bestowed, according to the grace of the most magnificent God, on those who have hoped in him.*" The *Collectanea* of Hermann bring forward these words against the merits of holy actions, but violently and perversely, as [they do] the rest. For Basil everywhere proclaims merits,¹ but most of all on Psalm 61, where, expounding that sentence of David, "Because thou renderest to every one according to his works,"² he says: "*With what measure ye shall have measured, the same shall be measured back to you*."³ *thou hast afflicted a brother — expect the [counter]balance; thou hast plundered the goods of inferiors, thou hast calumniated, thou hast lied — expect the retribution of these; for 'what things each one sows, such also shall he reap.'*⁴ *But if anything of good has been done by thee, expect manifold retributions of that also, because he will render to every one according to his works.*" Basil, therefore, did not wish to take away the efficacy of merit, but to extol the immense munificence of God — who compensates the individual merits of our works, not keeping an equality of quantity, but, exceeding the measure of the merits, remunerates our labors, above all condignity, with most ample rewards. Thou hast sentences looking hither above, in Annotation 92.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** St. Basil proclaims the merits of good works.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Psalm 61:13.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Matthew 7:2.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Galatians 6:8.

Annotation CC

"I believed, for which cause I have spoken." — Psalm 115:1

Whether the divine vocation is from the merits of those called.

Chrysostom, expounding these things, seems to establish that the divine vocation is from the dignity and merits of those who have made themselves worthy to be called. For he says: "*If the Father draws, the Son leads, the Spirit illumines: how do they sin who are neither drawn, nor led, nor illumined? Because they do not offer themselves worthy to receive that illumination. See, therefore, that this happened to Cornelius*."⁵ *for he did not find this at home within himself, but God called him, because he himself, anticipating [prevening], rendered himself worthy. For although it is [God's part] to draw and to lead in, yet he requires a soul that will comply, and then applies his aid.*" Wherefore Paul elsewhere says, "*called according to purpose.*"⁶ The sense of these words [thou hast] in Annotation 251 of the sixth book.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Acts 10.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Romans 8:28.

Annotation CCI

"Blessed are the undefiled in the way." — Psalm 118:1

On the number of the alphabetic Psalms.

Hilary, prefacing on this Psalm, handed down that only three Psalms are found among the Hebrews [that are] alphabetic — that is, whose verses begin with the letters arranged according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet — namely Psalm 111, and 112, and 118. But the very truth of the Hebrew Psalter plainly indicates, and Jerome in the epistle to Paula Urbica confirms, that the alphabetic Psalms are five⁷ — namely the three aforesaid, and, besides them, [Psalms] 25 and 34. **Thomas Cajetan**, in the commentaries on the Psalter, to these five adds also two other Psalms arranged according to the series of the alphabet: that is, the thirty-seventh, woven with an interpolated and interrupted alphabet, and [the one] which — [Psalm] 145 — runs on with a continuous alphabet.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** The alphabetic Psalms are five.

Annotation CCII

"My soul hath coveted to desire thy judgments." — Psalm 118:20

Whether all the saints must be purged by the fire of the conflagration.

Hilary, in the commentaries on the Psalms, appending an interpretation to this little verse, seems to intimate that all men — however holy, and Mary herself too, the Mother of God — must be expiated from [their] sins by the pain and punishment of fire in the conflagration of the last judgment. For these things are written by him: "*The Prophet remembers that it is arduous to desire the judgment; for since no living [man] is clean in [God's] sight, how can the judgment be desirable, in which that unwearied fire must be undergone by us — in which those grave punishments, to be expiated from the sins of the soul, must be undergone? A sword passed through the soul of blessed Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed:*⁸ *if, therefore, that Virgin of God, [full of] capacity, is to come into the severity of the judgment, who will dare to desire to be judged by God?*" See above, Annotations 170 and 171.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Luke 2:35.

Annotation CCIII

"My portion, O Lord — I have said [it is] to keep thy law." — Psalm 118:57

Whether the possession of secular things befits the clergy.

Hilary, expounding these things in the commentaries, brings forward some [statements] from which **Erasmus**, in the annotations he published on Hilary, gathers that it is not lawful for priests to retain the possession of secular things. The words of Hilary are these: "*One must renounce the world, and all its things, that God may be our portion; but if ambition detains us, if the care of money occupies [us], if the businesses of family affairs delay [us], the Lord will not be our portion — we [being] held by the possession of secular cares and vices. To Moses, when it had been commanded that he distribute the portions of the [land of] sojourn to the twelve tribes of Israel, [God] thus commanded concerning the Levitical tribe:*" →

[...continues on folio 598 (PDF p. 415): the rest of Hilary (via Erasmus) on the Levites' portion and whether clergy may hold secular possessions (Annotatio CCIII).]

*(printed folio 598 [PDF p. 415]. **Annot. CCIII–CCVIII** (Ps 118:57–129:2): the Levites' portion is God, not earthly goods; Ambrose seeming to forbid all oaths; whether sins are remitted to the still-unbelieving ("faith" = conscience); and three textual notes from Jerome to Marcella — the "sons of the shaken-off," the "labors of thy hands" (καπόός/כפית), and whether the soul was formed before the body → folio 599.)*

(folio 598, left column → right column)

Annotation CCIII (continued)

concerning the Levitical tribe it is commanded: "*To the sons of Levi there shall be no portion, nor lot in the midst of their brethren, because the Lord God is their part.*" To those, therefore, serving God, the law willed [there to be] no earthly portion, because God is their part. The preacher of the Gospel, Peter, also remembers that there was to him no portion of human possession, when to [the beggar] praying for sustenance he answered, "*Gold and silver I have not; but what I have, this I give thee.*"¹ What is that? What is that, Peter, which thou possessest? Thou hadst renounced all things to thy God, saying, "*Behold, we have left all things,*" etc.² See below, Annotation 121 of the following book.

◇ 1. Left margin: Acts 3:6.

◇ 2. Left margin: Matthew 19:27.

Annotation CCIV

"I have sworn, and I have determined to keep the judgments of thy justice." — Psalm 118:106

On the Oath.

The commentaries of **Ambrose** seem here to contain a certain opinion which would forbid to Christians every kind of oath — even a just one, and in just causes. Consult Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CCV

"Thou art just, O Lord, and thy judgment is right." — Psalm 118:137

Whether sins are remitted to those remaining in unbelief.

Ambrose, in the commentaries, inquiring into the allegory of the letter \aleph [Tzadi], from which this little verse begins, seems to be in the opinion that, the sin of unbelief remaining, certain offenses are remitted to unbelievers by God. For he thus writes: "*There is also another kind of consolation for those who have paid grave penalties, as it is written in Isaiah: 'Comfort ye my people, for his sin is loosed'*³ — even if faith was lacking, the penalty had satisfied." St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 86, article 3, illustrating this passage, says: "*In that word of Ambrose, 'faith' cannot be taken for that by which one believes in Christ; because, as Augustine says upon that [saying] of John, 'If I had not come, and had not spoken to them, they would not have sin'*⁴ — namely, [the sin] of unbelief (for this is the sin by which all sins are held [retained]) — but it is taken for conscience, because sometimes, through the penalties which one patiently sustains, he obtains the remission of a sin of which he has no awareness."

◇ 3. Left margin: Isaiah 40:1–2.

◇ 4. Left margin: John 15[:22].

Annotation CCVI

"As an arrow in the hand of the mighty, so [are] the sons of those cast out." — Psalm 126:4

On the sons of those cast out.

Hilary's exposition upon this little verse, **Jerome**, writing to Marcella, disapproves in these words: "*That also of the same Psalm thou hast deigned to ask — Who are the 'sons of those cast out' [fili] excussorum]? I wonder that thou hast not read [it] in Hilary's Commentaries — that he interprets 'the sons of those cast out' [as] the peoples of believers, namely, that he supposed the Apostles to be called by that name, to whom in the Gospel it is enjoined, into whatever city they enter, and are not received, to shake off the dust of their feet in testimony against the unbelievers: although thou subtly object beforehand that the Apostles cannot be understood under the name of 'the shaken-off,' since it is one thing [to be] of the shakers, another of the shaken (because the shakers are those who shake off, but the shaken those who are shaken off by others), and that it is incongruous [for] the Apostles to be taken [as] 'shaken off,' who ought rather to have been called*

'shakers.' *What, then, shall I do? So great a man, and in his own times most eloquent, I dare not reprehend — [one] who, by the merit of his confession, the industry of [his] life, and the brightness of [his] eloquence, is praised wherever the Roman name is: except that it must not be ascribed to his fault that he was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.*⁵ *Of Greek letters also he had caught a certain little breeze [smattering], but from Heliodorus the presbyter, with whom he was familiarly acquainted, [he sought] those things which he could not understand — how they had been said according to Origen; who, because he could not find Origen's commentary on this psalm, chose to insinuate his own opinion rather than confess his ignorance — [an opinion] which he set forth in clear speech, and pursued another's error the more eloquently. It remains, therefore, that we run back again to the fountain of the Hebrew speech, and see how it is written where we have 'As the sons of the shaken-off': there is read *ken bene ha-neurim* (כֵּן בְּנֵי הַנְּעוּרִים) — which Aquila translated 'As the sons of [their] youth'; Symmachus and Theodotion, 'As the sons of youth'; the Seventy [rendered it otherwise], which we may render 'Sharpened perceptions' [Exacuti sensus] — from which it is manifest that by [the sons] of youth the Christian peoples are to be understood."*

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Hilary was ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.

Annotation CCVII

"Because thou shalt eat the labors of thy hands." — Psalm 127:2

On the correct rendering of this passage.

Hilary, in the interpretation of this little verse — though erring slightly — **Jerome** noted, in the epistle to Marcella, writing thus: *"In this Psalm Heliodorus rather than our Hilary erred: who, concerning that passage in which it is written, 'Thou shalt eat the labors of thy fruits,' opining various things, asserted that the sense stands better if it be written, 'to eat some fruit of [one's] labors,' and not 'the labors of [one's] fruits' — whence a spiritual understanding must be sought; and, entering upon this occasion into a long disputation, he used as much elaborateness [to make] what he wished to be understood [seem persuasive] as falsehood always needs, that it may seem true. Whereas in this place not the Seventy interpreters, but the Latins — deceived by the ambiguity of the Greek word — translated καρπούς rather 'fruits' than 'hands,' although καρποί are also called 'hands' [wrists]; which in the Hebrew is set as **calphecho** (כַּפֵּיךָ) — and Symmachus, and the Fifth Edition, translated 'of thy hands,' that they might escape the ambiguity of the former [Greek] speech."*

Annotation CCVIII

"Let thy ears be attentive." — Psalm 129:2

Whether the Soul was formed before the body.

Hilary, illustrating this passage by [his] exposition, indicates that the Soul of the first man was formed before the body; for thus we read in him: *"When God, the world being now finished, began the most beautiful work — namely, making man to his own image — he composed him of a lowly and a heavenly nature, that is, of Soul and body; and first indeed he constituted that Soul by that divine and (to us) incomprehensible work of his power. For that God did not, when he made man to the image of God, then also make the body, Genesis teaches: [namely, that] long after man had been made to the image of God, the dust [was] taken, and the body formed, and thereupon again made into a living Soul by inspiration — this nature, namely the earthly and the heavenly, being coupled by a certain covenant of the in-breathing."*

From this opinion **Augustine** does not altogether shrink, in the book *On Genesis, to the Letter*, book 7, chapter 24, where he committed these things to writing: *"Let us therefore see whether perchance that can be true which certainly seems to me more tolerable to human opinion: that God, in those first works in which he created all things at once, created also the human Soul — which in its own time he might breathe into the*

members of the body formed from clay; of which body, among those things established all at once, he had created causally the rational principle, according to which it should come to be when the human body was to be made. For neither that which is said, 'to his image,' do we rightly understand except in the soul; nor that which is said, 'Male and female,'⁶ except in the body. Let it be believed, therefore, if no" →

◇ 6. Right margin: Genesis 1:27.

[...continues on folio 599 (PDF p. 416): the rest of Augustine on whether the soul was created causally before the body (Annotatio CCVIII).]

(printed folio 599 [PDF p. 416]. **Annot. CCVIII–CCXI** (Ps 129:2–Proverbs 1:1): the “soul before body” question closes (Leo I: souls did not pre-exist their bodies); whether Christ’s soul is omniscient; Origen on souls imprisoned in bodies (read with caution); and **the Psalms end, Proverbs begins** — whether Solomon was a prophet → folio 600.)

(folio 599, left column → right column)

Annotation CCVIII (continued)

authority of the Scriptures, or reason of truth, contradicts, that man was so made on the sixth day, that the causal ratio of the human body indeed [was] in the elements of the world, but the Soul itself was now created — as the day was first made — and, [once] created, lay hidden in the works of God, until, at its own time, by breathing upon it, he might insert it into the body formed from clay."

Rufinus, in the first book of the *Invectives*, asserts that Jerome once held this same [opinion], in the commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians, when he elucidated that [saying] of the Apostle, "For we are his workmanship,"¹ etc.; and he brings forward his words, having this form: "*Diligently observe that he did not say, 'We are his figuration and molding [plasmatio],' but, 'We are his making [factura]'; for the molding draws its origin from the clay of the earth, but the 'making' took its beginning according to the likeness and image of God — which, in the one-hundred-and-eighteenth psalm, being placed together, signifies diverse things: 'Thy hands have made me, and formed me'*² — the 'making' holds the first place, then the 'formation.'"

◇ 1. Left margin: Ephesians 2:10.

◇ 2. Left margin: Psalm 118:73.

Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, adheres to this opinion so constantly that, in the catalogue of heresies published by him, chapter 99, he judges those who think otherwise [to be] heretics; against whom he also brings forward the testimony of Moses, who, describing the formation of man, first narrated the creation of the Soul, when in the first chapter of Genesis he said: "*God created man to his own image*"³ — for man is not the image of God according to the body, but according to the soul only. Then, in the second chapter of the same book, relating the formation of the body, he says: "*God therefore formed man of the clay of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life*" — by which distinction of narrations Moses willed (as Philastrius says) to signify that the Soul was first created, and then the body was molded.

◇ 3. Left margin: Genesis 1:27.

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, consenting to these, affirms that not only the Soul of the first man, but the Souls of all men also, were created at once, before the body of Adam; and this he strives to demonstrate by the authority of the sacred Letters and by reason, in the second book of [his] *Philosophy*, chapter 6, writing: "*If anyone shall think that the Soul was sent in after the fashioning of the body, or that it was begotten after the body, he strays from the truth: for neither does Moses say that it was then created, when it was being sent into the body, nor does it so stand according to reason.*" And further, bringing forward the demonstration of his opinion, he says: "*It is the most principal work of creation, to make some things out of non-existents. If,*

therefore, Souls came to be from mutual procreation, they would surely come to be by [the] reason of providence, and would be corruptible — no otherwise than the animals begotten from the succession of [their] kind. But if they come to be out of non-existents, [then] creation still goes on, and that [saying] of Moses is not true, 'God rested from all his works.'⁴ But both of these are unfitting; not therefore are souls now coming to be." And again, meeting Eunomius — who, from that sentence of Christ saying, "My Father worketh until now,"⁵ showed that new souls are created daily — he subjoins: "But that [Christ] says, 'My Father worketh until now,' is to be taken not of creation, as it seems to him, but of provision, and that [things] may be well [maintained in being]."

◇ 4. Left margin: Genesis 2:2.

◇ 5. Left margin: John 5:17.

There are [some] who think that this assertion can be both believed and defended without any danger of heresy, provided we do not think that the Souls sinned before they glided into bodies, and were thrust down into bodies on account of [their] sins, as into prisons — which [error], in Origen and in the Origenists and Priscillianists, the decrees of the Councils condemned. Nor does Peter, bishop of Paris, seem to differ from these, leaving this matter in doubt, in book 2 of the Sentences, distinction 17.

But against these [opinions] the authority of Pope **Leo** the First openly protests, who in the epistle to the bishop of Astorga thus decrees: "*The Catholic faith constantly and truly preaches that the Souls of men were not, before they were breathed into their own bodies.*" St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the Theological Summa, question 90, opines that this position can in some manner be sustained, if we say that the Souls of men preceded [their] bodies not according to act, but according to a certain likeness of kind, by which souls agree with the Angels in intellectual nature. **Albert** [the Great], bishop of Regensburg, in the *Summa on Man*, question 15, rejecting the aforesaid opinion of Gregory of Nyssa as a Platonic figment, says that the authority of Moses, adduced by him, is to be so taken that we understand God indeed to have rested from the specific creation of all the species,⁶ but not from the individual creation of Souls, which are daily infused into human bodies.

◇ 6. Right margin: God rested from the creation of new species.

Annotation CCIX

"Thy knowledge is become wonderful [beyond] me; it is exalted, and I shall not be able to [reach] it."
— *Psalms 138:6*

Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient.

Cassiodorus, elucidating this, seems to intimate that the Soul of Christ neither has knowledge equal with God, nor knows all things which God knows. For he says: "*The wonderful knowledge of the Father was made [manifest] through Jesus Christ, when the mysteries of the holy law were narrated to the earth-born; and, that the truth of the human condition might be laid open, he added, 'And I shall not be able to [reach] it,' because the nature of man, which he deigned to assume, could not equal itself to the divine substance.*" **Peter** [Lombard], bishop of Paris, in the third book of the Sentences, distinction 14, explaining this authority adduced by [his] adversaries, says: "*The Soul [of Christ], through the wisdom freely given to it in the Word of God, to which it is united, knows all things which God knows — but not so clearly and perspicuously as God, whose wisdom is far more worthy, and embraces all things far more excellently and perfectly than the Soul of Christ, although that too is omniscient, nor does any thing escape it which God knows.*"

Annotation CCX

"Bring my soul out of prison." — *Psalms 141:8*

The error of Origen concerning souls thrust into bodies.

Read Origen's commentaries here prudently, lest thou strike upon the error concerning Souls thrust down into the prison of bodies — for the confirmation of which Origen uses the present little verse. See above, Annotation 185.

Annotation CCXI

"The parables of Solomon, the son of David," etc. — Proverbs 1:1

Whether Solomon was a prophet.

Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre and martyr, when in the *Synopsis* of divine scripture he touched briefly on the arguments of the books of Solomon, seems to have asserted that Solomon did not receive the gift of prophecy, in these words: "*Solomon wrote*" →

[...continues on folio 600 (PDF p. 417): the rest of Dorotheus, and whether Solomon was a prophet (Annotation CCXI).]

(printed folio 600 [PDF p. 417]. Annot. CCXI–CCXIV (Proverbs 1:1–Ecclesiastes 11:3): Solomon's prophecy closes; Ecclesiastes begins — whether the stars are animate (Jerome, Origen, Virgil, vs. Basil); whether worlds existed before this one (Origen's Peri Archon vs. Augustine's Confessions XI); and whether the soul's state after death is fixed forever (the fallen tree) → folio 601.)

(folio 600, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXI (continued)

the Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesiastes; for when he had received the grace of wisdom from God, he admonished all men to live wisely in this life; but the gift of Prophecy he did not receive: for we have already reckoned up those who received [it] by the divine bounty, that they might prophesy concerning Christ." **Athanasius**, in the *Synopsis*, thinks otherwise, [as do] **Origen**, on the Canticle of Canticles, and St. **Augustine**, who in book 17 *On the City of God*, chapter 20, says: "**Solomon himself is also found to have prophesied, in his books which are received into canonical authority — three [of them]: the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles,**" etc. Perhaps [Dorotheus] understands that Solomon is not to be placed in the catalogue of the major or minor prophets, who are called prophets in the proper and more usual signification. For Augustine also, although in book 2 *On Christian Doctrine* he had numbered the books of Solomon among the prophetic [books], separated [them] from the books of the sixteen prophets, whom he said are properly called prophets.

Annotation CCXII

"The spirit goeth, surveying all things round about in [its] circuit." — Ecclesiastes 1:6

Whether the stars are animate.

Jerome, in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes, discussing the sense of this sentence, writes these things: "*But in that he says, 'Surveying all things round about in [its] circuit' — or 'wheeling, the spirit goeth wheeling, and returns into its own circuits' — [Solomon] either called the Sun itself 'spirit,' because it animates, and breathes, and is vigorous, and completes the yearly courses of the orb, as the Poet says: 'Meanwhile the great Sun rolls round the year'; and elsewhere, 'And into itself, along its own tracks, the year rolls back'; or because [it is written]: 'The Spirit within nourishes the shining globe of the Moon and the Titanian stars, and Mind, infused through the limbs, moves the whole mass, and mingles itself with the great body' — [either way] he speaks not of the yearly course of the Sun, but of its daily paths.*" St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Theological Summa*, question 70, article 3, gathers from these [words] that Jerome held, with Origen, that

the Sun and the other stars are animate¹ — against the opinion of Basil and of many Fathers. See above, Annotation 108.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** St. Jerome held the stars to be animate.

Annotation CCXIII

"What is that which has been done? The same thing which is to be." — Ecclesiastes 1:9

Whether before this world there were other worlds, and whether there will be [others] after this.

Origen, as Methodius is witness in the book *On the Resurrection*, when in the commentaries on Ecclesiastes he was discussing the proposed clause, said that Solomon signified by this saying both that before this world there were other worlds, and that after this world there will be others — which of old, among the ethnic philosophers, Democritus and Epicurus handed down. This same thing Jerome, in the epistle to Avitus, reports that Origen wrote in the third book of the *Peri Archon*; which, when I myself perused it, I read in it these words: "*The adversaries are wont to object to us, saying: If the world began from time, what was God doing before the world was made? For to say that the nature of God is idle is at once idle and absurd, [and so is it] even to think that the goodness [of God] at some time did not act, and the omnipotence at some time did not exercise [its] power. To which propositions we, observing the rules of piety, will answer: that God did not then first begin to work when he made this visible world; but that, as after the corruption of this world there will be another world, so also, before this one was, we believe there were others. Both of which the divine Scripture confirmed by [its] authority. For that there will be another world after this one, Isaiah teaches, saying: 'There shall be a new heaven, and a new earth, which I will make to remain in my sight, saith the Lord.'*² But that before this world there were others also, Ecclesiastes shows, saying: 'What is that which has been done? The same thing which is to be. And what is that which has been created? The very thing which is to be created; and there is nothing at all new under the Sun. But who shall speak and say, 'Behold, this is new'? It was already in the ages which were before us.'³ By which testimonies both are proved: that there were ages before, and that there will be [ages] afterward — yet it must not be thought that many worlds exist at once, but that after this [one] others will be, in the meantime."

◇ 2. **Right margin:** Isaiah 65:17.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Ecclesiastes 1:9[–10].

These things [are] in the books of the *Peri Archon*: whether they were corrupted by the corruptors of Origen's volumes, or whether Origen himself either imprudently uttered [them], or knowingly and willingly committed [them] to writing, is uncertain. Yet no one would think that Origen — a man of exceptional erudition — was so dull and stupid as not to have perceived that the objection of the adversaries could be resolved no less easily than [it could be] evaded. For if he had preferred to deride [it], there was ready at hand [the retort] which Augustine, in book 11 of the Confessions, chapter 12, writes that a certain [man] said: who, to those asking, "What was God doing before he founded the world?"⁴ — jestingly enough mocking the vanity of the question — answered, "He was preparing hells for those who pry into deep things." Or, if he had thought the question unworthy of laughter, he might indeed have answered that the nature of God was never idle, nor did his goodness and power ever grow torpid by ceasing.⁵ For that eternal Deity, remaining ever in itself, outside all place, was working within itself by an unceasing action of intellect and will — namely, beholding in [its] mind the world which it bore in [its] thought, handling [it] with intelligence, and deliberating and determining by [its] will that the world itself should not be made from eternity, but together with time, when the divine providence knew that it would be good and opportune for it to exist. For it was not because the world's being-to-come was good that God therefore founded the world; but because God willed the world to be, therefore it was good that the world exist.⁶ Rightly, therefore, was the world founded then, when God decreed it to be good, and not before.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** What God was doing before he founded the world.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** God was never idle.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Because God willed the world to be, therefore it was good that the world exist.

Annotation CCXIV

"If the tree fall to the south, or to the north, in the place where the tree shall fall, there shall it be." — Ecclesiastes 11:3

Whether after this life there is given a place from which Souls, once entered, can go out.

Jerome, on Ecclesiastes, expounding these words, seems to hint that after this life there is no place from which Souls, when they shall have come to it, can any more go out. For thus it is written in him: "*In the place where the tree shall fall, there shall it be*": for wherever thou shalt have prepared for thyself a place, and a future seat — whether to the north or to the south — there, when thou art dead, shalt thou remain. For thou, like the tree, however long-lived thou be, shalt not be [so] forever; but, overthrown by the sudden tempest of death (as [trees] by that of the winds), wherever thou shalt fall, there shalt thou remain continually — whether the last [hour] shall have found thee stiff and savage, or clement and merciful."

Olympiodorus, in the commentaries on this book and passage, subscribes to Jerome in these words: "*In whatever place, therefore, whether luminous or dark,*" →

[...continues on folio 601 (PDF p. 418): the rest of Olympiodorus on the soul's fixed abode after death (Annotatio CCXIV).]

*(printed folio 601 [PDF p. 418]. **Annot. CCXIV–CCXIX** (Ecclesiastes 11:3–Wisdom 1:1): the fixed state after death closes (the Lutherans abuse it against Purgatory, answered by Bunderius); **Canticles begins** — whether angels are corporeal, whether guardian angels desert their charges, and Bernard's "my merit is the Lord's mercy" (vs. Calvin); **Wisdom begins** — its authorship (Augustine's retraction; Jerome and Philo) → folio 602.)*

(folio 601, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXIV (continued)

— that is, whether in the base station of crimes, or in the honorable [station] of virtues, a man be found when he dies, in that order and grade he remains forever: for he either rests in the light of eternal felicity with the just and Christ the Lord, or is tormented in the darkness with the wicked, and their prince, the Devil." These testimonies the Lutherans are wont to bring forward against the Catholic assertion concerning **Purgatory**, whence souls, the expiation of [their] sins being completed, are freed. Refuting their madness, **John Bunderius**, in the eleventh title of his *Concertationes*, says that the authority of Solomon, Jerome, and Olympiodorus means nothing else for him than that the dead [man], in whatever state he departed, in that shall he remain — namely, in charity, or outside charity. So that, if one has died without charity — which is to be stiff and savage — he cannot become merciful and clement in charity, or the reverse. For after death no one is able to lose charity, or to acquire [it] anew for himself;¹ yet with this [truth] it stands, by an immutable state, that those who have merited this while existing in charity can, on departing hence, be relieved from [their] due punishments by the suffrages of the living. For that relief of punishments does not change the state, but they are in that state in which they can be relieved from [their] due punishments.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** After death no one loses or acquires charity.

Annotation CCXV

"Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth." — Canticle 1:1

Whether the Angels are corporeal.

Bernard, in the fifth sermon on the Cantic of Canticles, seems to teach that the Angels are corporeal, when he says: "Now, that even the super-celestial spirits have need of bodies, let that true and truly divine sentence make us most certain: for 'all are ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who receive the inheritance of salvation.'² In what manner, then, do they fulfil their ministry without a body — especially among those living in the body? Finally, to run about, and to pass from place to place, belongs only to bodies: which that the Angels frequently do, an authority as undoubted as [it is] known proves. Hence it is that they were also seen by the Fathers," etc. See above, Annotation 8, on the first chapter of Genesis.

◇ 2. Left margin: Hebrews 1:14.

Annotation CCXVI

"Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth." — Cantic 1:1

Whether the Angels desert those whom they have received into [their] custody.

The words of **Bernard**, from the seventh homily on the Cantic of Canticles, the Scholastics are wont to use when, for the sake of disputing, they contend that the guardian Angels sometimes desert the custody of those whom they have received to guard. They run thus: "I grieve, likewise, that some of us are weighed down by a heavy sleep in the sacred vigils, and reverence not the citizens of heaven, and appear in the presence of the princes as [it were] disorderly: I fear lest [the angels], sometime abominating our sloth, depart with indignation, and each one of us begin, too late, to say with groaning, 'Thou hast put my acquaintances far from me: they have made me an abomination to themselves,'³ and that [other], 'Thou hast put away from me my friend,'⁴ etc." **Albert the Great**, in the first volume of the Summa, question 8, weighing this passage, says that men are deserted by the guardian Angels not according to place, or local custody, but according to [the angel's] power and efficacy⁵ — and this not from the Angel's sloth, but from the man's fault, in that manner in which the saints are wont to say that a sinner departs from God "into the region of unlikeness," not by distance of place, but of merit.

◇ 3. Left margin: Psalm 87:9.

◇ 4. Left margin: Psalm 87:19.

◇ 5. Left margin: In what manner men are deserted by the Angels.

Annotation CCXVII

"Come, my dove, in the clefts of the rock." — Cantic 2:10, 14

On the merits of the just.

Bernard, in homily 61 on the Cantic of Canticles, inserted into the exposition of this clause these words: "My merit, therefore, [is] the mercy of the Lord: I am not plainly destitute of merit, so long as he [the Lord] shall not be [destitute] of mercies; and if the mercies of the Lord are many, I too am, nonetheless, abundant in merits. Shall I sing of my own justices? O Lord, I will be mindful of thy justice alone: for that is mine also — namely, thou hast been made unto me justice from God."⁶ **John Calvin**, in chapter 10 of his Institutes, while he strives to show that there are no merits of our good [works] before God, abuses this testimony; adding also that [saying] which was uttered by the same author in the fifteenth sermon on Psalm 90: "This is the whole merit of man, if he place his whole hope in him who has made the whole man safe," etc.

◇ 6. Right margin: Psalm 70:16.

But Bernard does not suffer himself to be so interpreted, whose plain definition concerning the merits of the pious thou hast in the 68th sermon on the Cantic of Canticles, to this effect:⁷ "It suffices," he says, "to know, for [obtaining] merit, that merits do not suffice; but as, for merit, it is enough not to presume upon [one's] merits, so to be destitute of merits is enough for [condemnation at the] judgment. Furthermore, none of the

reborn infants is destitute of merits, but they have the merits of Christ — of which nevertheless they render themselves unworthy, if they, who ought to join their own merits [to Christ's], have neglected [to do so]: which danger indeed is [only] of the adult age. Take care, therefore, to have merits; [and] when thou hast [them], know [them] to be given [to thee]. And thus thou hast escaped all danger of poverty and of presumption: for pernicious is the poverty and penury of merits, but presumption [is] the deceitful riches of the spirit; and therefore, 'Give me neither riches nor poverty, O Lord,' says the Wise Man."⁸ These [are] Bernard's words: from which it appears that he, in those [passages] which Calvin adduced, does not destroy nor condemn the merits of holy works, which are humbly done by the servants of God (God leading, and the Holy Spirit favoring), but [rather] admonishes the servants of God not so to swell up over their own virtues and merits as to think that they have them either from themselves, without the breathing of the divine Spirit, or that they are worthy, without the aid of heavenly grace, to merit anything, however small. Hither look the things thou hast above in the sayings of Augustine, Annotation 92.

◇ 7. Right margin: St. Bernard acknowledged the merits of pious men.

◇ 8. Right margin: Proverbs 30:8.

Annotation CCXVIII

"Love justice," etc. — Wisdom 1:1

On the author of the book of Wisdom.

Augustine, in the second book *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 8, in which he enumerates the canon of the sacred Scriptures, said that the book which is entitled the *Wisdom of Solomon* had for [its] author Jesus, the son of Sirach, who wrote the book of Ecclesiasticus. This same thing he retracted, in book 2 of the *Retractations*, chapter 3, in these words: "*Concerning the author of the book which many call the Wisdom of Solomon — that it too, like Ecclesiasticus, [was written] by Jesus the son of Sirach — [I say that] it does not so stand as was said by me; for I afterward learned, and found [it] altogether more probable, that he is not the author of this book.*"⁹

◇ 9. Right margin: St. Augustine retracts himself.

Annotation CCXIX

"Love wisdom [justice], you that judge the earth." — Wisdom 1:1

On the author of the book of Wisdom.

Jerome, proposing the argument [preface] to the book of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, [as] emended by himself, says: "*The book of Wisdom is nowhere [found] among the Hebrews; whence its very style savors of the Greek language and speech. The Jews affirm this [book] to be Philo's,*" etc. →

[...continues on folio 602 (PDF p. 419): the rest of Jerome on the authorship of the book of Wisdom (Annotation CCXIX).]

(printed folio 602 [PDF p. 419]. **Annot. CCXIX–CCXXV** (Wisdom 1:1–Isaiah 14:19): the authorship of *Wisdom* closes (Faber attacks Jerome, answered by Beda); **Isaiah begins** — the LXX omission at 2:22; angels enjoy God's glory not his nature; Origen's Trinitarian misreading of the two Seraphim; the "Wonderful... Prince of peace" prophecy (9:6, with the Greek restored); whether angels have a soul; and whether the damned ever find rest (Anselm's "impossible hypothesis") → folio 603.)

(folio 602, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXIX (continued)

For the sake of this argument [preface], **Jacobus Faber**, bishop of Vienna — a man very often dissenting from the ecclesiastical dogmas¹ — bites Jerome with insolent words, and [words] little worthy of the modesty of a Bishop, writing thus against him in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans: "*In composing the argument of the book which is called Wisdom, Jerome seems to have been too credulous of a certain perfidious Jew — provided [the argument] be his, [and] more worthy (as indeed I believe) of the ashes than of the Bibles. The zeal of God and of truth compels me thus to speak: would that Jerome — otherwise a holy and admirable man — had never, when he composed the arguments of the sacred books, consulted the Jews.*" This error [of Faber], **Noël Beda**, theologian, most amply confuted, in book 1 of the Annotations against the same Bishop: to the reading of which — hastening elsewhere — we send the curious reader.

◇ 1. Left margin: Jacobus Faber is reprehended.

Annotation CCXX

"For he is reputed high." — Isaiah 2:22

A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy.

Jerome wonders at the Seventy Interpreters, that they left this sentence untouched; for thus he writes at the end of the first commentary on Isaiah: "*Handling it silently in my mind, I cannot find the reason why the Seventy were unwilling to translate into Greek so perspicuous a prophecy concerning Christ. For the others [Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion], who did indeed translate [it], but drew the ambiguous phrase to a sense of impiety — [it is] no wonder why they translated ill, and were unwilling to say anything glorious concerning Christ, in whom they did not believe — namely, as Jews, or half-Jews, that is, Ebionites.*"

Annotation CCXXI

"I saw the Lord sitting," etc. — Isaiah 6:1

On God being seen.

Chrysostom, in the first homily on the present passage, says that the Angels enjoy the ineffable glory of God, but do not see his nature. See Annotation 182 of book 6.

Annotation CCXXII

"The Seraphim cried one to another." — Isaiah 6:3

On the Trinity.

That **Origen** wrongly expounded these things in [his] commentaries, **Jerome** testifies, in book 3 on Isaiah, saying: "*Impiously does he understand the two Seraphim [to be] the Son and the Holy Spirit — whereas, according to the Evangelist John and Paul the Apostle, we are taught that the Son of God was seen reigning in majesty, and that the Holy Spirit spoke.*" And in the epistle to Pammachius and Oceanus: "*In the reading of Isaiah, in which the two Seraphim are described crying — Origen interpreting [them as] the Son and the Holy Spirit — I changed his detestable exposition into the two Testaments.*" Although Jerome says that he changed [this], we nevertheless still read, in Origen, in the fifth homily on this passage of Isaiah, that our Lord Jesus Christ is one of the two Seraphim — which indeed one ought to understand according to the allegory, and according to the dispensation of the flesh.

Annotation CCXXIII

"His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, God, Mighty, Father of the world to come, Prince of peace." — Isaiah 9:6

A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters.

Jerome, in book 3 on Isaiah, notes that the Seventy Interpreters — terrified by the majesty of these words — did not dare manifestly to translate this prophecy of Isaiah, pronounced concerning the Messiah, Christ, lest they be compelled openly to confess that Christ was to be called Wonderful, God, Mighty, Father of the world to come, Prince of peace; but for those six names they put others, which are not had in the Hebrew, writing in this manner: "*His name shall be called the Angel of great counsel; and I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him.*" And yet now, in the vulgate Greek edition — which is believed to be [that] of the Seventy interpreters — there plainly appear [the words] which Jerome wonders [to be] changed or omitted. For thus is it found written in it:

Καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος, Θαυμαστός, σύμβουλος, Θεὸς ἰσχυρός, ἐξουσιαστής, ἄρχων εἰρήνης, πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος· ἄξω γὰρ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν τέλος —

that is: "*His name shall be called the Angel of great counsel, Wonderful, Counselor, God, Mighty, Having power, Prince of peace, Father of the world to come; for I will bring peace upon the princes, and his health; and great [is] his rule, and of his peace there is no end.*" But that the true and emended version of the Seventy of old had [it] in this manner, Eusebius testifies, in book 7 of the *Evangelical Demonstration*, saying: "*Therefore, according to the Seventy themselves, [there was foretold] not simply an Angel, but the Angel of great counsel, and Wonderful Counselor, and God Mighty, and Having power, and Prince of peace, and Father of the world to come, [who was] to arise at some time, and to be a little child.*" In the same manner also Chrysostom reads [it], in the book *On the Deity of Christ, against the Gentiles*, writing thus: "*These things no one says of a [mere] child-man; for no one of men was ever called God, Mighty — as neither Father of the world to come, nor Prince of this peace: for of his peace, he says, there is no end.*"

Annotation CCXXIV

"Every soul of man shall fear." — *Isaiah 13:7*

Whether angels have a soul.

Basil, in the commentaries on Isaiah, says: "*Beautifully is the word 'of man' added: for the Soul of the Angels is not subject to fear; for the Soul of the Angel is superior to this turbulent affection.*" He seems by these [words] to hint that the Angels are living beings, which consist of body and soul — unless perchance, this being a figurative form of speaking, by "the Souls of the Angels" we understand the Angels [themselves], who are souls, and most simple spirits. Of this we have spoken more fully above, in Annotation 8.

Annotation CCXXV

"But thou art cast out," etc. — *Isaiah 14:19*

Whether the souls of the damned shall at some time have rest.

Anselm of Laon, in the Interlinear Gloss, drawing this passage allegorically to the Devil, says: "*Even though all souls shall at some time have rest, thou shalt never have [it].*" A scholion of this kind is taken from the fifth commentary of Jerome on Isaiah, where he himself, bringing forward the mystical [interpretation] of an uncertain author — and perhaps of Origen — says: "*But others interpret this passage thus: All souls, among the dead, shall receive some rest; thou alone shalt be bound in the outermost darkness.*" St. **Thomas**, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 46, question 2, admonishes that these words are to be read prudently, lest anyone through carelessness slip into the dogma of Origen, who thought that the punishments of the damned would at some time be ended. But they will be read prudently, if we consider that Anselm spoke not simply and absolutely, but under an impossible hypothesis, to exagge-" →

[...continues on folio 603 (PDF p. 420): the rest of Sixtus's resolution of Anselm's "impossible hypothesis" on the rest of the damned (Annotatio CCXXV).]

(printed folio 603 [PDF p. 420]. **Annot. CCXXV–CCXXIX** (Isaiah 14:19–66:24): *the rest of the damned closes; the shaving of the beard (cross-ref); whether open sin is lighter than feigned holiness (malicious hypocrisy mortal, well-meant concealment venial); whether the saints remember their past evils (a memory without pain); and the Isaiah 66:24 crux — Jerome reports two “damnable expositions” of hell-fire without refuting them → folio 604.)*

(folio 603, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXV (continued)

the magnitude of the sin into which the Devil cast himself of his own accord.

Annotation CCXXVI

"Every beard shall be shaven." — Isaiah 15:2

What **Jerome** wrote to this [effect] concerning the shaving of the beard and of the head, see below, Annotation 244 of this book.

Annotation CCXXVII

"In three years the glory shall be taken away, [like the glory] of a hireling." — Isaiah 16:14

Whether it is a lighter [sin] to sin openly than to feign holiness.

Jerome, at the end of book 6 on Isaiah, says: *"If I feign myself chaste, and there is another thing in my conscience, I have not the glory [reward] of a hireling, but the punishments of a sinner; because, in the comparison of the two evils, it is lighter to sin openly than to simulate and feign holiness."* **St. Thomas**, in the Second Part of the Second, question 111, article 4, notes this passage, [saying] that at first sight it seems to favor those who assert that hypocrisy is always a mortal sin;¹ but he indicates that Jerome's words must be understood of that kind of simulation whereby someone feigns a holiness which he neither has, nor desires to have — nay, even hates — but not of that kind of simulation whereby many feign a holiness which is none of theirs, not for the cause of deceiving and harming, but rather from a zeal of helping [edifying]: for this, although it be not altogether free from fault, is nevertheless not a deadly vice, nor worthy of eternal punishment.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Whether all hypocrisy is a deadly sin.

According to this understanding, **St. Thomas** judges that two sentences of Strabo must be interpreted. Of these, the one is had in the glosses collected by him, on Job 1, where, expounding that [verse], "As it pleased the Lord, so it was done," etc.,² he says: *"Feigned equity is not equity, but a double sin"*; the other is had on the Lamentations, chapter 4, where, expounding that [verse], "The iniquity of my people is greater than the sin of Sodom,"³ he says: *"Crimes are bewailed in the soul which slips into hypocrisy, whose iniquity is greater than the sin of Sodom."*

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Job 1:21.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Lamentations 4:6.

Annotation CCXXVIII

"The former distresses are given over to oblivion." — Isaiah 65:16

Whether the saints in heaven remember [their] past evils.

Jerome, in book 18 on Isaiah, seems to hand down that the saints in heaven will not have memory of [their] preceding evils or crimes. For he says: *"In the new heaven and in the new earth, all memory of the former*

conversation is blotted out, lest this very thing be a part of the evils — to remember the former distress." The Master of the Sentences, in book 4, distinction 43, citing this passage otherwise than it is read in the Hieronymian codex, says that it must be so understood by us that we do not exclude from the blessed the memory of [their] preceding evils, but [only] the injury and molestation of the memory: for the memory of [their] offenses will not in any part diminish the felicity of the Saints, but will render [them] the more prompt and eager to render thanks to God. Which interpretation there is no doubt that he took from Gregory, who most aptly explained this at the end of book 4 of the Explanations on Job, saying thus: "*It must be asked, how the mind of the elect can be perfect in beatitude, if the memory of its own guilt touches it amid [its] joys? But it must be known that, as often now we joyfully remember [past] sad things, so then we shall remember the wickedness [we have] passed through, without injury to our beatitude: for often, in the time of wholeness, we recall past griefs to memory without grief, and by how much we recollect ourselves [as having been] sick, by so much [the more], being whole, do we love [our health]. There will be, therefore, in that beatitude a memory of guilt — not [one] that pollutes the mind, but [one] that binds us more closely to gladness: so that, while the mind remembers its own grief without grief, it both more truly understands itself a debtor to the physician, and loves the more the salvation received, by how much it remembers the trouble which it has escaped.*"

Annotation CCXXIX

"Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be extinguished," etc. — Isaiah 66:24

Whether the fire of hell is metaphorical.

Jerome, at the end of book 18 on Isaiah, brought hither two damnable expositions of other authors, [but] without their name: of these, the one teaches that the fire of hell is metaphorical, placed in the affliction of the conscience and memory alone; the other, that the fire of hell and the burnings of the damned are at some time at last to be ended. Since he relates these explanations not only without any confutation or accusation of the error, but even confirms [them] by bringing forward very many testimonies of the divine Scripture, **Rufinus**, the detractor of Jerome, took occasion of calumniating him, as a favorer of both dogmas.

The words of the former exposition are these: "*The worm which shall not die, and the fire which shall not be extinguished,' is taken by very many [to be] the conscience of sinners, which torments those set in punishments, because by their own vice and sin they were deprived of so great a good — according to that which is said, 'I was turned in misery, while the thorn is fixed in me,'⁴ and in Proverbs, 'The moth of the bones [is] an understanding heart,'⁵ and again, under the obelus, 'As the moth [consumes] a garment, and the worm the wood, so grief tortures the heart of a man.'*"

◇ 4. Right margin: Psalm 31:4.

◇ 5. Right margin: Proverbs 25:20.

The words of the latter interpretation are thus: "*But those who wish the punishments at some time to be ended — and, though after long times, yet the torments to have a term⁶ — use these testimonies: (a) 'When the fulness of the gentiles shall have entered in, then all Israel shall be saved';⁷ and again, (b) 'God hath concluded all under sin, that he may have mercy on all';⁸ and in another place the holy [man] speaks, (c) 'I will bear the wrath of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he judge my cause, and take away my judgment, and bring me forth into the light';⁹ and again, (d) 'I will bless thee, O Lord, for thou wast angry with me; thou hast turned away thy face from me, and hast had mercy on me.'¹⁰ The Lord also speaks to the sinner: 'When the anger of my fury shall be [past], I will heal again.' And this is that which is said in another place, (f) 'How great is the multitude of thy goodness, O Lord, which thou hast hidden for them that fear thee.'¹¹ All which [testimonies] they repeat, desiring to affirm that after the torments there will be refreshments — which now must be hidden from those to whom fear is useful, that, while they dread the punishments, they may cease to sin: which [matter] we ought to leave to the knowledge of God alone, whose*

not only mercy, but also torments, are [weighed] in a balance; and he knows whom, how, or how long he ought to judge. And let us only say what befits human frailty: 'O Lord, rebuke me not in thy fury, neither correct me in thy wrath.'¹² And, as of the Devil — [and] as of all deniers and impious [ones], who have said in their heart, 'There is no God'¹³ — we believe [there are] eternal torments: so of sinners and impious [ones], and yet Christians, whose works are to be tried and purged in the fire, let us think [that there will be] a moderated sentence of the judge, and [one] mingled with clemency." →

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Whether the punishments of hell are at some time to be ended.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** (a) Romans 11:25–26.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** (b) Galatians 3:22.

◇ 9. **Right margin:** (c) Micah 7:9.

◇ 10. **Right margin:** (d) Isaiah 12:1.

◇ 11. **Right margin:** (f) Psalm 30:20.

◇ 12. **Right margin:** Psalm 6:2.

◇ 13. **Right margin:** Psalm 13:1.

[...continues on folio 604 (PDF p. 421): Sixtus's Catholic resolution of both expositions, defending Jerome against Rufinus (Annotatio CCXXIX).]

(printed folio 604 [PDF p. 421]. **Annot. CCXXIX–CCXXXII** (Isaiah 66:24–Jeremiah 13:12): Sixtus resolves the Isaiah 66:24 crux (both expositions are Origen's, reported not asserted; Jerome holds hell-fire corporeal). **Jeremiah begins** — Origen on the expiatory fire (Jer 2:22); the oath (Jer 4:2); and whether anyone in this life is truly just (Jer 13:12), where Bodius abuses "no living man shall be justified" and others the "kings of the churches" clause → folio 605.)

(folio 604, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXIX (continued)

Both of these explanations are so faithfully and word-for-word expressed in the second volume of Origen's works, in the ninth homily on divers passages of Matthew, that I could easily have been persuaded that Jerome translated both from thence — had I not first, by most certain conjectures noted in the preceding book, discovered that that homily is not Origen's. Nevertheless, the dogmas of both expositions are Origenic — proposed by Jerome indeed under another's person, but not confirmed by [his] own assertion. For the impiety of the second interpretation he everywhere detests, as we show below, Annotation 290 of the sixth book; and the error of the former he in many places altogether condemns — especially in the epistle to Avitus, where, enumerating Origen's heresies, he reckons this one too among the others, in these words: "**Origen**, in book 2 of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, places the fire of gehenna, and the torments which holy Scripture threatens to sinners, not in punishments, but in the conscience of sinners — when, by the virtue and power of God, all memory of [our] offenses is set before our eyes, and, as it were, from certain seeds left behind in the soul, the whole harvest of vices springs up; and whatsoever we had done in life, whether base or impious, the picture of all these things is portrayed in our sight; and the mind, beholding [its] past pleasures, is punished with the burning of conscience, and pierced through with the goads of penitence." And in the book on the epistle to the Ephesians, book 3, expounding that [saying] from chapter 5, "Let no man deceive you with vain words,"¹ etc., he says: "Because there are very many who say that there are no future punishments for sins, nor torments to be applied from without, but that the very sin and the conscience of the offense is [itself] the punishment — while the worm in the heart dies not, and a fire is kindled in the mind after the likeness of a fever, which does not torment the sick [man] from without, but, seizing the very bodies, punishes [them] without the application of torments from without: these persuasions, therefore, and fraudulent snares, Paul

called 'vain and empty words,' which seem to have a certain flower of speech, and to flatter sinners — but, while they give [false] confidence, rather carry them to eternal punishments." From these [passages] it is clear how piously and catholically Jerome held that the fire of hell is corporeal,² and that those who are set in it are tormented within and without.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Ephesians 5:6.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The fire of hell, in Jerome's judgment, is corporeal.

But to those very testimonies of the divine Scripture, which Jerome — because he had elsewhere most fully explained [them] — here left unexplained, it must be said that by these the corporeal and external punishments of the damned are not taken away, but [that] mention is made of the interior and spiritual punishment: the memory and conscience of the damned being tortured with a perpetual goad. For the first and greatest punishment of the reprobate is the scourge of the avenging conscience;³ next to this is the exterior punishment — namely, fire, sulphur, the spirit of tempests, and the other corporeal torments which the divine Letters everywhere threaten to the impious and impenitent. Consult, on those things which pertain to the reality of the fire of hell, the fortieth Annotation of this book; but on those things which regard the eternity of the same fire, read Jerome's opinion [in] Annotation 290 of book 6.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** What is the greatest punishment of the damned.

Annotation CCXXX

"Though thou wash thyself with nitre," etc. — Jeremiah 2:22

The expiatory fire.

Origen, in the thirteenth homily on Jeremiah, expounding this, says that all who sinned after the laver of baptism are to be purged by the fire of the conflagration on the day of judgment. See above, Annotation 167.

Annotation CCXXXI

"Thou shalt swear, 'The Lord liveth,' in truth." — Jeremiah 4:2

The Oath.

What **Jerome** held concerning the Oath, expounding this passage, **John Arboreus** noted in his *Theosophia*. See below, Annotation 26 of book 6.

Annotation CCXXXII

"Every bottle shall be filled with wine, and all the kings and priests [shall be filled] with drunkenness." — Jeremiah 13:12

Whether anyone in this life is truly just.

Jerome, in book 3 on Jeremiah, brought forward these things to the elucidation of this passage: "*The Prophet shows that we are a fragile vessel, according to the Apostle, saying, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels'; and that it cannot but be that there is fulfilled in us that which is written, 'There dwelleth no good in my flesh'; and again, 'For the good which I will, this I do not, but the evil which I will not, this I work'; and then, 'Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' But by this drunkenness, by which we forget the precepts of God, and by vices and sins, the whole human condition is filled — the prophet saying, 'No living [man] shall be justified in thy sight' — not in comparison with God (as the old and new heretics, and the patrons of heretics, wish), but in respect of his knowledge. For man sees in the face, God in the heart; and what to us sometimes seems beautiful, is found sordid in his eyes. Not only the ignoble common crowd and the vile populace, but the kings of the churches, who sit upon the throne — the priests themselves also, the second grade in ecclesiastical honor — are filled with the variety of sins.*"

This passage of Jerome the heretics of our times abuse in two ways. **Bodius**, in the *Collectanea*, drags it to the defenses of the Lutherans, who teach that no one — however perfect — is truly just in this life, but that in all [men] sin, worthy of the wrath of God, remains until death. Again, those who impugn the Ecclesiastical power⁴ adduce the last clause of this passage against the Sacerdotal power, which they contend must be subjected to the secular magistrate. But both violently wrest these words: for as regards the dignity of the Priest and of the King, we have already shown above — namely, in Annotation 166 — that Jerome here spoke of the Jewish priesthood, not of the Christian. But in the other words of the proposed sentence, we say that Jerome had regard to the human condition, destitute of the grace of God: for no one is just without the aid of divine grace,⁵ nor can [anyone] long remain without a deadly crime. But if thou press [the point] that he pronounced these things also of the just, in whom the divine grace is present, infused through the Holy Spirit: we will answer that Jerome must be understood of light and venial errors, and not of deadly and pernicious crimes. For there are many venial vices, from which no one — however just, the holy Virgin excepted — is altogether freed. For there is, even in the saints [who have been] repaired by grace, a certain downward inclination to sinning, from the frailty of the flesh —" →

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Whether the royal power is inferior to the sacerdotal.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** No one is just without the aid of divine grace, nor can [anyone] long live without a deadly sin.

[...continues on folio 605 (PDF p. 422): the rest of Sixtus on the inclination to sin remaining in the just (Annotatio CCXXXII).]

(printed folio 605 [PDF p. 422]. **Annot. CCXXXII–CCXXXIII** (Jeremiah 13:12–19:11): whether anyone is truly just closes (the "indwelling sin" of Romans 7 leaves even the just, save the Virgin, with venial faults). Then the great annotation on **Chiliasm / Millenarianism** (Jer 19:11) — Jerome and Augustine treat it gently yet deride it, sparing the ancient Fathers (Papias, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Victorinus); Sixtus distinguishes the orthodox millenarians' golden age from Cerinthus's carnal fable → folio 606.)

(folio 605, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXII (continued)

inclination, which Paul called "indwelling sin," because it arose from sin, and was left, for the punishment of sin, for the contest and exercise of the just;¹ and from this also many venial sins emerge, the just being unwilling. Looking to this, therefore, Paul exclaimed, "Unhappy man that I am," etc.;² and, "I know that there dwelleth no good in my flesh," and, "Not the good which I will do I do, but the evil which I will not";³ and David, directing his mind to the venial but continual errors of the saints, said: "No living [man] shall be justified in thy sight,"⁴ if he be examined according to the rigor of the divine justice — because "Seven times a day the just [man] falleth."⁵

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Romans 7:17.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Romans 7:24.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Romans 7:18–19.

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Psalm 142:2.

◇ 5. **Left margin:** Proverbs 24:16.

Annotation CCXXXIII

"I will break this people, and this city, as the potter's vessel is broken, which cannot be made whole again." — Jeremiah 19:11

Whether the opinion of the Chiliasts is to be condemned.

Jerome, in book 4 on Jeremiah, so explains this passage that he seems to assert that the error of the χιλιασταί [Chiliasts] — that is, of the Millenarians — is not to be condemned; which [error], nevertheless, very many most holy Fathers condemned, in [the person of] Cerinthus the heresiarch, as a heretical dogma; but [Jerome holds] that it is free to each one to think in this [matter] what he will. For these things we read in him: "*Manifestly this is said not of the Babylonian, but of the Roman captivity; for after the Babylonians both the city was restored, and the people brought back into Judaea, and restored to [its] former abundance; but after the captivity under Vespasian and Titus, and [what] afterward befell under Hadrian, unto the consummation of the age, the ruins of Jerusalem shall remain — although the Jews think that a golden and jeweled Jerusalem is to be restored to them, and again victims and sacrifices, and the marriages of the saints, and the kingdom of the Lord Savior on earth: which, though we do not follow, yet we cannot condemn, because many ecclesiastical men and martyrs said these things. And let each one abound in his own sense, and let all things be reserved to the judgment of the Lord.*"

These things Jerome; who, disclosing by name the asserters of this opinion, says in the book *On Illustrious Men*: "**Papias**, the hearer of John, bishop of Hierapolis, is said to have published a Jewish Δευτέρωσις [Deuterosis, a 'second [teaching]'] of a thousand years, whom Irenaeus and Apollinaris followed, and the rest, who say that after the resurrection the Lord will reign in the flesh with the saints. Tertullian also, in the book *On the Hope of the Faithful*, and Victorinus of Poetovio, are led by this opinion." And in book 11 on Ezekiel, indicating the writings in which the same authors taught this, he says: "*For neither, according to the Jewish fables — which they call Deuteroses — do we expect a golden Jerusalem from heaven: which [error] both many of ours, and especially the book of Tertullian which is entitled *On the Hope of the Faithful*, and the seventh volume of the *Institutions of Lactantius*, promise; and the frequent expositions of Victorinus of Poetovio; and lately our own Severus, in the dialogue on which he imposed the name Gallus; and — to name the Greeks, and to join the first and the last — Irenaeus and Apollinaris.*"

Nor does **Augustine** seem to have shrunk from this opinion of Jerome; who, not daring to call it either a heresy or an error, wrote thus concerning it in the twentieth [book] *On the City of God*, chapter 7: "*This opinion would be in some way tolerable, if some spiritual delights were believed to be about to be present to the saints in that Sabbath — namely, of a thousand years — through the presence of the Lord. For we too once held this opinion.*" Thus far Augustine.

Know, therefore, that neither Jerome nor Augustine tempered their discourse in this manner in order to show that this opinion is not damnable — which both of them in many places assail and deride⁶ — but in order to indicate, by the example of their modesty and benignity, that we too must dissent from the errors of the ancient Fathers of the Church with the highest reverence; and lest they should seem to persecute the many Catholics who were then led by that opinion — which Jerome hints not obscurely in the preface of the eighteenth commentary on Isaiah, in these words: "*The Apocalypse of John, if we take [it] according to the letter, we must judaize; if we treat [it] spiritually, as it was written, we shall seem to go contrary to the opinions of many of the ancients — of the Latins, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius; of the Greeks (to pass over the rest), I will make mention only of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons: against whom that most eloquent man Dionysius, Pontiff of the Alexandrian church, writes an elegant book, deriding the fable of the thousand years, and the golden and jeweled Jerusalem on earth, the restoration of the temple, the blood of victims, the rest of the Sabbath, the injury of circumcision, the marriages, the births, the education of children, the delights of banquets, and the servitude of all the nations; and again wars, armies, and triumphs, and the slaughters of the conquered, and the death of the hundred-year-old sinner — to whom Apollinaris responded in two volumes: whom not only the men of his own sect, but also (in this part only) a very great multitude of ours follows; so that with a foreboding mind I already perceive how great a rage is to be stirred up against me by [these], to whom I bear no envy, if they so love the earth that in the kingdom of Christ they desire earthly things, and, after the abundance of foods and the gluttony of belly and gullet, seek those things which*

are beneath the belly."

◇ 6. **Right margin:** The opinion of the Chiliasts is disapproved.

Thus far Jerome, hinting by these words that the opinion of those [millenarians] is not far distant from the dogma of Cerinthus. There are, however, [some] who judge that the two opinions are most widely distant from each other. For Cerinthus, as Eusebius writes in the third book of the Ecclesiastical History, because he was given to the belly, and the gullet, and lust,⁷ taught those things which lust dictated to him — decreeing not only that Christ, after the resurrection, would administer a kingdom on earth for a thousand years, but also that in that very kingdom there would be all base pleasures: that is, the foul gluttony of banquets, of the belly, and the most exquisite incitements of those things which are beneath the belly, and certain most base vices of every monstrous and execrable lust. But those [orthodox millenarians], although they thought that Christ — the bodies of the Saints being raised up — would return to the earth and there reign a thousand years, nevertheless believed that there would be in that kingdom no wickedness, nor impiety, nor injustice of evil men, but, on the contrary, an inestimable tranquillity of a most happy and truly golden age, in which the Saints, living in the flesh, would enjoy all the delights of soul and body with the highest innocence, purity, justice, temperance, and piety. Which, that it may become more clear, it pleases [me] to write down here what Lactantius, in the seventh book of the Divine Institutions, has recorded concerning this matter, saying thus:" →

◇ 7. **Right margin:** To what vices Cerinthus was given.

[...continues on folio 606 (PDF p. 423): the long passage from Lactantius on the millennial reign (Annotatio CCXXXIII).]

(printed folio 606 [PDF p. 423]. **Annot. CCXXXIII** (continued; Jeremiah 19:11): the long Lactantius passage (Divine Institutions VII) on the thousand-year reign — Christ ruling the raised just, the gentled beasts, the earth flowing with honey and wine (with Virgil's fourth Eclogue), the Devil bound, then loosed, the last assault, the conflagration, and the general resurrection. Sixtus closes: it still errs against the Gospel (after the resurrection no marriage or food — "as the Angels of God"); the Anabaptists revived it → folio 607.)

(folio 606, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXIII (continued)

"The Son of the most high and greatest God will come, that he may judge the living and the dead; and when he shall have blotted out injustice, and executed the greatest judgment, and restored to life the just who were from the beginning, he will dwell among men for a thousand years, and will rule them with a most just governance. Then, those who shall be alive in [their] bodies will not die, but through those same thousand years will beget an infinite multitude, and their offspring will be holy and dear to God. But those who shall be raised from the dead, these shall preside over the living as judges; and the nations shall not be altogether extinguished, but certain [of them] will be left for a victory of God, that they may be triumphed over by the just, and subjugated to a perpetual servitude. About that time also the prince of the Demons, who is the contriver of all evils, will be bound with chains, and will be in custody for the thousand years of the heavenly empire, in which justice shall reign in the world, lest he contrive any evil against the people of God. After his coming, the just shall be gathered together out of every land; and the judgment being finished, the holy city shall be set up in the midst of the earth, in which the founder God himself may dwell with the just [who are] ruling. Then shall be taken away from the world that darkness by which heaven was affronted and obscured; and the Moon shall receive the brightness of the Sun, and shall no more be diminished; but the Sun shall become seven times brighter than it now is. And the earth shall open its fruitfulness, and of its own accord

shall bring forth most abundant crops; the rocks of the mountains shall sweat honey, wines shall run down through the streams, and rivers shall overflow with milk; finally the world itself shall rejoice, and all the nature of things shall be glad, snatched away and freed from the dominion of evil, and of impiety, and of crime, and of error. In this time the beasts shall not be nourished with blood, nor the birds by prey; but all things shall be quiet and placid: lions and calves shall stand together at the manger; the wolf shall not seize the sheep; the dog shall not hunt; hawks and eagles shall not harm; infants shall play with serpents. In fine, then shall come to pass those things which the Poets said were done in the golden ages, Saturn then reigning; whose error arose from this, that the Prophets bring forth and pronounce very many things as if already accomplished. For visions were presented by the divine Spirit to their eyes, and those things were seen in their sight as if being done and finished; which prophecies of theirs, when report had gradually spread [them] abroad — since the profane, ignorant of the mystery, knew not in what sense they were said — they thought that all those things had been fulfilled in the ancient ages: which surely could not be done and fulfilled while [mere] man was reigning. But when, the impious religions being blotted out, and crime suppressed, the earth shall be made subject to God,

The sailor too shall give up the sea, nor shall the nautical pine exchange [its] wares; every land shall bear all things. The ground shall not suffer the harrows, nor the vine the pruning-hook; the sturdy plowman also shall now loose the yokes from the bulls. Then too the field shall grow golden with the soft ear [of grain], and the reddening grape shall hang on the wild brambles, and the hard oaks shall sweat dewy honey. Nor shall wool learn to counterfeit varied colors, but the ram himself in the meadows shall now change his fleece, now to a sweetly-blushing purple, now to a saffron dye; of its own accord scarlet shall clothe the grazing lambs. The she-goats themselves shall bring home their udders swollen with milk, and the herds shall not fear the great lions.

"Men shall therefore live a most tranquil and most abundant life, and shall reign together with God; and the kings of the nations shall come from the ends of the earth with gifts and presents, to adore and honor the great King, whose name shall be illustrious and venerable to all the nations which shall be under heaven, and to the kings who shall rule on the earth. But when the thousand years of the kingdom shall have begun to be ended, the prince of the Demons will be loosed again, and, sent forth from custody, will go out; and he will stir up all the nations which shall then be under the dominion of the just, that they may make war on the holy city; and there shall be gathered from all the globe of the earth an innumerable people of nations, and it shall besiege and surround the city. Then shall come the last wrath of God upon the nations, and he shall vanquish them to the last man. And first he shall shake the earth most violently, and by its motion the mountains of Syria shall be rent, and the hills shall sink down into a chasm, and the walls of all cities shall fall; and God shall fix the Sun for three days, that it set not, and shall inflame it; and there shall descend an excessive heat, and a great burning upon the rebellious and impious peoples; and showers of sulphur, and hailstones of stone, and drops of fire; and their spirits shall melt in the heat, and [their] bodies shall be crushed in the hail; and they themselves shall strike one another with the sword: the mountains shall be filled with corpses, and the fields shall be covered with bones. But the people of God shall, for those three days, be hidden beneath the hollows of the earth, until the wrath of God against the nations, and the final judgment, be ended. Then shall the just go forth from their hiding-places, and shall find all things covered with corpses and bones. But every race of the impious shall utterly perish by the root, nor shall there be any longer any nation in this world, save only the nation of God. Then, for seven whole years, the forests shall be untouched, nor shall wood be cut from the mountains, but the arms of the nations shall be burned; and there shall not even be war, but peace and everlasting rest. But when the thousand years shall have been completed, the world shall be renewed by God, and the heaven shall be folded up, and the earth shall be changed; and God shall transform men into the likeness of the Angels, and they shall be white as snow, and shall dwell forever in the sight of the Almighty, and shall sacrifice to their Lord, and serve [him] forever. At the same time shall come to pass that second and public resurrection of all, in which also the impious shall be raised up to everlasting torments. These are they who worshiped things made by hand, who either knew not, or denied,

the Lord and Parent of the world. But their lord [the Devil] also, with his ministers, shall be seized, and condemned to punishment; with whom likewise all the crowd of the impious, for their crimes, in the sight of the Angels and of the just, shall be burned with perpetual fire forever. This is the doctrine of the holy Prophets, which we Christians follow: this is Christian wisdom."

Thus far the opinion of Lactantius, and of the others whom we have commemorated: which, although it be diverse from the dogma of Cerinthus, nevertheless contains an error foreign to the Evangelical doctrine, which teaches that after the resurrection there will be no union of male and female, no use of food and drink, and, finally, no delight of the carnal life — Christ saying, to those who dreamed that there would be carnal marriages after the resurrection: "*You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God: in the resurrection they shall neither marry, nor be married, but shall all be as the Angels of God*"¹ — who indeed neither use wives, nor are delighted with banquets, but feed on an invisible food, as Tobias says, which is God:² with whose nectar and ambrosia the minds of the blessed are spiritually fed; so that, according to Paul's word, "*the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but joy and peace in the Holy Spirit.*"³ **Frederick Staphylus**, in the *Epitome of Lutheran Theology*, reports that the Anabaptists — the plagues of our times — received this error among their other heresies. A very similar observation thou hast below, in Annotation 347 of the following book.

◇ 1. **Right margin:** Matthew 22:29–30.

◇ 2. **Right margin:** Tobit 12:19.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Romans 14:17.

*(printed folio 607 [PDF p. 424]. **Annot. CCXXXIV–CCXL** (Jeremiah 22:30–Ezekiel 1:12): a chain of Origen-refutations from Jerome on Jeremiah — Christ the "abominated man" torn like a ring from the Father; Jerome on free will (vs. the Lutheran Bodius and Pelagius); the descent of souls into bodies (demons into aerial, men into gross bodies); the Susanna question (Jer 29:22 vs. Daniel 13; Rufinus attacks Jerome); hypocrisy worse than Sodom; and Ezekiel begins → folio 608.)*

(folio 607, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXXXIV

"Write this man abominated, or sterile." — Jeremiah 22:30

On Christ.

Origen, in the fifth book of the *Stromata*, expounding this wrongly, **Jerome** censures, in book 4 of the commentaries on Jeremiah, in these words: "*Origen refers this passage to Christ — that from the hand of the Father he was torn off like a ring, and sent into the land of captivity, into the vale of tears, and delivered to the cross; his mother also — doubtless — [being] the synagogue captured and cast out; and he does not fear, in commemorating these things, to understand this which follows — 'O earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord: thus saith the Lord, Write this man abominated, or sterile,' and the rest — of the Lord of majesty. But he writes this, lest his disciples dare to deny [it], in the fifth book of the Stromata.*" These things Jerome against Origen — who, it is credible, brought these things forth (expounding, as he does, allegorically) concerning Christ, in that sense in which Paul dared to say that Christ was made for us sin, a curse, and an execration:¹ that is, an oblation for sin and for the curse, to which we all were liable.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** In what sense Christ is called sin. — 2 Corinthians 5:21. [The printed margin cites "1 Cor. 5, 21," but the text — "him who knew no sin he made sin for us" — is **2 Corinthians 5:21**; the "curse" (*maledictum*) is from Galatians 3:13.]

Annotation CCXXXV

"The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream." — Jeremiah 23:28

On free will.

Jerome, in book 4 on Jeremiah, from the interpretation of this clause fell into these words: "*Heretics are wont always to promise prosperous things, and to throw open the kingdoms of heaven to sinners, so that they say, 'The kingdoms of heaven are prepared for thee: thou canst imitate the majesty of God, so that thou be without sin; for thou hast received the power of free choice, and the knowledge of the law, through which thou mayst attain what thou wilt' — and they deceive the wretched by flatteries, and especially poor little women laden with sins, who are carried about with every wind of doctrine.*" This pericope, as is conjectured from the *Collectanea* of **Bodius**, the Lutherans usurp, to show that we are heretics — [we] who teach that man received the power of free choice, so that, by divine grace favoring, he can abstain from every deadly fault. Know that Jerome by these words does not reject this our Catholic opinion concerning free will — which everywhere he proclaims, and excellently defends² — but condemns the proud and insolent dogma of Pelagius: who, the aid of divine grace being excluded, asserted that man, from the knowledge of the law and from the strength of his own will, could become altogether impeccable in imitation of God, and the possessor also of eternal felicity. And to this especially looks that which Jerome noted against Origen above, Annotation 159.

◇ 2. Left margin: Jerome defends free will.

Annotation CCXXXVI

"The captivity of Judah, which I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans, [I will regard] for good." — Jeremiah 24:5

On souls fallen down from heaven.

Origen expounding this allegorically, concerning the descent of Souls into the earth on account of crimes perpetrated in the heavens, **Jerome**, in book 5 on Jeremiah, refuted [him] with these words: "*The allegorical interpreter always dotes in this place, and, wishing to do violence to the historical truth, refers [it] to captives from the heavenly Jerusalem, and [says] that they were transferred into the land of the Chaldeans, and again about to return to their former place — like Jeremiah and the other holy prophets; but that others, who shall have been sinners in this land and in the vale of tears, are about to die.*" The same [thou hast] above, Annotation 185.

(left column continues into the right column)

Annotation CCXXXVII

"Thou hast broken chains, or wooden yokes: I will make for them iron yokes." — Jeremiah 28:13

The incarceration of souls.

Origen, discoursing on these things allegorically, said that Souls sinned in the heavens, and that on that account the Souls of demons [were sent down] into aerial, subtler bodies, but the Souls of men into grosser bodies sent down. **Jerome** reports this, in book 5 on Jeremiah, thus writing: "*The allegorical interpreter dotes in this place, calling forks and wooden chains 'ethereal and aerial bodies' — namely of the Demons and of the adverse powers — but 'iron forks or chains' our grosser bodies, which are woven together with nerves and with bones of flesh and veins: so that those who wished, out of the heavenly Jerusalem, according to the quality of [their] sin, to undergo lesser torments, are condemned into the chains of our bodies, and sustain the wailing of infancy, the bonds of swaddling-cloths, and filth, and serve the Devil, the king of Babylon — that is, of this world (Scripture saying, 'The world is set in the malignant one' [1 John 5:19]) — together with the beasts of the earth, which [souls] are bound fast into the bodies of brute animals.*" See above, Annotation 185.

Annotation CCXXXVIII

"The Lord make thee like Sedecias and Achab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire." — Jeremiah 29:22

On the history of Susanna. — Daniel 13:52, 56.

Jerome, in commentary 5 on Jeremiah, appended to this passage such an exposition: "*The Hebrews say that these two were the presbyters [elders], of whom Daniel says to the one, 'O thou that art grown old in evil days,' and to the other, 'O thou seed of Chanaan, and not of Juda, beauty hath deceived thee: thus did ye to the daughters of Israel, and they for fear conversed with you.' But that which is at present said — 'whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire' — seems to be contrary to the history of Daniel. For he asserts that they were stoned by the people according to the sentence of Daniel; but here it is written that the king of Babylon roasted them in the fire — whence also by very many, and almost all the Hebrews, that [book] is not received, as [being] a fable, nor is it read in their synagogues. For how, they say, could it be that captives should have the power of stoning the princes set over their own prophets? And they affirm this to be more true, which Jeremiah wrote — that the presbyters [elders] were indeed convicted by Daniel, but that the sentence was carried out upon them by the king of Babylon, who over the captives, as victor and lord, held the command.*" **Rufinus**, in the second book of the *Invectives*, accuses Jerome, that under the assumed person of a Jew he confuted the history of Susanna with various arguments. Thou hast these things more fully in Annotations 245 and 250 of this book.

Annotation CCXXXIX

"The iniquity of my people is greater than the sin of Sodom." — Lamentations 4:6

On hypocrisy.

Strabus, in his Gloss which is called the *Ordinary*, annotating this clause, said that hypocrisy is a crime far greater than the sin of Sodom. See above, on Isaiah chapter 16, Annotation 227.

Annotation CCXL

"Whither the spirit was to go, thither they went, and returned not when they walked." — Ezekiel 1:12
(the body of this annotation begins on folio 608; the catchword "GRE—" points to Gregory) →

[...continues on folio 608 (PDF p. 425): the exposition of Ezekiel 1:12 (Annotatio CCXL), opening with Gregory.]

(printed folio 608 [PDF p. 425]. Annot. CCXL (continued)–CCXLII (Ezekiel 1:12–14:13): whether charity once had can be lost — Gregory and Augustine seem to make it unlosable, Aquinas resolves (unlosable in its essence, but easily lost on the side of the mutable will); whether one sin is remitted without another (Gregory on Amos 4:7, tempered by Aquinas); and Origen's fancy that the earth is a rational animal → folio 609.)

(folio 608, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXL (continued)

"Whither the spirit was to go, thither they went, and returned not when they walked." — Ezekiel 1:12

Gregory, in homily 5 on Ezekiel, so interprets this passage that he seems to assert that charity once had cannot be lost.¹ For he says: "*They returned not when they walked: because the elect indeed so go to good things, that they return not to the perpetrating of evils.*" And, after many things, expounding that, "*A splendor of fire running about in the midst of the animals,*"² he says: "*The running-about and the mobility*

can be understood thus. For in the hearts of the saints, according to certain virtues, [charity] always remains; but according to certain [others], it comes as one about to withdraw, and, about to come [again], withdraws. For in faith, hope, and charity, and the other good things — without which the heavenly country cannot be attained, such as humility, chastity, justice, and mercy — it deserts not the hearts of the perfect. But in the virtue of prophecy, in the eloquence of doctrine, in the exhibition of miracles, it is sometimes present to its elect, sometimes withdraws itself. In these virtues, therefore, without which life is by no means attained, the Holy Spirit remains in the hearts of his elect — whence rightly it is called stable; but in these, through which sanctity is demonstrated, it is sometimes mercifully present, sometimes mercifully withdraws."

◇ 1. Left margin: Whether charity once had can be lost.

◇ 2. Left margin: Ezekiel 1:13.

Likewise, in homily 11 on Matthew chapter 13: "Strong," he says, "is love as death:³ because, namely, as death destroys the body, so charity — for [the sake of] eternal life — slays the love of corporeal things; for whom it has perfectly absorbed, it renders as it were insensible to earthly, outward desires." Again, in homily 30 on chapter 14 of John, he says: "Never is the love of God idle: for it works great things, if it be great; but if it has refused to work, it is not love."

◇ 3. Left margin: Song of Songs 8:6.

In this opinion it is believed that **Augustine** also was, in treatise 3 on the first epistle of John — where, explaining that [saying] from chapter 2 of the same epistle, "The unction which we have received from him, let it abide in us,"⁴ etc., he says: "The invisible Unction is the Holy Spirit; the invisible unction is charity — which, in whomsoever it shall be, will be like that root which cannot dry up under a burning Sun. For everything which is rooted is nourished by the heat of the Sun, and dries not." And, in the eighth treatise on the same epistle: "It is rooted," he says, "[this] charity: be secure, nothing evil can proceed." That opinion also — "The charity which could be deserted was never true" — **Gratian** cites, [in the treatise] *On Penance*, distinction 2, from a certain epistle of Augustine to Julianus the count, which is now not found among his epistles. To this sense looks what, from the commentaries of **Ambrose** on the sixth chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians, the same Gratian alleges: "Feigned is the charity which deserts in adversity"; or, as it is read in Ambrose himself: "Simulated is the charity in those who, in [time of] necessity, desert [their] brethren." To the same [point] pertains what **Bede**, in the exposition of the first epistle of John, chapter 1, gathered from the Rhapsodies of Gregory in these words: "It must be noted that the Holy Spirit always remained in the Lord; but in holy men, as long as they bear the mortal body, partly it remains forever, partly, about to return, it withdraws. For it remains with them, that they may insist upon good acts, love voluntary poverty, embrace cleanness of heart and the tranquillity of peace, fear not to suffer persecution, insist upon almsgivings, prayers, fastings, and the other fruits of the Spirit. But it withdraws for a time, lest they should always have the faculty of healing the sick, of raising the dead, or even of prophesying. It abides always, that they may be able to have the virtues, and that they themselves may live marvelously; it comes at [set] times, that they may also shine forth to others, through the signs of miracles, [showing] of what sort they are within."

◇ 4. Left margin: 1 John 2:27.

(left column continues into the right column)

Peter Lombard, in the third book of the *Sentences*, distinction 31, writes that there were certain persons who, having taken from these opinions an occasion of erring, affirmed that Charity can neither be had by those who are to be damned, nor, when once had, be lost by those who are to be saved. St. **Thomas**, in the second [part of the] question 24, article 11, paving a way to the understanding of these passages, says that charity, which here on earth can be had, comes into consideration in three ways:⁵ either in its own essence, or as it proceeds from its author, or as it is received by the recipient. If we inspect it according to the two former modes of contemplating, then, according to the proposed opinions of the Fathers, it must be pronounced that

Charity is altogether unlosable [inamissible] — both because God himself, the author of Charity, offers to no one an occasion of losing Charity, and because Charity itself, indefectible by its own nature, cannot destroy itself. But if we regard Charity on the part of the recipients, whose disposition is various and always mutable, there is no doubt that Charity, on account of the free and unstable will of men, can easily be lost.⁶

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Charity is considered in three ways.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Why charity is lost.

Annotation CCXLI

"Thus saith the Lord: If perhaps they will hear, and be quiet," etc. — Ezekiel 3:11

Whether one sin is remitted without another. — Amos 4:7.

Gregory, in homily 10 on Ezekiel, cursorily running over that saying of Amos chapter 4, "*I rained upon one city, and upon another I rained not,*" etc., seems to hint that to penitents one sin is sometimes remitted, another not remitted. For thus he speaks: "*When the very [man] who hears the preachers corrects himself of some vices, and disdains to amend of others, one and the same city is partly rained upon and partly remains dry — [that part] in which it repels from itself the rain of preaching. For there are certain [men] who do not at all hear the words of exhortation: these utterly refuse to receive the rain. And there are certain who hear, but nevertheless do not follow this marrow [inwardly]: because they cut off some vices in themselves, but in others [vices] they grievously persist.*" St. **Thomas**, in the third part of the *Summa*, question 86, article 3, thus writes: "*The word of Gregory is not to be understood as to the remission of the fault, but as to the cessation from the act: because sometimes he who was accustomed to commit several sins deserts one, [but] not however another — which [desertion] is indeed done by divine help, which nevertheless does not reach unto the remission of the fault.*"

Annotation CCXLII

"When a land shall have sinned against me, so as to transgress by transgressing." — Ezekiel 14:13

Whether the earth is an animal capable of reason.

Origen, in homily 4 on Ezekiel, from the interpretation of this sentence attempts to establish that the earth is an animal endowed with sense and reason, capable of virtue and of vice, of reward and of punishment. His sayings, summarily excerpted, are these: "*Reviewing the most ample forest of Scripture, I am constrained to suspect that this earth which we behold is an animal — receiving proofs taken from [what is said] concerning the earth: [namely] from, 'Who looketh upon the earth, and maketh it tremble';⁷ and, 'The earth is offended by those who dwell in it'; and, 'The earth shall take complacency in its sabbaths';⁸ likewise from, 'Attend, O heaven, and I will speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth';⁹ and...*" →

◇ 7. **Right margin (a):** Psalm 103:32.

◇ 8. **Right margin (b):** Leviticus 26:34.

◇ 9. **Right margin (c):** Deuteronomy 32:1.

[...continues on folio 609 (PDF p. 426): the rest of Origen's proofs that the earth is a rational animal (Annotation CCXLII).]

(printed folio 609 [PDF p. 426]. **Annot. CCXLII (continued)–CCXLIV** (Ezekiel 14:13–44:20): Origen's proof-texts that the earth is a rational animal, answered by Chrysostom (all prosopopoeia); Origen's "imitate no one but Christ" turned against monks who imitate Basil, Benedict, Dominic, Francis (Sixtus: in the saints we imitate only Christ in them); and clerical tonsure and beard — Jerome abused by the apostate Hortensius Landus's mocking On the Persecution of Beards → folio 610.)

(folio 609, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLII (continued)

"When a land shall have sinned against me, so as to transgress by transgressing." — Ezekiel 14:13

(the excerpt from Origen continues:) "...and Jeremiah: 'Earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord.'¹ And Paul: 'Every creature groaneth together and travaileth.'² If every creature groaneth and travaileth, and part of the creatures is earth and heaven, and every creature shall be freed from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God — who knows also concerning the earth, whether according to its own nature it be held liable to some sin? whether it be an animal, whether rational, whether it needs the hearing of the prophetic word — [Scripture] saying, 'Attend, O heaven, and let it speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth,'³ and, 'Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth'⁴ — why should we not say that, as there is to be a judgment of men and of Angels, so there shall be a judgment of the air and of the earth? But if thou thinkest that we ought not to consent to this disputation, through which we assert that every creature is to be judged, hear yet another testimony concerning the earth, [addressed] to Cain: 'Cursed [be] the earth, which hath opened its mouth to receive the blood of thy brother from thy hand;'⁵ likewise, 'Cursed [be] the earth in thy works;'⁶ likewise, concerning the coming of the Lord it is written, 'All the earth crieth out with joy.'⁷ For it is capable, as an animal, according to the qualities of the portions of good acts and of evil, in which it either merits praise or punishment. When therefore it is said, 'The land which shall have sinned against me,' a certain mystery is signified; for one thing is said concerning the inhabitants, another concerning it [the land] which is inhabited. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away'⁸: why does heaven pass over? why does the earth pass away, except because their passing has merited certain worthy things? And in another place, 'Corrupt,' it says, 'is all the earth.'⁹ When was it corrupted? before the flood — not because it was corrupted through the inundation of the deluge. I could also interpret it otherwise, that the earth sometimes offends: for the earth is our soul, as is signified in the parable of the Gospel; but since here it is added, 'And I will take away from it man and beast,'¹⁰ [it is] one thing [that is] earth, another man: for it does not now name the inhabitants of the earth for the earth, as some think; for if it wished the inhabitants of the earth to be taken by [the word] "earth," it would have been superfluous to say, "I will take away from it man and beast."¹¹

◇ 1. Left margin (d): Jeremiah 22:29.

◇ 2. Left margin (e): Romans 8:22.

◇ 3. Left margin (a): Deuteronomy 32:1.

◇ 4. Left margin (b): Isaiah 1:2.

◇ 5. Left margin (c): Genesis 4:11.

◇ 6. Left margin (d): Genesis 3:17.

◇ 7. Left margin (e): Psalm 95:1 and 99:1.

◇ 8. Left margin (f): Luke 21:33.

◇ 9. Left margin (g): Genesis 6:11.

◇ 10. Left margin (h): Genesis 6:13.

These things Origen — or rather the corrupter of Origen. To whom, according to the opinion of **Chrysostom**, we respond that all the aforesaid testimonies are to be accommodated to the earth through prosopopoeia — that is, through the fashioning of a person.¹¹ For the divine writers are wont, that the discourse may become more significant, to feign animated persons for inanimate things — introducing now rivers clapping with [their] hands,¹² now hills leaping, now mountains skipping¹³ — not that we should think these to be animated, nor that we should attribute to them any cogitation, but that we may understand how great is the amplitude of the goods proposed, so that it may reach even to those things which lack sense. This same thing they do also in troublesome matters, introducing both a lamenting life, and mountains, and the wailing ceilings of the temple, that from this too we may reckon the gravity of evils.

◇ 11. Left margin: Prosopopoeia is frequent in the Scriptures.

◇ 12. **Left margin:** Psalm 97:8.

◇ 13. **Left margin:** Psalm 113:4.

In this same homily of Origen, about seventy lines far from the beginning, read cautiously that which he says: "*That some of the Angels are those who transgress, others who do not transgress, and both are to be judged in the day of judgment according to their works.*"

Annotation CCXLIII

"Taking of my garments, thou hast made to thyself high places." — Ezekiel 16:16

Not only Christ is to be imitated. — Matthew 23:2–3.

Origen, in homily 7 on Ezekiel, when he was expounding this particule, cursorily proceeded to the explanation of Christ's sentence from Matthew: "*Upon the chair of Moses have sat the Scribes and Pharisees: all things whatsoever they say to you, hear and do; but according to their works do not [do]: for they say, and do not. This discourse is about me, who teach good things and do the contrary, and am a seat upon the chair of Moses, as a scribe and Pharisee. The precept is to thee, O people: if thou shalt not have ground of accusation — [namely] the worst doctrine, foreign to the dogmas of the Church — but shalt behold my culpable life and sins, [thou art bidden] not to order thy life according to [me] who speak, but to do those things which I shall speak: let us imitate no one; and if we wish to imitate anyone, Christ is set before us for imitation.*"

This passage, as is gathered from the *Collectanea* of **Hermann**, the heretics twist against Catholics — especially against monks, who imitate Basil, Benedict, Dominic, Francis, and the other founders of the monastic life — as if it were not enough to imitate the one Christ, whom Paul sets before us as the sole exemplar of imitation, saying: "*Be ye imitators of Christ.*"¹⁴ To whom it must be responded: We, when we imitate the saints, imitate in the saints no other than Christ, dwelling and living in the saints — Paul saying, "*I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me.*"¹⁵ Nor do we imitate the saints in any other way than [in imitating] him whom Paul — in whom Christ was speaking — set before us, saying, "*Be ye imitators of me, as I also [am] of Christ*"¹⁶ — that is, in so far as the saints themselves imitate Christ. To this sense, therefore, are the proposed words of Origen brought forth.

◇ 14. **Right margin:** Ephesians 5:1.

◇ 15. **Right margin:** Galatians 2:20.

◇ 16. **Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 4:16 and 11:1.

Annotation CCXLIV

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

Whether clerics ought to have beard or hair shorn.

Jerome's explanation, appended to this passage, the heretics of our times usurp against the ecclesiastical Traditions concerning the shaving off of the hair and beard of priests. Of their number, a certain **Hortensius Landus** [Ortensio Lando], a deserter of the Augustinian profession, put out a booklet peculiar to this argument, prefaced with a title impiously enough jocose — *On the Persecution of Beards*¹⁷ — in which, with various and shameless jests, revilings, and blasphemies, he attacks the Clerics, and especially the monks, who observe the religious institute of shaving the crown and the chin; wresting against them several testimonies of divine Scripture, and the sayings of Catholic interpreters — among which is the explanation of the proposed clause, expressed by **Jerome** in the thirteenth commentary on Ezekiel in these words: "*But that which follows — 'They shall not shave their head,' etc.*"¹⁸ — *plainly demonstrates that we ought not, like the priests and worshippers of Isis and Serapis, [to be] with shaven heads, nor again to let down the hair — which is properly luxurious and barbarian — but that the honorable habit of priests should be shown by the countenance; and that baldness is not to be made by the razor, nor the head to be shorn so close that we*

seem to be like shaven men, but the hair to be let down only so far that the skin be covered." And after a few [words]: "The superstition of the gentiles has shaven heads; but I do not think that any of the Gentiles abstains from wine." Again, in book six on Isaiah, elucidating that, "In all heads [there shall be] baldness, and every beard shall be shaven,"¹⁹ etc., he says: "If virility was seen to be had in the beard, [then], with it shaved off from an ecclesiastical man, he is proved effeminate and weak." And again, in book three on Isaiah, expounding that threat of God, "In that day the Lord shall shave with a razor,"²⁰ etc.: "Therefore," he says, "with that most sharp razor — that is, in the king of the Syrians [Assyrians] — all the hairs, and the comeliness of the beard (which is a sign of virility), the Lord shall shave from Judaea, that nothing in that"

→

◇ 17. **Right margin:** A booklet of the heretic on the persecution of beards.

◇ 18. **Right margin:** Ezekiel 44:20.

◇ 19. **Right margin:** Isaiah 15:2. [The quoted words — "in all heads baldness, every beard shaved" — are Isaiah 15:2.]

◇ 20. **Right margin:** Isaiah 7:20.

[...continues on folio 610 (PDF p. 427): the rest of Jerome on Isaiah 7:20 and the shaving of the beard (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

(printed folio 610 [PDF p. 427]. **Annot. CCXLIV (continued)** (Ezekiel 44:20): the beard-and-tonsure defense continues — Jerome on Isaiah 7:20, Epiphanius, and Clement of Alexandria on the beard; then Sixtus's rebuttal of Hortensius (shearing is warranted by God, the Church, and nature — Paul and Chrysostom on hair as the badge of male rule; the Nazarites, Ezekiel's razor, Paul's vow-shavings; the tonsure traced from the Nazarites through the Apostles) → folio 611.)

(folio 610, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (continued)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(Jerome on Isaiah 7:20 concludes:) "...that nothing in that [Judaea] perchance remain beautiful, but that it be compared to effeminate men, nay to ignominious women."

To this sentence of Jerome is annexed another, of **Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis, who, in the third volume of the *Panarion*, contending against the Massalians [Messalians], affirms that it was sanctioned by the Apostles, by the authority of divine Scripture, that the beard should not be shaved. His words are these: "Brethren who live in the monasteries throughout Mesopotamia — what is worse — cut off the beard, the form [mark] of a man, but often nourish the hair of the head. And yet concerning the beard indeed the divine Scripture says, in the Constitutions and the doctrine of the Apostles: 'Thou shalt not corrupt' — that is, 'Thou shalt not cut off the hairs of the beard,'¹ nor after the manner of a harlot make thyself wild on account of [thy] hair."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Leviticus 19:27.

There is joined to Epiphanius **Clement of Alexandria**, presbyter, the preceptor of Origen,² in the third book of the *Paedagogus*, chapter 11, thus writing: "The hairs of men — lest they be too much let down from the head — glide into a womanish mane; for to men the beard suffices; because, if anyone also trim the beard somewhat, yet it is not to be altogether denuded: for it is a base spectacle, and a beard shorn down to the skin does not seem to be far from plucking and laceration. For the psalmographer [was] delighted with a beard as with a mane, [saying,] 'As the ointment,' he says, 'which descends into the beard, the beard of Aaron³ — who, with the beard by [its] doubling adorning [him], praised the comeliness, [and] gladdened the countenance with the ointment of the Lord. The hairs, therefore, are to be shorn — not with the razor, for

this is illiberal, but with the scissors of barbers. But the hairs of the beard, which bring no annoyance, are not to be vexed, as [those] which bring a gravity to the countenance, and strike in a certain paternal awe."

◇ 2. **Left margin:** Clement of Alexandria was the teacher of Origen.

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Psalm 132:2.

These sayings of the Fathers, **Hortensius** confirms with the authorities of divine Scripture — by which he not only reproves this custom of shaving, but also blames that form of shearing which the clerics now use, the head being shorn in the manner of a crown [the tonsure]. And [he says] that concerning shaving indeed it is written, by prohibition, in Ezekiel: [a] "*The priests shall not shave their head*";⁴ and concerning Samuel the priest: [b] "*A razor shall not pass over his head all the days of his life*";⁵ and in Numbers, to him who has consecrated himself to God, it is said: [c] "*A razor shall not pass over his head all the time of his consecration*";⁶ and in Leviticus it is commanded to all: [d] "*You shall not shave your beard, nor shall you make marks upon you*";⁷ whence also, in the epistle of Jeremiah [in Baruch], the Prophet, detesting the rite of the priests of Babylon shaving [their] head and beard, says: [e] "*In the houses of the idols the priests sit, having torn tunics, and their head and beard shaven, whose heads are bare.*"⁸ But concerning the circular shearing of the head, he says that God commanded in Leviticus: [f] "*You shall not shear your hair round, nor shave your beard*";⁹ and in Jeremiah God, threatening dispersion to the contemners of this law, says: [g] "*I will disperse into every wind those who are shorn round in [their] hair.*"¹⁰

◇ 4. **Left margin (a):** Ezekiel 44:20.

◇ 5. **Left margin (b):** 1 Samuel [1 Kings] 1:11.

◇ 6. **Left margin (c):** Numbers 6:5.

◇ 7. **Left margin (d):** Leviticus 19:27–28.

◇ 8. **Left margin (e):** Baruch 6:30. [The "epistle of Jeremiah," Baruch chapter 6.]

◇ 9. **Left margin (f):** Leviticus 19:27.

◇ 10. **Left margin (g):** Jeremiah 9:26. [The wording quoted — "I will disperse into every wind those shorn round in hair" — corresponds most closely to Jeremiah 49:32.]

And these are [the things] which that uncowed deserter [transfuga] brought into his booklet against the sacred custom of shearing and shaving — before approved by himself for a long time — intermixed with jests, gibes, and impure fables; to whom we briefly respond that neither by divine laws, nor by any decrees of the Fathers, is the shearing or shaving of the head and the chin simply prohibited; but, on the contrary, we assert that the custom of shearing was received both from God, and from the Church, and in a manner from the very laws of nature herself.

(left column continues into the right column)

For, writing concerning the natural law of shearing, **Paul**, in the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, says: "*Nature itself teaches you, that if a man nourish [long] hair, it is an ignominy to him; but if a woman nourish [long] hair, it is a glory to her: because the hairs are given to her for a veil; and it is base for a woman to be shorn, or made bald.*"¹¹ Expounding which words, **Chrysostom** says: "*Nature has given to the human race, even in the dressing of the hairs, a presidency [rule], and the symbols of subjection. For it bade the man, with the hair cut, to display with a free and uncovered head the sign of principality; but the woman it willed to wear the hair [long], as a certain veil of submission, and a mark of servitude. As, therefore, a woman — if, with hair cut off and head bared, she shall have usurped the man's symbol against the order of nature — disfigures herself; so a man, if — the dignity of his power being neglected — he shall have assumed the womanish [long] hair, shall affect himself with ignominy, bearing the mark of servitude and the token of an effeminate soul. Since, therefore, men are all persuaded by the instinct of nature to the shearing of the hair, how much more consentaneous is it that Priests — who, in the dignity of [their] office and by the example of [their] life, ought to preside over the rest — should bear about the insignia of virile presidency, with the womanish hair shorn?"*

◇ 11. **Right margin:** 1 Corinthians 11:14–15.

But that God very often commanded the shearing of the hair and beard, and the shaving [abrasion], the sacred letters teach us — in which it is written that the Nazarites, the hair being first kept [grown], at length, after a great continence of life, shaved the head, and were bidden to put the hairs into the fire of the sacrifice;¹² that by this visible sign they might be admonished to cut away from themselves all the superfluous goods of the present life (which are signified by the superfluities of the hairs of the human body), and to sacrifice [them] in the service of God. This also we read to have been commanded to Ezekiel the prophet and priest, God saying to him: "*Thou, son of man, take to thyself a sharp razor, shaving the hairs, and thou shalt lead it over [thy] head, and over thy beard.*"¹³ And in the Acts of the Apostles, Luke committed to memory that Priscilla and Aquila, the vow of the Nazarites being undertaken, shaved the hair in Cenchreae, the port of the Corinthians;¹⁴ and that the same [was] done, not long after, at Jerusalem, by Paul, at the exhortation of James the Apostle, together with very many other disciples of Christ.¹⁵

◇ 12. **Right margin:** Numbers 6:18.

◇ 13. **Right margin:** Ezekiel 5:1.

◇ 14. **Right margin:** Acts 18:18.

◇ 15. **Right margin:** Acts 21:24, 26.

Moreover, that this very thing was established by Ecclesiastical sanctions from the very beginning of the nascent Church, **Isidore**, bishop of Hispalis [Seville], is witness, in the second book *On Ecclesiastical Offices*, chapter four, thus writing: "*The use of the ecclesiastical tonsure — arisen, if I err not, from the Nazarites — was introduced into the Church by the Apostles, that those who, dedicated to divine worship, should be consecrated to the Lord as Nazarites (that is, saints of God), might be renewed with the hair cut off.*" Which sentence of Isidore, that it is true, the epistle of **Anicetus** the pontiff [pope] confirms — written not long from the times of the Apostles to the bishops of Gaul — in which also these things, among the rest, are had: "*Prohibit, brethren, throughout all the Churches of your regions, that Clerics — who ought to be an example of virtue, honesty, chastity, and gravity to the laity and the simple, and prudently to exhibit themselves, as a sign of a purer life, to the ruder [sort] for imitation — should, according to the Apostle, not nourish the hair [long], but should shave the head above in the manner of a sphere: because, as they ought to be set apart in [their] manner of life, so also in the tonsure, and in every habit, ought they to appear set apart.*" There is extant also, in the fourth Council of Carthage — which, in the year of our salvation 416," →

[...continues on folio 611 (PDF p. 428): the Fourth Council of Carthage and the rest of the tonsure argument (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

(printed folio 611 [PDF p. 428]. **Annot. CCXLIV (continued)** (Ezekiel 44:20): the tonsure defense concludes — the Councils (Carthage IV, Toledo IV) and Isidore's four causes of the tonsure (the "royal priesthood," 1 Pet 2:9); Bede on the shaven beard as a memorial of humility; then Sixtus's two classes of proof-texts — those binding only the Nazarites and Levites, and those condemning only pagan-imitating or effeminate shaving (Caesar, Otho) → folio 612.)

(folio 611, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (continued)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(the Fourth Council of Carthage, held in the year of our salvation 416, continues:) was collected [held], the canon numbered forty-fourth, in these words:¹ "*Clerics shall neither nourish the hair, nor the beard.*" It is had likewise, in the fourth synod of Toledo (celebrated a thousand years ago from now), another canon, forty-second in order, prescribing the form and figure of the ecclesiastical tonsure in this manner: "*Let all*

clerics, or readers, like the levites and priests, the head being shorn entirely above, leave below only the crown of a circle [the ring]; not as hitherto the readers in the parts of Galicia are seen to do, who, with prolix [hair], like laics, shear a slight little circle only on the top of the head. For this rite hitherto in the Spains was of the heretics; whence it behooves that, for cutting off scandal from the Churches, this sign of dishonor be taken away, and that there be one tonsure, or habit, as is the use of all Spain. But he who shall not have kept this shall be guilty [of an offense] against the Catholic faith."

◇ 1. **Left margin:** What was the form and figure of the ecclesiastical tonsure.

Isidore of Hispalis [Seville], in the book which we just now cited, referring the causes of the ecclesiastical tonsure, says that the Church instituted this in the first place,² that, as clerics ought to be distinct from the laics in the manner of living, and conspicuous among them by probity of life, so by a certain distinct cultivation of the head it behooved them to be discerned from the rest of the seculars — which also the decree of **Anicetus** openly indicates, saying, "*that, as they ought to be distinct from others in [their] conversation, so let them be distinct in the tonsure and habit.*"

◇ 2. **Left margin:** The cause of the ecclesiastical tonsure.

Secondly, that clerics by this external symbol of the shorn head might be taught that they should bear within, in the mind (whose seat the head is said to be), that which it would be right [to bear] — that is, to cut away the superfluous cares of the flesh (which the superfluity of the hairs adumbrates) together with the hairs; and to cast away crimes [sins] with the tresses; and to lay aside the carnal and womanish mind together with the carnal and womanish hair; and to impose a new and virile mind, virilely, upon the shorn head.

Thirdly, that in the Clerics the insignia of each dignity — namely, the royal and the sacerdotal — might be beheld. For as in the old Law the Priests placed upon the head the tiara (that is, a little cap having the figure of a half-sphere), but the kings girded [their] temples with a golden crown: so now the upper portion of the head, shorn to the likeness of a hemispherical tiara, displays the sacerdotal dignity; but the garland of hairs, led round the temples in the manner of a crown, represents the likeness of royal majesty — so that plainly that sentence of Peter may suit the clerics: "*You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood.*"³

◇ 3. **Left margin:** 1 Peter 2:9.

Fourthly, **Germanus**, bishop of Constantinople, in the explanation of the divine Liturgy, and **Bede** the presbyter in [his] history, add a fourth cause of a rite of this kind: that, when the Jews, in contumely of the Christian name, had shaved Peter — preaching at Antioch — in the upper part of the head, the later pontiffs and bishops, imposing upon their own heads, for the sake of humility, the ignominy inflicted upon Peter, changed it into an ornament and glory of the Christian priesthood. And these, they report, were the causes of the shearing of the head.

The reason for shaving the beard, **Bede**, in the commentaries on Ezra, says was instituted for the recollection of humility⁴ — namely, lest men dedicated to God should be extolled into pride by the magnitude or multitude of their virtues. For since the beard, which is [a mark] of the virile sex and of age, signifies

◇ 4. **Left margin:** Why priests shave the beard.

(left column continues into the right column)

the right hand, fortitude, prudence, and the other virtues worthy of a perfect man — therefore holy men are bidden to cut it off, or shave it away, that from this they may understand that they ought to cast away all confidence in their own virtue, and to remember that their virtues, howsoever great and many, are mingled with vices, and that accordingly they are few and small, or almost none, if they be examined by the scrutiny of the divine equity — David saying: "*Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, because no living [man] shall be justified in thy sight*";⁵ and Job: "*If I wish to justify myself, and to show myself innocent, God will prove me depraved.*"⁶ From these, therefore, it is manifest that the tonsure is not only approved by the Divine and Ecclesiastical Laws, but is even enjoined for many and just causes.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Psalm 142:2.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Job 9:20.

But, that we may respond to those [testimonies] which seem to shake this determination, it must be known that those [things] which Hortensius brought against us are distinguished in a twofold order. In the first are placed the testimonies of Scripture, which do not interdict shaving or shearing to all persons, and everywhere, and always, but to certain persons, places, and times — that is, only to the Nazarites, until they should fulfill [their] vow, or only to the Levites, until they should tarry in the holy land, and while the temple at Jerusalem stood, in which alone they could sacrifice, and exercise the other things pertaining to the sacrifice. For there, and for that time, and to the priests alone, God commanded that they should not shave the head and beard, that they might be as far as possible from the superstition of the neighboring nations — whose priests, as is read in the epistle of Jeremiah,⁷ with head and chin shaven, sacrificed to the idols. But now neither do the priests of the Jews, cast out of Palestine, abstain from shaving, nor are the Christian priests prohibited from it — whom Christ, by his death, freed from the laws of the ancient priesthood. To this order, therefore, pertain [those things] which God imposed upon the Nazarites in the book of Numbers,⁸ and commanded concerning shaving to the priests, whether through Moses, or through Ezekiel, or through the other prophets.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Baruch 6:30.

◇ 8. **Right margin:** Numbers 6:5.

In the second order are the oracles of the Scriptures and the sayings of the covenant, which seem to prohibit shearing and shaving — when nevertheless they forbid neither, but only restrain the perverse intention, and the depraved custom of those shearing and shaving: of whom some, persuaded by a vain superstition, shaved themselves in imitation of the gentile priests; others, led by a certain womanish softness, shaved the beard, that they might make themselves effeminate — as Suetonius relates concerning certain Roman Emperors: that Julius Caesar shaved the beard with such diligence and fastidiousness that he even plucked out the hairs, not without reproach; but that Otho daily shaved the face, and smeared [it] with moist bread, and instituted this from the first down [of youth], that he might never be bearded. Such an impious use, therefore, and the wicked custom of shaving and shearing, **Jerome, Clement, Epiphanius**, and the apostolic — nay, the divine — law condemn: [the law] cited by Epiphanius from chapter 19 of Leviticus: "*You shall not shear the hair round, nor shave the beard.*"⁹ For thus does **Theodoret**, bishop of Cyrus [Cyrrhus], explain it, in question 28 on Leviticus, saying: "*Certain [interpreters] — that which the Seventy rendered, 'You shall not make a σισόην [sisoe, a curl] out of the hair of your head, nor...' —*" →

◇ 9. **Right margin:** Leviticus 19:27.

[...continues on folio 612 (PDF p. 429): Theodoret's explanation of Leviticus 19:27 and the rest of the tonsure argument (Annotatio CCXLIV).]

(printed folio 612 [PDF p. 429]. **Annot. CCXLIV (concl.)–CCXLV** (Ezekiel 44:20–Daniel 1:1): the tonsure annotation closes — Theodoret and Cardinal Cajetan on the Hebrew of Leviticus 19:27 (only the *pe'ot*, not shaving as such). **Daniel begins** — Jerome's preface on the apocryphal appendices (Susanna, the Hymn, Bel and the Dragon) and the Jewish teacher's cavils; Daniel ranked among the Hagiographa; then Rufinus's three charges and Jerome's reply from the *Invectives* → folio 613.)

(folio 612, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLIV (concluded)

"The priests shall not shave their head." — Ezekiel 44:20

(Theodoret continues:) "...corrupting your face [with] your beard' they have interpreted [as] 'the hairs made curly of set purpose.' But I think that something else is interdicted by the law: for it is the custom among the Greeks, in boys, not to shear the extremities of the hairs, but to let the hairs grow long, and some time after to dedicate them to the Demons. They were wont also to shave the beard when they mourned someone, and to cut the cheeks in honor of the dead; and moreover they pierced some parts of the body with a needle, and clothed [themselves] in black in reverence of the Demons. These things, therefore, are interdicted by the divine law."

But **Thomas**, the presbyter Cardinal [Cajetan], thinks that no mention of the tonsure is made here; for thus he writes in the commentaries: "*In the Hebrew is had* לא תקפו פאת ראשכם [*Lo thakkiphu peath roschem*], that is, 'You shall not round the corner of your head.' Nothing is said of shearing, but of rounding; and I would believe that the superstition of the garlands is restrained, which garlanded the heads of those celebrating the sacred [rites] of the Gods: for, crowned with a circle of the ivy sacred to Bacchus, they celebrated [them], as the book of Maccabees relates. Nor 'shalt thou shave the beard' — in Hebrew ולא תשחית את פאת זקנך [*Ve lo thaschid eth peath zechanecha*], that is, 'And thou shalt not destroy the corner of thy beard.' There is interdicted, to the letter, the total shaving of the corners of the beard; and there are called 'corners of the beard,' as the Hebrews testify, the uppermost parts of the beard, which are joined to the temples; and to this day the Hebrews keep these corners hairy, although they shave the rest of the beard."

Annotation CCXLV

"In the third year of the reign of Joachim," etc. — Daniel 1:1

On the Appendix of Daniel.

Jerome, in the preface of the translation on Daniel, giving [his] opinion concerning the parts of the book of Daniel, thus writes: "*These things I therefore relate, that I might show you the difficulty of Daniel — which, among the Hebrews, has neither the history of Susanna, nor the hymn of the three children, nor the fables of Bel and the dragon; which we, because they are dispersed throughout the whole world, having prefixed a spit [obelus], and stabbing them through, subjoined [appended], lest we should seem, among the unskilled, to have cut off a great part of the volume. I heard, therefore, a certain one of the teachers of the Jews, when he derided the history of Susanna, and said that it had been fabricated by some Greek or other, to object that which the African [Julius Africanus] also opposed to Origen: [namely] that these etymologies — ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου, σχίσαι [from the mastic-tree, to split], and ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου, πρῖσαι [from the holm-oak, to saw]¹ — descend from the Greek speech; of which matter we can give this understanding to our [readers]: that, for example, we might say concerning the holm-tree [ilex] that [the judge] said to him, 'Straightway mayest thou perish' [ilico pereas], and 'from the mastic [lentisco] into a lentil [lentem] may the Angel crush thee'; or, 'Mayest thou not perish gently, or slowly [lentus]' — that is, 'flexible mayest thou be led to death'; or something else suiting the name of the tree. Then he cavilled that there was only so much leisure to the three children,² that in the furnace of the raging fire they should sport in meter, and in order provoke all the elements to the praise of God; or [cavilled] what a miracle, and token of divine inspiration, it was, either that the dragon was slain by a lump of pitch,³ or that the contrivances of the priests of Bel were detected — [things] which were perpetrated rather by the prudence of a shrewd man than by a prophetic spirit. But when he came to Habakkuk — [reading] that he was snatched from Judaea into Chaldaea to carry the dish [of pottage] — he sought an example, where we might have read, in the whole Old Testament, that any of the saints had flown with [his] heavy body, and in a point of an hour had crossed such spaces of lands.⁴ To whom, when a certain one of ours, prompt enough for speaking, had brought Ezekiel into the midst, and said that he had been translated from Chaldaea into Judaea, he laughed at the man, and, from the very volume, demonstrated that Ezekiel had seen himself transposed in the spirit.⁵ Finally, [he objected] that even our Apostle — namely, as a learned man, and one who had learned the law from the Hebrews — had not dared*

to affirm that he was snatched away in the body, but had said, 'Whether in the body, or out of the body, I know not; God knoweth.'⁶ By these and such arguments he argued the [tales] in the book of the Church [to be] apocryphal fables. Concerning which matter, leaving the judgment to the arbitration of the reader, I admonish this: that Daniel is not had among the Hebrews among the Prophets, but among those who wrote the Hagiographa. For all Scripture is divided by them into three parts — into the Law, into the Prophets, and into the Hagiographa — that is, into five, and eight, and eleven books; concerning which it is not of this time to discourse. But what things Porphyry objects out of this Prophet — nay, against this book — Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius are witnesses, who, answering his madness with many thousands of verses, [I know not] whether they have satisfied the curious reader."

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Daniel 13:54. [The Greek word-plays of the Susanna story — σχῆνος/σχίσαι and πρῖνος/πρῖσαι — cited by Julius Africanus as proof it was composed in Greek.]
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Daniel 3:51–52, etc. [The Hymn of the Three Children.]
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** Daniel 14:26. [Bel and the Dragon — the dragon killed with cakes of pitch.]
- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** Daniel 14:35. [Habakkuk carried by the angel to Babylon.]
- ◇ 5. **Left margin:** Ezekiel 8:3. [Ezekiel lifted up "in the spirit."]
- ◇ 6. **Right margin:** 2 Corinthians 12:2–3.

(left column continues into the right column)

These things Jerome; whom **Rufinus**, presbyter of Aquileia, in the book of the *Invectives*, criminales especially on account of three [things]. First, that, at the exhortation of Baraba the Jew, his teacher, he cast out from the volume of Daniel the history of Susanna — which for almost four hundred years the Church had read for the instruction of chastity — and that by a certain rhetorical craft, under another's person, he brought in arguments against it. Second, that he removed from its place, and cut off, the hymn of the three children, which the Church especially chanted on solemn days. Third, that he said Daniel was not to be held among the Prophets.

Meeting these charges, **Jerome**, in the first book of the *Invectives* against Rufinus, responds to him in this manner: "Concerning Daniel, however, I will briefly respond: that I did not deny him [to be] a Prophet — whom I straightway, at the front of the prologue, confessed to be a Prophet — but [wished] to show what the Hebrews said, and by what arguments they strove to prove their opinion; and I taught the reader that the Churches of Christ read this Prophet according to Theodotion, and not according to the Seventy translators. Of which [editions], if in that book I said the [Septuagint] edition to differ much from the truth, and to be reprobated by the right judgment of the Churches of Christ, it is not my fault, [I] who said [it], but theirs who read [it]. There are at hand four editions — of Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy, and Theodotion. The Church reads Daniel according to Theodotion. What have I sinned, if I followed the judgment of the Churches? But when I report what the Hebrews are wont to say against the history of Susanna, and the hymn of the three children, and the fables of Bel and the dragon — which are not had in the Hebrew volume — he who criminales me [as] a fool proves himself a slanderer [sycophant]: for I explained not what I myself thought, but what they are wont to say against us; whose opinion if I did not answer in the prologue, studying brevity, [it was] lest I should seem to write not a preface, but a book. I said, therefore, that I straightway subjoined [it]: for I said, 'concerning which it is not of this time to discourse.' Otherwise also, from that which I asserted — that Porphyry said many things against this prophet, and I called as witnesses of this matter Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius, who answered his madness with many thousands of verses — he will be able to accuse me [and ask] why I did not, in the little preface, write against the books of Porphyry. He who pursues trifles of this sort, and will not receive the truth from the Hebrew Scripture, let him hear [me] freely proclaiming: No one is compelled to read what he does not wish; I wrote for those seeking [it], not for the fastidious; gratis, not for the envious; for the studious, not for the yawning. And yet I wonder how [he could call] Theodotion a heretic —" →

[...continues on folio 613 (PDF p. 430): the rest of Jerome's reply to Rufinus on Daniel and Theodotion (Annotatio CCXLV).]

(printed folio 613 [PDF p. 430]. **Annot. CCXLV (concl.)–CCXLVII** (Daniel 1:1–3:18): Jerome on Theodotion closes; the fourth kingdom of iron is Rome (Jerome answers the charge of dishonoring the empire); and CCXLVII opens **the great image controversy** — the Anabaptist Balthasar Hubmaier's iconoclast dossier (Jerome; Epiphanius's Anablatha-veil letter and a second letter; Eusebius to Constantia; Ambrose; the Council of Elvira; the iconoclast council) → folio 614.)

(folio 613, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLV (concluded)

"In the third year of the reign of Joachim," etc. — Daniel 1:1

(Jerome's reply to Rufinus concludes:) "...[a heretic] whom he both reads as judaizing, and [yet] disdains the translation of whatsoever Christian sinner."

Read these things more fully in book 8, in the confutation of the sixth heresy.

Annotation CCXLVI

"And the fourth kingdom shall be as iron," etc. — Daniel 2:40

On the kingdom of the Romans.

Jerome so expounds this clause in the commentaries on Daniel: "*The fourth kingdom, which plainly pertains to the Romans, is the iron which crushes and subdues all things; but its feet, and the toes, [are] partly of iron and partly of clay — which at this time is most manifestly proved: for as in the beginning nothing was stronger and harder than the Roman empire, so in the end of things nothing [is] more feeble, when both in civil wars, and against the diverse nations of other barbarous peoples, we need [outside] aid.*" There were not lacking, of old, [those] who accused Jerome on account of these things — that he had treated the majesty of the Roman empire, then defended by a most Christian Emperor, with too little honorific words. To whom he, answering, in the preface of the eleventh [book] of the commentary on Isaiah, thus says: "*If, in the exposition of the statue, and of its feet, and the discrepancy of the toes of iron and clay over the Roman kingdom, I interpreted that which perhaps [was] first [strong], then feeble, [as] the Scripture portends — let them not impute [it] to me, but to the Prophet. For neither is it so to be flattered to Princes, that the truth of the holy Scriptures be neglected; nor is a general disputation an injury to one person.*" These things the divine Jerome.

Annotation CCXLVII

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — Daniel 3:18

Whether the sacred Images are to be venerated.

Jerome, for the elucidation of this clause, uses these words: "*The worshippers of God ought not to adore images: therefore let the judges and princes of the world, who adore the statues and images of the Emperors, understand themselves to do that which the three children, unwilling to do, pleased God. And the property [distinction] is to be noted: they say that God is worshipped, [but] the image adored — which neither [of the two] suits the servants of God.*"

Balthasar Hiemairus [Hubmaier] — who, on account of the pertinacity of heresy, was burned at Vienna in the year of the Lord 1528 — in the book which he inscribed against the worshippers of images, abuses these

words of Jerome for the protection of his error, a testimony being added after that very [passage] from the epistle of Epiphanius to John, bishop of Jerusalem, translated and approved by Jerome himself, in these words: "*When I had come to the villa which is called Anablatha, and, passing by, had seen there a lamp burning, and had asked what place it was, and had learned that it was a Church, and had entered in to pray — I found there a veil hanging in the doors of that same Church, dyed and painted, and having an image as it were of Christ, or of some saint; for I do not sufficiently remember whose the image was. When, therefore, I had seen this — that, in the Church of Christ, against the authority of the Scriptures, the image of a man was hanging — I tore it, and rather gave counsel to the keepers of that place that they should wrap [in it] and carry out some poor dead [person]. But they, murmuring against [me], said: If he wished to tear [it], it was just that he should give another veil, and change [it]. When I had heard this, I promised that I would give [one], and that I would send [it] straightway; but now I have sent what I was able to find, and I pray that thou command the presbyters of that same place to receive*

(left column continues into the right column)

the veil from the bearer, which has been sent by us; and henceforth [give order] to command, in the Church of Christ, that veils of this sort — which come against our religion — be not hung up: for it becometh thy reverence rather to have this solicitude, that it take away the scrupulosity which is unworthy of the Church of Christ, and of the peoples who are entrusted to thee."

Again, in another epistle, which is cited in the acts of the seventh synod, the same author thus writes: "*Be ye mindful, beloved sons, not to bring images into the Church, nor to place them in the cemeteries of the saints, but always carry God about in your hearts; nay, let them not even be tolerated in a common house: for it is not lawful for a Christian to be held [in suspense] through the eyes, but through the engagement of the mind."* These things Epiphanius; to which the author of the book [Balthasar] annexes the opinion of **Eusebius**, bishop of Caesarea.

He, in the epistle to Constantia Augusta — who was asking from him an image of Christ — so wrote: "*Since thou hast written to me concerning an image of Christ, that I should send [it] to thee, I would that thou signify to me which image of Christ thou thinkest [of] — whether that true and incommutable [one], bearing the characters [features] of his nature, or this [one] which, for our sake, he assumed, putting on for us the servile form. But indeed concerning the divine form I do not think that thou thyself art solicitous, since thou hast been taught by him that no one has known the Father except the Son, nor that anyone has worthily known the Son himself, except him who begot him, the Father."* And after other [things]: "*But if thou altogether requirest an image of the form, and of the flesh, which for our sake he put on — this too we have learned to be commingled with the glory of his deity, and [to be] passible, and mortal."* And after a few [words]: "*Who, therefore, could portray with dead and lifeless colors, and with shadowy painting, the shining and coruscating splendors of glory and of dignity of this sort? — since not even his divine disciples were able to contemplate him on the mountain, [but], falling on their face, confessed that they could not behold a spectacle of this kind. If, therefore, in the figure of his flesh he received such power from the divinity dwelling in it, what must one say [of it] then, when — having put off mortality, and washed away corruption — he transferred the form of a servant into the glory of the Lord and of God? [namely] after the victory of death; after the ascension into the heavens; after being seated with the Father on a royal throne, at the right hand; after rest in the ineffable and unnamable bosoms of the Father — into which, as he ascended and took his seat, the heavenly powers acclaimed him with blessed voices, saying: 'Princes, lift up your gates; be ye lifted up, O heavenly gates; and the King of glory shall enter in.'*"¹ Thus far Eusebius.

◇ 1. **Right margin:** Psalm 23:7–9. [Vulgate Psalm 23 = Psalm 24 in the Hebrew numbering.]

To whom Balthasar subjoins the authority of **Ambrose**, from the funeral oration on Theodosius, where thus is read: "*Helena, therefore, found the cross of the Lord — [and] adored the King, not indeed the wood; because this is a gentile error, and a vanity of the impious: but she adored him who hung on the wood —*

inscribed in the title of the cross."

At length, after many explanations of these opinions, he [Balthasar] concludes his narration with two decrees. Of these, that which is the more ancient is contained in canon 36 of the Council of Elvira [Eliberitanum], celebrated in the year of the Lord 320. Its words are these: "*It has pleased [us] that pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted on the walls.*" But the other [decree] was published much later, about the year of the Lord 730, under Leo and Constantine his son, Augusti, in the third Ephesine council, published in these words: "*If anyone [presume] to figure the figure of the incarnate Word of God, and the ideas of all the saints,*" →

[...continues on folio 614 (PDF p. 431): the rest of the iconoclast decree, and Sixtus's refutation of Balthasar (Annotatio CCXLVII).]

(printed folio 614 [PDF p. 431]. Annot. CCXLVII (continued) (Daniel 3:18): Sixtus refutes the iconoclasts — Jerome meant pagan idols, not Christian images; Ambrose affirms the cross is to be adored (the honor referred to Christ); the Nicaea II rhymed couplet; John Damascene's threefold answer to Epiphanius; the Council of Elvira as a temporary remedy; and emperors receive the Church's laws, they do not impose them → folio 615.)

(folio 614, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLVII (continued)

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — Daniel 3:18 *(the iconoclast decree concludes:)* "...[if anyone presume to figure the incarnate Word of God, and the ideas of all the saints] in lifeless and mute images, with material colors, since they bring no use at all — let him be anathema. For it is a vain excogitation, and a diabolical invention of insidious plotting." After the promulgation of which decree, the same Emperors commanded all images and statues to be taken away from the temples, and burned.

By these, and by other testimonies of the Fathers and of the divine Scripture — forcibly wrested, and wrongly expounded — the impious Balthasar strives to demolish the cult of the holy Images. To whom we respond briefly, and as much as the brevity of the present undertaking permits: that he, in the first place, most ineptly accommodates to the venerable images of the saints [those things] which Jerome had written concerning the statue of the king of the Assyrians, and concerning the other images of the gentiles¹ — which they placed not only to their gods (that is, to their demons), but also to their kings and princes, living and dead, and impiously adored. These [Jerome] said were not to be adored — not, however, those which we Christians consecrate to the true God, and to his blessed friends and servants. Nor less insipidly does he bring Ambrose into the midst: who, although he says that Helena did not adore the cross, because to adore the wood is a gentile error and vanity, nevertheless does not deny that the cross is to be adored,² whose adoration, a little after the proposed words, he confirms, saying: "*Wisely did Helena, who raised the cross upon the head of kings, and placed [it there], that the cross of Christ might be adored in kings. This is not that insolence, but piety, which is paid to the sacred redemption.*" And then, some words being interposed, concerning the adoration of the nail by which the feet of our Savior were transfixed, he says: "*By the iron of the feet of Christ are kings inclined [bowed] — do kings adore, and do the Photinians deny his divinity? The emperors prefer the nail of his cross to their diadem — and do the Arians diminish his power?*" By which sayings Ambrose prudently admonishes that we should not worship the cross with a gentile superstition — that is, thinking that wood to be God, or some numen of deity — but that we should adore it with a pious and Christian cult, as a symbol of human redemption, and a monument of those things which for us our redeemer

Christ endured upon it, referring to him whatsoever of honor and reverence we exhibit to his cross. In this order, therefore, and with this scope, we venerate also the other sacred images, according to the formula handed down in the second Nicene synod — which [formula], as **Sabellicus**, in book 8 of the eighth Ennead, is witness, the Latin Fathers, in the times of Charlemagne, concluded [expressed] in these two verses, translated from the Greek, under a little rill of rhythm's consonance [i.e., with rhyme], with which that age had then first begun to be delighted:

◇ **1. Left margin:** The heretics wrest, against the images of Christ and of the saints, [those things] which are written concerning idols and the statues of impious men.

◇ **2. Left margin:** The cross, in the judgment of St. Ambrose, is not to be adored with a gentile superstition, so that the wood be thought to be God.

This is God, which the image teaches — but the image itself is not God; this thou mayest look upon, yet worship with the mind that which thou discernest in it. (Hoc Deus est, quod imago docet: sed non Deus ipsa. / Hanc videas, sed mente colas quod cernis in ipsa.)

But to that which is opposed from the epistles of Epiphanius, **John Damascene**, almost eight hundred years ago from now, responded, in the first book against the Iconomastigi [the Image-scourgers], in this manner:³ "*But if thou objectest that that eminent and admirable Epiphanius openly interdicted the cult of them [images]: first indeed I would respond that that doctrine — related perhaps from a marginal annotation into the text, and so being spurious — did not likewise proceed from his lucubration, [but] is rather of another, who was called by the same name,*

◇ **3. Left margin:** Response to the authority of Epiphanius against Images.

(left column continues into the right column)

lest [we do] that which many are wont to do. Then, in the second place, if thou opposest [it] — we know that the blessed Athanasius forbade the relics of the saints to be placed in little caskets or coffers, or rather commanded that they be buried in the earth, for this [reason]: because he desired by all means to abrogate the absurd custom of the Egyptians, who did not cover the cadavers of their [dead] with earth, but deposited [them] on beds and biers. Perhaps also Epiphanius, that eminent [man], wishing to recall some such thing to rectitude, provided by law that images should not be painted — that we may also grant it to have been his opinion. For, [seeing] that this was not his purpose, to remove them, the Church, by the testimony of this blessed Epiphanius, is even unto our times adorned in every part with images.⁴ Thirdly I would respond: it is not infrequent, nor rare, [that] some [newly] found thing is a law handed down to the Church; for neither does one swallow make the spring — as it seems to Gregory the Theologian, and to truth itself — nor can one opinion demolish from the foundations the tradition of the whole Church, and pull [it] up from the boundary of the earth even to the extreme limit." Thus far Damascene.

◇ **4. Right margin:** The Church, in the time of blessed Epiphanius, was — [on Damascene's testimony] — adorned with images. See what I have written on the matter in book 2 of the *Disputations*, chapter 27.

From whose second response the reason can easily be rendered why the provincial Council of Elvira [Eliberitanum] — held in Spain by only nineteen bishops — forbade images to be painted in the temples of that province:⁵ namely, that it might extinguish idolatry by this remedy. For although the fathers of that synod knew that the cult of the sacred Images confers the greatest utility upon the now-adult [mature] Church, nevertheless, since they had observed that those nations — lately coming to Christ from the superstition of the idols — were still inclined to their former idolatry, and were paying divine honors to the images painted in the churches of the Christians, as if there were in them something of divinity, they judged that the present disease could not otherwise be healed than by the interdiction of images. Accordingly, since now the Christian people is not, as those Spaniards of old were, prone to idolatry, no cause appears why Images should be taken away from the Church; for although one or another, deceived by a certain simplicity, may err in the worshipping of Images, the Images are not, for the sake of those [few], to be altogether abolished, but their simplicity is to be instructed: for laws provide not for the number of the few, but for the

greater multitude of the peoples.

◇ **5. Right margin:** On the decree of the Council of Elvira, the author's judgment.

Moreover, to the Council of Ephesus, and the edicts of the two Emperors pronounced against the venerable Images, it pleases [me] to respond nothing else than that which the same **Damascene**, in the second volume of the same work, said: "*In the dogmas and dispositions ecclesiastical, it is not for Emperors⁶ to impose laws, but to receive [them]; but to the pastors and doctors of the Church is it committed, that they prescribe the order of the ecclesiastical matter not according to the arbitration of the Emperors, but according to the norm of the right faith — the Apostle saying, 'In the Church God has placed certain ones: first the Apostles, secondly the Prophets, thirdly the Pastors and Doctors' [1 Cor 12:28], making no mention of emperors among these. Wherefore those Emperors, who invaded the apostolic and pastoral function, and, a synod being violently forced together in Blachernae near Ephesus, commanded impious canons to be made, according to their [own] lust, by the bishops — deservedly, as robbers and brigands, were they condemned by the Catholics.*" And some of the bishops who had been present at that detestable council, afterward repenting, abjured that canon — published against the blessed images — in the presence of three hundred →

◇ **6. Right margin:** An excellent opinion.

[...continues on folio 615 (PDF p. 432): the abjuration of the iconoclast canon and the rest of Sixtus's defense of images (Annotatio CCXLVII).]

(printed folio 615 [PDF p. 432]. **Annot. CCXLVII (concl.)–CCL** (Daniel 3:18–13:1): the image controversy closes (the 350 Fathers of Nicaea II; Eusebius's letter rejected); the world's-end error (Judas the Syrian, Lactantius); the calumny that Jerome cited too many opinions on the seventy weeks; then CCL opens **the question of Susanna's authenticity** — Julius Africanus's letter to Origen with eight arguments that the story is a Greek fabrication → folio 616.)

(folio 615, left column → right column)

Annotation CCXLVII (concluded)

"We do not worship thy gods, and the statue which thou hast set up we do not adore." — **Daniel 3:18**
Eusebius's epistle against Images is condemned.

(the abjuration concludes:) [they abjured that canon] in the presence of three hundred and fifty Fathers, in the second Nicene synod, in whose first action [session] the palinode [recantation] of the penitent bishops is still read. There remains the epistle of Eusebius of Caesarea, to which it is superfluous to respond: for it is established, from the sixth action of the same synod, that it was reprobated by the common consent of all the Fathers, and — [being] among the impious writings not retracted by its own author — was rejected.

Annotation CCXLVIII

"Seventy weeks are abbreviated [shortened]." — **Daniel 9:24**

On the time of the world's destruction.

Judas the Syrian [Judas Syrus], explaining this chapter in his commentaries, **Jerome**, in the catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, notes with these words: "*Judas disputed most fully concerning the seventy weeks in Daniel, and produced their chronography, through the times of former [ages], down to the tenth year of Severus; in which he is convicted of error, because he said that the coming of Antichrist would be about his own times — that is, in the two-hundredth year after Christ: but this [he said] for this reason, because the magnitude of the persecutions portended the end of the present world.*" These things he [Jerome]. For the

same cause, long before, those faithful were led into the same error, whom Paul, admonishing in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, says:¹ "*We beseech you, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you be not quickly moved from your [right] sense, nor terrified, as if the day of the Lord were at hand.*" There were also many other not ignoble authors in nearly the same opinion — among whom Lactantius Firmianus defined the space of two hundred years, from his own age even to the end of the world.

◇ 1. Left margin: 2 Thessalonians 2:2.

Return to Annotation 187.

Annotation CCXLIX

"Seventy weeks are abbreviated." — Daniel 9:24

On the calumny imposed upon St. Jerome.

To **Jerome**, expounding the seventy weeks, it was imputed as a fault by [his] rivals that in recounting the opinions of the Jews and of certain heretics he was excessive [too copious]; and that, [these] authors in many things receding from the purity of the faith, he called [them] masters of the Church. To whom he, responding, in the preface of the eleventh commentary on Isaiah, thus writes: "*In the little commentaries of Daniel I studied brevity, except [for] the last and the penultimate vision — in which it was necessary for me, on account of the magnitude of the obscurity, to extend [my] discourse, especially in the exposition of the seven, and sixty-two, and one weeks; in the treating of which — what Africanus the writer of times [the chronographer], what Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea, Clement also, presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and Apollinarius of Laodicea, and Hippolytus, and the Hebrews, and Tertullian thought — I briefly comprehended, leaving to the arbitration of the reader what he should choose out of the many. And so, that which I did with the modesty of judging, and for the honor of those who were about to read, displeases certain ones, who desire to know not the opinions of the ancients, but our [own] opinion: to whom [there is] an easy response — that I was unwilling so to receive [adopt] one [opinion], that I might seem to condemn others; and certainly, if [the work] of so great and so erudite a man displeases fastidious readers, what will they do to me, who lie exposed to the bites of the envious for the slenderness of [my] little talent? But if I named the aforesaid men masters of the Church — let them understand this: that I do not approve the faith of all [of them], who certainly are contrary among themselves; but [I cited them] for the distinguishing of Josephus and of Porphyry,*

(left column continues into the right column)

who disputed very many things concerning this question." These things Jerome.

Annotation CCL

"And there was a man dwelling in Babylon, and his name [was] Joachim." — Daniel 13:1

Whether the history of Susanna is to be received.

Julius Africanus, when he doubted concerning the truth of the history of Susanna, refuted Origen in a brief epistle, in which he embraced, most tersely, eight conjectures inferring to him[self] a suspicion of falsity. The copy of the epistle thus reads:

"Hail, from Africanus, to my lord, and son, and most honored of all men, Origen. When thou wast holding a sacred disputation with that friend of thine, and wast making mention of the prophecy [uttered] by Daniel in [his] youth, I was, at that time, as was fitting, embracing [it]. [1.] But I wonder by what means it has escaped thee that this part of the book is spurious; for this segment of the book, though it is indeed otherwise a pleasing little work, is nevertheless a little work which is shown by many [tokens], and is convicted, to be of a modern manner, and fabricated in Greek by a Greek author.² [2.] First indeed, because, when Susanna had

been ordered to die, the Prophet, seized by the spirit, cried out that the sentence had been unjustly brought forth — whereas Daniel prophesies in another mode through the whole time, namely by visions, and dreams, and the apparition of an Angel, but not by prophetic inspiration. [3.] Then afterward, when he had spoken so admirably, he uses toward the people and the elders that kind of confutation which would be most remote from the common expectation, and which not even that Philistine mime would have used: inasmuch as, not content with the rebuke effected through the spirit, he interrogates each of the two, separated from the other, apart, in what place he had seen her committing adultery; and when the one had said 'under a holm-oak' [prinos], he answered that it would come to pass that the Angel would saw [seco] him; likewise threatening cutting to the other, who had answered that he had seen her under a mastic-tree [schinos]. [4.] For in the Greek words such [words] have the same sound — παρὰ τὴν πρῖνον, πρῖσαι [from the holm-oak, to saw], and παρὰ τὴν σχῖνον, σχῖσαι [from the mastic, to split]; but in the Hebrew tongue they have an altogether different sound. Moreover, from the Hebrew are translated to the Greeks whatsoever words are reported of the old Testament. [5.] Besides, by what means — since they were captives among the Chaldaeans in Babylon, and the slain were thrown out into the streets unburied (as the histories narrate concerning the first captivity of Israel), and their sons were torn away to be made eunuchs, and their daughters concubines, as the Prophets had foretold — do these [elders] pronounce [capital] judgment?³ [6.] And — what thou mightest wonder at more — against Joachim, the king of those very [people], whom the king of the Babylonians had made assessor to himself? But if this is not that Joachim, but some other one of the people, whence [came] this captive dwelling? whence to him [that] spacious garden? [7.] But before all these things, this particle of this book, with the other two particles which are at the end of Daniel, is not similar to [the] Daniel which is received by the Hebrews; nay, even the character of the diction differs. [8.] But to all these let it be added, that — although so many Prophets have preceded — [none] thenceforth used the testimony of another, inasmuch as their truthful speech begged [borrowed] from nowhere else; but here the one, threatening the other, alludes to the Lord saying, 'The innocent and just thou shalt not slay.'⁴ From all these things I judge that this segment of the book was added. I have knocked; do thou, writing back, instruct [me]. Salute all my lords; and thee also all the learned [men] salute; and I pray thee to be well, together with thy company — and this I pray from [my] heart."

- ◇ **2. Right margin:** The first argument of Africanus against the history of Susanna. [The margin numbers each of Africanus's eight arguments in turn — "1. Argumentum," "2. Argumentum," ... "8. Argumentum" — matching the bracketed [1.]–[8.] in the text.]
- ◇ **3. Right margin:** 2 Kings [4 Kings] 25. He understands the history of Bel and the Dragon.
- ◇ **4. Right margin:** Exodus 23:7.

To this epistle **Origen** responded with a learned and magnificent epistle; which, since, on account of its prolixity, it would not be fitting, into this →

[...continues on folio 616 (PDF p. 433): Origen's reply to Africanus in defense of the history of Susanna (Annotatio CCL).]

*(printed folio 616 [PDF p. 433]. **Annot. CCL (concl.)–CCLI** (Daniel 13:1–Amos 5:2): Origen's eight answers to Africanus defending Susanna (its deuterocanonical parity, the tree-puns, Solomon's judgment, captive courts, prophets citing prophets), closing with his wish to write a full encomium; then CCLI (Amos 5:2) — whether the fallen, after penance, may be restored to their former dignity (Strabus and the Council of Lérida seem to deny it) → folio 617.)*

(folio 616, left column → right column)

Annotation CCL (concluded)

"And there was a man dwelling in Babylon, and his name [was] Joachim." — Daniel 13:1

Solution of the first argument of Africanus. [The margin flags each of Origen's eight solutions in turn — "Solutio 1/2/3 ... argumenti."].

(Origen's reply, since it would not be fitting to stuff his whole long letter into this place, is given only in the summary of its solutions to Africanus's arguments:)

First, as to that which he says — that the little work of Susanna is neither genuine, nor written in Hebrew, but in Greek, and by a modern author — it is [held as] uncertain; and it will be more credible that it was of old written by its author either in Hebrew or in Syriac, and preserved among the books stored apart by the studious lovers of truth, [and] then translated by a Greek interpreter. But even if we should grant [it] to be the work not of a Hebrew but of a Greek writer, it is nevertheless not on that account to be repudiated as spurious and fabricated — especially since credit is not withheld from those [pieces] among the Hebrews — lest, by the same reasoning, we be compelled to cast away many scriptures of the same kind received by the Church, and mingled among the sacred volumes: such as are the Prayer of Sidrach, Misac, and Abdenago [Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego]; the Hymn of the three children in the book of Daniel; the Prayer of Esther, and the Prayer of Mardocheaus [Mordecai]; the Epistle of Aman [Haman], and the Epistle of Mardocheaus in the book of Ezra; and other things similar to these, which our fathers received for the edification of the Church, whose bounds, constituted for us, we ought by no means to transgress.

Second, when he says that Daniel nowhere prophesied [being] seized by prophetic inspiration, but only by dreams, and visions, and angelic apparition, he seems to have too little observed that [saying] of Paul,¹ "*In many ways and in many manners God spoke of old to the Prophets*" — for nothing hinders but that one and the same Prophet may, together with dreams, visions, and Angelic apparitions, obtain also the prophetic inspiration: as in the old Scripture innumerable examples of this matter may everywhere be seen in the Prophets.

◇ 1. **Left margin:** Hebrews 1:1.

Third, he does too little gravely, when he compares the writer of this book to the Philistine mime, because Daniel — according to the counsel of human prudence — interrogated the elders, separated apart, each of the two severally, as if it were not enough that the spirit had, by its breath, so admirably rebuked them: for by this reasoning it will be permitted to deride that admirable example of judging, similar to this, which the divine Scripture relates that Solomon employed in judging the cause of the two harlots concerning the surviving little infant of the litigants.² Wherefore it is to be believed that, as it was not enough, for persuading the people, that Solomon — although breathed upon by the divine spirit — should say, "*Give to this [woman] the living [infant], for she is its mother,*" but it behoved that he [proceed] to command the infant to be divided into two parts, that all the people, by the experiment of maternal charity, might recognize the true mother of the infant: so it was not enough for Daniel to rebuke the elders, unless he had moreover received [a means] whence he might convict them out of their own mouth before the universal multitude.

◇ 2. **Left margin:** 1 Kings [3 Kings] 3:27.

Fourth, as to what he says — that the Greek allusion of πρῖνος to πρῖσις, and of σχῖνος to σχῖσις, is not had among the Hebrews, but [that they are] altogether diverse words — it is dissolved in three ways. First, because it is uncertain whether the words which among the Hebrews signify the same which among the Greeks πρῖνος and πρῖσαι, and σχῖνος and σχῖσαι [signify], so differ among themselves that they have no similitude of sound; since indeed, in the sacred volumes of the Hebrews, no mention is ever made of the plants which are signified by the names πρῖνος³ and σχῖνος,⁴

◇ 3. **Left margin:** Σχῖνος is a small shrub — the lentisk [mastic] — whence mastic-gum is gathered.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Πρῖνος is a small tree, from which the scarlet [kermes] is born.

(left column continues into the right column)

[so that] no one of the Hebrews can affirm with certainty how these [words] allude in Hebrew, whose Hebrew names are unknown. Then, it is also credible that Daniel used, for the Hebrew tongue, Syriac words, which had such a consonance of denomination [a like wordplay]. Finally, perhaps it happened that, when the Greek interpreter wished to express — as the matter demanded — the force of the Hebrew allusion, and could not [do so directly], he, according to a certain dispensation [licence] conceded to interpreters, found the names of other plants which among the Greeks should have a similar derivation, and [thus] more lucidly explain the proposed sentence of Daniel.

Fifth, when he doubts by what means the captives had the right of bringing judgment concerning death, he ought not to wonder if the Jews obtained from the king of Babylon the power of living under their own laws and judgments — since he sees that, in his own time, the same [Jews] received from the Roman Emperors, under whose captivity they live, the right of life and death over their own [people].

Sixth, [it] is eluded with the same facility, that which he asks — whence, to the captive Joachim, a man of private condition, [there was] a magnificent house and garden:⁵ for neither is this to be wondered at, since in the sacred letters we read that Mardocheaus, Nehemiah, and very many others were rich captives, and prosperous in their captivity.

◇ 5. **Right margin:** Esther 2; Nehemiah [2 Esdras] 2.

Seventh, as to what he says — that this segment does not have similitude with the volume of Daniel, and that the character [style] of each is diverse — he seems to have pronounced [this] from his own judgment and taste:⁶ for if anyone attentively examine both, he will find no very great dissimilitude in the two.

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Solution of the seventh argument.

Eighth, when he asserts that no one of the Prophets was wont to use the sayings of another Prophet, he is deceived: for very frequently the one uses the testimonies of the other in the same sense, and in nearly the same words — as may be seen in Micah, saying,⁷ "*And it shall be in the last days, the mountain of the Lord [shall be] prepared,*" etc. — which words are written in Isaiah.

◇ 7. **Right margin:** Micah 4:1; Isaiah 2:2.

These things we have briefly touched upon from the Origenic epistle, in the close of which Origen himself thus inferred: "*These things I would say for the defending of the history of Susanna; and would that I could celebrate the Scripture of Susanna with an encomium — especially after the accusations [made against it] — both by dwelling upon each of its words, and by showing [its] exquisite senses; which [is] a thing that anyone who has studiously and abundantly meditated in the divine [Scriptures] could privately compose.*"

Annotation CCLI

"She is fallen, and shall no more rise, the virgin of Israel." — Amos 5:2

Whether the fallen, after penance, are to be restored to their former dignity.

Strabus, in the glosses of this passage, seems to be in the opinion of those who think that sinners, after penance, cannot be restored into their former dignity. For thus he says: "*The Prophet does not deny that Israel can rise again; but 'it shall not rise,' he says, 'the virgin of Israel'; because [Israel], once going astray, even if it be carried back on the shoulders of the shepherd, has not so great a glory as [that] which never erred.*" This opinion the canon of the Council of Ilerda [Lérida] seems to confirm, which is cited by Gratian in the fifteenth distinction of the decree, in these words: "*They who serve the holy altar, if suddenly, by the frailty of the flesh to be bewailed, they are corru-*" →

[...continues on folio 617 (PDF p. 434): the canon of Lérida and Sixtus's resolution on the restoration of penitents (Annotatio CCLI).]

(printed folio 617 [PDF p. 434]. **Annot. CCLI (concl.)–CCLIII** (Amos 5:2–Jonah 1:12): Aquinas resolves the “fallen virgin” (sonship restored, innocence not); whether the soul’s post-mortem liberty means “only two places” (Peter of Crete: it is contemplative, not physical); and whether one may take one’s own life to preserve chastity — Jerome allows it only where chastity is imperilled, Ambrose counts Pelagia’s death a martyrdom → folio 618.)

(folio 617, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLI (concluded)

***"She is fallen, and shall no more rise, the virgin of Israel."* — Amos 5:2**

St. Thomas, [Summa Theologica] third part, question 89, article 3.

(the canon of Lérida concludes:) "...are overtaken, and, the Lord looking upon [them], have worthily done penance — let them so receive the places of their offices that they cannot be promoted further to higher offices." St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the Theological Summa, explaining the sayings of these [authorities], says that a twofold dignity is lost by sinners: the one before the Church, the other before God; and that this [former] is double — one chief and primary, by which the just, by the gift of divine grace, are numbered among the sons of God; and this is restored to penitents, of which the proof is that prodigal son, to whom, [when] returning to his senses, the father commanded the stole of the lost dignity to be given back.¹ But he says that the other, before God, is a secondary dignity — that is, innocence, which no one, however penitent, can recover; although sometimes he may be able to attain far greater honors, just as Gregory, in the homily on the hundred sheep, shows by the example of a soldier who, after flight, bravely returning to the battle, deserved greater praise and more excellent rewards from his leader than he who neither ever gave [his] back [in flight], nor ever did anything boldly. Concerning the glory, therefore, of this latter dignity, the words of Strabus are to be interpreted.

◇ 1. Left margin: Luke 15:22.

There is also, after these two, an ecclesiastical dignity, concerning which Thomas thinks that the canon of the aforesaid Council is to be understood — by which the higher grades of honors are denied, not to all penitents simply, but only to those who have done public penance. For also to Peter, as **Arnobius** on psalm 38 says, after the threefold denial a greater grade is restored to the penitent than had been taken away from the denier; and it was given to him by Christ, that he should be the bishop of all bishops.

Annotation CCLII

***"If they descend even unto hell, thence my hand shall bring them out."* — Amos 9:2**

Whether [there are] only two places after this life.

Jerome, in book 3 of the commentaries on Amos, among the other things which he heaped up for the exposition of this passage, has these: "*When the Soul, loosed from the corporeal bonds, shall have the liberty of going whither it wills, or whither it is compelled to go — either it is led to the infernal [places], concerning which it is written, [a] 'Let the sinners be turned into hell, all the nations that forget God,² and, [b] 'In hell who shall confess to thee?³ and, 'Thy glory descends into hell'; or certainly it will be lifted up to the heavenly [places]."* **Peter**, archbishop of Crete, in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 21, question 1, where he discourses concerning Purgatory, proposes this saying, for the sake of disputing, under the person of those who assert that after this life [there are] only two Places, to which the Souls, loosed from bodies, are borne — namely heaven, and hell. But then, opening the ambiguity of this saying, he says that Jerome does not speak concerning the loosing of the Soul which is made through nature, corporeal death coming on, but concerning the voluntary and spiritual loosing of the soul from the body through speculation and contemplation — in which the Soul is so separated from the body that the body is not separated from the

Soul. And this sense the following words of Jerome openly show, when he says: "...or certainly it will be lifted up to the heavenly [places], where are the spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly [places]," etc.

◇ 2. Left margin (a): Psalm 9:18.

◇ 3. Left margin (b): Psalm 6:6.

Annotation CCLIII

"Take me up, and cast me into the sea." — Jonah 1:12

Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it be licit to die by one's own hand.

Jerome, in the commentaries upon Jonah, so expounds this saying of the Prophet offering himself voluntarily to death, that he seems to hold it licit, in persecutions, for the sake of preserving chastity, to inflict death upon oneself with one's own hand. His words are these: "*It is not ours to snatch at death, but willingly to receive [death] inflicted by others; whence also in persecutions it is not licit to perish by one's own hand, except where chastity is imperilled — but [it is licit] to submit the neck to the striker.*" Of the same mind **Ambrose** is thought to have been: for he, in the third book *On Virgins*, responding to Marcellina his sister, inquiring of him concerning this matter, judges that the deaths of those women who — that they might safeguard their chastity — laid violent hands upon themselves, were martyrdoms; and he demonstrates this by the example of **Pelagia**, the virgin of Antioch, and of her two sisters, and their mother: of whom she [Pelagia], throwing down first the altars of the idols, slew herself with the sword; but the [mother and sisters] plunged themselves together into a river. But it is worthwhile to set down here the mind of Ambrose — although expressed in a somewhat more prolix narration — both for the elegant gravity of the sentences, and for the sharp little arguments by which he seems to persuade his assertion under the person of another:

(left column continues into the right column)

"Now, to [thee] spreading the sails toward the end of the oration, thou askest, holy sister, what is to be thought concerning the merits of those who cast themselves down from a height, or plunged themselves into a river, lest they should fall into the hands of the persecutors — since the divine Scripture forbids a Christian to inflict violence upon himself. And indeed, concerning virgins placed in the necessity of guarding [chastity], we have a clear assertion, since there is extant an example of martyrdom.⁴ Saint Pelagia was once, at Antioch, about fifteen years [old], a sister of virgins, and herself a virgin: she, at the first trumpet of the persecution shut up at home, when she saw herself beset by the robbers of [her] faith or of [her] modesty — [her] mother and sisters being absent, [she] void of protection, but the more full of God — 'What do we,' she says, 'unless captive virginity look to itself? Both [my] vow is [to die], and [my] fear is to die; because death is not [merely] received, but is taken up [freely]: let us die, if it be licit; or if they will not allow it to be licit, let us die. God is not offended by [this] remedy, and faith washes away the deed. Certainly, if we consider the very force of the name — what violence [is this]? a voluntary one? That is the more [truly] violence: to wish to die, and not to be able. Nor do we fear the difficulty; for who is there who wishes to die, and cannot, since there are ways so ready to death? For now I will overthrow the sacrilegious altars, cast down headlong, and extinguish the kindled hearths with [my] blood: I fear not lest [my] right hand, failing, strike not the blow, nor lest [my] breast withdraw itself from the pain; I will leave no sin to the flesh: I fear not

◇ 4. Right margin: Pelagia, and the death of the [mother's] daughters.

lest a sword be lacking: we can die by our own arms, we can die without the executioner's service.' On [her] mother's bosom she is said to have adorned [her] head, to have put on the nuptial garment, so that thou wouldst say [she was going] not to death, but to a bridegroom. But when the detestable persecutors saw the prey of [her] modesty snatched from them, they began to seek the mother and sisters; but they, by that spiritual flight, already held the field of chastity, when suddenly — the persecutors here pressing, and there [the way] being excluded from flight by a rushing torrent — shut up unto the crown [of martyrdom], 'What

do we fear?' they say: 'Behold water! Who forbids us to be baptized?'⁵ And this is the baptism by which sins are forgiven, and the kingdoms [of heaven] are sought; and this is the baptism after which no one falls away. Let the water receive us, which is wont to regenerate; let the water receive us, which makes virgins; let the water receive us, which opens heaven, covers the weak, hides death, renders [us] martyrs. We pray thee, O Creator of things, that the water hold not the lifeless spirit" →

◇ **5. Right margin:** Acts 8[:36]. [The virgins' cry "Behold water! who forbids us to be baptized?" echoes Acts 8:36; the printed "Act. 8, 8" is imprecise.]

[...continues on folio 618 (PDF p. 435): the rest of Ambrose's narration, and Sixtus's resolution on suicide for chastity (Annotatio CCLIII).]

(printed folio 618 [PDF p. 435]. **Annot. CCLIII (concluded)** (Jonah 1:12): the suicide-for-chastity question — Eusebius on the Antiochene mother, her daughters, and the Roman matron Sophronia, all honored as martyrs; Augustine (City of God I) counters that suicide is never licit (bodily chastity is not lost while the soul stays pure); Sixtus resolves that their deaths were peculiar dispensations of the Holy Spirit, not to be imitated (cf. Razis) → folio 619.)

(folio 618, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLIII (concluded)

"Take me up, and cast me into the sea." — Jonah 1:12

The Antiochene virgins laying hands upon themselves.

(Ambrose's narration of Pelagia's family concludes:) "...or the body; let not the wave disperse [them], lest death separate the corpses of those whose life affection did not separate: but let there be one constancy, one death, and also one burial.' Having said these things, and having tucked up [their garments] a little, the bosom being girt, that they might cover [their] modesty and not impede the step — [their] hands joined together as though they led choruses — they advance into the midst of the channel; and there where the wave [was] more torrential, where the depth [was] broken off, directing [their] steps thither, no one drew back [her] foot, no one checked [her] gait, no one hesitated where she should fix [her] step, anxious when the ground met [her], the ford dashed against, glad in the deep. Thou wouldst see the pious mother, tightening the knot of [her] hands, rejoice over [her] pledge, fear the chance, lest the flood should carry away from her the one or the other of the daughters. 'These victims,' she says, 'O Christ, I immolate to thee — guardians of virginity, leaders of chastity, companions of [thy] passion.' But who could by right wonder that there was so great a constancy in the living, since even in death they vindicated an immovable posture of the body? The wave stripped not the cadavers, nor did the swirls of the rapid current disturb [them]; nay, even the holy mother, although void of sense, still preserved the embrace of piety, and loosed not by death the religious knot which she had tightened: so that she might merit — by piety [as] heir — what she had owed to religion; for those [daughters] whom she had joined to martyrdom, she claimed even unto the tomb."

These things Ambrose: before whom **Eusebius**, bishop of Caesarea, shows himself to have been of the same opinion, who, among many martyrdoms of holy virgins described in the eighth book of the ecclesiastical history,¹ persuaded the same by the example — either the same, or a not-dissimilar one — of an Antiochene mother and daughters, in these words: "There was a certain admirable woman, noble by birth, comely alike in beauty and in modesty, who had two virgin daughters, nourished to the rule of maternal modesty — rivals in beauty and likewise in morals, contending among themselves in probity. These, absent for the sake of avoiding the persecution, the soldiers sent for this very purpose compel to come to Antioch; but when, the soldiers urging [them] on, being set in a vehicle they journeyed, the religious and modest mother uses such

words to [her] daughters: 'You know, most sweet daughters to me, in what discipline of God I have educated you: you know that, from [your] infancy, God has been to you father, God nourisher, God instructor; and that you have loved, equally with me, the good of modesty and chastity, so that not even your eye ever — as I am witness to you — was stained with a too-wanton look. What, therefore, do we now do? You see that all this violence studies either to [tear] us from God, or to separate [us] from [our] chastity. Shall the members, then, be prostituted to the public brothels — [members] which the almost public air itself has held unknown [kept hidden]? Nay, I pray, daughters: for neither is [our] faith in God so small to us that we should dread death, nor [is our] chastity so dejected that we should desire to live even with baseness; nay rather, if it please [you], [that] which you hold in all things, follow in this also the mother's example: let us forestall the impure hands of the executioners, and snatch away [ourselves from] the assaults of the unchaste, and let us condemn, by a pure and modest death, this world, which would compel us to an impure and unchaste [life], and would drag [us] on.' And when, by such exhortations, she saw [her] daughters kindled to a like purpose, they came to a certain river set in [their] way; where, when they had pretended to have gone down for the cause of human necessity, and the guards had withdrawn a little (natural reverence compelling [them]), their garments being diligently drawn together here and there, they cast themselves into the threatening rapid streams of the river. But also two other virgins, sisters, noble by birth, admirable in life, in the first flower of age, beautiful enough, but more beautiful in soul, adorned more with morals than with necklaces, exceedingly approvable in [their] pursuits, not bearing the violence

♦ 1. Left margin: Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 8, chapter 24.

(left column continues into the right column)

to their chastity by public edicts and laws, plunged themselves into the sea-waves."

And again, in chapter 27 of the same volume, persisting in the same narration and opinion, he adds these: "I think it not to be passed over in silence concerning that most noble woman in the city of Rome, Sophronia — admirable [in her deed] — whose husband, prefect of the city of Rome, lived under Maxentius the tyrant: who, when he had learned of the aforesaid woman's beauty (as was his custom), sending the ministers of debauchery, ordered the woman to be brought to him; she referred the matter to [her] husband, who, when he had discovered [it], revolving much with himself, at last groaning more deeply, 'And what,' he says, 'shall we do, by which these things must either be tolerated, or [our] life laid down?' Then she, when she saw [her] husband terrified by fear of death [seeming] to have betrayed her chastity, 'A little while,' she says, 'wait, [ye] who were sent, until, composed as is fitting, and adorned, I may come forth.' Thereupon, having entered [her] chamber, when first, on bended knees, she had prayed, as one about to immolate her chastity to God, she transfixed [her] breast and vitals with a seized dagger — sending, by the maidservants standing by, messengers of this sort to the tyrant: 'Such,' she says, 'is the woman that would please the tyrant.'" Thus far Eusebius; whose opinion the whole Church of the Christians willingly seems to embrace — [the Church] which decreed for the aforesaid virgins, in testimony of [their] precious death, the perpetual honors of martyrdom.

But **Augustine**, in the first book *On the City of God*, treating this argument with a long discourse, established that there is absolutely no case in which it is licit to lay hands on oneself,² but [that] he becomes so much the more guilty who kills himself, as he was the more innocent in that cause for which he thought he must kill himself. But if thou say that this is licit, lest the integrity of virginity and chastity be lost, he responds that the chastity of the body, the chastity of the Soul remaining, is not lost:³ because, since the chastity of the Soul is a virtue which is not numbered among the goods of the body (as are health and beauty), it follows that, the body of the woman being oppressed and violated, [the woman] whose mind remains incorrupt, her chastity does not perish. Accordingly, she who kills herself, that she may avoid the violence of another's lust, chooses a greater crime, that she may avoid a lesser sin. Finally, meeting those who opposed to him the aforesaid examples of holy women, he thus speaks in chapter 26 of the same book: "But certain holy women, they say,

in time of persecution — that they might escape the persecutors of their chastity — threw themselves into a river to be swept away and killed, and in this manner departed; and their martyrdoms in the Catholic Church are celebrated with most thronged veneration. Concerning these I dare judge nothing rashly. For whether the Church, by certain trustworthy testimonies, so honors their memory [as] the divine authority may have persuaded [it], I know not; and it could be that it is so. For what if they did this not humanly deceived, but divinely commanded — not erring, but obeying? — as concerning Samson⁴ it is not licit for us to believe otherwise. When, moreover, God commands, and signifies himself to command without any ambiguities, who shall call obedience into crime? who shall accuse the dutifulness of piety?" Thus far Augustine; from which, inferring that the voluntary deaths of these virgins were peculiar economies [dispensations] of the divine will — not to be imitated by all, but by those only to whom it was singularly commanded by the certain and undoubted command of the Holy Spirit. See what we have written concerning **Razias** [Razis], killing himself, in book 8, in the confutation of the 12th heresy, argument 6.

◇ 2. **Right margin:** For no cause is it licit to bring death upon oneself.

◇ 3. **Right margin:** The chastity of the body, the chastity of the soul remaining, is not lost.

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Judges 16:30.

[...folio 619 (PDF p. 436) opens a new annotation (catchword "AN—"): Annotatio CCLIV.]

(printed folio 619 [PDF p. 436]. **Annot. CCLIV–CCLVI** (Jonah 3:4–Micah 6:1): the LXX's "three days" for the Hebrew "forty days" (Jerome; Theophylact excuses it); **the gourd-versus-ivy controversy** — Rufinus derides Jerome for turning *κολοκύνθη* into "ivy," and Jerome answers with the *kikaion* plant and his letter to Augustine on the Oea riot; and whether the guardian angels of nations are judged at the last day → folio 620.)

(folio 619, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLIV

"Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." — **Jonah 3:4**

A passage badly translated by the Seventy.

The Seventy Interpreters, for that which in Hebrew is read ארבעים יום (*Arbaim yamim*), that is, "forty days," translated τρεῖς ἡμέραι, that is, "Three days": which **Jerome** so much wonders at — that they so rendered [it], when in Hebrew there is no community either of syllables, or of accents, or of the words [themselves], and the ternary number does not suit penitence, to which the number forty is more accommodated according to the sacred letters. Hence it happened that Chrysostom, and very many of the Greek expositors who followed the Septuagint edition, said various things upon this ternary number of days, [things] pertaining nothing to the truth of the Hebrew Scripture. **Theophylact**, in the commentaries upon Jonah, civilly excuses the error of the Septuagint interpreters in these words: "It is to be observed here, that the other interpreters said forty days for three, and received it as a fitting number — [reading it thus,] since in three days he first went round the whole city, then they offered that laborious Penitence of Nineveh to God, [and] afterward the Prophet, sitting before the gates of the city, awaited the end of his prophecy: whence also they say the space of forty days to be the truer [reading]. And yet it is likely that the Seventy first put forty days, and that those who at the beginning transcribed erred, and that afterward the error was diffused into all the copies. Nevertheless see, that neither to those taking [it as] three days does anything absurd befall: for neither was it necessary for the Prophet to go round the whole city, but, having at the same time set out on the journey of one day, preaching, that this preaching might be carried to all, and might reach even to the king himself, and that this grave and anxious penitence of the Ninevites might be shown, and received by God — there

sufficed, after the preaching, [some] days, whether we posit those three, or two: since indeed one day would have been enough to show that men had genuinely repented, and had put on a better mind.*" Thus far Theophylact.

Annotation CCLV

"And the Lord God prepared an ivy [a gourd]." — Jonah 4:6

On the ivy of Jonah.

Jerome, in the translation of this passage, was noted [criticized] by very many of the ancients, because, for that which the LXX interpreters translated κολοκύνθη, that is, "a gourd," he turned "ivy." **Rufinus**, in the second book of the *Invectives*, deriding him, says: "After the world has grown old, and all things are urged toward the end, let us write even upon the sepulchres of the ancients — that they too may know, who here read otherwise — that Jonah did not have the shade of a gourd, but of ivy; and again, when the lawgiver shall have willed [it], not even ivy, but [the shade] of a shrub." **Augustine**, in the third [letter] to Jerome, jokes with an inserted fable. To each Jerome, rendering like for like, responds to Rufinus (his name being changed) thus, in the commentaries on Jonah: "Canthelium — that is, a huge ass, slow and dull, of the most ancient race of the Cornelii, or, as he himself boasts, of the stock of Asinius Pollio — is long since said, at Rome, to have accused me of sacrilege, because for 'gourd' I translated 'ivy.' He feared, forsooth, lest, if for gourds ivy should be born, he might not have whence he might occultly and darkly drink; and in very truth, in those little gourd-vessels — which the common [people] call saucomariae [drinking-cups] — the [companions] of the Apostles are wont

(left column continues into the right column)

to shadow forth images: whence also he took to himself a name not his own. But if vocables are so easily changed, that for 'Cornelii, seditious tribunes,' [one may write] 'Aemilii, consuls' — I wonder why it be not licit for me to translate 'ivy' for 'gourd.' But let us come to serious matters. For 'gourd,' or 'ivy,' we read in Hebrew קיקיון (*kikaion*), which also in the Syriac and Punic tongue is called *elkeroa*. It is, moreover, a genus of shrub, or a little tree, having broad leaves in the manner of a vine-tendrill, and a most dense shade, sustaining itself by its own trunk; which in Palestine grows most frequently, and especially in sandy places; and, in a wonderful manner, if thou cast the seed into the ground, it quickly, being nourished, springs up into a tree, and within a few days [that] which thou hadst seen a herb, thou findest a little tree. Whence also we, at the same time in which we were interpreting the Prophets, wished to express the name itself in the Hebrew tongue, because the Latin speech did not have this species of tree; but we feared the grammarians, lest they should find licence for caviling, and feign either beasts of India, or mountains of Boeotia, or certain portents of this sort: and so we followed the old translators, who also themselves interpreted 'ivy,' which in Greek is called κισσός; for they did not have whence they might say [it] otherwise."

These things Jerome, to Canthelium; but to Augustine, in the epistles, he writes back this passage in this manner: "In an epistle of thine of this kind thou weavest a fable. A certain [bishop], our brother and fellow-bishop, when he had appointed thy interpretation to be read in the Church over which he presides, [something] put down far otherwise than it was — inveterate in the sense and memory of all, and chanted through so many successions of ages — [and thereupon] there was made so great a tumult in the people, especially the Greeks arguing and crying out the calumny of falsity, that the Bishop (for that city was Oea) was compelled to demand the testimony of the Jews. Whether these, by unskillfulness or by malice, responded that this was [so] in the Hebrew codices which the Greeks and Latins had, and were saying, is uncertain. Why [say] more? The man was compelled to correct [it] as though a lie, wishing, after the great peril, not to remain without a congregation. Whence also it seems to us that sometimes, in some things, thou too couldst be deceived. Thou sayest that I translated something badly in the prophet Jonah, and that, by a sedition of the people crying out on account of the dissonance of one word, the Bishop almost lost his priesthood. And

what that is which I badly interpreted, thou withdrawest, taking away from me the occasion of my defense — lest, whatever thou shouldst say, it be dissolved by my responding: unless perhaps, as [it was] very many years ago, the gourd comes into the midst, [thou] asserting that in those times Cornelius and Asinius Pollio [charged] that I had translated 'ivy' for 'gourd,' upon which matter, in the commentary on the prophet Jonah, we have more fully responded. I ask, at the end of the epistle, that thou compel not a resting old man, and once a veteran, to militate again, and again to be imperilled concerning [his] life. Thou, who art young, and constituted in the pontifical summit, teach the peoples, and enrich the Roman households with the new fruits of Africa: it suffices me, with a hearer and a poor little reader, to whisper in a corner of the monastery."

Annotation CCLVI

"Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc. — Micah 6:1

Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment.

Jerome, opening the understanding of this clause, seems to imitate Origen, asserting that the Angels set over the care of men can err in their administration, and accordingly that they are to be set before the judge on the day of judgment, that, according to the merit of the care performed, they may [receive] punishments or →

[...continues on folio 620 (PDF p. 437): the rest of Jerome on the judgment of the guardian angels (Annotatio CCLVI).]

(printed folio 620 [PDF p. 437]. **Annot. CCLVI (concl.)–CCLVIII** (Micah 6:1–Zephaniah 3:4): the "mountains" of Micah 6:1 are the angels over the nations, arraigned at the judgment; whether God has providence over the least creatures (Jerome, reconciled by Peter of Poitiers); and unworthy priests and the sacraments — the errors an objector draws (a wicked priest cannot consecrate) plus Calvin's fourth, answered by Gratian → folio 621.)

(folio 620, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLVI (concluded)

"Arise, contend in judgment against the mountains," etc. — Micah 6:1

(Jerome continues:) [that, according to the merit of the care performed, they may receive] punishments or rewards. His words, in the second commentary on Micah, thus read: "Arise, and contend in judgment against the mountains — which [mountains] I think to signify no others than the Angels, to whom the administration of human affairs has been committed¹ — the Canticle of Deuteronomy agreeing in this very thing: 'When the Most High divided the nations, when he disseminated the sons of Adam, he constituted the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God.' These are administering spirits, sent for ministry for the sake of those who shall possess the inheritance of salvation.² And contend in judgment, that whether the mountains or the hills [higher or lower angels] shall have been found not worthily to have administered the peoples — either it may seem to be mine [my fault], who set such ones over [them], or the fault may be taken away from the people and referred to the princes. Let us read the Apocalypse of John the Apostle,³ in which are praised and accused the Angels of the Churches for the virtues and vices of those over whom they are said to preside: for as it is sometimes the Bishop's fault, sometimes the people's, and often the master sins, often the disciple, and sometimes it is the father's fault, sometimes the son's — whether they be well or badly instructed: so in the judgment of God, [it will be] that the crime shall be referred to the Angels, if they have not done all the things which pertained to their office, or to the people, if — those [angels] doing all things — they have contemned to hear them." Thus far Jerome, who, although in many places he often assails this error, at present wrote these things from the mind of Origen — [Origen's name] being suppressed for

modesty, as is his custom, under the Origenic name: which also can be discerned from those things which not much below he added.

- ◇ 1. **Left margin:** Hebrews 1[:14]; Deuteronomy 32:8. [The quoted "he constituted the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the Angels of God" is Deuteronomy 32:8 (Septuagint); the printed "Deut. 3, 8" is a misprint for 32:8.]
- ◇ 2. **Left margin:** Hebrews 1:14.
- ◇ 3. **Left margin:** Revelation 2:2.

Thou wilt find Origen's opinion on this matter above, Annotation 126.

Annotation CCLVII

"Thy eyes are clean, that thou mayest not behold evil." — Habakkuk 1:13

Whether God has knowledge and providence of the least things.

Jerome, on the first chapter of the prophet Habakkuk, seems to affirm that God does not have a singular providence of irrational [creatures], and a peculiar and certain knowledge of each particular little animal, but bears the care of them only in general, and in the species. For thus he speaks: "*In the other animals we can indeed understand the general disposition and order of God, and the courses of things: for example, in what manner the multitude of fishes is born, and lives in the waters; in what manner reptiles [and] quadrupeds arise on the earth, and by what foods they are nourished. But it is absurd to draw down the majesty of God to this — that he should know, through single moments, how many gnats are born, [and] how many die; what is the multitude of bugs, and fleas, and flies on the earth; how many fishes swim in the water; and which of the smaller ought to fall as prey to the greater. Let us not be such foolish flatterers of God that, while we draw down his providence even to the lowest things, we be injurious to ourselves — saying that the providence of rational and of irrational [creatures] is the same.*"

But that this was not Jerome's [true] mind, the same [author's] explanation on Matthew chapter 10 shows,⁴ where, expounding that, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and one of them shall not fall upon the ground without your Father?" he says: "*The sense is: If small and vile animals do not fall without God [as] author, and in all things there is always providence, and [those things] which are to perish among these do not perish without the will of God — you, who are eternal, ought not to fear that you live without the providence of God.*" And a little after: "*When it is said, 'Fear not therefore; you are of more value than many sparrows' — more manifestly the sense of our exposition is expressed, that we ought not to fear: because, if without God's knowledge small animals do not die, how much more [shall not] man? But as to what he says, 'The very hairs of your head are all numbered' — it shows the immense providence of God toward men, and signifies [his] ineffable affection: that nothing of ours lies hidden from God; even small and trifling things do not flee his knowledge.*"

- ◇ 4. **Left margin:** Matthew 10:29.

(left column continues into the right column)

Peter of Poitiers, bishop, in the first book of the Sentences, distinction 39, demonstrates that Jerome's sayings are to be interpreted in a twofold manner. First, that he understand [Jerome to mean] that God does not so — alternately, particularly, and through the diverse moments of times — foresee all the least things, as [if], through various moments, some of them fail, [and] some begin; but by a single, indivisible, and sempiternal gaze knows all things at once and singly, however small — knows the number of gnats, and fleas, and flies, both being born and perishing, at each single moment. Secondly, that he wish it to be understood that God does not have the knowledge and providence of men and of brutes in the same and equal manner:⁵ for to men he has given both precepts, and Angels for [their] custody; but to brutes [he administers] only those things which are of the body.

- ◇ 5. **Right margin:** He does not have altogether the same manner of providence of mute animals and of men.

Annotation CCLVIII

"Her priests have polluted the sanctuary." — Zephaniah 3:4

On the power of the priesthood.

Jerome applies such an exposition to this sentence: "*The priests who serve the Eucharist, and divide the blood of the Lord to his people, act impiously in the law of Christ, thinking that the Eucharist [is made] by the imprecation of words, not by [the] life [of the priest], and that only a solemn prayer is necessary, and not the merits of the priests — of whom it is said: 'And the priest in whom there shall be a blemish shall not approach to offer the oblation to the Lord.'*" And a little after, expounding the same, he says: "*The priests who give Baptism, and at the Eucharist invoke the coming of the Lord, make the oil of chrism, impose hands, instruct catechumens, constitute Levites and other priests — let them not be indignant at us thus expounding, but let them act carefully, lest they be counted of the [number of] priests who violate the holy things of the Lord.*"

From these words of Jerome, the Scholastics and canonists have deduced three [errors], from the person of the opponent [that an objector might draw]: of which the first is, that the Sacrament of the Lord's body cannot be consecrated by a wicked Priest; the second, that it is lawful for any Priest [whatever] to confect the holy chrism of confirmation, and to impose hands on those who are confirmed; the third, that it is in the power of any Priest [whatever] to confer the sacred orders. A fourth error also, besides these, **Calvin** the heretic gathers, in chapter eighteen of his *Institution* — namely, that the Eucharist is to be exhibited to the laity under both species, from that [passage] where Jerome said: "*The priests divide the blood of the Lord to the peoples.*"

Gratian, in the Collectanea of the decrees, Cause 1, question 1, says that Jerome, in the first proposition, wished to signify that the life and merits of the Priest are necessary — not indeed to the consecration, but to the effect of the consecration. For although an impure and unworthy priest, by the virtue of the divine word, may complete the consecration of the sacrament most perfectly, yet he does not obtain the grace and virtue of the consecration, but rather prepares for himself judgment and condemnation; and in this manner also he admonishes that it is to be understood, that the Roman Pontiff **Gelasius** →

[...continues on folio 621 (PDF p. 438): Gelasius and the resolution on the power of unworthy priests (Annotatio CCLVIII).]

(printed folio 621 [PDF p. 438]. Annot. CCLVIII (concl.)–CCLXII (Zephaniah 3:4–Malachi 1:1): unworthy priests (Gelasius, Aquinas); Origen's Trinity reading of the two olive-trees; whether Christians may swear (Jerome); whether Abraham's bosom and the hell of the damned are one (Jerome, Augustine, and Aquinas — one enclosure divided by the χάσμα); and whether an Angel wrote Malachi (Origen, rejected by Jerome) → folio 622.)

(folio 621, left column → right column)

Annotation CCLVIII (concluded)

"Her priests have polluted the sanctuary." — Zephaniah 3:4

Gelasius wrote concerning this matter to Elpidius, saying: "*For the invoked celestial Spirit will not come to the consecration of the mystery, if the priest who prays him to be present be proved full of criminous actions.*" The divine **Thomas**, in the third part of the Summa of theology, question 82, article 5,¹ says, in these words, that the error of certain priests is reprov'd, who from this cause alone — that they are Priests — think that they rightly and worthily perform the consecration of the Eucharist, even though they be unclean

with the filth of sins; and according to this sense he interprets a not-dissimilar sentence of Dionysius the Areopagite, writing to Demophilus the monk, in these words: "*Perfectly has he fallen from the sacerdotal order who is not illuminated; and rash indeed does such a one seem to me, laying [his] hand upon the sacred rites, and [who] dares to pronounce impure infamies (for I will not say prayers) over the divine symbols in a Christ-like manner.*" **Peter**, bishop of Crete, in the fourth book on the Sentences, distinction 13, thinks that Jerome, in the second [and] third proposition — by "Priests who consecrate the oil of chrism, impose hands, and constitute priests and Levites" — understood Bishops; because from the sacrament of order they differ not from [simple] Priests, although in jurisdiction and dignity they are far distant.

◇ 1. Left margin: Article 5. [St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica* III, question 82, article 5.]

Concerning the fourth proposition, see Annotation 268 of the sixth book.

Annotation CCLIX

"What are these two olive-trees, on the right of the candlestick, and on its left?" — Zechariah 4:3, 4
On the Trinity.

Origen, in the commentaries on Zechariah, interprets the two olive-trees [as] the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the lamp, or candlestick, which is in the midst of them, [as] God the Father. **Jerome**, in book 1 on Zechariah, confesses that he knows not how, without blasphemy, the Son and the Holy Spirit — the one on the right, the other on the left — may be so said.

Annotation CCLX

"Love not a false oath." — Zechariah 8:17

Whether it is licit for Christians to swear.

Jerome, in book 2 on Zechariah, on the occasion of this precept, seems to affirm that absolutely every oath is interdicted to Christians; for he speaks in this manner: "*Love not a lying oath,' he says: the Lord in the Gospel commanding, 'But I say to you, that you swear not at all; but let your speech be, Yea, yea, Nay, nay':² for whosoever shall not have sworn will never be able to perjure. In precepts which pertain to life, and are manifest, we ought not to seek an allegory: lest, according to the comic [poet], we seek a knot in a bulrush.*"

John Arboreus annotated this passage in [his] *Theosophia*.

◇ 2. Left margin: Matthew 5:34, 37.

See below, Annotation 26 of the following book.

Annotation CCLXI

"Thou also, in the blood of thy testament, hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, in which there was no water." — Zechariah 9:11

Whether the bosom of Abraham and the hell of the damned are the same.

Jerome, in the second commentary on Zechariah, is thought to have placed the bosom of Abraham in the hell of the damned, and to have thought both [to be] the same; for there he put these words: "*Thou also, in the blood,' etc. — which is thus understood: 'In the blood of thy passion [thou hast freed] those who were bound in the prison,*

(left column continues into the right column)

in which there is no mercy — by thy clemency thou hast freed [them].' And a little after: '*In the prefiguration of this pit, which did not have water, both Joseph was sent by [his] brothers into the pit, and Jeremiah [was cast] by the Chaldeans — not into the water of the pit, but into the mud; and into the mire the pit was sunk down, which could suffocate rather than refresh. Whence in the psalm it is written, 'I am fixed in the mud of*

the deep, and there is no footing.³ In this pit of hell tarried that rich man once clothed in purple,⁴ whose boastful tongue was burned with the burnings of punishments; and to such a degree he had no refreshment of the punishments, that he demanded the refreshment of the extreme finger of the poor man, dipped in water."

◇ 3. **Right margin:** Psalm 68:3. [Vulgate Psalm 68 = Psalm 69 in the Hebrew numbering.]

◇ 4. **Right margin:** Luke 16:24.

The divine **Augustine** — [in] epistle 57 to Dardanus, epistle 99 to Evodius, and in book 12 *On Genesis to the Letter* — seems to refute this opinion for a twofold cause: first, because in the Gospel there is said to be a vast chaos, and a deep and impassable gulf set between the bosom of Abraham (where Lazarus enjoyed solace) and Hell (where the rich man burned in torments); then, because, since in the sacred Letters nowhere is the name of the infernal [places] found to be taken in a good sense, it is not credible that that rest, in which Lazarus with the other souls of the holy Fathers rejoiced, was among the Infernal [places]. The Scholastic theologians teach that the bosom of Abraham and Hell are the same in situation, [but] differ in quality; [being] moreover enclosed by the same enclosure of a subterranean place — as Jerome rightly holds — each is comprised together, yet so that they are distinguished into a supreme and a lowest region by some interval. But the quality of each region is so diverse, that there [in the one] were of old the refreshments of pious souls, but here [in the other] are the perpetual punishments of the impious; and that [gulf], moreover, [is] χάσμα, that is, an immense gap, lying between each region — whether Augustine understood it corporeally, or spiritually, as a most firm law of God, as [it were] by a certain impermeable abyss prohibiting the commingling of these and those. Nothing prohibits but that the bosom of Abraham and Hell are comprehended in the same circuit of the earthly cavity.⁵ But to that which Augustine says — that nowhere is Hell called in a good sense — **Thomas**, in the fourth volume of the Sentences, distinction 45, question 1, responds plainly in these words: "*The place and state of the holy Fathers, as to that which it had of good, was called the bosom of Abraham; but as to that which it had of defect, was called hell: and so neither is the bosom of Abraham taken in an evil sense, nor hell in a good sense — although in a certain manner they are one.*"

◇ 5. **Right margin:** In what manner the bosom of Abraham and Hell differ.

Annotation CCLXII

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel, by the hand of Malachi," etc. — Malachi 1:1

Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi.

Origen, following the edition of the LXX — who, for that which in Hebrew is put בְּיַד מַלְאָכִי (Be-yad Malachi), translated ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου, that is, "By the hand of the angel" — asserted that the author of this book was an incarnate Angel; which **Jerome**, who thinks that the author of the volume was Ezra, indicated in the preface of Malachi in these words: "*Origen wrote three volumes upon this book, but he touched not the history [literal sense] at all; and, after his manner, being wholly occupied in the allegorical interpretation, he made no mention of Ezra, but, thinking [it] to have been an Angel who wrote [it] — according to that [saying] which we read concerning John,⁶ 'Behold, I send my angel before thy face' — which we altogether do not*" →

◇ 6. **Right margin:** Matthew 11:10.

[...continues on folio 622 (PDF p. 439): the rest of Jerome against Origen on the authorship of Malachi, and the end of Liber Quintus (Annotatio CCLXII →).]

(printed folio 622 [PDF p. 439]. **Annot. CCLXII (concl.)–CCLXIV — the end of Liber Quintus** (Malachi 1:1–2 Maccabees 7:41): Origen's fancy that John the Baptist, Malachi, and Haggai were incarnate Angels (rejected by Jerome); whether election and reprobation spring from foreknowledge of merits (Jerome vs. the

Pelagians); and CCLXIV, the 264th and final annotation — whether the Maccabees' mother died of joy (Marius Victorinus's verse) or was martyred by Antiochus (Josephus, the Fathers' view). **The Fifth Book here ends: "QVINTI LIBRI FINIS. F. Sixtus."**

(folio 622 — the last folio of Liber Quintus; left column → right column)

Annotation CCLXII (concluded)

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel, by the hand of Malachi," etc. — Malachi 1:1

(Jerome against Origen concludes:) "...[which we] altogether do not receive, lest we be compelled to admit the falls of Souls from heaven." And in the commentaries on Haggai, chapter 1, repeating the same more fully, he says: "Certain [persons] think that John the Baptist, and Malachi (which is interpreted 'Angel of the Lord'), and Haggai were Angels, and, by the dispensation and command of God, assumed human bodies, and were conversant among men — nor [is it] a wonder that this was believed concerning Angels, since for our salvation even the Son of God assumed a human body. And for this cause also they furnish testimony from the apocrypha, where it is said that Jacob (who afterward was called Israel) was an angel, and that on that account he supplanted [his] brother in the womb of his mother; and that John, too, exulted at the voice of the mother of the Lord in the womb of Elizabeth; and that there is one nature of all rational [beings]; and that for this cause men who have pleased God are made equal to the Angels. Let those [persons] hold this opinion: but we [hold] otherwise." This passage is had in Origen, volume 2 on the Gospel of John, and in book 3 of the *Peri Archon*.

Annotation CCLXIII

"I have loved Jacob, but Esau I have hated." — Malachi 1:2, 3

Whether election and reprobation are from the foreknowledge of merits.

Jerome, in the commentary on Malachi, explaining this, seems not to be far from the opinion of the Pelagians, saying that election and reprobation arise from the foreknowledge of merits, since indeed he writes in this manner: "Moreover, the love and hatred of God arises either from the foreknowledge of things to come, or from works: otherwise we know that God loves all things, and hates nothing of those [things] which he created; but properly he vindicates to his love those who are enemies of the vices, and rebels [against them]; and, on the contrary, he hates those who desire to build up again the [things] destroyed by God."

See below, Annotation 251 of book 6.

Annotation CCLXIV

"But last of all, after the sons, the mother also was consumed," etc. — 2 Maccabees 7:41

Whether the mother of the Maccabees died of joy.

Marius Victorinus, the preceptor of St. Jerome, in the book on the Maccabees which

(left column ends; the right column concludes:)

he composed in heroic verse, expressing the sense of that word "*Consumpta est*" [she was consumed] — for which in the Greek is had ἐτελεύτησεν [she died] — seems to indicate that the mother of the Maccabees did not perish, slain by the hands of the executioners, but that, after the slaughter of the last and younger son, [she died] the amplitude of joy and gladness being exhausted [i.e., overcome by an excess of joy]: since, on account of the triumphs obtained over death by [her] seven sons, she had conceived [so great a joy]; which sentiment he not inelegantly expressed in these verses:

While the boy bears these things, the joys undid the mother. And now, as she was, unstrung by [her] woes, now with voice failing, Sighing, and collapsed amid the hands of her own, She fell down lifeless, and [her] loosened limbs grew still. So she too, with [her] sons, was received into the portion of the saints. (Dum puer ista gerit soluerunt gaudia matrem. / Iamque, ut erat laxata malis, iam voce negata / Suspirans, interque manus collapsa suorum, / Concidit exanimis, resolutaque membra quierunt. / Sic ipsa, & nati sanctorum in parte recepta est.)

This sense, although the historical record does not reject it (for Livy also has handed down to memory that, after the noble battle at Trasimene, two mothers, their sons being received back unexpectedly, were extinguished by excessive joy)¹ — nevertheless all ecclesiastical writers hand down that she was killed by the lictors with various tortures and torments, according to Polybius of Megalopolis, who writes these things concerning her: "*Last of all, her single sons being consumed, the admirable parent of such great champions, in the cruel butchery of punishments, suddenly, [her] knees being bent, besought from God the dissolution of the body: for [she had drawn out the time] not by desire of living, but had prolonged so much time only for the sake of [her] sons. Antiochus, therefore, gnashing [in his throat], orders the noble mother to be afflicted; she is snatched away tyrannically, is stripped in [her] tender limbs, [her] hands are bound aloft, the old woman is struck with scourges, she mourns with wounded breasts; and, condemned to the frying-pan of flame, she of her own accord accompanies her burnt sons into the punishments, and, extended in prayer, and [her] hands raised up as though for child-bearing mothers, being poured out [prostrate], she poured forth [her] chaste spirit.*" This opinion of Josephus all the Christian Fathers receive, as it is said, with open arms.

◇ 1. **Right margin:** The mother of the Maccabees was killed by the lictors.

QVINTI LIBRI FINIS.

[THE END OF THE FIFTH BOOK.]

— *F. Sixtus [Senensis]*

TOPICAL INDEX

Each annotation is listed under every theme it touches; the number is the Annotation, linked to its page.

God & the Holy Trinity

- I** — Whether the beginning of Genesis pertains to the Trinity (p. 11)
- II** — Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods (p. 12)
- VII** — Whether the spirit that was borne over the waters was the Holy Spirit (p. 15)
- XVIII** — Whether God is corporeal (p. 24)
- C** — Whether this passage pertains to the Trinity (p. 79)
- CXXX** — Whether from this passage the mystery of the Trinity ought to be elicited (p. 103)
- CXXXIV** — Concerning the Trinity (p. 107)
- CXXXV** — Impious dogmas concerning the Trinity are falsely ascribed to Origen (p. 108)
- CXLIII** — Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born (p. 113)
- CXLIV** — The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (p. 114)
- CXLVI** — Origen seems to have thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (p. 114)
- CLVIII** — Eusebius of Caesarea thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (p. 120)
- CLXVIII** — Whether this passage pertains to the Holy Spirit (p. 125)
- CXCVI** — On the Holy Spirit (p. 154)
- CCXXII** — On the Trinity (p. 166)
- CCLVII** — Whether God has knowledge and providence of the least things (p. 206)
- CCLIX** — On the Trinity (p. 208)

Christ — person & work

- XCIX** — The dove descending upon Christ — whether it was truly an animal (p. 78)
- CII** — Whether the Son of God was an angel (p. 81)
- CXVII** — Whether Christ suffered for the Angels, as Origen taught (p. 93)
- CXIX** — Whether Christ still mourns our sins (p. 96)
- CXLIII** — Whether the Son of God is always begotten and always born (p. 113)
- CLX** — Whether the body of Christ was placed in the Sun (p. 121)
- CLXI** — Whether the prayer of Christ was heard (p. 121)
- CLXII** — Whether Christ truly feared and grieved (p. 122)
- CLXV** — Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell (p. 124)
- CLXXXII** — Whether hunger, thirst, grief, and death were natural to Christ (p. 139)
- CLXXXVI** — Whether Christ's humanity was, by its own nature, capable of grief and misery (p. 145)
- CCIX** — Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient (p. 160)
- CCXX** — A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy (p. 166)
- CCXXXIII** — A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters (p. 166)
- CCXXXIV** — On Christ (p. 176)

Angels & demons

- V** — Whether an invisible world and angels were created before this world (p. 13)
- VIII** — Whether angels and demons are corporeal (p. 17)
- XVII** — Whether the angels, together with God, created man — as Origen held (p. 23)
- LVII** — Whether the Cherubim are angels, or specters (p. 46)
- LVIII** — Theodoret denies that the Cherubim are spiritual and blessed minds (p. 47)
- LX** — Whether the Cherubim are incorporeal substances (p. 50)
- LXX** — That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen (p. 57)
- LXXI** — Whether the angels are aerial souls, as Philo thought; or whether the stars are animate, as the same [Philo] reckoned (p. 57)
- LXXII** — Whether the angels are called "sons of God" in the sacred letters (p. 58)
- LXXIII** — Whether the angels can have intercourse with women (p. 58)

- LXXVII** — Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women (p. 62)
XC — Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held (p. 72)
XCIV — Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held (p. 75)
CII — Whether the Son of God was an angel (p. 81)
CXXVI — Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (p. 99)
CXLII — Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal (p. 113)
CXLVII — Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound (p. 115)
CCXV — Whether the Angels are corporeal (p. 163)
CCXVI — Whether the Angels desert those whom they have received into [their] custody (p. 164)
CCXXXIV — Whether angels have a soul (p. 167)
CCLVI — Whether the Angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (p. 205)
CCLXII — Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi (p. 209)

The human soul

- XXVI** — Whether the soul alone is man (p. 28)
XXVIII — Whether the body was made before the soul (p. 29)
XXX — Whether the soul was created with the angels on the first day (p. 30)
XXXII — Whether man, formed of an earthly body and an immortal soul, is the man whom God created to his own image (p. 30)
XCIV — Whether the angels created the sensitive soul of men, as Philo held (p. 75)
CVIII — Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held (p. 87)
CXLII — Whether the nature of Angels and Souls is corporeal (p. 113)
CXLVIII — Whether the future resurrection will be in the [self-same] individual (p. 115)
CLXXXIV — Whether men shall rise again in the same individual [body] (p. 139)
CLXXXV — Whether Souls, on account of sins committed in heaven, are thrust down into bodies (p. 140)
CLXXXIX — Whether the Soul was created before bodies (p. 148)
CCVIII — Whether the Soul was formed before the body (p. 158)
CCIX — Whether the Soul of Christ is omniscient (p. 160)
CCX — The error of Origen concerning souls thrust into bodies (p. 160)
CCXXXVI — On souls fallen down from heaven (p. 177)
CCXXXVII — The incarceration of souls (p. 177)

Creation & the cosmos

- II** — Heaven — whether it is the dwelling of many gods (p. 12)
III — Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (p. 12)
IV — Augustine of Kissamos wrongly taught that the empyrean heaven was not created (p. 13)
IX — Whether there is only one heaven, as Chrysostom seems to hold (p. 18)
X — Whether the firmament is between the upper and lower waters (p. 19)
XI — Whether the upper and lower waters are real water, or rather Angels, as Origen held (p. 19)
XII — Whether the binary [double] number is infamous, as Jerome held (p. 19)
XIII — The ancients denied that there are Antipodes (p. 20)
XIV — Whether it must be believed that the stars are fixed in the heaven (p. 21)
XV — For the stars foreshow the future events of men, as Origen held — whom the judicial Astrologers follow (p. 21)
XIX — Whether the stars are animate (p. 25)
XXII — Whether herbs and trees are given as food to the animals (p. 27)
XXIII — Whether God completed his works on the sixth day (p. 27)
XXIV — Whether the six days of the world's creation are real days (p. 27)
LXIX — Whether the curse of the earth was removed under Noah, as Francesco Giorgio thought (p. 57)
LXXX — Whether heaven is spherical and mobile (p. 65)
LXXXI — Whether the Noachic Flood could have been foreknown from observation of the stars, as Pierre d'Ailly thought (p. 65)
CV — Whether the heavens emit a vocal sound by their motion (p. 82)
CVIII — Whether the stars are rational living beings, as Philo and Origen held (p. 87)
CXV — Whether the world is the Son of God, as Philo held (p. 92)

- CXLVII** — Whether the angels were created before the world, and whether the heavens emit a vocal sound (p. 115)
CCXII — Whether the stars are animate (p. 161)
CCXIII — Whether before this world there were other worlds, and whether there will be [others] after this (p. 162)
CCXLII — Whether the earth is an animal capable of reason (p. 180)

Adam, Eve, the Fall & original sin

- XX** — Whether, if Adam had not sinned, there would have been coitus (p. 25)
XXI — Whether the first parents would have had children if they had not sinned (p. 26)
XXVII — The breath breathed into Adam is the rational soul, as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and others hold (p. 28)
XXIX — Whether man was created first in the species than in the individual, as Francesco Giorgio held (p. 29)
XXXI — Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (p. 30)
XLIII — Whether God threatened the first man with bodily death, or rather only the death of the soul (p. 38)
XLIV — For what cause abortion is a grave sin, even if the embryo was not [yet] animated (p. 39)
XLV — Whether Adam was created androgynous, as Francesco Giorgio thinks (p. 39)
XLVI — Whether Eve was formed from Adam's rib (p. 40)
XLVII — Cajetan denies that a rib was truly taken from Adam (p. 41)
XLIX — Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (p. 42)
L — No one's nature is harmed by another's sins (p. 43)
LI — Whether the giants sprang from the seed of the devil, as Francesco Giorgio thought (p. 43)
LII — Whether sin brought upon Adam the necessity of bodily death (p. 44)
LIII — Whether the tunics of skin of the first parents were the skins of animals (p. 44)
LIV — Whether the tunics of skin were true skins (p. 45)
LXIII — If the first parents had not sinned, whether there would have been generation (p. 51)
LXXV — Whether God restricted the life of man to 120 years (p. 61)
LXXVI — Whether the giants were men who exceeded others in unusual bodily size (p. 62)
LXXVII — Whether the giants were begotten from Angels and women (p. 62)
CLXXXVII — Whether Adam's sin transmitted to posterity only the death of the body (p. 137)
CLXXXVIII — Concerning original sin (p. 137)
CLXXXIX — Whether the sin contracted from Adam is only the occasion of sin, and not sin [itself] (p. 137)
CLXXX — If the first parents had not sinned, whether [there would have been] conception and generation (p. 138)

The earthly Paradise

- XXXIII** — Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (p. 31)
XXXIV — Francesco Giorgio tries to prove by four arguments that there is no terrestrial Paradise (p. 31)
XXXV — Whether there is a terrestrial Paradise (p. 33)
XXXVI — Whether Paradise, after Adam's fall, entirely ceased to exist (p. 34)
XXXVII — Whether the terrestrial Paradise was created before the world (p. 35)
XXXVIII — Whether the earthly Paradise reaches up to the orb of the Moon, as Bede held (p. 36)
LVI — Whether Adam, cast out of paradise, was placed before the door of paradise (p. 46)

Grace, free will, merit & predestination

- VI** — Whether faith and charity are from ourselves (p. 15)
CI — Whether divine grace comes before us, or is preceded by us (p. 79)
CXXXII — Concerning free will (p. 106)
CXXXVIII — Whether the just man sins in every work [he does] (p. 110)
CXLV — Whether anyone may be certain that he does not always sin (p. 114)
CLIX — Whether a man can be made impeccable (p. 120)
CLXVII — Whether all the works of unbelievers are sins (p. 125)
CLXXXI — Whether Peter, in the denial of Christ, lost [his] faith (p. 138)
CLXXXIII — Whether our merits are the cause of the eternal election (p. 139)
CXCII — On the merit of good works (p. 152)
CXCIII — On the merit of good works (p. 152)
CXCV — Whether good works are meritorious (p. 152)
CXCVII — On predestination and reprobation (p. 154)

- CXCVIII** — On God swearing (p. 154)
CXCIX — On the merit of works (p. 155)
CC — Whether the divine vocation is from the merits of those called (p. 155)
CCXVII — On the merits of the just (p. 164)
CCXXXII — Whether anyone in this life is truly just (p. 171)
CCXXXV — On free will (p. 176)
CCXL — Whether charity once had can be lost (p. 178)
CCLXIII — Whether election and reprobation are from the foreknowledge of merits (p. 210)

Sin, penance, confession & the keys

- XVI** — Whether satisfaction is necessary for penitents (p. 22)
LXII — Whether priests bind and loose (p. 51)
CLXXIII — Whether penance is to be repeated (p. 132)
CLXXIV — Concerning satisfaction (p. 133)
CLXXV — Whether sacramental confession is necessary (p. 133)
CCV — Whether sins are remitted to those remaining in unbelief (p. 157)
CCXLI — Whether one sin is remitted without another (p. 180)
CCLI — Whether the fallen, after penance, are to be restored to their former dignity (p. 198)

The sacraments

- LXXXV** — Whether circumcision conferred anything to the soul's salvation (p. 67)
XCVI — Whether circumcision conferred grace on infants (p. 76)
XCVII — Why circumcision was given on the eighth day (p. 77)
CXX — Whether the flesh and blood of Christ are nothing else than his doctrine (p. 96)
CXXI — And he shall put incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord (p. 97)
CLII — Concerning the Eucharist (p. 118)
CLXIII — Whether the Eucharist is to be denied to sinners (p. 123)
CLXIII — Concerning the Eucharist, the heretics feign that St. Chrysostom thought wrongly (p. 123)
CXCIV — On the Eucharist (p. 152)
CCLVIII — On the power of the priesthood (p. 207)

The Church, clergy & discipline

- CXVIII** — Whether bishops are to be elected by the authority of the people (p. 94)
CXXII — Whether it is lawful for priests to possess temporal goods (p. 97)
CLXXVI — Whether the royal power is to be preferred to the sacerdotal (p. 136)
CCIII — Whether the possession of secular things befits the clergy (p. 156)
CCXLIII — Not only Christ is to be imitated (p. 182)
CCXLIV — Whether clerics ought to have beard or hair shorn (p. 182)
CCLVIII — On the power of the priesthood (p. 207)

The Virgin Mary, the saints & sacred images

- CIV** — Whether the Virgin Mary ever labored under unbelief (p. 82)
CLIII — Concerning the invocation of the saints (p. 118)
CLIV — Whether Mary hesitated at the death of Christ (p. 118)
CLVI — In what manner the Blessed Virgin was sanctified by the entrance of Christ (p. 119)
CCXLVII — Whether the sacred Images are to be venerated (p. 190)

The vision of God & the state of souls after death

- XL** — Whether the places and punishments of souls after this life are only spiritual, as St. Augustine seems to hold (p. 36)
XLI — Whether Moses and Paul saw the very essence of God with the mind, but not with the eyes of the body (p. 37)
LXIV — Whether the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, enjoy the divine vision (p. 52)
LXXXVIII — Whether God can be seen by the angels (p. 64)
CXXVII — Whether all the blessed shall see God (p. 101)

- CXXVIII** — Whether the saints, immediately after the judgment, are raised to the contemplation of God (p. 101)
CXXXIX — Whether the souls of the blessed see all things which are done here (p. 110)
CXL — Whether the souls of Christians are blessed immediately after this life (p. 111)
CLXIX — Whether the souls of the saints are in heaven before the resurrection (p. 126)
CCXXI — On God being seen (p. 166)
CCXXVIII — Whether the saints in heaven remember [their] past evils (p. 168)

Hell, purgatory, limbo & the purging fire

- XXXIX** — Tertullian held that all souls are in the underworld until the day of judgment (p. 36)
XLII — Whether the place of the underworld is under the earth (p. 38)
XCIII — Whether hell is only the conscience of sinners, as Philo held (p. 74)
CXXXI — Whether the demons and hell shall suffer everlasting punishments (p. 104)
CXXXVII — Whether infants are punished with the punishments of the damned (p. 108)
CXLI — Whether the fire of hell is incorporeal (p. 111)
CLXV — Whether Christ the Lord sustained in [his] soul the pain of hell (p. 124)
CLXX — Whether after this life all, both good and evil, shall enter the fire of gehenna (p. 127)
CLXXI — Whether all Souls, after this life, are to be tried by fire (p. 129)
CLXXXVIII — Whether the punishment of Hell exceeds the gravity of the sin (p. 148)
CCII — Whether all the saints must be purged by the fire of the conflagration (p. 156)
CCXIV — Whether after this life there is given a place from which Souls, once entered, can go out (p. 163)
CCXXV — Whether the souls of the damned shall at some time have rest (p. 167)
CCXXXIX — Whether the fire of hell is metaphorical (p. 169)
CCXXX — The expiatory fire (p. 171)
CCLII — Whether [there are] only two places after this life (p. 199)
CCLXI — Whether the bosom of Abraham and the hell of the damned are the same (p. 208)

The end of the world & millenarianism

- CXC** — Whether the age of the world consists of only six thousand years (p. 148)
CCXXXIII — Whether the opinion of the Chiliasts is to be condemned (p. 172)
CCXLVI — On the kingdom of the Romans (p. 190)
CCXLVIII — On the time of the world's destruction (p. 194)

Scripture — text & translation

- LXV** — A passage from the fourth chapter of Genesis, badly translated by the Seventy (p. 53)
LXVI — The clause "let us go out into the field," superfluously added by the Septuagint (p. 53)
LXVII — The clause "vagabond and fugitive," badly rendered by the Septuagint (p. 54)
LXVIII — The years of the illustrious men wrongly reckoned by the Septuagint (p. 54)
LXX — That "Angels of God" was wrongly put by the Septuagint for "sons of God," and hence grave questions have arisen (p. 57)
LXXIV — The clause "My spirit shall not remain," etc., badly rendered (p. 61)
LXXIX — The number of the years and the months of the Flood [is] corrupted (p. 64)
LXXXII — The days of the ceasing Flood wrongly reckoned (p. 66)
LXXXIII — Whether the raven returned into the ark (p. 66)
LXXXIV — What kind of branch the dove brought (p. 67)
LXXXVIII — An error in the number and the years of the generations of Shem (p. 69)
CIII — That "Sabek" is wrongly expounded as "a he-goat." (p. 81)
CVI — The Septuagint wrongly translated, "We have not found water." (p. 83)
CIX — Mandrakes [rendered] for lilies (p. 89)
CX — An error of the Septuagint interpreters (p. 89)
CXII — Many have not rightly interpreted the word "Israel." (p. 90)
CXVI — Whether Moses's face was horned (p. 93)
CXXV — The man said, whose eye is stopped up (p. 98)
CXXXIII — Concerning Seba and Sceba (p. 106)
CXXXVI — As it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done (p. 108)

- CL** — I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession (p. 117)
CLI — Whether this passage was well rendered by Jerome (p. 117)
CLV — Concerning the eight little verses added to Psalm 13 (p. 119)
CCI — On the number of the alphabetic Psalms (p. 155)
CCVI — On the sons of those cast out (p. 157)
CCVII — On the correct rendering of this passage (p. 158)
CCXX — A prophecy of Christ omitted by the Seventy (p. 166)
CCXXIII — A prophecy of Christ ill translated by the Seventy interpreters (p. 166)
CCXXVI — Every beard shall be shaven (p. 168)
CCLIV — A passage badly translated by the Seventy (p. 203)
CCLV — On the ivy of Jonah (p. 204)

Scripture — canon, authorship & the sense of Scripture

- LV** — Whether the letter of divine Scripture sometimes says something false (p. 46)
CXXIX — Whether the land of promise is to be understood according to the letter (p. 102)
CXLIV — The author of the commentary on Job which is falsely attributed to Origen thought wrongly concerning the Trinity (p. 114)
CXLIX — Concerning the beginning of Genesis (p. 116)
CLVII — Whether the Psalms speaking literally of David can be expounded literally of Christ (p. 120)
CXCI — On the theme of Psalm 90 (p. 151)
CCXI — Whether Solomon was a prophet (p. 161)
CCXVIII — On the author of the book of Wisdom (p. 165)
CCXIX — On the author of the book of Wisdom (p. 165)
CCXXXVIII — On the history of Susanna (p. 178)
CCXLV — On the Appendix of Daniel (p. 188)
CCXLIX — On the calumny imposed upon St. Jerome (p. 195)
CCL — Whether the history of Susanna is to be received (p. 195)
CCLXII — Whether an Angel was the author of the book of Malachi (p. 209)
CCLXIV — Whether the mother of the Maccabees died of joy (p. 210)

Moral, practical & historical questions

- XXV** — Whether the Jews sacrificed in the lands of the gentiles (p. 28)
XLVIII — Whether it is lawful for Christians to swear (p. 42)
LIX — Whether Moses died (p. 49)
LXI — Whether Moses has yet died (p. 50)
LXXXVI — Of what kind was Noah's drunkenness (p. 68)
LXXXVII — There was only one language for all before the tower was built, as St. Chrysostom rightly held (p. 68)
LXXXIX — Whether Abraham lied (p. 70)
XC — Whether Melchisedech was a man, or rather an Angel, as Origen held (p. 72)
XCI — Whether Melchisedech was the Holy Spirit (p. 73)
XCII — Whether it is lawful for soldiers to take booty (p. 74)
XCIV — Whether Abraham's intercourse with Hagar was adultery (p. 74)
XCVIII — Whether Abraham sinned by unbelief (p. 77)
CVII — Whether it is lawful for a good man to lie (p. 84)
CXI — Whether Jacob contended with the Angel in a bodily wrestling (p. 90)
CXIII — Whether Joseph's brothers accused him of a most wicked crime (p. 91)
CXIV — Whether Tamar, in lying with Judah, perpetrated a crime (p. 91)
CXVI — Whether Moses's face was horned (p. 93)
CXXIII — Concerning Moses's wife (p. 98)
CXXIV — Whether the rods brought to Moses were more than twelve (p. 98)
CLXVI — Whether it is lawful to use lots (p. 124)
CLXXII — Whether one ought to pray in an unknown tongue (p. 132)
CLXXXVII — Whether trading [commerce] is condemned (p. 147)
CCIV — On the Oath (p. 157)

CCXXVII — Whether it is a lighter [sin] to sin openly than to feign holiness (p. 168)

CCXXXI — The Oath (p. 171)

CCXXXIX — On hypocrisy (p. 178)

CCLIII — Whether, for the sake of preserving chastity, it be licit to die by one's own hand (p. 200)

CCLX — Whether it is licit for Christians to swear (p. 208)

INDEX OF PERSONS

Fathers, Doctors, and adversaries whom Sixtus discusses; each Annotation number is linked to its page.

- Origen** II, V, VII, VIII, XI, XIV, XV, XXVI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XLIX, LIII, LIV, LXVI, LXVIII, LXXVI, XC, XCIII, CII, CIV, CVII, CVIII, CXI, CXVII, CXVIII, CXIX, CXX, CXXI, CXXII, CXXVI, CXXVII, CXXVIII, CXXXI, CXXXIV, CXXXV, CXLI, CXLIII, CXLIV, CXLVI, CXLVIII, CL, CLIX, CLX, CLXX, CLXXI, CLXXXIV, CLXXXV, CLXXXIX, CCVI, CCVIII, CCX, CCXI, CCXII, CCXIII, CCXXII, CCXXV, CCXXXIX, CCXXX, CCXXXIV, CCXXXV, CCXXXVI, CCXXXVII, CCXLII, CCXLIII, CCXLIV, CCXLV, CCXLIX, CCL, CCLVI, CCLIX, CCLXII
- Jerome** V, XI, XII, XVIII, XXIII, XXXIV, XXXVII, LVIII, LXV, LXVI, LXVIII, LXX, LXXII, LXXIV, LXXV, LXXXI, LXXXVIII, XC, XCVIII, CIII, CVI, CVII, CVIII, CIX, CX, CXI, CXII, CXIV, CXVI, CXVII, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXVI, CXXIX, CXXXI, CXXXIII, CXXXVI, CXLI, CXLII, CXLIX, CLI, CLV, CLIX, CLXI, CLXXI, CLXXVI, CLXXXI, CLXXXV, CLXXXVI, CLXXXIX, CXC, CXCI, CCI, CCVI, CCVII, CCVIII, CCXII, CCXIII, CCXIV, CCXIX, CCXX, CCXXII, CCXXIII, CCXXV, CCXXVI, CCXXVII, CCXXVIII, CCXXIX, CCXXXI, CCXXXII, CCXXXIII, CCXXXIV, CCXXXV, CCXXXVI, CCXXXVII, CCXXXVIII, CCXLIV, CCXLV, CCXLVI, CCXLVII, CCXLVIII, CCXLIX, CCLII, CCLIII, CCLIV, CCLV, CCLVI, CCLVII, CCLVIII, CCLIX, CCLX, CCLXI, CCLXII, CCLXIII, CCLXIV
- Augustine of Hippo** I, II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, X, XIII, XIV, XV, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI, XXXIV, XXXVI, XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV, XLV, XLIX, L, LI, LII, LVIII, LXVI, LXVIII, LXX, LXXIII, LXXVII, LXXXV, LXXXVII, LXXXIX, XCI, XCII, XCIV, XCVI, XCVIII, CIV, CV, CVII, CVIII, CXIV, CXX, CXXX, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXXXIV, CXXXVII, CXXXIX, CXLI, CLII, CLX, CLXII, CLXIII, CLXV, CLXVI, CLXVII, CLXIX, CLXX, CLXXI, CLXXXIII, CLXXXVI, CLXXXVIII, CXC, CXCI, CXCIII, CXCIV, CXCV, CXCVII, CCV, CCVIII, CCXI, CCXIII, CCXVII, CCXVIII, CCXXXIII, CCXL, CCLIII, CCLV, CCLXI
- Augustine, Bishop of Kissamos** IV, XXXVI, LII, LXV, LXVI, LXXXIII, CXVI, CXXIII, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXX, CXXXIII
- Ambrose of Milan** I, II, IV, V, VII, XXIV, XXXV, XLIX, LVIII, LIX, LXI, LXII, LXIV, LXX, LXXVII, XCII, XCIV, XCVIII, C, CV, CXIV, CXXXI, CXXXIV, CXLVII, CLVII, CLXVIII, CLXXI, CXC, CXCVI, CCIV, CCV, CCXL, CCXLVII, CCLIII
- Ambrose Catharinus (of Compsa)** I, IV, VII, XXXVI, LIX, LXI, C, CLVII, CLXVIII, CXCVI
- John Chrysostom** II, III, VII, VIII, IX, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX, XXIV, XXVII, XXXIV, XLVI, XLVIII, LVIII, LXIII, LXXII, LXXIII, LXXV, LXXVII, LXXVIII, LXXXIV, LXXXV, LXXXVII, LXXXIX, XCIV, XCVI, XCVIII, CI, CIV, CVII, CXII, CXIII, CXIV, CLIII, CLIV, CLXIII, CLXXIII, CLXXIV, CLXXV, CLXXVIII, CLXXX, CXC, CXCVIII, CC, CCXXI, CCXXIII, CCXLII, CCXLIV, CCLIV
- Hilary of Poitiers** V, VIII, LXI, CXII, CXLIX, CL, CLXXI, CLXXXI, CLXXXII, CLXXXIII, CLXXXVI, CXC, CCI, CCI, CCIII, CCVI, CCVII, CCVIII
- Philo** II, VIII, XVII, XIX, XXIII, XXIV, XXXII, XXXV, XLIII, LXVIII, LXX, LXXI, LXXVII, XCIII, XCV, CV, CVIII, CXII, CXV, CLXXVI, CCXIX
- Gregory the Great** V, XX, XXIV, XL, CXXX, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, CXXXIX, CXL, CXLI, CXLIII, CXLV, CLXXX, CCVIII, CCXXVIII, CCXL, CCXLI, CCXLVII
- Basil** II, V, VII, VIII, XI, XVII, XXIV, XXXIV, CVIII, CXLVII, CLXXI, CXCIX, CCXII, CCXXIV, CCXLIII
- Bede** XXXIV, XXXVIII, LXVIII, XCVI, CCXL, CCXLIV
- Tertullian** XVIII, XXXIX, CXLIX, CCXXXIII, CCXLIX
- Lactantius** III, VIII, XIII, LXVIII, LXX, LXXV, LXXVII, CLXXI, CXC, CCXXXIII, CCXLVIII
- Eusebius of Caesarea** XIV, XV, XVIII, LXVIII, LXX, LXXVII, LXXXIX, CIII, CXII, CLVIII, CCXXIII, CCXXXIII, CCXLV, CCXLVII, CCXLIX, CCLIII
- Theodoret** V, VII, XVII, XVIII, XXIII, LV, LVIII, LXXVI, CXIII, CXIV, CXXX, CLXXIX, CCXLIV
- John Damascene** VIII, XX, CVIII, CXLI, CLXXXVI, CCXLVII
- Rufinus** CXVII, CXXXI, CLI, CCVIII, CCXXIX, CCXXXVIII, CCXLV, CCLV
- Cardinal Cajetan** I, V, VII, XLVI, XLVII, C, CVIII, CXX, CLVII, CLXI, CLXVIII, CXCVI, CCI, CCXLIV

Thomas Aquinas V, VIII, IX, XIV, XV, XX, XXIV, XXX, XXXII, XXXVIII, XL, XLVII, XCII, XCIV, XCVI, CVIII, CXXXVII, CXXXIX, CXLI, CLXI, CLXIII, CLXVI, CLXXVI, CLXXXVII, CLXXXVIII, CCV, CCVIII, CCXII, CCXXV, CCXXVII, CCXL, CCXLI, CCLVIII

Peter Lombard I, VIII, LXII, CXLIII, CLXII, CLXVII, CLXXV, CLXXXVI, CXCIV, CCIX, CCXXVIII, CCXL

Francesco Giorgio (Giorgio Veneto) XXVI, XXIX, XXXIV, XXXVII, XLV, LI, LIV, LXIX, LXXXVI, XCVII, CIX

Luther LXXIII, CI, CXXXIV, CXXXVIII, CXL, CXLV, CLIII, CLXVII, CLXXV, CXCIV, CCXIV, CCXXXII, CCXXXIII, CCXXXV

Calvin CLXVII, CLXXIV, CLXXV, CXCII, CCXVII, CCLVIII

Oecolampadius CI, CLXIII

Bucer ("Bodius") CXVIII, CXX, CLII, CXCIV, CCXXXII, CCXXXV

The Anabaptists (Balthasar Hubmaier) CLXIX, CCXXXIII, CCXLVII

Cerinthus XVII, CCXXXIII