



W. de Vries fecit
J. de Witt sculp.
BERNHARDINUS DE MOOR,

Bernh. Fil. Barthol. Nep. Catar. ad Mosam Batavus.
THEOLOGIE DOCTOR et PROFESSOR ORDIN.

primam FRANEQUERÆ C1719CCXLIV. *secundam* LUODUNI BATAV. C1719CCXLV.
ibidemque Ecclesie Pastor. Ætat. XXXVI.

Prof. at V. of Leiden

Bernardinus de Moor's
Didactico-Elenctic Theology

That is, his *Continuous Commentary on Johannes Marckius' Didactico-Elenctic Compendium of Christian Theology*

**Volume 2: Concerning the
Principium of Theology, or Holy
Scripture**

Translated by Dr. Steven Dilday

Central, South Carolina
From Reformation to Reformation Translations
2018

*Bernardinus de Moor's Didactico-Elenctic Theology: Volume 2: Concerning
the Principium of Theology, or Holy Scripture*
Copyright © 2018 Steven Dilday

Published by From Reformation to Reformation Translations
426 Patterson St., Central, SC 29630
bernardinusdemoor.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced without
the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief
quotations for the purpose of review or comment.

Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

I. Prefatory Matter	9
Who is Bernardinus de Moor? and Why Translate His Work?	11
Dedication	15
Preface to the Benevolent Reader	19
A Survey of the Entire Work	33
II. Chapter II: Concerning the Principium of Theology, or Holy Scripture	37
Summary of Chapter II	39
§ 1: The Denomination of the Word as Sacred Scripture ...	47
§ 2: The Definition of Sacred Scripture.....	49
§ 3: The Word of God Unwritten	50
§ 4: The Word of God Written	58
§ 5: The Infallible Inspiration of the Scriptures.....	69
§ 6: The Certainty of the Inspiration and Authority of Scripture	89
§ 7: The Authority of Scripture and the Testimony of the Church	114
§ 8: The Authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Originals	127
§ 9: The Authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Originals Defended	162
§ 10: Against the Authenticity of the Vulgate	188
§ 11: Against the Authenticity of the Samaritan and Septuagint	202
§ 12: The Instrumental Cause of Scripture: The Amanuenses	228
§ 13: The Canon of Scripture.....	258
§ 14: The Canon and the Church	292

§ 15: Canonical Books Imperishable, Part 1	329
§ 16: Canonical Books Imperishable, Part 2	335
§ 17: The Abiding Canonicity of the Old Testament, Part 1	359
§ 18: The Abiding Canonicity of the Old Testament, Part 2	369
§ 19: The Apocrypha, Part 1	375
§ 20: The Apocrypha, Part 2	396
§ 21: The Argument of Scripture	403
§ 22: The Truth of Scripture.....	405
§ 23: The Self-Consistency of Scripture	411
§ 24: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 1	429
§ 25: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 2.....	438
§ 26: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 3.....	442
§ 27: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 1	446
§ 28: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 2	454
§ 29: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 3	462
§ 30: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 4	470
§ 31: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 5	481
§ 32: The Proximate End of Scripture: the Rule of Faith and Practice	487
§ 33: The Translation of Scripture, Part 1	493
§ 34: The Translation of Scripture, Part 2	508
§ 35: The Reading of the Scriptures, Part 1	514
§ 36: The Reading of the Scriptures, Part 2.....	519
§ 37: The Sense of Scripture, Simple or Composite, Part 1	527
§ 38: The Sense of Scripture, Simple or Composite, Part 2	536
§ 39: Private and Ministerial Judgment.....	557
§ 40: The Supreme Judge: Neither Enthusiastic Experience, nor Reason	563
§ 41: The Supreme Judge: Not the Church, Part 1	572
§ 42: The Supreme Judge: Not the Church, Part 2	579
§ 43: The Supreme Judge: The Holy Spirit	588
§ 44: The Object of Interpretation: the Whole Scripture	592
§ 45: The Means of Proper Interpretation	596
§ 46: The Use of the Fathers in Interpretation, Part 1	602
§ 47: The Use of the Fathers in Interpretation, Part 2	609

§ 48: Hermeneutical Canons, Part 1	610
§ 49: Hermeneutical Canons, Part 2	613
§ 50: Scripture's Highest End	616
III. Theological Disputation on Mark 15:25 and John 19:14... ..	617
§ 1: The Chronological Paradox	619
§ 2: Literature on the Chronological Paradox	620
§ 3: Resolution to Focus on the More Plausible Solutions	622
§ 4: Possible Resolution through Textual Emendation	623
§ 5: The Sixth Hour of the Day of Preparation? of the Trial?	627
§ 6: The Sixth Hour of the Roman Civil Day?.....	629
§ 7: The Sixth Hour More Broadly Defined?	634
§ 8: Greater and Lesser Hours?	637
§ 9: The Preferred Harmonization	639
§ 10: The Preferred Harmonization Defended	641
§ 11: A Possible Objection Answered	645
IV. Theological Disputation on Ephesians 5:14	647
§ 1: Questions on Ephesians 5:14.....	649
§ 2: Who Is the Speaker? (Part 1).....	650
§ 3: Who Is the Speaker? (Part 2).....	654
§ 4: Who Is the Speaker? (Part 3).....	657
§ 5: Who Is the Speaker? (Part 4).....	659
§ 6: Who Is the Speaker? (Part 5).....	666
§ 7: What Are the Sources? (Part 1)	671
§ 8: What Are the Sources? (Part 2)	676
§ 9: What Are the Sources? (Part 3)	681
§ 10: What Are the Sources? (Part 4).....	683
§ 11: What Are the Sources? (Part 5)	685
§ 12: What Are the Sources? (Part 6).....	692
§ 13: What Are the Sources? (Part 7).....	696
§ 14: What Are the Sources? (Part 8).....	698
§ 15: What Are the Sources? (Part 9).....	701
§ 16: Who Are the "Sleepers"? Who the "Dead"?.....	704
§ 17: To Whom Is This Directed?	708
§ 18: How Can the Dead Be Made Mindful to Arise?	712

§ 19: What Is the Meaning of the Promise? (Part 1).....	715
§ 20: What Is the Meaning of the Promise? (Part 2).....	717
§ 21: How Does the Prophecy Serve the Apostle's End? ..	719
V. Index	721

Prefatory Matter

Who is Bernardinus de Moor? and Why Translate his *Commentarius*?

Bernardinus de Moor was born on January 29, 1709. He studied at the great, Dutch University of Leiden, which had been a center of Reformed scholarship from the time of its founding in 1575. Its faculty had included some prominent Reformed theologians, such as Franciscus Junius (1592-1602),¹ Franciscus Gomarus (1594-1611),² Antonius Walæus (1619-1639),³ Johannes Hoornbeeck (1653-1666),⁴ and Herman Witsius (1698-1708),⁵ among others. De Moor attended at Leiden from 1726-1730, and had the opportunity to study under Johannes Wesselius (1712-1745),⁶ remembered for his *Dissertationibus academicis*, and Johannes à Marck (1689-1731).⁷ De Moor was especially

¹ Franciscus Junius (1545-1602) was a French theologian and pastor. He studied theology in Geneva under John Calvin and Theodore Beza. Together with Emmanuel Tremellius, he produced a major Latin translation of the Scriptures. He concluded his career as a Professor of Theology at Leiden, at which time he published *De vera theologia* and *Theses theologicæ*.

² Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) was a Dutch theologian. Gomarus is most remembered for his opposition to Arminius and Arminianism, and was a significant participant at the Synod of Dort. His systematic work is entitled *Disputationes theologicæ*.

³ Antonius Walæus (1573-1639) was a Dutch Reformed minister and theologian. He studied at Leiden under Franciscus Junius, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus. He was appointed as a professor at Middelburg (1609), and in this capacity he attended the Synod of Dort. In 1619, Walæus became a member of the theological faculty at Leiden. He joined Johannes Polyander, Andre Rivet, and Anthony Thysius in the composition of the *Synopsis purioris theologicæ*.

⁴ Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617-1666) earned the degree of doctor of theology under Voetius at Utrecht (1643), where he was also appointed professor. In 1653, he went to teach at Leiden, where he died. He excelled in the fields of philology, Old Testament exegesis, church history, and polemical theology.

⁵ Hermann Witsius (1636-1708) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian of the Voetian school. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1675-1680), Utrecht (1680-1698), and Leiden (1698-1708). Witsius' federal theology was heavily influential in the Netherlands, Germany, and Scotland.

⁶ Johannes Wesselius (1671-1745) was a Dutch Reformed Pastor and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Rotterdam (1711), and then at Leiden, where he produced his systematic *Dissertationes academicas*.

⁷ Johannes Marckius (1656-1731) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian, serving

attached to à Marck, and à Marck, shortly before his death, asked De Moor to continue his work,¹ which he would indeed do.

After his time at Leiden, De Moor labored in the pastoral ministry at Ingen, Broek in Waterland, Zaandam, and Enkuizen.² He was appointed as professor of theology at Franeker in 1744, but, before he was even able to deliver his inaugural address, he was appointed to succeed his former teacher, Johannes Wesselius, as professor of theology at Leiden, upon Wesselius' death in 1745; De Moor continued in this position for the rest of his life.

It seems that in his teaching method, De Moor honored the dying wish of his teacher and friend, Johannes à Marck. The substance of De Moor's lectures survives in his massive *Continuous Commentary on Johannes Marckius' Didactico-Elenctic Compendium of Christian Theology* (1761-1778; in seven volumes). As its title indicates, De Moor's lectures were something of a running commentary upon the *Compendium* of à Marck, while also drawing upon and digesting the fruits of two centuries of Reformed theological thought. De Moor's *Commentary* is a masterpiece.

The translation of De Moor's *Commentarius* is certainly a massive undertaking. It raises the question: Why expend the effort?

The great Scottish divine William Cunningham said, "The English language, though it contains many valuable works on particular doctrines and on separate subjects in systematic theology, contains comparatively very few systems; *i.e.* very few works in which all the leading doctrines of Christianity are arranged in systematic order, proved from the word of God, and their connections and relations pointed out. Systems of theology have been chiefly the productions of Continental writers, and are to be found principally in the Latin language, —one fact among many others of a similar kind, which establishes the necessity of students of theology acquiring the capacity of reading Latin with perfect ease and readiness. Systematic theology, however, has been always a good deal studied by Scottish Presbyterians;

as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1676-1680), Groningen (1682-1689), and finally at Leiden (1689-1731).

¹ J. Martin Bac, "Clear and Distinct Freedom: A Compendium of Bernardinus de Moor (1709-1780) in a Cartesian Context," *Reformed Thought on Freedom*, eds. Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 201.

² Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 177.

and indeed Bishop Burnet alleges that the Presbyterian ministers of the era of the Restoration had for their principal learning an acquaintance with the systematic writers of the Continent.... Calvin, Turretin, Maestricht, Pictet, Marckius, and Witsius, are the authors who have been most generally studied in Scotland as writers on systematic theology; and there can be no doubt that the study of the writings of these men has tended greatly to promote correct and comprehensive views of the scheme of divine truth.... [T]he English language does not contain a great deal, *comparatively speaking*, that is of much value in the way of systems of theology.”¹

“Correct and comprehensive views of the scheme of divine truth”, and all the means that foster such views (including these massive Continental Systems), are certainly to be coveted with a holy covetousness. Since “the capacity of reading Latin” is relatively rare among Ministers and students, and since this does not seem likely to change any time in the near future, it seems desirable to render these works into English. Calvin, Turretin, and Witsius are available in English, but Mastricht, Marckius, Wendelin, and a great many more remain locked up in the Latin tongue. Since translation seems desirable, and yet a translator has limited time and strength, where would be the most economical and advantageous place to begin?

If there was a System, written relatively late in the period of Reformed Orthodoxy, that surveyed and summarized the preceding Systems, this would be valuable in and of itself, giving some knowledge of the others, and would be a springboard for other translation projects in the future. As it turns out, such a System does indeed exist. “[Bernardinus de Moor] wrote a commentary on à Marck’s dogmatic compendium...which represents the most comprehensive dogmatic text that was ever produced in the Netherlands. In this work of seven volumes (1761-1778), de Moor classified and combined material from the Reformed dogmatics produced by his predecessors at Utrecht and Leiden into a whole.”² “The *Commentary* gives an all-round description of theology.... The *Commentary* has the character of an extensive and comprehensive handbook for theology.... [T]he primary task was to lend an overview of the clearest expositions for each theological topic.”³

¹ *Theological Lectures* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1878), 39, 40.

² Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 176.

³ J. Martin Bac, “Clear and Distinct Freedom: A Compendium of Bernardinus

May the Lord bless this work again, now in English-speaking lands, so that He might be glorified, and His people edified.

Dedication

To the Most Illustrious and Noble

Men

of the Academy of Batava,

which is at Leiden,¹

the Curators,

Gulielmus Count of Bentink,² Toparch³ in Rhoon⁴ and Pendrecht,⁵ member of the Equestrian Order of Holland,⁶ and holding in the name of the same in the Assembly of the delegates of Holland the first place among the Orders,⁷ Assessor to the Prefecture of the highways and waters⁸ of Rhenolandia,⁹ etc., etc., etc.,

Cornelius de Witt, Jurisconsult, Senator and Consular Man of the City of Dordrecht,¹⁰ and Assessor of the illustrious archithalassic college by

¹ Leiden University (*Academia Lugduno Batava*, in Latin) is the oldest university in the Netherlands, founded by William of Orange in 1575.

² William Bentinck (1704-1774) was the first Count Bentinck of the Holy Roman Empire. The Bentincks are a prominent family of Dutch Nobility. Their family estate, Schoonheten House, is in Overijssel, in the central-eastern part of the Netherlands.

³ A *toparchy* is a civil administrative district.

⁴ Rhoon is a village just south of the city of Rotterdam in South Holland.

⁵ Pendrecht is an area located in Rotterdam.

⁶ Each province had its *Equestrian Order*, or *Ridderschap*, composed of representatives of the families of the old feudal nobility. This body exercised executive and legislative powers in its province.

⁷ The State of Holland met four times per year. One delegate was sent to represent the College of the Nobility, and one delegate per city was allowed to each of the eighteen principal cities.

⁸ The *prefects of the highways and waters* were government officials, charged with the administration of the common lands.

⁹ Rhenolandia (*Rijnland*, or *Rhineland*) was an area surrounding Oude Rijn, a minor branch of the Rhine flowing through South Holland.

¹⁰ Cornelius Johansz de Witt (1696-1769) was Burgemeester of Dordrecht, and member of the States of Holland. Dordrecht (or, *Dort*) is a city in South Holland, famous in the annals of Church History for the Synod convened there in 1618-19 to address the Arminian controversy.

the authority of the same city, which is on the Meuse River,¹ etc., etc.

Petrus Steyn,² Jurisconsult, Counselor and Supreme Syndic of the Orders of Holland,³ Keeper of the Great Seal,⁴ Protector of the Supreme Feudal Court and Administrator of its Registry, a Septemvir for the care of the highways, roads, and waters of the Rhine-tract, etc., etc.

And to their colleagues,
the most Honorable and Grave
Men,
the Consuls
of the city of Lugduno-Batava,
Nicolaus van de Velde, Jurisconsult,
Johannes van der Marck, Ægid. Fil., Jurisconsult,
Quæstor of the Sacred Treasury,
Peter Cunæus, Jurisconsult,
Henricus van Buren, Jurisconsult,
all rightly celebrated
for various offices in the republic happily administrated.

And also
to that most Renowned and Prudent
Man,
Johannes van Royen, Jurisconsult,
Syndic of the city of Leiden, and also to the illustrious
College of Curators and Consuls
in charge of the acts.

¹ The Meuse River has its source in France. It flows through Belgium and the Netherlands before emptying into the North Sea. The *Stadhuis*, located on the Meuse, was Dordrecht's City Hall and seat of government.

² Pieter Steyn (1706-1772) studied law at Leiden from 1724 to 1726. He was appointed by the States of Holland as the Grand Pensionary (1749-1772), which was the most important government office during the time of the United Provinces. The Grand Pensionary was the political leader of the whole of the Dutch Republic (when there was no Stadtholder); he served as the chairman of the States of Holland, and was recognized by foreign powers as the rough equivalent of a Prime Minister.

³ *Syndic* (in general terms, an *advocate* or *representative*) was a title given to the Grand Pensionary.

⁴ The Great Seal of Holland was committed to the Grand Pensionary.

To all these is dedicated
this first part of the *Commentary*
upon the *Compendium of Theology*
of Johannes Marckius,¹
formerly a most brilliant star, illuminating by his light
the Academy of Franeker, of Groningen,
and of Lugduno-Batava,
that the author might testify to his own attentiveness,
and commend himself to their benevolence,
with a prayer for every kind
and long-lasting felicity,

Given and Dedicated to God,
Bernardinus de Moor

¹ *Bernhardini de Moor Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii compendium theologiæ christianæ didactico-elepticum.*

Preface to the Benevolent Reader

Greetings.

When in the *latter part* of Psalm 22 the Messiah joyfully gives a presentiment of the saving and super-abounding fruit, that, out of His Sponsorial Merits and vicarious Passion, the people, given to Him by the Father to be redeemed to Himself, were going to carry off, which people were to be satisfied with the delights of the house of the Lord unto eternal life;¹ the Messiah signifies that in the enjoyment of these spiritual benefits, to be communicated to a world brought unto a glory merited by Himself through sufferings, absolutely every distinction of peoples and nations is going to be removed; to the extent that all the families of the nations and those that were inhabiting the very ends of the earth were to be led to the gracious communion of God in Christ through the Spirit of faith and repentance, no less than those that were able to be named of Israel by right of birth;² indeed, with the rejection of the latter having been appointed for an especially ἱκανὸν/*suitable* time, the former are to be reputed as the Israel of God, verses 23-28. But also, among all these nations, whichever ones might be in view, without distinction of condition, whether more sumptuous or slight, in the world, it is prophesied that they are to be made partakers of this grace, to be bequeathed most abundantly, verse 29: Indeed, this is not going to be the prerogative of one age or of a brief time; but, through all ages succeeding one another unto the consummation of this world, the seed of the Church is going to be roused, which is going to enlist under God and under Christ as King, and rejoice in the privileges of the holy city, verse 30. Now, serving the lavish grant of this elect people, after the likeness of a means, is what is foretold in the *final verse*, יבֹאוּ וַיְגִידוּ צְדִקָתוֹ, לְעַם נֹלָד כִּי עָשָׂה: *they shall come, and shall declare His righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that He hath done this*; with God granting that such would never be wanting to the Church to serve the edification of the same, and to serve the promotion and consummation of its spiritual joy; but they would willingly come continually, that might persuasively invite

¹ See Psalm 36:8; 65:4.

² See Psalm 87.

each and every one unto the saving communion of God and Christ through the preaching of faith and repentance, and might most clearly and publicly declare unto this end the Righteousness of the Lord, and all the divine Virtues at work, manifested especially in the brilliant manner of Redemption. Oh, an especially excellent honor to miserable little men, of whose labor, with God intervening, in such a work He is pleased to make use! in which it is certainly fitting that they carry themselves as worthy of so excellent a labor, throughout all the industry employed in the business entrusted to them. Now, the Lord stood firm to these His promises, and there have not been wanting at any time, from the first infancy of the Christian Church unto this day, those that have diligently kept watch over the establishment and extension of the same by the preaching of the heavenly Doctrine, both by mouth and by writing.¹

Unto this honor it has also fallen to me to be called as one undeserving *καὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων*, and *the least of all the saints*,² to whom has been entrusted the assertion and vindication of sound Doctrine and Evangelical Truth under the twofold title both of Pastor of the Church and of Doctor in the Academy. Which office, committed to me as by a living voice from the dais and throne, I make it a practice to pursue with all my might; thus I believe that there is to be no resistance at all to the peculiar impulse of delivering the same form of sound words also in writing; but that this is to be referred to the divine vocation also, by which divine Providence is wont frequently to stir internally men of our office, to fulfill parts of the imposed function in this manner also. Apart from this, we could not be altogether certain that Witnesses of the Truth existed in every age, and that the Church has always subsisted in the world by an embracing of the faith delivered to the saints:³ by which experience now, on the other hand, we urge in our preaching unto the celebration of the praise of the divine fidelity. Treading in the footsteps of the best Men instead of the poverty of my own talent, I have given, besides some other things, a delineation of Practical Theology in the vernacular language four years and more ago, following especially *ὑποτύπωσις*, *the pattern*, left to us by Saint Peter in his second Epistle.⁴ Now my soul proceeds to impart to each one a

¹ See also Ephesians 4:11-13.

² Ephesians 3:8.

³ See Jude 3.

⁴ *Het kort begrip en de zekere vastigheid der apostolische leere; van Petrus voorgesteld in het eerste hoofdstuk van zijnen Tweeden Algemeinen Zendbrief.*

richer testament through a description of Dogmatico-Elenctic Theology, even as we in the Academy of Batava in our age should religiously cleave to the Holy Doctrine formerly revealed to the Prophets and Apostles, and which, as we have received from our Predecessors of pious memory, so to deliver it undefiled again to the following age is to us the highest of obligations.

So that I might achieve this end, I have undertaken an exposition of the *Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ* of JOHANNES MARCKIUS, certainly in human terms a most complete Theologian, and far below whose merits, commemorated by the eloquent tongue of the illustrious WESSELIUS in his *Funeral Oration*, my meager preaching must always sink. I took up this Compendium of Theology, in preference to others, for laborious study, for various reasons. Both so that I might show a grateful spirit for the solid education that I was allowed to draw from the mouth and writings of such a Teacher; and for the singular benevolence with which he embraced me while he lived. And so that I might in some measure act answerably to the obligation, concerning which, in the few months before his death, that Man most dear to me, when I, about to perform the final year of my Academic apprenticeship in the gymnasium of Utrecht, was departing hence, said his last farewell to me; indicating that he was hoping that the labor undertaken by me might go forward, where he himself left off: only it was given to me to follow so great a Man at a distance;¹ and to walk with him with equal steps would require a far greater abundance of acute intellect, vast erudition, disciplined judgment, memory most tenacious, and facility most prompt and incredible, than it has befallen either me or most to obtain through the benign Providence of God. Therefore, it was also pleasing to me to expound this Compendium of Theology, for, while he surpasses many other Erudite men in his other writings, in abridging this System this most illustrious Man would appear to have surpassed even himself: to such an extent, according to fit and impartial arbiters and judges of these things, it most properly stands out before most other Compendia of Theology, both in its elegant order, apt brevity of words, and immense abundance of most solid matter. But this very thing renders a more distinct explication of this Compendium to the Youth of the Academy so much the more necessary and desirable. For verily our Author wrote in the “Preface” set before this work: *A contracted style has been employed by*

Nader verklaart en betoogt (Leiden: 1756).

¹ See 1 Kings 2:1-9.

me, not so that I might studiously conceal truths, or because I would not be able to express my thoughts more clearly in a massive volume...; but so that according to the method of a Compendium I might embrace many things in a few words, and stir up the judgment and industry of my hearers, etc. Behold, most excellent Young Men, ...this is such a Compendium, that it requires indefatigable labor from you; without which ye shall not make progress by a light reading of it.... The reading ought to follow closely, with attention to the individual words, of which ye shall not easily discover many set down to little purpose; and the reading rather repeated than excessively hurried or prolonged. Into a part of this labor, with the studious Youth committed to my care, I have desired to enter; and what things everywhere in this Compendium, whether by the brevity of the words, of which hardly a single one slips past without diminishment, or by the dense weight of infinite matters, either are or at first glance appear more obscure, I have tried to illustrate in this writing for easier understanding.

You might say that thus I cut down my own vineyards, since it appears that now nothing remains to Systematic, oral instruction, to be delivered yearly to the Youth of the Academy. But apart from the fact that only the very smallest part of those things that I have undertaken or will undertake to have transcribed by the press would I be able to set forth by mouth to my students in the yearly curriculum; I am not able to keep it intact, so as to prevent those that in the course of instruction desire to compile certain notes into a record from easily committing more errors, errors easily corrected in this manner. Furthermore, by mouth I teach my students alone, but by writing also those that either in other places are at pains in the unfolding of this System of topics, or shall hereafter advance the same labor also. It had appeared to me hardly advisable after the deliverance of my utterance to commit to others those things that, in this arrangement, I had smeared over paper: but, since we are of a brief age, and that very uncertain, I was unwilling to delay any longer from delivering my commentaries to the press to be inscribed: out of which, if no other use might redound, at least it might be able to be plain that I have not spent this passing period altogether idly; and the attempt to help the zeal of hearts for God and of those dedicated to the Ministry of the Church perhaps shall not be deprived of all praise. I was unwilling to place the text of Marckius' Compendium before my Commentary, both because thus the work would grow excessively into a great mass; nevertheless, it is large enough on its own: and because I suppose it to be far more advantageous, and therefore also

more agreeable, to the Reader, if he would place the entire Compendium of the Illustrious Author next to this Commentary, and then with one glance of the eye be able to read over the entire sentence that I explain, with the things preceding and following, even indeed the whole paragraph here and there; than if for the most part he find one or a few lines, indeed often no line, at the head of a section; hence it would be required to unfold more leaves of the book, before he would discern and understand the genuine sense of the AUTHOR. For the same reasons that moved our AUTHOR to omit subjoining Practical Uses derived from the individual Heads of Doctrine, I also have refrained from adding the same to this Commentary: to which it is added that whoever is eager to see the summary of Christian Doctrine here related solidly applied to Praxis, he may find his desire satisfied in the works of others, of which ESSENIUS¹ and VAN MASTRICT² I commend before the others: but, that after the age of these and others like them the Praxis of Theology was brought unto a greater height of perfection, I have not yet been persuaded. Following the thread of the AUTHOR, Christian Doctrine itself, whether Theoretical or more Practical, I have studied to treat so solidly that I might endeavor to furnish at the same time a guide to the Youth, especially the Academic Youth, to the use both of the rest of the writings of the Illustrious MARCKIUS, in which he very frequently explains quite copiously those things which he touched upon with a word in this Compendium, and as a *Supplement* of which writings this Commentary could be held; and of many other Authors whether of the more ancient or more recent age, either whose footsteps MARCKIUS followed, or unto whom he is to be thought to have alluded, or even a fresh acquaintance with whom for the sake of the truth, whether defended or attacked, also appeared to me not at all useless, indeed even necessary. In the oft repeated praise of the *Fathers*

¹ Andreas Essenius (1618-1677) was educated at the University of Utrecht under the tutelage of Gernardus Schotanus and Gisbertus Voetius. He first served as a minister, and then as a professor of theology at Utrecht (1653). Among his students were Wilhelmus à Brakel and Philipp van Limborch. Essenius wrote both *Systema Theologicæ Dogmaticæ* (1659) and *Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ* (1669), as well as multiple works on the Ten Commandments.

² Petrus van Mastricht (1631-1706) studied at Duisberg, Utrecht, Leiden, Heidelberg, and Oxford. He labored both as a pastor and a professor, eventually succeeding Voetius at Utrecht. His *Theoretico-practica theologia* includes a practical treatment of each doctrinal topic.

of the Church, who were wont to go solemnly by this name, and in the somewhat fuller exposition of those things which our AUTHOR superficially and in haste surveyed out of the Ecclesiastical History and old Heresiology, I have labored to stir the appetite of the studious Youth for the diligent and painstaking cultivation of the study of Patristics and what is involved in searching out the varied condition of the Church, both by rehearsal debate performed in the academic stadium, and by a freer excursion into these expanses throughout all the rest of life; inasmuch as this has been treated more neglectfully by many, nevertheless it is hardly able to be said just how much it would not only be acceptable and agreeable to its cultivators, but how it would grow apt to furnish fruits, additionally solid and most copious to those in handling Dogmatico-Elenctic Theology, but also in the undertaking of the sacred Ministry, fruits abundantly commended by others, and which the plan of the work does not bear to review here. Now, here and there, in matters regarding the History of the Church, I am wont to appeal and send to the greater Historical Work of SPANHEIM,¹ besides other labors of this most excellent Man, in which he illustrated Sacred History and Antiquities from the stock of his recondite erudition; for, as in the rest of the disciplines, so also in the History of the Church, it is very advantageous to make for oneself one System more familiar before the others: now, I know no fuller and better Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, and which has been produced with greater candor, holy love of the truth, and the polish of judgment, not to mention elegance of pen, than that of Spanheim. Indeed, with so much more willingness I am wont to praise Spanheim in many places, since I am going to recommend to my blessed students, if according to the measure of gifts granted to them by the Lord they propose to themselves for imitation that pair of Gravest Theologians, in which our Academy deservedly boasts, MARCKIUS, I say, and SPANHEIM, the teacher of Marckius, whom this Disciple and successor in the Profession of Ecclesiastical History, worthy of such a Teacher, in his *Oratione de Christianismi propagati Admirandis*, calls a *Man set above all praise, and altogether worthy of immortality before others, whose varied and solid erudition even late posterity will admire:*

¹ Frederic Spanheim (1632-1701) studied at Leiden and took the doctoral degree in 1651. He was Professor of Divinity at Heidelberg (1655), and later at Leiden (1670), where he replaced Johannes Cocceius, but was a committed Voetian. He excelled in Historical Theology; the work here referred to is his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

VRIESIUS¹ no less truly sang this of the same Theologian,

*The SPANHEMIAN hand alone is able to
demonstrate by deeds,
not another with words, the merit of SPANHEMIUS.*

Indeed, of the Brethren devoted to the Augsburg Confession,² the Illustrious Buddeus,³ making mention of SPANHEIM'S *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, adds: *Indeed, nothing is able to be said illustriously enough concerning this Author, as far as this branch of studies is concerned, that he would not surpass in many ways. And elsewhere again: This most erudite Man with great vigor drew together many things, most learned in every sort of subsidiary for the perfection of a work of this sort; and he has drawn all things from authentic sources, to such an extent that, if thou depart from certain hypotheses, in which he serves the interests of his Church, in this regard you would appear to all to accomplish a doubtful victory.*

To divide my work into parts, and to publish the same individually, seemed good to me for different reasons, and especially so that I might begin to satisfy more speedily so great a desire of my students, and reinforce the uses of the same. In the meantime the entire Commentary has already been prepared for the press, and, if I observe that this first part of the same is received benevolently by the Reader, I will by no means cease enthusiastically to urge the press in promoting the rest of the work. Some Academic Disputations, previously committed to writing and aired publicly by me, which make for a further declaration of this or that systematic truth, I will add to that part of the Commentary, to which they most nearly have regard; as also one and another Oration delivered by me as the business of my office I will add to the final volume. As, indeed, day teaches day,⁴ so also, with the wheel of the press rushing to thrust forth this volume, some things have

¹ Gerardus de Vries (1648-1705) was a Voetian philosopher and theologian, and he served as professor of Philosophy (1674-1705) and of Theology (1685-1705) at Utrecht.

² The Augsburg Confession, originally drafted and adopted at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, is the primary confession of the Lutheran Church.

³ Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729) was a German Lutheran philosopher and theologian. He served the church as a professor, of philosophy, first at Wittenberg (1687), then at Jena (1689); of Greek and Latin at Coburg (1692); of moral philosophy at Halle (1693); of theology at Jena (1705). He was considered among the most learned and able theologians of his era.

⁴ Psalm 19:2.

occurred to me during the reading, which I have judged useful to know, to be exhibited at the end of the tome by means of *Addenda*,¹ which I wish to be consulted equally with the very argument of the Commentary. Also, in the use of a transcript of this work made by types I have learned that almost among ἀδύνατα, *things impossible*, is an edition of any book of greater mass that would be altogether free of all typographical errors: while, although I myself have presided over the correction, and in the doing of it have applied all ἀκρίβειαν, *minute care*, nevertheless some have crept in, although generally of little moment, since in these either the similarity of the letters or the same pressed less clearly often beguiled the keenness of the eye: nevertheless, lest perhaps the less skillful should stick in these things, I wished to subjoin a small index of the same to the individual volumes. Indeed, I have already prepared indices for this part of the work, but which I believe to be better to subjoin for the whole work at the end of the last volume, lest one should deem it necessary to consult four, or perhaps even five, Indices, instead of one. So that one might also be able so much the more expeditiously to consult the places in the Ecclesiastical *Fathers*, unto which I sometimes appeal, behold, a syllabus of editions of these Holy Men, whose writings have frequently appeared, of which I am wont to make use, and to cite everywhere:

Magna Bibliotheca Patrum. Paris: 1644, seventeen *tomes*.²

Concilia Generalia Binii, four *tomes*, nine *volumes*. Cologne: 1618.³

Patres Apostolici Cotelerii, two *volumes*. Antwerp: 1698.⁴

¹ In this translation, the *Addenda* have been inserted into the body of the work in the appropriate places.

² Marguerin de la Bigne (1546-1595) was a French theologian and expert in Patristic literature. In an effort to lend the strength of the Fathers to the Roman Counter-Reformation, he published *Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum* in nine volumes (1575), containing more than two hundred authors. His work went through several editions and enlargements, including the 1644 *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*.

³ Severin Binius (1573-1641) taught ecclesiastical history and discipline at the University of Cologne, and was eventually appointed as Rector Magnificus of the same (1627-1630). Binius' *Concilia generalia et provincialia* provides the acts of the councils, decretal letters, and the lives of the popes, with explanatory notes.

⁴ Jean-Baptiste Cotelier (1629-1686) was a Roman Catholic theologian and patrologist. Although never ordained to the priesthood, he held a variety of academic posts. His principal work was *Sacrosanctorum Patrum qui*

IGNATIUS' *Epistolæ Pearsoni et Smithi*. Oxford: 1709, in 4^o.¹

JUSTIN MARTYR'S *Opera, cum annexis*. Paris: 1615.²

IRENÆUS' *Contra Hæreses Massueti*. Paris: 1710.³

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA'S *Opera*. Paris: 1641.⁴

ORIGEN'S *Opera de la Rue*. Paris: 1733 and following, four volumes.⁵

ORIGEN'S *libri VIII contra Celsum, etc., Gulielmi Spenceri*. Cambridge: 1677, in quarto.⁶

HIPPOLYTUS' *Opera Fabricii*. Hamburg: 1716.⁷

ATHANASIUS' *Opera, two tomes*. Cologne: 1686.¹

temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera edita et non edita, vera et supposita græce et latine, cum notis, otherwise known as *Patres Apostolici*. It was first published at Paris in 1672; a revised edition was published in 1698 at Antwerp.

¹ Ignatius (c. 40-c. 110) was Bishop of Antioch. He was arrested for the faith, and, as he was being transported through Asia Minor to Rome in order to be executed, wrote seven letters, encouraging the churches. This particular edition of Ignatius' letters includes the annotations of the Anglican Bishop John Pearson (1613-1686), who vigorously defended the authenticity of the Ignatian letters in his *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii* (1672). Thomas Smith (1638-1710), fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and librarian of the Cottonian library, also participated in the editing.

² Justin, also known as the Martyr, was one of the great Greek apologists of the second century.

³ Irenæus was a second century Church Father, born near Smyrna, but serving as Bishop in Lyon. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was in turn a disciple of the Apostle John. *Against Heresies* was originally written in Greek, but preserved only in Greek (albeit lengthy) quotations (in Hippolytus and Epiphanius) and a few Latin manuscripts. The first printed copy was provided by Erasmus in 1526. From that time to the present, the text of *Against Heresies* has been edited and revised many times, including the 1710 edition by the Benedictine monk Rhenatus Massuet.

⁴ Titus Flavius Clemens Alexandrinus (died c. 215) was the head of the Christian catechetical school in Alexandria, Egypt. He was trained in pagan philosophy before his conversion to Christianity.

⁵ Origen (c. 185-c. 254) succeeded Clement of Alexandria as the head of the catechetical school in Alexandria. He was perhaps the greatest scholar of his age. The standard edition of Origen's *Opera* was produced by two learned Benedictines, Charles de la Rue, and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, in four volumes published between 1733 and 1759.

⁶ William Spencer, fellow of Trinity-college, edited and annotated this edition of Origen's *Against Celsus*, printing it with Origen's *Philocalia*.

⁷ Hippolytus was a third century bishop and martyr, noteworthy for his learning. He was a disciple of Irenæus and teacher of Origen. Johann Albert Fabricius (1668-1737), a German classicist, produced this edition.

BASIL the GREAT'S *Opera*, three *tomes*. Paris: 1638.²

GREGORY Nazianzen's *Opera Billii*, two *tomes*. Cologne: 1690.³

GREGORY Nyssen's *Opera*, three *tomes*. Paris: 1638.⁴

CYRIL of Jerusalem's *Opera* of Thomas Milles. Oxford: 1703.⁵

EPIPHANIUS' *Opera*, two *tomes*. Cologne: 1682.⁶

CHRYSOSTOM'S *Opera Bernardini de Montfaucon*, 13 *tomes*. Paris: 1718-1738.⁷

DIONYSIUS the Areopagite's *Opera Corderii*, 2 *volumes*. Antwerp: 1634.⁸

EUSEBIUS' and others' *Historia Ecclesiastica Valesii*, 3 *volumes*. Mainz: 1672 and following.⁹

¹ Athanasius (c. 298-373) was bishop of Alexandria, and a great defender of Nicean orthodoxy.

² Basil the Great was a fourth century Church Father and stalwart defender of Nicean Trinitarianism.

³ Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389) was Archbishop of Constantinople, and a doctor of the Church, known as *the Trinitarian Theologian*. Jacques de Billy (1535-1581) was a French patrologist and Benedictine abbot. His first edition of Gregory's *Opera* appeared in 1569.

⁴ Gregory Nyssen (c. 332-396) was Bishop of Nyssa, and a divine of profound learning and great piety. He was a fierce opponent of Arianism, and he took an active part in drafting the Constantinopolitan enlargement of the Nicene Creed.

⁵ Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) was elected Bishop of Jerusalem in 350. Cyril was a significant early theologian, and he is remembered for his *Catechetical Lectures*. Thomas Milles (1671-1740) was a bishop of the Church of Ireland.

⁶ The profound erudition of Epiphanius (c. 310-403) led to his installation as Bishop of Salamis. He was something of a heresy hunter, combating Apollinarianism, Origen, and even at one point Chrysostom.

⁷ John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) was Bishop of Constantinople, and the most eloquent preacher of his age. Bernard de Montfaucon (1655-1741) was a French Benedictine monk and patrologist; his edition of Chrysostom's *Opera* in Greek and Latin is the most complete.

⁸ Dionysos was an early sixth century Christian philosopher (showing some Neoplatonic influences) and mystical theologian. This Dionysos was confused with the biblical Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts 17:34) and with Saint Denis of Paris (martyred c. 250). Balthasar Cordier (1592-1650) was a Belgian Jesuit and patrologist. His edition of Dionysos remains the standard.

⁹ Eusebius (c. 267-338) was Bishop of Cæsarea, author of that famous *Ecclesiastical History*, and supporter of Constantine the Great. Henri Valois (1603-1676) was a philologist and expert in the classical and ecclesiastical historians. In 1659, he published an annotated edition of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, followed later by editions of Socrates' and Sozomen's histories, and finally completed with his work on Theodoret, Evagrius, Philostorgius, and Theodore the Lector (1673).

EUSEBIUS' *Præparatio et Demonstratio Euangelica*. Cologne: 1688, 2 volumes.

AMPHILOCHIUS' *and others' Opera Combefisii*. Paris: 1644.¹

CYRIL *of Alexandria's Opera Auberti*, six tomes, seven volumes. Paris: 1638.²

THEODORET'S *Opera Sirmondi*, four tomes: Paris: 1644; 5 tomes *Garinerii*: Paris: 1684.³

PHOTIUS' *Bibliotheca*. Rouen: 1653.⁴

PHOTIUS' *Epistolæ*. London: 1651.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS' *Opera*. Basle: 1575.⁵

ÆCUMENIUS and ARETHAS *in Novum Testamentum*. Verona: 1532.⁶

¹ Amphilochius (c. 340-c. 400) was bishop of Iconium, and worked closely with the famous Cappadocian Fathers in the defense of orthodox Trinitarianism and Christology. François Combefis (1605-1679) was a French Dominican and patrologist. In 1644, he published an edition of the *Works* of Amphilochius of Iconium, Methodius of Olympus (died c. 311; bishop, opponent of Origen, and martyr), and Andrew of Crete (c. 650-c. 720; bishop, theologian, hymnographer, and opponent of Monothelism).

² Cyril of Alexandria (c. 378-444) was a participant in the third ecumenical council, held at Ephesus. He repudiated the heretical Nestorian Christology but tended himself to the monophysitism.

³ Theodoret (393-457) was bishop of Cyrus, and a significant participant in the Christological controversies of his age. He was an advocate of Antiochian dyophysitism, or moderate Nestorianism, although he condemned the Nestorian affirmation of two Sons in Christ, and the Nestorian denial that Mary was *Theotokos*, that is, *the Mother of God*. His orthodoxy was cleared at the Council of Chalcedon (451). Jacques Sirmond (1559-1651) was a French Jesuit scholar; his edition of the works of Theodoret was augmented by a fifth volume of supplementary materials by Jean Garnier (1612-1681), another French Jesuit patrologist.

⁴ Photius (c. 820-893) was a Patriarch of Constantinople. He is most remembered for his controversies with Rome. His *Bibliotheca* preserves extracts from two hundred and eighty works of classical antiquity, a great many of which are otherwise lost.

⁵ John Damascenus (c. 676-c. 760) was a monk of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem. He is remembered for his piety of life, writings, and compilation of chants in the eastern style; and, due to his defense of icons and his summary of the faith of the Fathers (*Fountain of Knowledge*), he is regarded by many as the last of the Eastern Fathers.

⁶ *Æcumenius* was thought to have been a late-tenth century bishop of Trikkala in Thessaly, but the authorship of the commentaries traditionally ascribed to him is confused. The commentaries on Acts and the Catholic Epistles are the same as those of Theophylact of Bulgaria (eleventh century); the commentary on the Pauline Epistles is older, copied in part from the work of Andrew of

TERTULLIAN'S *Opera Rigaltii*. Paris: 1664.¹

CYPRIAN'S *Opera Felli*. Amsterdam: 1700.²

MINUCIUS FELIX *Ouzelii*. Leiden: 1652, in 4°.³

ARNOBIUS' *Adversus Gentes Elmenhorstii*. Leiden: 1651, in 4°.⁴

LACTANTIUS' *Opera Thysii*. Leiden: 1652, in 8°.⁵

LACTANTIUS' *de Mortibus Persecutorum Pauli Bauldri*. Utrecht: 1693, in 8°.⁶

HILARY'S *Opera studio Benedictinorum*. Paris: 1693.⁷

Cæsarea (563-637); the commentary on the Apocalypse appears to have been composed around the turn of the seventh century. *Arethas* of Cæsarea (ninth century) was a Greek Orthodox bishop and scholar. He compiled *scholia* on the Apocalypse, the oldest extant. Arethas' comments on the Apocalypse were appended to the work of Æcumenius in this 1532 edition.

¹ Tertullian was a Latin Father of the second century. He labored as an apologist during times of persecution, and was important in the development of the Trinitarian vocabulary in the Latin-speaking West. Nicolas Rigault (1577-1654) was a French classical scholar. He produced an annotated edition of Tertullian, as well as of Minucius Felix and Cyprian.

² Cyprian (died 258) served as Bishop of Carthage. He is noted for his strict standard of readmittance into the Church for those who had "lapsed" under persecution. This edition of Cyprian's *Works* was produced by John Fell (1625-1686), bishop of Oxford.

³ Marcus Minucius Felix (third century) was perhaps the earliest Latin apologist. His *Octavius* presents an apologetic encounter between Cæcilius Natalis, a pagan, and Octavius Januarius, a Christian. Jacobus Ouzelii (1631-1686) was a student of classical literature, and produced this heavily annotated edition of Minucius Felix at the age of twenty-one, preserving the comments of the scholars preceding him.

⁴ Arnobius of Sicca (died c. 330), formerly an opponent of Christianity, was one of the great Christian apologists of his age. Geverhart Elmenhorst (c. 1580-1621) was a native of Hamburg, and a skilled critic. He published his annotated edition of *Adversus Gentes* in 1610, and the 1651 edition contains not only his notes, but those of others as well.

⁵ Lucius Cælius Firmianus Lactantius (c. 240-c. 320) was a trained rhetorician, who, upon his conversion to Christianity, employed his rhetorical gifts in the defense and explication of the Christian faith. His *Divinæ Institutiones* is one of the early attempts at a systematic theology. This edition of Lactantius' *Opera* was produced by Antonius Thysius (1565-1640), a Dutch Reformed theologian, professor at the University of Harderwijk and University of Leiden. He was also one of the authors of the 1625 *Synopsis purioris theologiæ*.

⁶ Paul Bauldri (1639-1706), learned professor of Church history at Utrecht, produced this annotated edition of *de Mortibus Persecutorum*.

⁷ Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (died 368), was, among the Latin Fathers, one of the chief defenders of the Nicæan theology against Arianism. This edition of

PRUDENTIUS' *Opera Weitzii*. Hannover: 1613, in 8°.¹

PHILASTRIUS' *de Hæresibus Fabricii*. Hamburg: 1721, in 8°.²

OPTATUS *of Milevis' de Schismate Donatistarum*, Louis Ellies du Pin.
Antwerp: 1702.³

AMBROSE'S *Opera*, five tomes, 2 volumes. Paris: 1642.⁴

JEROME'S *Opera Erasmi*, nine tomes, 4 volumes. Basil: 1537.⁵

AUGUSTINE'S *Opera studio Benedictinorum*, twelve tomes. Antwerp:
1700-1703.⁶

GREGORY THE GREAT'S *Opera*, six tomes, 2 volumes. Paris: 1619.⁷

BERNARD'S *Opera*. Antwerp: 1609.⁸

Furthermore, although in this work I have not wished to offend or provoke to jealousy anyone, at the same time I am wont to speak frankly my opinion, often testifying agreement and remembering them with praise in one place, from whom elsewhere I by no means conceal that I dissent; sometimes even, although quite rarely, from the Most Celebrated AUTHOR, without violation of my respect, which I owe and shall ever have for him. Indeed, attached to no parties, I desire to satisfy

Hilary's *Opera* was corrected and annotated by the Benedictine Monks of the Maurist Congregation, and is still widely regarded for its quality.

¹ Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348-407) was a Spanish Christian poet. This edition of his *Opera* was produced by Johann Weitz (1576-1642).

² Philastrius (died c. 397) was Bishop of Brescia. He participated in the anti-Arian synod of Aquileia held in 381, and wrote *Diversarum Hereseon Liber*.

³ Optatus was a fourth century bishop of Milevis, in Numidia. He was active against the schism of the Donatists. Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719), a French ecclesiastical historian, produced this edition of *de Schismate* by a careful comparison of ancient manuscripts.

⁴ Ambrose (340-397), Bishop of Milan, was a man of great influence, ecclesiastically and politically, and was instrumental in the conversion of Augustine.

⁵ This edition of Jerome's *Opera* was produce by the famous Desiderius Erasmus (1467-1536), Dutch humanist, classical scholar, and Roman Catholic theologian.

⁶ This edition of Augustine's *Opera* was corrected and annotated by the Benedictine Monks of the Maurist Congregation, and was the last critical edition of Augustine's complete works.

⁷ Gregory the Great (c. 550-604) was elected Pope in 590. He was a monk, scholar, prolific author, and, having been made pope, instrumental in reinvigorating the missionary work of the Church

⁸ Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1157) was a Cistercian monk and abbot, whose learning and austere piety made him very influential in his day.

the truth alone, and to be serviceable in the declaration, confirmation, and modest defense of the same, by the leading of the Spirit of Truth; so that in this manner the Name of the God of Truth, through the propagation of the Kingdom of Truth, might be glorified more and more, whose glory I am certainly eager always to set before myself as the chief End of all labors, and to whom alone I commit all the success of this work by fervent prayers. Reader, Farewell, and make use of my labor for thine edification in the Lord, if it please Him. Given at Lugduno-Batava on the fifth of August, 1761.

- BB. Is discussed specifically concerning the most excellent of Creatures, namely, the *Angels*, Chapter IX,
- ††. *Providence*, concerning which Chapter X,
- . or of *Grace*, which works shall be explained, in which shall be treated the *Subject* to be instructed in Theology, namely, *Man*, considered in his fourfold State;
- b. *The Worship of GOD*, of which worship thus
1. The *Nature* is explained, Chapter XI, § 1-6, so that
 2. The *Norm* of this worship might be especially explained, §. Namely, the many-faceted *Law of God*, as it is to be seen, Chapter XI, § 7-21,
 - §§. Especially the *Moral Law*, concerning which it is discussed in more detail, to the end that
 - / . The *Preamble, Propriety, and Division* of this Law might be premised more generally, Chapter XI, § 22-40,
 - // . The individual *Precepts of the Decalogue* might be explained one-by-one, Chapter XII:
- γ. from its *Subject*, to be furnished with the Knowledge of Theology, which in itself, as an eminent Work of God, and the End and Object of the greatest works of God, is most worthy of consideration, and hence also is wont to be called the *Secondary Object of Theology*, see Chapter I, § 35: There is a relating of
- a. Its *Nature* in general, Chapter XIII,
 - b. Its *Fourfold State* in particular;
 - a. As *Instituted, or of Integrity*, concerning which Chapter XIV,
 - b. As *Destituted, or of the Fall*, comprehending under itself
 1. *Sin*, concerning which Chapter XV,
 2. *Punishment*, concerning which Chapter XVI,
 - c. As *Restituted, or of Grace*, by way of *the Covenant of Grace*; of which
 1. A nominal Treatment and real Definition see Chapter XVII, § 1-4,
 2. An Explication of this Definition follows,
 - §. With respect to *Genus, of mutual Compact*, Chapter XVII, § 5,
 - §§. With respect to the *Difference of Species*, according to which this Compact is *differentiated* from others,

- / . By the *Word*, by which it is revealed, namely, the *Gospel*, concerning which there is a treatment, and concerning the diverse dispensation of this and of the Covenant of Grace itself, Chapter XVII, § 6-19,
- // . By the *Mediator* appointed, concerning whom
 - . It is discussed *more generally*, Chapter XVIII,
 - . Then *more specifically* are delineated this Mediator's
 - † . *Person*, with respect to His *Names*, *Natures*, the *Union* of those, and the *Effects* of this, Chapter XIX,
 - †† . Threefold Mediatorial *Office*, *Prophetic*, *Priestly*, and *Royal*, Chapter XX,
 - ††† . *State of Humiliation* and of *Exaltation*, Chapter XXI,
- /// . By the prescribed *Duties*, of *Faith* and *Repentance*, which are explained, Chapter XXII,
- //// . By the *Benefits* promised, of which
 - . The four primary are distinctly explained,
 - † . *Vocation*, Chapter XXIII,
 - †† . *Justification*, Chapter XXIV,
 - ††† . *Sanctification*, which is considered,
 - AA. In itself, Chapter XXV, § 1-13,
 - BB. In its proper fruit of Holiness and of *Good Works*; concerning which again
 - ⌘⌘. It is discussed *more generally*, Chapter XXV, § 14-21,
 - ⌘⌘. It is treated *more specifically*
 - αα. concerning *Prayer*, which is the most excellent Good Work, Chapter XXVI, § 1-21,
 - ββ. concerning some Works closely connected to Prayer, such as *Fasting*, *Keeping Vigil*, *Alms-giving*, *Vows*, Chapter XXVI, § 22-40,
- . The same things, expressed under a different notion, are propounded by the names of

Regeneration, Adoption, Reconciliation, and Redemption or Liberation; under which relation the same Benefits are more briefly explained, Chapter XXVIII,

- ////. By the *Seals* annexed, namely, the *Sacraments*, which
 - . Are *generally* declared, Chapter XXIX, § 1-4,
 - . Are *specifically* expounded individually,
 - † . Both of the *Old Testament*,
 - AA. The *Extraordinary*, at least cursorily, Chapter XXIX, § 5,
 - BB. The *Ordinary*, more prolixly,
 - ⌘⌘. *Circumcision*, Chapter XXIX, § 6-17,
 - ⌘⌘. *Passover*, Chapter XXIX, § 18-27,
 - †† . And of the *New Testament*, which
 - AA. In general are taught to be only *Two*, with whatever *Sacraments Falsely So-Called* hence rejected, Chapter XXIX, § 28-36,
 - BB. Are set forth painstakingly,
 - ⌘⌘. *Baptism*, Chapter XXX,
 - ⌘⌘. *The Lord's Supper*, Chapter XXXI;
- ///// . By the *Multitude Covenanted*, to which the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace are actually conferred, namely, the *Church*,
 - . Concerning which, Chapter XXXII,
 - . And concerning its *Government*, both *Special, Ecclesiastical*, and *Common* with other men, *Political and Domestical*, Chapter XXXIII;
- d. As *Constituted*, or *Pre-determined*, or of *Glorification*, which is declared, Chapter XXXIV, in which we especially attain,
- δ. The *End of the Glory of God and of the Salvation of the Elect*, which, as the End of the whole of our Theology, the AUTHOR was propounding, Chapter I, § 36.

Chapter II:

*Concerning the Principium of
Theology, or Sacred Scripture*

Summary

This Chapter contains a Treatment of the *Principium of Theology*, or SACRED SCRIPTURE:

- I. A Nominal Treatment: *in which the reason the denomination of Sacred Scripture is explained*, § 1.
- II. A Real Treatment: *in which a very full Definition of Sacred Scripture occurs*, § 2, *of which is explained*:
 - A. The Genus, *which is the Word of God, which our AUTHOR discusses*, § 3-11.
 - ⌘. *That Word is considered as*:
 - α. *Formerly ἄγραφον/unwritten*,
 - a. *With the prophecy of Enoch, etc., not hindering*,
 - b. *On account of various reasons*, § 3.
 - β. *Afterwards ἔγγραφον/written at the Commandment of God, who*
 - a. *Is shown to have given a Commandment*
 - a. *To write to His Ministers*,
 - b. *To read to His people*, § 4, part 1.
 - b. *Hence the twofold Error of the Papists is rejected*,
 - a. *That the Scripture was written down only by chance and at the bare pleasure of men*.
 - b. *That the Scripture is not necessary*, § 4, part 2.
 - β. *That is called the Word of God, especially on account of its Infallible Inspiration; of which*
 - α. *The Object is set forth, which are*
 - a. *All the Persons, that wrote or are set forth as impelled by the Spirit to speak*.
 - b. *All the Matters, dogmatic and historical, good and bad, more or less weighty, which last is defended against the Socinians*.
 - c. *The individual Words*, § 5.
 - β. *The Certitude of θεοπνευστίας/inspiration and of the connected Authority of Scripture in itself and with respect to us*,
 - a. *Is asserted in a legitimate manner*, § 6
 - b. *And that method of proving the Divinity of the Scripture is defended against the false method of the Papists, whose captious objections are refuted*, § 7.

- γ. *The Authority of Scripture, proceeding from Inspiration, as, with respect to Substance, is in every faithful Edition of the Scripture, so, with respect to the Words also, it is taught to be Independent and Authentic,*
- a. *Positively, only in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and Greek text of the New Testament, which*
 - a. *Is proven, § 8.*
 - b. *Is defended especially against the Papists, disparaging the current Authenticity of those texts, whose Objections are resolved, § 9.*
 - b. *Negatively, hence is rejected the Authenticity*
 - a. *Of the Vulgate Latin Version of the Papists, which thesis*
 1. *Is confirmed by Arguments,*
 2. *Is freed from the Objections of the Papists, § 10.*
 - b. *Of the Samaritan Pentateuch, § 11, in the beginning,*
 - c. *Of the Greek Version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, vulgarly called Viralis, which*
 1. *Is built upon by Reasons,*
 2. *Is defended against Objections, § 11.*
- B. *Its Differences of Species, sought from*
- κ. *The efficient, instrumental Cause, or Amanuenses, the Prophets and Apostles, of whose ministry God made use in the writing of His Word, § 12.*
 2. *The Material from which and the external Form, which*
 - α. *Positively is related, § 13-18.*
 - a. *The Material of Composition of the Sacred Scripture is the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, the number and division of which is discussed, § 13.*
 - b. *The present Form the Canon of θεοπνεύστων/inspired Books receives by the reception of those Books into the Canon by the Church, to which was competent*
 - a. *The Separation of those Books from the ἀκανονίστοις/non-canonical,*
 - b. *The Arrangement, Inscription, Subscription, Division into Chapters, etc., of the same, § 14.*
 - c. *The proper Attributes of these Canonical Books are,*
 - a. *That they have never perished:*
 1. *Neither all at the same time in the Babylonian devastation of the City and Temple of Jerusalem, § 15.*
 2. *Nor any one individually, which*

- §. *Is proven,*
- §§. *Is defended against Objections,* § 16.
- b. *That enduring, all the Canonical books remain,*
 - 1. *Always, even those Old Testament books under the New, which against the Anabaptists, etc.,*
 - §. *Is proven.*
 - §§. *Their Objections are resolved,* § 17.
 - 2. *Equally, which is observed*
 - §. *Against the Socinians and those Socinianizing, who sometimes make light of the predictions of the Prophets.*
 - §§. *Against the Papists, distinguishing between Books Proto- and Deutero-Canonical,* § 18.
- β. *Negatively from the Canon of θεοπνεύστων/inspired books are excluded the books that are called Apocryphal, the repudiation of which*
 - a. *Is confirmed,* § 19.
 - b. *Is defended against the Objections of the Papists, who hold six of those as Canonical, and of others,* § 20.
- λ. *The Object or internal Material, the Material concerning which, or the Argument of Sacred Scripture, which*
 - α. *Is taught to be the Doctrine of true Religion, unto which all the remaining things occurring in the Scriptures ought to be referred in their own manner,* § 21.
 - β. *The Mode is explained, in which concerning its own Object the Scripture is conversant. That is, Scripture relates that*
 - a. *Truly, and indeed equally Truly in all things, Natural things not excepted, which is proven and defended,* § 22.
 - b. *Consistently with itself, to such an extent that no Contradictions, rightly so called, are found among the Sacred Books,* § 23.
 - c. *Perspicuously, to such an extent that in necessary matters it is able to be understood by those reading piously. Which perspicuity*
 - a. *Negatively, is not Objective, and to such an extent is not able to be understood savingly apart from the Illumination of the Spirit: which*
 - 1. *Is proven,*
 - 2. *Is defended against the Socinians,* § 24.
 - b. *Positively, is Subjective: which Subjective Perspicuity*
 - 1. *Is proven against the Papists,* § 25.

2. *Is freed from their Objections*, § 26.
- d. Perfectly; *in such a way that*
- a. *Positively we hold that the Dogmas necessary for Salvation are contained Perfectly and Sufficiently in Sacred Scripture: which*
1. *Is proven by arguments*,
 2. *Is defended against various Objections*, § 27.
- b. *Negatively we reject*,
1. *Both the Traditions of the Papists orally propagated, which Traditions*
 §. *Are refuted by arguments*, § 28.
 §§. *A response is given to the Objections of the Papists on behalf of the same*, § 29.
 2. *And the Enthusiasts' private Revelations of the Spirit, as if these might be another principium of the Faith: which again*
 §. *Are confuted*, § 30.
 §§. *A response is given to the Objections of the Enthusiasts*, § 31.
7. *The Proximate End, which is that it might be a perpetual Canon or Rule of Faith and Manners: Which*
- α. *End itself*
- a. *Is proven*,
 - b. *Is defended against the Papists*, § 32.
- β. *The Means tending toward this end are exhibited: which are*
- a. *The Translation of the Scripture into the vernacular Languages, of which*
 - a. *The Propriety and Necessity is proven*, § 33.
 - b. *The Respect due to Versions is asserted*, § 34.
 - b. *The Reading of the Scripture before and by a Christian people, which*
 - a. *Is asserted validly*, § 35.
 - b. *Is defended against the Papists forbidding the Reading of the Bible to the people*, § 36.
- c. *The Understanding of the Sense of Scripture. Where*
- a. *The Subject is discussed by our AUTHOR, or the Sense of Sacred Scripture, which*
 1. *He observes*,
 §. *Is commonly said to be only One by us, and that either Simple, or Composite.*

- §§. *But is everywhere established by the Papists as Twofold, Literal and Mystical, which Mystical again is Allegorical, Tropological, or Anagogical, § 37.*
2. *His own Epicrisis concerning that, which concerning the Sense of Sacred Scripture he thinks is to be held, our AUTHOR subjoins in five distinct theses, § 38.*
- b. *And as far as the Predicate, of Understanding, is concerned, to this the Interpretation of Scripture and the Judgment of Controversies of Faith have regard. Of these matters is determined*
1. *The Subject, with which they agree. And thus*
- §. *The Private Judgment of Discernment agrees with individual Believers; which*
- /. Is proven,*
- //. Is defended against the Papists, § 39, in the beginning.*
- §§. *A Judgment Ministerial, public, and externally definitive, agrees with the Overseers of the Church, which is proven, § 39, in the middle.*
- §§§. *The Judgment Normative or directive agrees with the Scripture itself, § 39, near the end.*
- §§§§. *Whether there be in addition a Judge, Supreme and ἀνυπεύθετος, not accountable, in the Church, is disputed, § 39, at the end.*
- /. Negatively our AUTHOR holds that this Dignity is not to be bestowed upon*
- . An Enthusiastical Spirit, § 40a.*
- . Human Reason or Philosophy, which, against the Socinians and various Philosophers,*
- †. Is proven,*
- ††. Is defended, § 40b.*
- . The Church, which*
- †. Our AUTHOR proves by various arguments, § 41,*
- ††. And defends against the Objections of the Papists, who maintain the contrary, § 42.*
- //. Positively he concludes that this honor agrees with the Holy Spirit Alone, speaking now in the Word Written; which our AUTHOR*
- . Proves,*

- . *Defends against various arguments*, § 43.
2. The Object: *which our AUTHOR relates*
 §. *Negatively not to be Dominical sayings alone:*
 §§. *Positively, however, he maintains that the Interpretation of Scripture is extended to the whole Scripture, with the treatment of the Prophecies or of Controversial Passages not excluded*, § 44.
3. The Method *of arriving at the true Understanding of the Scriptures, and a right Judgment concerning matters of faith: to this have regard*
 §. *The various Means of Interpretation, which are*
 /. *Positively*
 — . Prayers,
 — . A Spirit humble, teachable, etc.,
 — . The Resources of other Interpretations, an investigation of the original Languages;
 — . The Analogies
 †. Of Faith,
 ††. Of Context, § 45.
- // . *Negatively the thesis of the Papists is not admitted, who maintain that the Unanimous Exposition of the Fathers is the best Means of true Interpretation and at the same time a most certain criterion. Which*
 — . *Opinion is refuted*, § 46.
 — . *The Objections of the Papists are resolved*, § 47.
- §§. *The Canons to be observed in Interpretation: of which sort are*
 /. The Interpretation of Scripture, as it ought to be done through clearer words of the Scripture itself.
 //. In that, there is to be no receding from the propriety of the words.
 ///. There is to be no transfer unto a Mystical Sense upon a slight basis, § 48.
 ////. The Force of the Words is to be retained, as far as the Analogy of Faith and of Context permits. *With which Canon is compared that other traditional Canon: The Words signify all that, which they are able to signify*, § 49.

- 7. The Highest End,
 - α. *Both subordinate*, the Salvation of the Elect,
 - β. *And supreme*, the Glory of God, § 50.

§ 1: The Denomination of the Word as Sacred Scripture

The Revealed Word of God is wont to be called *Sacred Scripture*, which contains the Principium of Revealed Theology, even indeed by its Biblical denomination, in which there is very frequent mention of γραφής/*Scripture*,¹ γραφῶν/*Scriptures*, but also of γραφῶν ἁγίων, *Holy Scriptures*, Romans 1:2. And with complete accuracy indeed is it thus called; namely, because the divine Word by divine command was committed to *Books* for the use of the Church, as we shall see in § 4. Now, this Scripture deserves to be called *Sacred*, not only from its *Object*, which treats of Sacred things; but also from its *End*, because it earnestly commends Holiness to man, delivers to him the norm of this Holiness, and causes the same to be instilled in him, with the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit being added: although this is generally common to the divine Word with human writings treating sacred things: but especially from its *Origin*, that it is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and also from its proper *Use*, that it is to be received by us with a Holy veneration of soul: both of which are taught by Peter, 2 Peter 1:19-21, where in *verses* 19 and 20 he commends a reverent use of the Scripture, in *verse* 21 he affirms the divine origin of the same: see my *Commentarium on the passage*. Commonly κατ' ἐξοχήν, *by way of eminency*, we call the Sacred Scripture *the Bible*, that is, *the Books*, on account of their superiority to all human Books. Among the Hebrews the *Word* is called the *Law*; consult VRIEMOET'S² *Adnotationes ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti*, tome 3, chapter XIV, page 132. Concerning other Hebrew denominations of Sacred Scripture ready to hand in the writings of the Jews and here mentioned by our AUTHOR, or similar denominations, consult HOTTINGER'S³ *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book I, chapter II, section III, pages

¹ For example, 2 Timothy 3:16: "All scripture (γραφή) is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness..."

² Emo Lucius Vriemot (1699-1760) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Orientalist, serving as Professor of Oriental Languages at Franeker.

³ Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620-1667) was a Swiss Reformed theologian philologist. He served as Professor of Church History, Oriental Languages, and Rhetoric at Zurich (1642-1655), and later as Rector of the same (1661-

88-105. Concerning the *dubious Sense of the word* מִקְרָא / *Mikra/reading* in Nehemiah 8:8,¹ consult below § 39, 45. The remaining things that pertain to the Synonyms and Homonyms of the word, *Sacred Scripture*, are able to be sought out of our AUTHOR.

1667), with a brief stay in Heidelberg as Professor of Oriental Languages (1655-1661).

¹ Nehemiah 8:8: “So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading (בְּמִקְרָא).”

§ 2: The Definition of Sacred Scripture

In the Definition set forth in this §, in general is observed

- A. The Genus, the *Word of God*, concerning which § 3-11.
- B. The Difference of Species, which are sought
 - Ⲡ. From the Efficient Instrumental Cause, or *Amanuenses*, *θεοπνεύστοις*, *inspired Men*, concerning whom § 12.
 - Ⲩ. From the Material of Composition, which are the *Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments*, concerning which § 13-20.
 - ⲛ. From the Object, *the Doctrine of true Religion*, concerning which § 21-31.
 - 7. From the End,
 - α. Both proximate, that is, that it might be a *perfect and perpetual Norm of this doctrine in the Church*, concerning which see § 32-49.
 - β. And more remote,
 - a. Subordinate, *the certain salvation of Elect men*:
 - b. Supreme, *the Glory of God*, see § 50.

§ 3: The Word of God Unwritten

The Word of God here supplies the place of a Genus. When the *Word of God* is called the *Genus of Scripture*, one might thence easily conclude that part of the *Word of God* is *Written*, concerning which we here treat, another part is *Not Written*, which the *Papists* also maintain. *Bellarmino*,¹ in his *Controversiis*, *tome 1*, *book IV*, *de Verbo Dei*, *chapter XII*, *column 255*: “In the next place, I say that *Scripture*, even if it was not composed so that it might be a rule of faith, nevertheless is a rule of faith, not total, but partial. For the total rule of faith is the *Word of God*, or the *Revelation of God* made to the *Church*, which is divided into two partial rules, the *Scripture* and *Tradition*.” But for that reason *Theologians* observe that, when we speak of the *Word of God* ἀγράφω/*unwritten* and ἔγγραφω/*written*, it is not thus a division of the *Genus* into *Species*, or of the *Whole* into *Parts*; but it is a description of the *Subject* according to its various *Accidents*; for to the same *Word*, formerly ἀγράφω/*unwritten*, it happens afterward to be written down, and thus to become ἔγγραφον/*written*: in a similar manner as it is permissible to affirm of a man that he is *naked* or *clothed*, which cannot be true of the same subject at the same time, but is able to happen unto the same man at different times. At the time that the *Prophets* were yet living among the people of *God*, the ἔγγραφον/*written*, *Mosaic*, etc., *Word* was flourishing in the *Church* together with the ἀγράφον/*unwritten* *Word*, which the *Prophets* were daily speaking forth: but with the ἀγράφω/*unwritten* ceasing now of a long time after the completion of the *Canon of Sacred Scripture*, the ἔγγραφον/*written* *Word of God* alone obtains. SPANHEIM,² in *Collegio Theologico Heidelbergæ de Principio Theologiæ*, *part 2*, § 1, 2, *opera*, *tome 3*, *column 1190*: “We have, therefore, established the *Word of God* as the true, sole, and adequate *principium* of *Sacred Theology*, which *Word* was at first ἀγράφως, *without writing*, from *Adam* unto *Moses*, —and was afterwards exhibited ἔγγράφως, *in writing*, in the *Canonical Scriptures* of both *Testaments*. Hence arose the

¹ Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) entered the Order of the Jesuits in his late teens. He became one of the great theologians of his era, a Cardinal, and, after his death, a Doctor of the Church.

² That is, the Younger.

distinction of the Word into ἄγραφον/*unwritten* and ἔγγραφον/*written*, not in a *composite sense* and with respect to the *present time*, as if today some might be written and some not written, but in a *divided sense* and with respect to *past time*, so that what was formerly ἄγραφον/*unwritten* might now be ἔγγραφον/*written*, both being the same *materially* and with respect to *substance*, but distinct *formally* and in the *mode of communication*.”

The ἄγραφον/*unwritten Word alone* obtained in the Church until Moses. Although we would not at all wish to say that Moses was the first inventor of letters. As far as we are concerned, letters would naturally have an origin far earlier, and would have been already in common use in the age of the Patriarchs: for why in that age, in which Music, Astronomy, and other arts were thriving, shall we be unwilling to allow that letters were also invented at that time, so that through the help of writing they might instruct posterity, since the signs of mortality were evident in daily experience? Indeed, I allow the invention of letters to be attributed to Adam himself as author. Concerning which matter HUGO’S¹ *de prima Scribendi Origine, notis Clarissimi Trotz*² illustratus, chapter III, is able to be consulted; and also GERHARD JOHANN VOSSIUS³ *de Arte Grammatica, book I, chapter IX, opera, tome 2, pages 13-15*; SPANHEIM’S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, epoch I, chapter III, § 7, column 275, epoch II, chapter VII, § 2, column 297*; GULIELMUS SALDENUS⁴ *Otia Theologica, book I, exercitation I, pages 1-18*; VITRINGA’S⁵ *Sacrarum Observationum, book I, chapter IV, pages 35-37, in notis*; BUDDEUS’ *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period I, section I, § 27, tome I, page 109*; likewise *Conjectures sur la Genese, à*

¹ Hermann Hugo (1588-1629) was a Jesuit priest. His *Pia desideria* was one of the most popular devotional texts of the period.

² Christianus Henricus Trotz (1703-1773) was a Dutch jurist.

³ Gerhard Johann Vossius (1577-1649) was a Dutch classical scholar and theologian. In 1619, his *Historia Pelagiana* brought him into suspicion of Arminianism.

⁴ Guilielmus Saldenus (1627-1694) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian, and supporter of the Nadere Reformatie.

⁵ Campegius Vitringa Sr. (1659-1722) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and Hebraist. He was a critical Cocceian, and heavily influenced by his pastor, Herman Witsius. He served the university at Franeker, first as professor of Oriental languages (1681), then of Theology (1682) and Church History (1697). He is remembered for his work in Jewish antiquities, and for his commentaries on Isaiah and Revelation.

Bruxelles¹ 1753, Remark I, pages 281-297. Yet we do not find the divine Word ἔγγραφον/*written* before Moses: but, if it had existed, written at the Command of God, and destined by God to be assigned to the Canon; certainly it would have been preserved by God, and by Moses inserted into, or set before, his Pentateuch. And so they would have committed sacred things also to letters before Moses; this they did by a more private decision for private uses, whence writings of this sort by the passage of time were able to be lost again: After Moses, by the leading of the divine Spirit, had perhaps transferred thence into the Book of Genesis those things that were profitable for us to know of the origins of the World and of the Church and its history: consult TRIGLAND'S² *Antapologiam*, chapter II, page 38.

For in vain on behalf of an ante-Mosaic, ἐγγράφω/*written*, Word is objected,

α. The *Prophecy of Enoch* mentioned by Jude in verses 14 and 15, προεφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνώχ, λέγων, Ἰδοῦ, ἦλθε Κύριος, etc., and Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh, etc. For it is not necessary that these things be sought, 1. either from *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*,³ cited by Origen and Procopius,⁴ and published by JOHN ERNEST GRABE⁵ in his *Spicilegio Patrum*, Century I, in which many prophecies of Enoch are inserted, and also things somewhat similar to what is mentioned by Jude, yet not altogether the same. But, that the author of this book was in fact a Jew, tinged with elements of the

¹ Jean Astruc (1684-1766) was a professor of medicine at Montpellier. His *Conjectures sur les Genese* was important in the early development of the Documentary Hypothesis of the Pentateuch.

² Jacobus Trigland the Elder (1583-1654) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian. He was deputed by the Synod of North Holland to the Synod of Dort; he was a member of the committee appointed to draw up the Canons of Dort. In 1633, he became Professor of Theology at Leiden.

³ *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* purports to relate the dying commands of the twelve patriarchs of Israel. It was composed in Greek, and appears to have reached its final form in the second century AD. In the *Testament* certain writings of Enoch are cited.

⁴ Procopius (c. 500-c. 560) was a Byzantine historian.

⁵ John Ernest Grabe (1666-1711) was an Anglican theologian and chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford. He was involved in producing the *Spicilegium Patrum et hæreticorum*, and new editions of Justin Martyr's *Apologia primæ*, Irenæus' *Adversus omnes hæreses*, and the Septuagint (based upon Codex Alexandrinus).

Christian faith, CAVE¹ and DODWELL² suppose, referring the writing of the book to the second *Century* of Christianity. 2. Neither with much right is recourse to be had to the book that is called Ἀποκάλυψις Ἐνὸς, *The Apocalypse of Enoch*, which, according to GROTIUS³ on *this passage*, is cited by *Irenæus*,⁴ *Clement of Alexandria*,⁵ *Origen*,⁶ and *Tertullian*,⁷ to which book the *Jews* in the *Zohar*⁸ bestowed almost the same confidence; and a great part of it SCALIGER⁹ gave in Greek out of *George Syncellus*¹⁰ in his *ad Eusebium notis*,¹¹ which Greek KIRCHER rendered into Latin in his *Oedipo Aegyptiaco*:¹² see SCALIGER'S *Notas in Græca Eusebii*, pages 404, 405. But concerning its argument SCALIGER, in his *Notis in Græca Eusebii*, page 405b, says that *he does not know whether the Jews*

¹ William Cave (1637-1713) was an Anglican churchman and theologian, and patristic scholar. His *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* is held in high esteem.

² Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) was an Irish theologian and controversialist. He produced several learned works on ecclesiastical chronology.

³ Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) distinguished himself in the field of international law, but he was interested in many fields of learning, including Christian apologetics, theology, and Biblical criticism and exegesis. His dual interest in international law and theology caused him to run afoul of civil authorities: Embracing Arminian doctrine, he was imprisoned from 1618-1621 after the Synod of Dort declared against the position.

⁴ *Against Heresies* 4:30.

⁵ *Excerpts out of Theodotus*.

⁶ *Against Celsus* 5.

⁷ *Against Idolatry; Concerning Female Fashion* 1.

⁸ The Kabbalah is a set of secret, esoteric Rabbinic doctrines, handed down orally and based on a mystical interpretation of the Hebrew Scripture. *Zohar* is one of the principal texts for Kabbalists. It was probably written by Moses de León in the thirteenth century, but it has traditionally been attributed to Simeon ben Jochai, a second century Rabbi and mystic.

⁹ Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609) was a skilled linguist and developed into one of the most learned men of his age. During the course of his studies and travels, he became a Protestant and suffered exile with the Huguenots. He was offered a professorship at Leiden (1593), a position which he eventually accepted and in which he remained until his death.

¹⁰ George Syncellus (died 810) was a monk, *syncellus* or secretary to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and a chronographer, chronicling the time from the creation to Diocletian.

¹¹ Scaliger, ever interested in matters of chronology, reconstructed Eusebius' lost *Chronicon*.

¹² Athanasius Kircher (c. 1601-1680) was a German Jesuit scholar, skilled in geology, medicine, and Oriental studies. His *Oedipus Aegypticus* is a large study of Egyptology and comparative religion.

have more leisure, that they would fabricate these things, or more patience, that they would write them. For there are so many things in them, says he, that disgust, weary, and shame, that, unless I had known that it belongs to the Jews to lie, and that now they are not able to leave off those trifles, I would have thought them to be not even worthy of reading. But nevertheless, which is strange, the same SCALIGER, in his *Notis in Græca Eusebii*, pages 404a, 405b, twice asserts that the passage, which in the Epistle of Jude is produced out of the work of Enoch concerning the angelic prevaricators, was taken out of this fragment. 3. With difficulty indeed would I believe with COCCEIUS¹ that Jude gathered this from Moses' history alone, that Enoch as Prophet had the argument of the prophecies, and by conjecture attributed such words to Enoch as might well agree with him and with the time in which he lived: for when Enoch is said to have prophesied λέγων/saying, it indubitably follows that the words next mentioned are the very words of that Prophet. 4. Therefore, I would rather say that certainly from Jude it is evident that Enoch προεφήτευσε—λέγων, prophesied...saying; but not that Enoch wrote down this prophecy. Therefore, this prophecy, delivered orally by Enoch, the Apostle would have had from the tradition of his ancestors, which nevertheless at a later time was able to be written down by others, and concerning the truth of which by the Spirit of God he would have been rendered quite certain; compare 2 Timothy 3:8: see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book I, chapter II, section II, pages 82-88; our AUTHOR'S *Expectationem Gloriæ futuræ Jesu Christi*, book I, chapter XXIII, § 6; WESSELIUS' *Fasciculum Dissertationum*, etc., *Dissertation XIII*, which is on Hebrews 12:18-21, § 12, pages 426, 427.

β. Neither do those things make more for the matter, which JOSEPHUS² has in *Antiquities of the Jews*, book I, chapter III, concerning the two Pillars of the Sethites, one of brick and the other of stone, on which their discoveries, τὰ εὐρημένα, σοφίαντε τὴν περὶ τὰ οὐράνια καὶ

¹ Johannes Cocceius (1603-1689) was born in Bremen, Germany, and went on to become Professor of Philology at the Gymnasium in Bremen (1630), held the chair of Hebrew (1630) and Theology (1643) at Francker, and was made Professor of Theology at Leiden (1650). He was the founder of the Cocceian school of covenant theology, bitter rival to the Voetian school.

² Flavius Josephus (37-93) was a priest in the Temple of Jerusalem, a Jewish general, and an eyewitness to the final siege of Jerusalem. Josephus' works are invaluable to the student of Jewish antiquities and of the history of the fall of Jerusalem.

τὴν τούτων Διακόσμησιν, and wisdom concerning the heavenlies and their order, they inscribed, one of which even in his own time survived in Syria, μένει δ' ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο κατὰ τὴν Συριάδα.¹ But, 1. there are learned men that think that Josephus, from the στηλαῖς/stone Columns of the Egyptian Hermes ἐν τῇ σηριαδικῇ γῆ, in the Seriadic country,² mentioned by Manetho,³ fabricated those Columns of Seth καὶ τῶν ἀπογόνων, and of his offspring, κατὰ τὴν Συριάδα, in Syria/Siriad. 2. They desire more definite proofs of the ἀξιοπιστίας/trustworthiness of this narration in Josephus, and more circumstances; that is, there had been an obligation to relate what was written on those Columns, in what language, in what characters, with what witness of Antiquity was it established that those Columns or this Column surviving the Flood was of Seth. 3. But, with the verity of the entire history narrated by Josephus conceded, this contributes nothing at all to our controversy; since on these Columns were inscribed only certain Astronomical discoveries, not the Revealed Word of God, concerning which inquiry is here made: see VOSSIUS' *de Arte Grammatica*, book I, chapter IX, opera, tome 2, pages 14b, 15a, where with the help of transposed punctuation he tries to emend the passage of Josephus cited: add SPANHEIM the *Younger's Chronologiam Sacram*, part 2, chapter I, column 145, and *Historiam Veteris Testamenti*, epoch I, chapter III, § 7, column 275, opera, tome I; SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica*, book I, exercitation I, which is *de Primo Scriptore*, and the whole worthy of reading, especially § 4, 10; and also ÆGIDIUS STRAUCH'S⁴ *Disputationem Historicam de Columnis Sethianis*, in CRENIUS'⁵ *Fasce V. Exercitationum* 297-320; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period I, section I, § 27, tome I, page 127.

γ. Hardly worthy of mention is the *Book* יֵצִירָה/Yetzirah, or concerning Creation, written by Abraham, at least according to the vulgar

¹ The Greek reads *Siriad*, a region in Egypt.

² *Hermes*, or Mercury, is another name for the Egyptian god, Thoth. Thoth is linguistically and mythologically related to Seth. The pillars were said to have been erected to preserve information concerning the ante-diluvian world.

³ Manetho (third century BC) was an Egyptian historian. His *Ægyptiaca* has been of enduring value in the study of Pharaonic dynasties.

⁴ Ægidius Strauch II (1632-1682) was a Lutheran theologian. He served as Professor of Philosophy (1653-1666), then as Professor of Theology (beginning in 1666) at Wittenberg.

⁵ Thomas Crenius (1648-1728) was a German Lutheran philosopher, theologian, and schoolmaster. He was one of his age's great gatherers and collectors of antiquities.

opinion of the Jews, according to the book of *Cosri*.¹ But by others this book is attributed to Rabbi Aquiba, son of Joseph, who flourished under Titus Vespasian and Hadrian.² While others, on the other hand, maintain that a book was written under the same title both by Abraham and by Aquiba. To what author the work is to be assigned is hardly evident with any certainty. It is certain that it was already written down before the Talmud was completed: for it is mentioned in *Gemara Sanhedrin, chapter VII, § 9, published by Cocceius, opera Cocceji, tome 9, page 222*. The argument of the book sufficiently indicates that Abrahamic authorship is safely rejected; since it is Kabbalistic and most obscure, and, according to the opinion of learned men, to a great extent embraces a Pythagorean method of philosophizing from letters and numbers:³ see the Most Illustrious JOHANN CHRISTOPH WOLF'S⁴ *Bibliothecam Hebraicam, tome I, pages 23-29*; HEIDEGGER'S⁵ *Historiam Patriarcharum, tome 2, page 143*; BAYLE'S⁶ *Dictionaire in Abraham et Akiba*; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period I, section III, § 21, tome I, page 325b, 326a*. Concerning other writings, attributed to the Patriarch Abraham by the *Sethians*⁷ and others, consult likewise WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam, tome I, pages 29, 30*, and others whom in that place he recommends.

¹ The Book of *Cosri* (*Kitab al Khazari*) was written by the Spanish Jewish philosopher, Rabbi Yehuda Halevi, and published around 1140. It is an apology for the Jewish religion, composed in a dialogue form.

² Rabbi Aquiba ben Joseph, or Rabbi Akiva (c. 17 AD-c. 137 AD), was a Jewish Tanna of great influence, considered to be one of the earliest founders of rabbinical Judaism. Vespasian reigned from 69 to 79; Hadrian, from 117 to 138.

³ Pythagoras (582-507 BC) was a Greek philosopher and mathematician.

⁴ Johann Christoph Wolf (1683-1739) was a German Lutheran Hebraist and scholar. His *Bibliotheca Hebræa* (published in four volumes, 1715-1733) was a standard reference work on Jewish literature for more than a century.

⁵ Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633-1698) was a Swiss Reformed theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Steinfurt (1659-1665), and then at Zurich (1667-1698).

⁶ Pierre Bayle (1647-1706) was a French philosopher. He was the son of a Reformed minister; for a short time he defected to Roman Catholicism, only to return again to his Reformed roots. He was influenced by Rationalism; and consequently he advocated for a separation between the domains of faith and reason, and for toleration of differing beliefs.

⁷ The *Sethians* were a Gnostic sect, the existence of which may pre-date the Apostolic era. They were heavily influenced by Judaism and Platonism. Their name comes from their veneration of the Biblical Seth.

And so, before Moses, God preserved His Word ἄγραφον/*unwritten* through Oral Tradition, according to Genesis 18:19, which at that time was more easily able to be done; 1. On account of the eminent *Longevity* of the Fathers; since Moses, the son of Amram and Jochebed, hardly attained to the age of his grandfather, Kohath son of Levi,¹ of which Levi Jochebed herself, the mother of Moses, is also said to be a daughter, Numbers 26:59. Now, Kohath was able to learn the way of the Lord from his grandfather Jacob; Jacob lived for some time with his grandfather Abraham; Abraham reached to the age of Shem, who survived more than a century after the birth of Abraham; Shem lived nearly a century with Methuselah, but Methuselah was able to have known for a very long time Adam, the parent of the human race. 2. The *smaller Number of the faithful*, before the human race at first multiplied, is added; then by a distinction, which very quickly arose, between the *sons of God* and *of men* before the Flood;² and after the Flood by a way laid out step-by-step to the rejection of the Gentiles, when already the *tents of Shem* were blessed above the rest by the *inhabitation of the Lord*,³ and Abraham was commanded to go out from his land and family, to be adopted by the Lord with the more blessed part of the posterity, with the rest esteemed less.⁴ 3. On account of the *multiplied Apparitions of God*, repeated examples of which are found in the history of the Patriarchs, and the frequency of which is to be gathered out of the history of *Job*, Job 4:12, etc.; 33:14, 15, etc.; 38 and *following*; 42:5, 7. 4. On account of the yet *lesser astuteness of Satan*, that is, *in feigning Oracles*, by which he was imitating the revelations of God: for, besides Knowledge natural and revealed, experimental knowledge also agrees with Angels, which doubtlessly is made greater by degress; see *Chapter IX*, § 8.

¹ See Exodus 6:16-20.

² Genesis 6:1, 2.

³ Genesis 9:27.

⁴ Genesis 12:1-4.

§ 4: The Word of God Written

The same reasons that teach that God most wisely instructed His Church through the space of two thousand and five hundred years by the ἄγραφο/*unwritten* Word alone: the same, I say, taken up and inverted, show by degrees the utility and propriety of the writing of the divine Word; since from the age of Moses, 1. the age of men was much diminished, 2. the seed of Abraham was formed by God into an adopted people of His own possession, a numerous nation, 3. apparitions did not happen so frequently and commonly to the faithful, 4. and the craft of Satan gradually grew, who transforms himself into an angel of light:¹ hence hereafter the ἄγραφο/*unwritten* Word of God would not be able so easily to be delivered without corruption to posterity.

And so in the time of Moses and thereafter God gave a *Commandment*

1. To His ministers *to Write*: which was

α. Either *Explicit*, which sort frequently occurs, Exodus 17:14; 34:27; Numbers 33:2; etc.; Isaiah 8:1, *Now, Jehovah said to me, Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz*. Which commandment HUET,² in his *Demonstratione Evangelica*, proposition VII, § 15, scandalously draws unto a commandment to the Prophet to lie with his wife, in such a way that the *Wife* is called a *great volume*; and the *pen of a man* denotes that member which is not able to be named with decency; and the Prophet is commanded *to write in it, Swiftly drag away the spoil, quickly plunder*,³ that is, to beget a son with her, for whom this was going to be the name. Which certainly is to make sport in a serious matter. Neither for the sake of modesty, as Huet professes, was it necessary for the Spirit to make use of this figurative sort of speech. It would have been far more decent without circumlocution to instruct the Prophet, *Take thy wife, apply thyself to the procreation of children*, than to make use of figurative speech of this sort. Although GREGORY NYSSEN in a somewhat similar exegesis goes before him,

¹ 2 Corinthians 11:14.

² Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721) was a Roman Catholic churchman and a universal scholar. He was the cofounder of the Academie du Physique in Caen.

³ This is the significance of the name מְהַר־שָׁלַל־חֶשְׁבָּז, *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*.

opera, tome 2, page 155 D, in which, among Testimonies concerning the Birth of Messiah from a Virgin, Testimonies found *there* in Latin, is also cited Isaiah 8:1, 3, and is added for the sake of illustration: “Therefore, by the *Scroll* we understand the *young Virgin*. For, just as a new sheet is pure, when it is without writing: so also the holy Virgin is without intercourse with a man.” The matter itself speaks. The *great roll* denotes a sheet, parchment, or tablet, which God willed to be *great*, either on account of the multitude of those things that were to be inscribed, or so that it might be all the more for show, suspended somewhere on a wall. He wills that it be written with the *pen of a man*, that is, to be read as clearly, perspicuously, and aptly, as it is able to be done by a man, to denote in this way the writing’s obviousness: consult WITSIUS’ *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XIII, § 2, 3. Habakkuk 2:2, *Jehovah answered me, saying: Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, so that he may run that readeth it*; that is, God wills the vision to be written, set forth upon tables, so clearly, so plainly, that not only might someone walking past have the opportunity to read; but also someone *reading it* might be able *to run*, that is, to read it expeditiously, not sticking anywhere because of the difficulty of the writing: or by hypallage, that anyone that even runs by on the street might be able to read the vision: consult our AUTHOR’S *Commentarium in Prophetas minores*, on this passage; and WITSIUS’ *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XIII, § 4; likewise CARPZOV’S¹ *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter I, § 15, pages 40, 41. Revelation 1:19. These and similar individual, explicit commands, in the rest do not exclude, but rather include and suppose the command to write, which one may in some things deduce from the lesser to the greater. Indeed, the fidelity of the Amanuenses does not allow us to doubt concerning this, since it does not belong to a faithful ambassador to do anything beyond his mandate.

β. Or this Commandment was *Implicit*, when it was commanded to Men of God to instruct men of a following age, who would live after their deaths, Isaiah 6:9, 10, with a comparison of the repeated citation of this passage in the New Testament,² and of the application of its argument to the age of Christ and the Apostles,

¹ Johann Gottlob Carpzov (1679-1767) was a Lutheran divine and Old Testament scholar. He served at Leipzig as Professor of Theology (1713-1719), and Professor of Hebrew (1719-1730).

² For example, Matthew 13:14, 15; Acts 28:26, 27; Romans 11:8.

Matthew 28:19, 20, for we are hardly able to teach posterity and those absent in any other way than by writing. Neither does it hence follow that, if the Command *to teach*, Matthew 28:19, implicitly also was obliging to write, all the Apostles were obliged to write, at any time they might not duly discharge their office. And indeed, this Command was obliging all in such a way that, nevertheless, a peculiar impulse and determination of the Spirit was required to be added for the execution of specific parts of this Commandment. Therefore, all the Apostles were bound to the best of their ability and according to the leading of the Spirit to teach all Nations; but instruction through the written Word was restricted to a few of them by a special dispensation of God; by which, from those things which the few had written, it would be evident what the rest taught; and what after their deaths should be taught in the world unto the consummation of the age.

α. Again, that Command to write was either *Internal*, through the impulse of the Spirit, which all the θεόπνευστοι/*inspired* enjoyed; 2 Timothy 3:16, πᾶσα γραφή, *all Scripture*, that is, not simply λόγος/*Word*, but the λόγος γραπτός, *Word written*, is θεόπνευστος/*inspired*; 2 Peter 1:21, upon which passage see *my Commentarium*. Now, there is no more efficacious Command than the Inspiration of the things to be written; so that it would be ἀσύστατον/*inadmissible* to say that the Prophets and Apostles wrote with God inspiring and moving, and yet not commanding.

β. Or *External*, which came through necessary occasions of writing being set before them by God Himself, through which occasions He stirred up Men of God to write: see Jude 3, 4; 1 Corinthians 1; 2; 7:1.

2. God gave a Command to His people *to read*, and to inquire after the value of all other words at this Lydian stone,¹ which without the writing of the Word was not even able to be done. Isaiah 8:20: Here הַחֹרֶן/*Law* and הַתְּעוּדָה/*testimony* are conjoined, as with inverted order it had also been done in *verse* 16, which words one may thus distinguish, that *Law* denotes the books of Moses, which are principally legal; and *Testimony* denotes the written or spoken words of the Prophets after Moses, who, not only as worthy witnesses confirmed the Law of Moses with other words of God set forth of themselves, but also made use of a various and valid attestation to the people: in which way in the New

¹ A type of black stone, formerly used to test the purity of precious metals.

Testament *Moses* and the *Prophets* are so often conjoined and distinguished: consult WESSELIUS' *Fasciculum Dissertationum, Dissertation II*, § 106, page 148. Concerning these it is commanded, לְתוֹרָה וְלַתְעוּנָה, *to the Law and Testimony*, that is, *attend ye or seek ye, consult, דְּרָשׁוּ*, by comparison with verse 19,¹ or, *let them attend, seek, consult*. Words are added for the commendation of this admonition, the sense of which is more doubtful and obscure, whence they are translated and explained with great variety, as it is seen in *Notis marginalibus* of the DUTCH ANNOTATORS; in our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationibus textualibus XXIII, Part III*; in VITRINGA'S *Commentario in loco*; in VRIEMOET'S *Adnotationibus ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti, tome 1, chapter II, page 108-112*. אִם-לֹא יִאמְרוּ כְּדָבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְנוּ לְךָ שָׁחַר: translate: *if they speak not according to this word (of the Law and Testimony), it shall be (which, omitted by ellipsis, is to be supplied in sense) because there is not going to be to him (any of them) a dawn*. Or, *if they speak not according to this word, assuredly, certainly, there shall not be to him a dawn*, with אֲשֶׁר taken for a particle of assertion, according to the observation of LOUIS DE DIEU² and SCHMIDT,³ which Vitringa thinks is able to be admitted; Vriemoet following COCCEIUS denies it. Or, with the verb *to say* repeated from the context, understand now verse 19 by ellipsis, as also it is not rare elsewhere: *When they will have said unto you, Seek ye familiar spirits, etc.: (say ye) Shall not a people seek their own God? etc. The Law, or to the Law and Testimony: if they speak not according to this word, (repeat from the preceding verse, say ye) that there is not going to be to him a dawn, true light, new and immediate after darkness, both of the body and of the soul, both of wisdom and holiness and of joy and prosperity, by a comparison with 2 Peter 1:19; but the night, deep even in the day and most obscure, remains to him; or in particular, that there is going to be no part for him, whether in the happy morning of the glorious resurrection and blessed eternity, לְבֹקֶר, in the morning, by a comparison with Psalm 49:14,*

¹ Isaiah 8:19: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek (דְּרָשׁוּ) unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead?"

² Louis de Dieu (1590-1642) was a Huguenot minister of Dutch origin, and he was a linguist and critic of extraordinary talent and judgment.

³ Sebastian Schmidt (1617-1696) was a German Lutheran Theologian and Hebraist. He studied under Buxtorf the Younger, and his efforts to interpret Scripture with philological accuracy influenced Philipp Jakob Spener. He commented on much of the Scripture, including Isaiah.

or in the grace to be brought in through the Messiah, *the True Light of the world*,¹ whose going forth is prepared בְּשֶׁחַר , as the dawn, Hosea 6:3 compared with Isaiah 9:1, 2. Or, *to the Law and to the Testimony* let them have recourse, attend, and compare; *if they are not going to speak*, or are unwilling to speak, *according to this word in which there is no dawn*, that is, if in sheer darkness they refuse to remain, and they sincerely seek the true light, which is not outside of the Law and Testimony of Jehovah. Or, *to the Law*, in such a manner that, as it was said, they have recourse, attend, and compare, *and to the Testimony*, that is, of the Prophets, *if these would not speak according to this word* of the familiar spirits and smatterers, *in which there is no dawn*, but rather that most lucid Law of God they would hold, follow, and inculcate. Yet another conjecture is supplied by the Most Illustrious VRIEMOET, according to which בְּשֶׁחַר /dawn might be able to be rendered *incantation, enchantment*, from a comparison with the Arabic word of this signification, شحر , which altogether agrees with the Hebrew form בְּשֶׁחַר , if only, as it is wont to be done, you exchange ש /*sh* with שׁ /*s*: and so the sense, *if they speak not according to the standard of this word, which is far from enchantment: understand, it shall be ill with them, woe to them!* see VRIEMOET'S *Adnotationes ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti*, tome 1, chapter II, page 108-112, and *Thesem Scripturæ* DCXCIX. Which conjecture, nevertheless, is so much less pleasing to me, since in this way, not only is the usual signification of the noun בְּשֶׁחַר destroyed, but at the same time also is destroyed the elegant opposition to *dawn*, bringing welcome light, against *darkness, obscuring, and murkiness*, which God threatens in verse 22, which phrase the Most Illustrious VITRINGA without artifice thinks *includes an exposition of the threatening clause*, the immediately preceding אֵין־לּוֹ שֶׁחַר , *there is not dawn to him*. ALBERT SCHULTENS,² in his *Epistola altera ad Menckenium*, page 76, briefly indicates his own opinion concerning the sense of this passage in these words: "Let him hear *Isaiah*, Isaiah 8:20, *To the Law and Testimony: If not! they speak according to that word for which there is no Dawn: they follow precepts and decrees, which extinguish Faith in the Word of God, henceforth never to be enlightened by any Dawn.*" John 5:39:

¹ John 8:12; 9:5.

² Albert Schultens (1686-1750) was a Reformed scholar and philologist. He served as Professor of Hebrew at Franeker (1713-1729), and Professor of Oriental Languages at Leiden (1732-1750). In his day, he was the pre-eminent teacher of Arabic in Europe.

Ἐρευνᾶτε, *search ye*, is not to be taken indicatively, but rather imperatively, on account of the reason added, *these Scriptures testify of me*; for this the Jews generally were not believing.

By this divine Mandate to write the Word of the Lord the twofold error of the *Papists* falls: of which the first is,

A. *That the Scripture was only written down by chance, and at the bare pleasure of men*; which they are able to be said to urge, so that in this way the authority and perfection of the Scripture or written Word might be lessened unto the advantage of Traditions. *Bellarmino*, in his *Controversiis*, tome 1, *de Verbo Dei*, book IV, chapter III, column 206, has: “It is not true that God commanded the Apostles to write. —God neither expressly commanded that they write, nor that they not write. Yet we do not deny that the Apostles wrote what things they wrote with God willing and inspiring: for it is one thing to do something with God suggesting and inspiring, another thing with Him plainly commanding.” Add chapter IV, column 212, where there is among other things: “Eusebius relates, in his *Historia*, book III, chapter XXIV, that *Luke* only wrote because he had seen many others rashly presume to commit those things to letters, of which they had not perfect knowledge, that is, so that he might rescue us from the uncertain narrations of others. —From which it is gathered that the Apostles in primary intention thought, not upon writing, but upon the preaching of the Gospel.” *Charron*¹ adds, “God never thought of teaching the Evangelical faith and of making Christians by the Scripture, still less by the Scripture alone,” in *CHAMIER’S*² *Panstratia Catholica*, tome I, *de Canone*, book IX, chapter VI, § 1. But in this way, in addition to the things already said, God would not be able emphatically to claim for Himself the Writing of the Scripture, as He does in Hosea 8:12, אֲכַתּוּב־לוֹ רַבִּי הַזֹּרֶתָּי, *I have written to him the great things of my law*.

Objection 1: That by opportune occasions presented frequently the Holy Men were stirred up to write. *Response*: It is one thing for them to write with opportune occasions presented, it is another thing to write only occasionally and without the special direction and impulse of

¹ Pierre Charron (1541-1603) was a French Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher.

² Daniel Chamier (1565-1621) was a Huguenot theologian. He studied at the University of Orange and at Geneva under Theodore Beza. After his ordination, he was installed as pastor at Montélimar. In 1607, he established an academy at Montpellier, and served there for a time as professor, concluding his career as Professor of Theology at Montauban (1612).

God. The former we grant; the latter we deny. The Apostles both by commandment and according to the occasion presented preached, and Men of God acted in like manner in writing the Sacred Codex. For those two things are not to be opposed, as it is done by the Papists, but rather composed as subordinates, which are not inconsistent. The principal impulsive cause of writing was the Command of God and the Impulse of the inspiring Spirit: the secondary and less principal impulsive cause was often the occasion presented, of which Holy Men, led by the Spirit, knew to make use for the glory of God and the edification of the neighbor: consult SPANHEIM'S *Collegium Theologicum Heidelbergæ de Principio Theologiæ*, part 3, § 3, 5, *opera*, tome 3, column 1192; PETRUS DINANT'S¹ *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 42, compared with § 41, *pages* 469-473.

Objection 2: That Luke wrote his Gospel by his own will, Luke 1:3, ἔδοξε κάμοί, etc., *it seemed good to me*, etc. *Response:* 1. This voluntary pleasure was excited in Luke by the Holy Spirit; in like manner also Paul was proclaiming the Gospel *willingly*, and at the same time from a *necessity* incumbent upon him, 1 Corinthians 9:16, 17. 2. And perhaps Luke himself in this passage signified this divine Impulse, writing: ἔδοξε κάμοί, παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, when those words are translated, *it seemed to me, having followed properly all things from above, in order to write unto thee:* and not, *having pursued accurately all things from the beginning.* And certainly ἄνωθεν denotes either, and frequently must signify *from above*, John 3:31;² James 1:17;³ 3:15,⁴ 17:⁵ thus Luke relates, that he was taught from heaven all things properly, that have regard to the Evangelical history: see GOMARUS' *Opera*, part I, *pages* 200, 201: consult what things STAPFER⁶ conveys on this Objection, an Objection

¹ Petrus Dinant (1663-1724) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian.

² John 3:31: "He that cometh from above (ἄνωθεν) is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all."

³ James 1:17: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above (ἄνωθεν), and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

⁴ James 3:15: "This wisdom descendeth not from above (ἄνωθεν), but is earthly, sensual, devilish."

⁵ James 3:17a: "But the wisdom that is from above (ἄνωθεν) is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated..."

⁶ John Frederick Stapfer (1708-1775) was a Swiss Reformed divine of the first

moved also by the *Jews*, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 3, chapter XI, section I, § 331, 333, 334, pages 265, 266, 268-271.

Neither, 3. is it fitting to obtrude upon the Holy Spirit a *Method* more *Scholastic*, as if more decent, with *Bellarmino*, *Controversiis*, tome 1, *de Verbo Dei*, book IV, chapter IV, column 212, where he has: “Moreover, if the Apostles had desired overtly to consign their doctrine to letters, they would have composed a Catechism or similar book. But they wrote either history, as Evangelists, or epistles on account of some occasion, etc.” For the Spirit did not hold it to be necessary to write down a System of Theology or Catechism through His amanuenses; it is sufficient that He related those things by which all Catechisms ought to be examined: and, if not formally, yet materially, a Theological System is comprehended in the Written Word; thence it is to be gathered by us that something remains to human industry. It is not to be doubted that the *Epistulary Method*, of which the Spirit made use through the Apostles, in order to instruct the Church, was the most agreeable method of writing; both for the speedy dissemination of the Gospel; and because that method of writing, simpler and more popular, was accommodating itself to all, the learned and unlearned; and because in this way they were delivering Theology, not merely theoretical and in idea, but at the same time practical and in supposition: consult STAPFER, refuting the cavils of the *Naturalists*, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter I, pages 1173-1175.

B. The other error of the *Papists* to be noted here is that *the Scripture is not necessary*. That is, so that they might suppress the authority of Scripture, and more easily establish their ἀγράφους/*unwritten* Traditions, and the supreme tribunal of their Pope, they are wont to speak in this way. *Bellarmino*, in his *Controversiis*, tome 1, *de Verbo Dei*, book IV, chapters III, IV, tries to evince that the writing of the Word of God is indeed useful to the Church, but not necessary. In *Controversiis*, tome 1, chapter III, column 206, he has: “We say that the New Testament ought to be written principally upon the heart, and that it is not necessarily required that it be written in books.” In chapter IV, column 209, “In the first place, we shall endeavor to demonstrate that the Scriptures without traditions were not simply necessary, nor sufficient.” And in column 210, “Now, what Chrysostom says, that—the Scriptures—are necessary to us because of the corruption of men; is understood concerning necessity,

order. He served as a Pastor in the canton in Berne. His *Institutiones theologicæ, polemicæ, universæ, ordine scientifico dispositæ* ranks among the best elenctic theologies.

not simply, but for well being, that is, concerning usefulness.” But Cardinal Hosius¹ contends that *it would have been better for the Church, if no Scripture had even existed*, as TURRETIN² testifies in his *Theologiae Elencticae*, locus II, question II, § I.

As far as the *Enthusiasts* are concerned, at this point receding in a similar manner from the right path, consult below, § 30, 32; and SPANHEIM, in his *Disputationibus Anti-Anabaptisticis, Disputationum theologicarum*, part 2, XX, § 2.

But in this way they wish to appear wiser than God, and are ungrateful for the excellent care which He has undertaken for His Church. We do not even urge the *Absolute Necessity of the Scripture*. The Revealed Word of God is absolutely necessary after the Fall; as it appeared in *Chapter I*, § 23: but just as He did in ante-Mosaic times, so also thereafter God, if He had willed, was able to provide for the Church without the Word Written: and so the Necessity of the Word Written is not *Absolute*, nor *Perpetual*, but only *Hypothetical*, proceeding *from the supposition of the divine Will*. The wisdom and propriety of this divine purpose we nevertheless readily acknowledge here. 1. The diverse mode of teaching, which God willed to employ, first through the Word ἄγραφον/*unwritten* only, then ἄγραφον/*unwritten* and ἔγγραφον/*written* at the same time, finally by the ἔγγραφον/*written* Word alone, is agreeable to the diverse ages of the Church. For, as infants are formed with the living voice first, then are taught by the voice of a Teacher and the Reading of books, and finally, having been removed from the care of pedagogues, of themselves take teachings from books: so the heavenly Father established the infant Church with the living voice alone, which is the simplest mode of Revelation; then He taught it, adolescent and constituted in early youth under the Law, both with the living voice, because of the remains of the infantile age, and writing, because of the beginnings of a more robust age, unto the time of the Apostles; finally, He willed that it be kept together as adult under the Gospel, by an

¹ Stanislaus Hosius (1504-1579) was a Roman Catholic Cardinal, a Papal legate, and active opponent of the Reformation.

² Francis Turretin (1623-1687) was a Genevan Reformed theologian of Italian descent. After studying at Geneva, Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, Saumur, and Montauban, he was appointed as the pastor of the Italian refugee congregation in Geneva (1648), and later Professor of Theology at academy (1653). His *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* has been heavily influential in Reformed circles, shaping Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology* and Herman Bavinck's *Gereformeerde dogmatiek*.

altogether perfect mode of Revelation, that is, by the light of the written Word. 2. Neither is it doubtful that He composes the written Word, especially under the New Testament, when the Church is extended to peoples of every sort throughout the entire globe, both for the more powerful Perservation of the divine Word, and for its broader Propagation. QUINTILIAN well says, “This is the Divine and marvelous benefit of letters, that they preserve sounds and, as it were, make a deposit for those absent.”¹ At the same time the writing of the Word is serviceable both for Uniformity, and for the greater Purity of the same, with the Word not so easily to be perverted through the fraud of Satan and the cunning of heretics. And thus the occasion is closed off for a thousand offspring of the human mind to be obtruded in the place of divine Revelations: and doubt is removed from the faithful concerning genuineness of Revelation.

Neither ought the *Utility of the γραφής/Scripture*, asserted by Paul, be opposed to its Necessity, since, because the uses mentioned by Paul, 2 Timothy 3:15-17, are thereby to be obtained more easily, God judged it to be *necessary* that Revelation be written. Respiration is useful to man, but it is no less necessary.

Now, as far as the *example of the Barbarous Nations in IRENÆUS* is concerned, *to whom in the beginning by mere preaching the Gospel was revealed*, which *Objection* on the letter δ our AUTHOR sets forth out of *Bellarmino's Controversiis, tome 1, de Verbo Dei, book IV, chapter IV, column 210*, where he says that it *sufficiently appears that the Scriptures are not simply necessary because after the coming of Christ, through many years, the Church was without the Scriptures, so that Irenæus might yet write in his own time, Against Heresies, book III, chapter IV, that there were some Christian Nations that were living very well by traditions alone without the Scripture*. The words of *Irenæus*, to which *Bellarmino* appeals, *Against Heresies, book III, chapter IV, § 2*, are thus: “To which appointment many nations of barbarians assent, of those that believe upon Christ, without paper and ink having salvation written by the Spirit on their hearts, and diligently keeping the old Tradition; believing upon one God, the maker of heaven and earth, etc. Those that have believed this faith, with respect to our speech are barbarians: but with respect to opinion, custom, and conversation, because of faith they are extremely wise, and pleasing to God, living in all righteousness, chastity, and wisdom.” By setting forth

¹ *Institutionum Oratoriarum Libri Duodecim* 8:30, 31. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (42-c. 122) was a Roman rhetorician.

this Objection, at the same time our AUTHOR resolves it by the interposition of the words, *but nevertheless from the Scriptures*: which solution is clearer if we compare what things TURRETIN has in his *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus II, question II, § 8: *Although certain particular Churches for a time would be able to be without the written Word of God, especially when they were first being erected; nevertheless, they were not without that Word of God that was written, which undoubtedly was sounding upon their ears through the ministry of men, neither was the Church at that time in general without the Scripture.*

It pertains to the *altogether empty praises of Traditions above the Scriptures*, of which our AUTHOR makes mention in letter E, for instance, what *Bellarmino* says, in his *Controversiis*, tome 1, *de Verbo Dei*, book IV, chapter IV, column 215, comparing the *words of Scripture* with a sheath, and asserting that the *sense* inclosed in the words is the very *sword of the Spirit*; that the first is had by all that know letters, but *concerning the second we in a great many places are not able to be certain, unless Tradition be added*. But see what things contrariwise are taught below, § 27-29, 41, 42.

§ 5: The Infallible Inspiration of the Scriptures

Hitherto concerning the *Word*; now it is necessary to see why the Scripture is called the *Word of God*.

The Scripture is so called *principally by reason of its infallible Inspiration*. Indeed, our AUTHOR in his *Compendio* enumerates more reasons why the Scripture is able to be called the *Word of God*; namely, α. the *Divine Command*, concerning which see the *preceding* §; β. the *Divine Example* in the writing of the Law, Exodus 31:18; Deuteronomy 9:10; γ. the *Divine Preservation* of the Scriptures as God's peculiar property in the midst of the power of the Babylonians, Syrians, and Romans. But the principal reason that it is so called is its *Infallible Inspiration*, according to 2 Timothy 3:16, *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος, all Scripture is given by inspiration of God*. 2 Peter 1:21: *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, on which passage see *my Commentarium*. And so Holy Men were internally urged and impelled by the Divine Spirit in the writing of His dictates, no less powerfully than various bodies are wont to be impelled and propelled by the wind. That *θεοπνευστία/inspiration* is not to be understood of the more common concurrence of Providence, by comparison with Job 32:8, but of the immediate and infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, who impressed upon the minds of holy men the matters to be committed to writing, and illuminated their understanding with an extraordinary and preternatural light, so that they might perceive what they had to write, and be completely persuaded of the truth and divine *ἀσφαλεία/certainty* of the things to be written;¹ and so that they might actually judge that these matters are to be set down on paper in these and no other words and in this order. Which sort of unusual leading was required, so that the Word of the Prophets and Apostles might be able to be held as divine: while in the rest, which we

¹ Luke 1:4: "That thou mightest know the certainty (τὴν ἀσφάλειαν) of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."

speak or write, we also enjoy either a common concurrence of divine providence, or the saving guidance of the Holy Spirit; nevertheless, what things we thus speak or write are said to be merely human words and writings, set forth *θελήματι ἀνθρώπων*, *by the will of men*, which concerning the Prophecy of Scripture, delivered to the Church *θεοπνεύστως*, *by inspiration*, is denied by Peter, who in this matter opposes *the will of men to the impulse of the Holy Spirit*: consult LAMPE'S¹ *Dissertationem philologico-theologicam*, volume II, *Disputation X*, which is *de Θεοπνευστία Auctorum Sacrorum*, pages 354 and *following*. That this is to be held, which was just now taught concerning the reason for the denomination of the *Word of God*, against *Hobbes*,² among others, see above, *Chapter I*, § 1. The Reverend PETRUS DINANT, in his tractate called *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, *chapter III*, pages 345-561, will by not means displease anyone to consult here; where, 1. he defines the state of the controversy concerning the Infallible Inspiration of the Word of God, and sets forth the position of the reformed Church concerning this matter. 2. He justifies his own assertions with respect to the Books of the Old Testament. 3. He demonstrates that the same infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit is not to be denied to the Writers of the New Testament. 4. He more distinctly explains that Inspiration; he shows what the Holy Spirit furnished to the Holy Men of God in *θεοπνευστία/inspiration*; and how that extraordinary influx and guidance of the Spirit did not at all exclude the diligence of the Holy Men, and the use of appropriate means to acquire the knowledge of divine things. 5. He answers certain difficulties that are wont to be moved against this Infallible Inspiration. You will see here also that the text of 2 Timothy 3:16 is cleared by *Grotius* from *παρερμηνεία/misinterpretation*, § 17, 18, pages 390-398.

It is worth the effort to see to what this divine Inspiration pertains, and to what it extends itself.

¹ Frederic Adolphus Lampe (1683-1729) studied under Campegius Vitringa, and held various ministerial posts. At Utrecht he was appointed Professor of Theology (1720), then of Church History (1726). He departed to teach at Bremen in 1727, and died there in 1729. He was especially learned in ecclesiastical history and antiquities.

² Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was an English philosopher, remembered for his work in political philosophy and social contract theory. He was also interested in theology, but heterodox in his beliefs, denying incorporeal substance (reducing all things to matter and motion), and the divine inspiration of the Biblical prophets.

1. It ought to refer to *All the Persons*, α. that wrote, β. and that are introduced as speaking, having been urged by the Spirit, of which sort are, for example, *Zacharias* the Priest, the father of John the Baptist, Luke 1:67; *Mary*, whose Song is related as worthy of God, Luke 1:46, etc.; *Simeon*, whose Song is found in Luke 2:29-32, together with the benediction of Joseph and Mary and the connected prophecy, verses 33-35, after it was narrated concerning Simeon that Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἦν ἐπ' αὐτόν, *the Holy Ghost was upon him*, verse 25, καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, *and he came by the Spirit into the temple*, verse 27; while also it is related that he had previously enjoyed extraordinary revelation of the Spirit, verse 26, ἦν αὐτῷ κεκρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, etc., *it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost*, etc. Stephen also, who after his great sermon was presented, is said, Acts 7:55, ὑπάρχων—πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, *to be full of the Holy Ghost*: while in Acts 6:8, he is already praised as one who πλήρης πίστεως καὶ δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ, *being full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people*; and when some opposed themselves to him, undertaking to quarrel with him, Luke testifies, Acts 6:10, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει, *and they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake*; indeed, when he was about to speak before the Sanhedrin, all saw his face as it had been the face of an angel, verse 15. But if to those, to whom, besides a splendor so extraordinary and procuring veneration, is so emphatically assigned the Spirit, by whom they were speaking, and here to Stephen, according to the promise made previously to them, Matthew 10:19, 20; John 16:13, etc.; the same Spirit yet comes to be denied, then He shall easily be able to be denied to all. And so it is not permissible for us to banish Stephen from the number of those that, having been urged by the Spirit, have spoken. The Chronological Difficulties that occur in his discourse are no reason that with MELCHIOR CANO¹ in NICHOLAS ABRAM² we should dare to say that Stephan *slipped in memory*; or with BUCHOLZER³ that his words

¹ Melchior Cano (c. 1509-1560) was a Spanish Dominican and Scholastic theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Salamanca (1546-1552).

² Nicholas Abram (1589-1655) was a French Jesuit theologian.

³ Abraham Bucholtzer (1529-1584) was a Lutheran theologian and historian. He wrote *Indicem chronologicum, monstrantem annorum seriem a mundo condito usque ad annum nati Christi 1616*.

are to be taken with a grain of salt; or with CALVISIUS¹ that Stephan, as far as it concerns times and other circumstances, speaks according to the opinion of his adversaries, who were thus teaching these things in their Synagogues out of the Septuagint or out of the Rabbis: consult our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* III, § 4, pages 39, 41; *Exercitationes* Part III. The θεοπνευστίαν/*inspiration* of Stephen WITSIUS vindicates from the rash cavils of the Critics, *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXI, § 54-56, pages 316-318. The θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* of Stephen in his discourse related in Acts 7 is also found to be approved by many and vindicated against *Johann David Michaelis*,² Professor of Gottingen, in *de Nederlandse Bibliotheek*, volume 3, n. 1, Mengelst, pages 1-13.

Nevertheless, it is to be observed, 1. that the Afflatus of the Spirit in the θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired* Men was not universal nor continuous, such that Men of God were also able to err in those things that they wrote or spoke, not as θεοπνεύστως, *by inspiration*, but as men; like David in the Letter written concerning the murder of Uriah;³ like Nathan in the counsel that he gave to David concerning the building of the Temple, but without consulting God.⁴ 2. That the Apostles and the Prophets were infallible in faith, not in manners. The Spirit was going to lead them into all truth, lest they should ever err, not into all piety, such that they might never sin. Hence the dissembling of Peter, concerning which Galatians 2:13 is no obstacle to the θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* of his sermons and Epistles; indeed, his hypocrisy was a sin of life, not an error of faith; a moral lapse of conversation from infirmity and fear, lest he should incur the odium of the Jews; not an error of the mind from ignorance of Christian liberty, of which he had already previously shown himself to be well aware: consult WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXII, § 22, 23.

Our AUTHOR himself excepts from the Men speaking by the infallible Inspiration of the Holy Spirit *Job* and his *Friends*, since, α. *indeed, these* (especially three of them, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar) *are reproved by God on account of their speeches*, Job 42:7, 8; *neither, β. is anything read*

¹ This is likely Sethus Calvisius the Younger (1639-1698), a Lutheran theologian.

² Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791) was a German biblical scholar and orientalist. He served as Professor at Gottingen from 1746 to 1791.

³ 2 Samuel 11:14, 15.

⁴ See 2 Samuel 7.

concerning the divine Inspiration of these: neither is it able to be gathered, α. whether from the citation of Paul, 1 Corinthians 3:19,¹ common to the Poetic Writings of the Gentiles;² β. or from their Poetic and lengthy Discourse, refined afterwards by the Holy Spirit through some Prophet. The θεοπνευστία/ inspiration and αὐθεντία/ authority of the speeches of Job and his friends were sharply debated in the preceding century by two celebrated Theologians, GISBERTUS VOETIUS,³ in his *Disputationum theologicarum*, part I, pages 31, 41, 42, and part V, pages 634-640, and, opposing him, SAMUEL MARESIUS,⁴ in his *adversus Tirinum*,⁵ tome 2, preface, and at greater length in *Controversiarium XXX*, pages 1028, 1029, and also in *Theologo paradox detecto et refutato*, pages 83-87; of which the former appears to detract too much from the normative Authority of the book of Job; the latter appears to ascribe too much authority to the speeches of Job and his Friends. But the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS not so long ago examined painstakingly this controversy in the preface set before the Dutch tractate of a certain *Wilhelm van Houten*, the title of which is *Materiæ selectæ Biblicæ*; and, holding the middle way, in this place he proposed this modest judgment concerning the whole matter.

He supposes it to be granted on both sides that the entire Book of Job was written by the impulse and infallible guidance of the divine Spirit, and that it exhibits an infallible narration of history that most certainly transpired; that, moreover, this Book has, with the remaining Canonical Books of the Old Testament, with which it is enrolled, Authority in all matters of History. Although the Pauline citation of the Book of Job is certainly not able of itself to procure for all the sayings of Job and his Friends the θεοπνευστία/ inspiration and Authority of a Norm; nevertheless, the Most Illustrious *Wesselius* contends that the mode of citation, where in 1 Corinthians 3:19 the Apostle prefixes that γέγραπται γάρ, for it is written, to the sentence of Eliphaz, no less than

¹ Citing Job 5:13.

² Acts 17:28; 1 Corinthians 15:33; Titus 1:12.

³ Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676) was a Dutch Reformed minister and theologian. In 1619, he attended the Synod of Dort as its youngest member. Some years later he was appointed as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1636-1676).

⁴ Maresius, or Samuel Desmarets (1599-1673), was a French Huguenot minister and polemist. He held various ministerial posts, and served as Professor of Theology at Sedan (1625-1636), and at Groningen (1643-1673).

⁵ James Tirinus (1580-1636) was a Flemish Jesuit priest. His abilities as a Biblical exegete are displayed in his *Commentaria in Sacram Scripturam*.

to the words of Psalm 94:11, is a proof, 1. that the Book of Job, from which the following sentence is obtained, belongs to the Canon of the Old Testament: 2. and that, since this saying is cited as Canonical for the sake of proof, the same formula of citation attributes the Authority of a Norm to the sentence of Eliphaz.

Then *Wesselius* judges:

1. That *Maresius* thought too much of the words of Job's Friends, since he pronounces those to be, not only *true in Thesis*, but also *divine*. Seeing that this thesis of theirs was most certainly erroneous, that the pious are not wont to be afflicted so grievously, but only the impious and hypocrites, by a comparison with Job 4:7, 8; and so their Conclusion with respect to Job was not only false, but also the major premise of the Syllogism: and, if they had been enjoying the infallible guidance of the Spirit, they would have been immune, not only to error in thesis, but also in hypothesis/supposition.

2. That *Voetius* falls unto the other extreme, when he writes: "I myself abstain, and teach my students to abstain, from demonstrating the truths of the faith from that place, lest they should appear to adversaries to be built upon sand." For the middle is granted; while not indeed from all the words of Job or his Friends, but nevertheless from certain of them, to be distinguished easily from the rest, one may obtain arguments confirming the truths of the faith.

3. That the Authenticity of History and the Authenticity of Norm are to be properly distinguished.

4. That the whole argument of this Book has the Authenticity of History, as written at the guidance of the Spirit, and is consequently infallibly true.

5. But, as far as the Authenticity of Norm is concerned, he observes:

α. That all the words of God, Job 38-41, as truly set forth by Himself, most certainly have Authenticity of Norm.

β. That Job said some things, either when the weight of his miseries had nearly conquered patience, or when he was in the heat of disputation with his Friends, which do not have the Authenticity of Norm, but were written for our dehortation and admonition: but that a great many other words of Job entirely have the Authenticity of Norm, whether mediate or immediate.

γ. That likewise a great many words of Job's Friends only have the Authenticity of History; but others, set forth summarily by

them, but drawn out by the Writer of the Book of Job at length, have Normative Authenticity:

a. Partly indeed *Immediate*, which is established on Immediate Revelation, which is not able to be denied either to the Writer of the Book of Job, mingling in more things for the sake of extension; or to the Friends of Job, Job 4:17, 18; 33:14-16; or to Job also, Job 6:10; 22:22; 23:12.

b. Partly *Mediate*, or

a. By a *common* divine approbation of the same words as good and *Right*, Job 1:21, 22; 2:10, 13, to which refer the sum of those things that were pertaining to the principal thesis of Job's disputations against his Friends, Job 42:7.

b. Or by *special* approbation of the Spirit of God, found in the citation of several notable sentences out of the book of Job in the books of the Old or New Testament, as was seen above out of 1 Corinthians 3:19.

c. Or they are matters that have regard unto the common doctrine of faith and manners, and that had come from the school of the Patriarchs unto these men; revealed *immediately* to the Patriarchs, and by these men, although not enjoying at this time the impulse of the Spirit, faithfully set forth: consult CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Poeticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter II, § 8, pages 49-51, § 13, pages 64-69.

What our AUTHOR has concerning *some Prophet by the Holy Spirit afterwards polishing the speech* of Job and his Friends; it is a matter for deeper research, and our limitations do not comprehend his worthy discussion. Some at this point name Moses; others, one of Job's friends, perhaps Elihu: others make Solomon, or a contemporary Prophet, the Writer of this Book. But what would prevent us from thinking with the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS, that those things, which are continuous from *chapter 3* to the end of *chapter 41*, or rather *verse 6* of *chapter 42*, in uninterrupted poetry, are the work of Job himself, now restored unto wholeness, and of memory hallowing the plight and most grievous conflict, in which he had been entangled, according to the manner of the times, in the very Tongue and connection of the matters and sentences, to which today we apply our eyes and minds? But, that the Introduction, *chapters 1* and *2*, and the Conclusion, from *verse 7* of *chapter 42* to the end, at least in that habit, were probably attached by one of the Hebrew Prophets, when this Hebræo-Arabic Codex was received into the Canon

of the Jewish Church: but, that when, or under what auspices, this was done is more curious than necessary for the understanding of the Book: see SCHULTENS' *preface* to his *Commentario in Jobum*; SPANHEIM'S¹ *Historiam Jobi*, chapter XVI; WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam*; CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Poeticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter II, § 9-11, pages 51-60; MICHAELIS' *preface in librum Jobi*; our AUTHOR'S *Exercise I in Exercitationibus textualibus*, Part VI, § 18, in which with censure he notes some things that the Most Illustrious VITRINGA wrote sometimes concerning the writing of the Book of Job and its Arabisms, little agreeing in the judgment of MARCKIUS with the divine authority of this Book.

2. Inspiration pertains to *all Matters* contained in Sacred Scripture, α. whether *Dogmatic*, or *Historical*, of whatever time these might be, whether conducted in the age of the Writers or before. Indeed, the Historians often knew without new revelation and infallible inspiration the matters that they were relating, whether by the power of memory, or by the testimony of ἀξιόπιστων/*trustworthy* men, from a comparison with Luke 1:2: but if in narrating these things they were not enjoying θεοπνευστία/*inspiration*, their history would only be a human narration, which would not be able to be the foundation of divine Faith, by which on account of the testimony of God we receive something, as what is not liable, nor is even able to be, to any error at all.

This is to be held against *Grotius*, who in *Voto pro Pace Ecclesiastica*, pages 99, 100, has this: "I have indeed said that not all the books that are in the Hebrew Canon were dictated by the Holy Spirit. —It was not needful that the histories be dictated by the Holy Spirit. It was enough that the writer by memory be proficient concerning the matters observed, or by diligence be proficient in describing the historical journals of the ancients. —If Luke, with the divine afflatus dictating, had written his own, thence he would have taken authority to himself, as the Prophets did, rather than from witnesses, whose faith he followed.² Thus in writing those things that he saw Paul doing, he had no need of any afflatus dictating. What, therefore, is the reason why the books of Luke are Canonical? because the Church of the first ages judged them to be written piously and faithfully, and concerning matters of the greatest moment to salvation." This opinion of *Grotius* is followed by

¹ That is, the Younger.

² Luke 1:1-4; Hebrews 13:7.

Spinoza,¹ in his *Tractato Theologico-Politico*, chapter XI, and by the Author of the book, *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*:² see SIMON'S³ *Critique de Nouveau Testament*, chapter XXIII, pages 273, 274. Thus also Hobbes in *Leviathan*, chapter VII: "The same is the manner of the histories written by Prophets in the name of God and of the others written, for example, by Livy,⁴ Curtius;⁵ so, if we would not believe Livy, that an ox spoke,⁶ we disbelieve, not God, but Livy, etc.": against whom see COCQUIUS'⁷ *Hobbesianismi Anatomen*, locus I, chapter I, § 3, pages 5-7. This also is the objection of the Jews against the divinity of the Books of the New Testament, that Luke himself, Luke 1:1-3, testifies that he did not write his Gospel by the afflatus and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but of his own will and according to the relation of trustworthy witnesses; unto which STAPFER responds, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 3, chapter XI, section I, § 331, 333, 334, pages 265, 266, 268-271. Consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter I, § 8, canon 1, 2, pages 54-56; RIVET'S⁸ *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter II, § 4-8, opera, tome 2, page 856. Add SPANHEIM'S *de Historicis Euangeliorum Scriptoribus*, in the Appendix to book II of *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquorum*, § 2-9, opera, tome 2, column 266-274, where he encounters Henry Dodwell, in whose *Dissertationibus in Irenæum* he relates, "He, being

¹ Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) was a Jewish-Dutch philosopher, and one of the great Rationalists in the tradition of Descartes.

² Jean Le Clerc (1657-1736) was educated in Geneva, under the tutelage of Philippe Mestrezat and Francis Turretin, and ordained circa 1680. His sympathy for the theology of the Remonstrants made it impossible for him to continue in Geneva. He settled as Professor of Philosophy at Amsterdam (1684-1731). In his *Sentimens*, Le Clerc finds fault with much of Richard Simon's work, but his critical approach to the Scripture is similar to that of Simon.

³ Richard Simon (1638-1712) was a French priest, orientalist, and biblical critic, sometimes called "the father of higher criticism".

⁴ Titus Livius (c. 59 BC-17 AD) wrote a history of Rome, *Ab Urbe Condita*, from its founding to the time of Augustus.

⁵ Quintus Curtius Rufus (d. 53) was a Roman and a historian. *Historiæ Alexandri Magni* is his only surviving work.

⁶ *Ab Urbe Condita* 35.

⁷ Gisbertus Cocquius (1630-1708) of Utrecht was a Reformed thinker and doctor of philosophy; he opposed Hobbes.

⁸ Andrew Rivet (1573-1651) was a Huguenot minister and divine. He ministered at Sedan and at Thouara; he went on to teach at the University of Leiden (1619-1632) and at the college at Breda. His influence among Protestants extended well beyond France.

unwilling, and not without some upset, read some things, which, as they lie, appear not a little to disturb the authenticity and reverence of the Gospels. That is, that the Writers of the Gospel History have no other *infallibility* than that they were faithful *witnesses* of those things that either they had seen or heard, in an *ordinary manner* of relating, with no interposition of any *afflatus*, or *θεοπνευστίας*/*inspiration*. Thus *Tradition*, upon which the belief of the Books of the New Testament, and of the Gospels in particular, rests, *is no firmer than that which belongs to Irenæus; Irenæus, Clement, and the rest have an Equal Authority with them, nor were these Fathers of the second Century less infallible, in matters of history and of fact; —Neither does any note appear from which you might gather that less was attributed to the Apocryphal Gospels, than to the true; the Apocrypha is praised with equal honor, for example, by Ignatius of Antioch, with which the true are also honored:”* then read *Spanheim* disputing against these things. Consult also the things to be taught below, *Chapter 33, § 10*. That *θεοπνευστίαν*/*inspiration* is not to be denied to the Writers of the *Historical Books*, whether of the Old or New Testament, *DINANT* also contends in his *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter III, § 16, 20, pages 387-390, 399-404, § 22, pages 405-414, § 30-33, pages 427-444, § 38, 39, 458-465*.

And, among these inspired histories, our *AUTHOR* says that the *Mosaic Genesis* is to be held specifically and in the first place: while *Episcopius*¹ hardly appears to recognize any other foundation for the verity of the primeval history that is contained in *Genesis*, than human reason and tradition, and the confidence of posterity applied to this tradition: whom, therefore, *TRIGLAND* refutes in his *Antapologia, chapter XVII, pages 258, 259*, observing that reason is not sufficient for the understanding of the things that are narrated at the beginning of *Genesis*; neither is tradition, unless you would say that the same is similarly sufficient for founding *Papal Theological science and doctrine*. And our *AUTHOR* rightly observes: *α. that Moses is set forth to us as the greatest and most faithful of the Prophets, to whom, before others, divine revelations were familiar, Numbers 12:7, 8, upon which text see above, Chapter 1, and DINANT’S de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter III, § 13, pages 373-378; Deuteronomy 34:10. β. That the narration of Moses*

¹ *Simon Episcopius* (1583-1643) was a Dutch theologian. He studied at the University of Leiden under *Jacobus Arminius*, and embraced his teacher’s distinctive doctrines. He became a leader among the *Remonstrants*, playing a significant role at the *Synod of Dort* (1618).

concerning the first Creation no man without the revelation of God was able to know. γ. But if *θεοπνευστία*/inspiration was ever needful, certainly it was needful in the writing of *Genesis*, since upon that hangs all the confidence of the Creation, Integrity, Fall, and Restoration of mankind.

And it was not necessary that Moses either note the individual moments of Time in which the divine Revelations came to him; or note on the individual parts of the history that these were divinely revealed to him.

It was possible that in some things Moses had certain *Historical Helps* from the *Fathers*, yet this cannot be demonstrated with certainty: if those helps were available to Moses, it is not thence concluded that he, with respect to those, did not need the immediate guidance of the Spirit; just as in the Conversion of man the immediate Grace of God is conjoined with the Word: see at length MARCKIUS' *Exercitationes textuales* I, Part VI, § 16, 21; with whom compare VITRINGA'S *Sacrarum Observationum*, book I, chapters IV, V; PETRUS BROUWER, Pastor of Barneveld, in his *Dissertatione philologico-theologica, qua disquiritur, unde Moses res in libro Geneseos descriptas didicerit*, publicly set forth at Leiden in 1753. Especially in the place cited of our AUTHOR, § 16, pages 37, 39, you will see the twofold hypothesis of *Vitringa* recalled to the anvil, a hypothesis insufficiently agreeing, according to our AUTHOR, with the reverence due to the divine origin of *Genesis*. Also deserving of attention is an Anonymous French tract, published at Brussels: *Conjectures sur les Memoires Originaux, dont il paroit que Moysse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese, avec des Remarques, etc.*:¹ in this tract the AUTHOR at great length attempts to render it probable that Moses had multiple historical journals, from which he composed the Book of *Genesis*, both written by the Patriarchs, and received by the neighboring nations also; among which two stand out as distinguished everywhere by the use of the divine name, *אֱלֹהִים*/*Elohim* in the one, and *יהוה*/*Jehovah* in the other; and, arranging the text of *Genesis* by various columns, by conjecture he attempts to show what Moses took from each journal. Now, conjectures of this sort are able with due solemnity to be harmonized with the *θεοπνευστία*/inspiration of the subject matter of the Book of *Genesis*; if we observe, that if, 1. the history of Creation and similar things, which were not able to be known by any mortal man without divine Revelation, Moses now found among the papers of the Patriarchs, those

¹ Written by Jean Astruc.

things were necessarily revealed by God to the earlier Patriarchs: 2. That Moses described neither these things nor all the other things in the Book of *Genesis*, unless taught by the guidance of the Spirit concerning those things that were to be referred unto the use of the Church, and advised concerning the most certain truth of all these. Now, from those papers, of which Moses not improbably made use, the AUTHOR of that French tract seeks an argument for Moses as the author of *Genesis*, against those that maintain that at a much later time this book was stitched together by human effort: since Moses was well able to obtain the necessary helps for the writing of this history; but at a later time it would have been impossible to obtain the journals necessary for this matter: see *Remarque XVI*, page 452-464; but compare TRIGLAND'S *Antapologiam*, chapter II, pages 38; and HENDRIK LUSSING'S *de Noodzekelykheid van den Godtsdienst in 't gemeen, en de Zekerheid van den Christelyken in 't byzonder, veweert*, volume 2, treatise 6, chapter 3, § 690-707, pages 86-126, where he recalls to the anvil the hypotheses of that French Author just now mentioned.

β. It is likewise so that Inspiration pertains to *all the Matters* contained in Sacred Scripture, whether the Matters delivered be *Good* or *Evil*: in both the Sacred Scriptures are equally Infallible and trustworthy, on account of the same guidance of the Holy Spirit in both. Nevertheless, in this they differ, that evil Matters have only the Authenticity of History, not of Norm, for example, when it is read in Psalm 14:1, *The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God, etc.* But good Matters have the Authenticity of History and of Norm at the same time. So, the *Authenticity of History* is universal, and it has equal regard to all the parts of Sacred Scripture: now, that procures for its an historical faith, for whatever is delivered in the Sacred Codex is believed to have been written down *ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΩΣ*, by *inspiration*, with the greatest trustworthiness and without any error, and to that extent is not able to be called into doubt with respect to historical truthfulness. But the *Authenticity of Norm* binds at once to obedience or adherence, whereby many things contained in Sacred Scripture, are not only narrated truly, but also have a binding virtue; so that they might oblige the conscience of man to faith, obedience, and the observation and imitation of those things that are set forth as to be believed, observed, done, and imitated for salvation.

γ. No distinction is to be made between *Matters Weightier* and

Lighter, as do the *Socinians*,¹ and, among the *Remonstrants*, *Episcopius* and his followers, as if the Holy Writers, at least in some things, in minute matters, in historical circumstances, were without the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, and hence in those things they were able to err by lapse of memory, ignorance, human frailty, or they did err actually and on some occasions: see HOORNBECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, tome I, book I, chapter I, section I, pages 2-8; TRIGLAND'S² *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen*, volume 4, page 585; *Catechesin Racovianam* "de Scriptura Sacra", chapter I, question 10, page 6 at the beginning.

Their *πρώτα ψεύδη*, *principal errors*, are, that what things are diverse are adverse; that what things are *δυσνόητα*, *hard to understand*, are false; that some errors, that were introduced into the Codices, were innate in the Scripture. Their *Scope/Goal*: to loose the reigns to reason in explaining and accommodating Sacred Scripture to their own ideas.

But opposing are, α. *general passages*, 2 Timothy 3:16; Psalm 12:6. β. *In this way the weight of the things contained in Sacred Scripture is rashly lightened*, while the greatest things often depend upon the least (the least at least in appearance); and thus *is suspended* the weight of the argument of Sacred Scripture *upon the changing will of men*: while there is controversy concerning many heads of the faith; what one esteems little, the other judges to be of great moment. γ. Whence in this way divine faith concerning the whole Codex of Scripture is very much shaken: see HOORNBECK at some length in his *Socinianismo confutato*, tome I, book I, chapter I, section II, pages 8-20; ARNOLDI'S³ *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, pages 16, 17, § 11.

a. Neither ought it to be objected by the *Author of the Criticism* also *upon the Critique of Simon*, or *Le Clerc*, that the Apostles themselves distinguish their own sayings from the sayings of Christ; therefore, they are not equally infallible in all things, from a comparison with 1 Corinthians 7:10, 12, 25: as if Paul had not thus spoken, if his hearers had believed that his words are equally infallible with those of Christ Himself. But well does WITSIUS observe, in his *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXII, § 31, that Paul in this chapter treats matters

¹ Fausto Paolo Sozzini, or Faustus Socinus (1539-1604), was the father of Socinianism, a rationalistic heresy (denying the Deity of Christ, the satisfaction theory of the atonement, etc.), an aberration of the Reformation.

² That is, Jacob Trigland the Elder.

³ Nicolaus Arnoldi (1618-1680) was Professor of Theology at Franeker (1651-1680).

of a diverse sort. Concerning some things the express commandment of the Lord was formerly heard, as concerning Divorce, from a comparison with Matthew 5:32; 19:3-9; concerning other things the commandment was not yet explicit. Concerning *the former*, says Paul, *I do not speak*, ye do not hear this for the first time from me, *but the Lord spoke previously*. Concerning *the latter*, *I speak, not the Lord*, that is, Christ hitherto commanded nothing concerning this matter; I am the first to set forth the mind of the Lord. Yet not by human argumentation only without internal Revelation, but by the instinct of Christ. For there was not wanting to him *δοκιμὴν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ λαλοῦντος Χριστου*, *proof of Christ speaking in him*, 2 Corinthians 13:3. Similarly in 1 Corinthians 7:25, *I do not have a precept of the Lord*, that is, on formerly expressed, which would oblige all universally. *Γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι*, *but I give a judgment*, that is, I suggest a counsel of prudence concerning that which may be expedient, here and now. Yet it was not fetched from my stock, but from the instinct of the Spirit, as one *to whom the Lord through mercy has granted to be faithful*. Verse 40 is altogether to be brought in for comparison, *μακαριωτέρα δὲ ἐστὶν ἐὰν οὕτω μείνη, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ καγὼ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν*, *But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God*. See also HEIDEGGER'S *Exercitationes Biblicas*, *Dissertation II*, § 19; DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, *chapter III*, § 34, *pages 448-452*, § 73, *pages 551-555*.

b. The *δυσνόητα*, *things hard to understand*, or the various Doubts agitated, which are found in the Sacred Codex, are not to be objected: since the *δυσνόητα*, *things hard to understand*, are not then *ἄπορα/impossible* or false; neither are things always truly opposed, which indeed seem so to us. α. The Scripture is not to be rashly accused of error here, but rather the sluggishness of our nature is to be acknowledged, on account of which it is not given to us to discover the fitting manner of solution, perhaps yet to be uncovered to posterity. Thus, for example, many things are given in Sacred Scripture, which perhaps a simple rustic will never solve, yet easily to be resolved by us: so also other difficulties are able to be presented, of which the correct explanation exceeds the keenness of our ability. β. All ways of harmonization are to be attempted, according to which the difficulties presented are able to be loosed, if not demonstratively, at least probably. γ. If an error, which nevertheless happens exceedingly rarely, be most

manifest, it is never to be attributed to the Writers, but to the Copyists, who were not θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired*: and the Sacred Codex is not so much to be accused because of one or two lapses of this sort by copyists, as, on the other hand, the goodness and singular care come to be proclaimed and adored with admiration, by which it has happened that with the passing of so many ages have errors of this sort crept into so few passages. Best of all, AUGUSTINE, *Epistola XIX, ad Hieronymum*, or according to the Benedictine edition, LXXXII, *chapter III, opera, tome 2, column 144*, which GRATIAN also entered into his *Decretum*,¹ *Distinction IX, Canon V*: “I have learned to bestow only upon those Books of Scripture that are called Canonical this fear and honor, that I most firmly believe that none of those authors has erred in the writing of anything. And if I might encounter anything in those books, which might appear to be contrary to the truth; it must be the case that either the codex is faulty, or the interpreter has not followed what has been said, or I have not understood:” consult HOORNBECK’S *Socinianismum confutatum, tome I, book I, chapter I, section III, pages 20-23*.

3. Finally, Inspiration pertains, not only to Matters, but also to *all the Words*, 2 Samuel 23:2; 2 Peter 1:21; Matthew 10:19, 20, in which then nothing unsuitable occurs, but the words are always *agreeable to the substance and worthy of God*. The Apostles spoke τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι, *the wonderful works of God, as the Spirit gave to them utterance*, Acts 2:4; add the assertion of Paul concerning this mark, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 13. Hence Sacred Scripture is so often called דְּבַר־אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *the word of our God*, דְּבַר־יְהוָה, *the word of the Lord*, τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the oracles of God*, ῥῆμα Θεοῦ, *the word/utterance of God*, τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου, *the word/utterance of the Lord*, Psalm 119 everywhere, Isaiah 40:8;² Romans 3:2;³ Ephesians 6:17;⁴ 1 Peter 1:25.⁵ Consult on 2 Samuel 23:2, DINANT’S *de Achtbaarheid van*

¹ Johannes Gratian was a theologian and canon lawyer from Bologna. He composed his *Concordia discordantium canonum*, commonly called *Decretum Gratiani* (circa 1150), to aid in the study of canon law.

² Isaiah 40:8: “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God (דְּבַר־אֱלֹהֵינוּ; τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, in the Septuagint) shall stand for ever.”

³ Romans 3:2: “Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ).”

⁴ Ephesians 6:17: “And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God (ῥῆμα Θεοῦ).”

⁵ 1 Peter 1:25: “But the word of the Lord (τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου) endureth for

Godts Woord, chapter III, § 14, pages 378-381: on 2 Peter 1:21, my *Commentarium in loco*; DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 15, pages 381-387: on Matthew 10:19, 20, DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 23, 24, 32, pages 414-420, 435-437: on Acts 2:4, DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 27, pages 423, 424, who also strenuously fights for the extension of the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /inspiration of the Sacred Codex to the very Words against Simon, Le Clerc, etc., *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 43-49, pages 473-494: and then he writes an exceptional apology for the Style of the Sacred Amanuenses, both of the Old and New Testaments, against all Pseudo-critics, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter IV, pages 561-742. That the Inspiration of the divine Word pertains, not only to the Matter, but also to *all the Words*, LAMPE elaborates admirably well, *Dissertatione philologico-theologica*, volume II, Disputation X, § 9-31, pages 359-378.

α. *In vain is the Diversity of Styles and Expressions in the diverse Writers Objected.* Since to this God prudently accommodated Himself in writing, as to the sound of one's voice in speaking; as one had a greater and clearer, and another a more feeble, which here implies no difference. The Diversity of Styles is also able to be compared with the diverse sounds of Musical Instruments, although they be played and beaten by the same Artist. That is, on the one hand, the Holy Spirit by His supernatural influence did not overwhelm the natural faculty of the holy Prophets and Amanuenses, and so dictate by some $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}$ /enthusiasm the particular Words that they should write, that no rational operation of the Men of God in considering and arranging them intervened; that in their own mind they conceived, arranged, and shaped nothing. For this does not agree with a difference of Style. Neither, on the other hand, is it to be said that the matters were inspired by God; but that the Style, Speech, and Words were left to the will of the Writer: that the Holy Spirit only took care of His directing, lest they should stray at all from His intention. But the native habit and character of Style is to be distinguished from its accommodation to the divine mysteries and writing to be noted down. The Holy Spirit left to each his character, his customary manner of speaking, and his natural gifts: but, when the Holy Spirit applied these natural gifts, this manner of speaking proper to each, to the setting forth of the divine oracles, or to the consigning of them to

ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.”

letters, He supplied Words to them according to their ability, and in suggesting words accommodated Himself to the particular character and diction of the Writer; indeed, He selected for Himself such a Writer, of which sort He knew to be especially suitable to express this or that character of speech, so that the construction of the speech might flow naturally, as it were. Therefore, the Style was proper and peculiar to the individual Writers; but the Words, which, having been accommodated to this Style, they were setting forth or writing, belonged to the Holy Spirit, making use of their ministry in speaking or writing. Most aptly does the Most Illustrious RIVET, in his *Isagoge ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter II, § 18, call the holy Writers *living pens*, and illustrate this matter by a comparison drawn from a skilled Scribe, who aptly makes use of diverse pens, sometimes finer and sharper, sometimes thicker and blunt; in which case indeed the letters and writing of the are to be fully attributed to the Scribe; but a guidance subtler or coarser is to be ascribed to the character and habit of the pen, being finer or thicker: see and read over RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter II, § 9 and following, *opera*, tome 2, page 856-858; HEIDANUS'¹ *Corpus Theologiæ*, tome I, locus I, page 36; HEIDEGGER'S *Exercitationes Biblicas*, Dissertation II, § 20, page 23; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter I, § 8, canon 3, pages 57, 58; *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter I, § 23, pages 62, 63; BUDDEUS' *Institutiones Theologiæ dogmaticæ*, book I, chapter II, § 10, pages 121-127, tome I; WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XI, § 11-14; SCHULTENS' *Excursus III, adversus Honert*,² chapter V, § 53, 54, page 229-231. Compare SIMON'S *Critique du Nouveau Testament*, chapters XXIII, XXIV, where with criticism he relates a contention, which in the year 1586, because of this business, came between the Jesuits of Louvain with the Theological Professors of Louvain and Douai. Add PFAFF'S³ *Historiam Formulæ Consensus Helveticæ*, chapter I, § 8, in which he relates

¹ Abraham Heidanus (1597-1678) was a Dutch Reformed minister and Cocceian theologian. He served as professor of theology at Leiden from 1648 to 1676, but he was ultimately dismissed for his Cartesianism.

² Jan van den Honert (1693-1758) was a Dutch Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1727-1734), and later at Leiden (1734-1758).

³ Christoph Matthæus Pfaff (1686-1760) was a German Lutheran Theologian of encyclopedic learning. He was appointed Professor of Theology at Tubingen (1716). Within four years, he became chancellor, and held the post for thirty-six years.

the history of the controversy concerning the Inspiration of the Sacred Scripture, whether substantial only, or also verbal, and on behalf of verbal Inspiration also he cites the most excellent of the Reformed and of the Lutherans; by which latter he affirms this opinion to be universally received at this day. The Most Illustrious GISBERT AB ISENDORRN, Professor of Philosophy at Harderwijk,¹ related to my reverend grandfather, Peter Montanus,² that he heard *Daniel Tilenus* of Sedan,³ at which time he was beginning to befriend members of the Remonstrants, in the public reading reciting these words: “The Prophets of God in the Old Testament and the Apostles in the New Testament were not led by the Holy Spirit in such a way that they were His own proper organs and instruments: they were able to write, now one way, now another, what was pleasing to themselves; not necessarily what the Holy Spirit dictated.”

β. It is likewise *objected* in vain, that Every error was not able to be prevented by the Men of God, which is inconsistent with the *θεοπνευστία*/*inspiration* of the words: since Paul, in Acts 23:5, *a.* professes that he did not know the High Priest, which is scarcely credible; *b.* with an excuse added, he acknowledges the weakness of the soul, whence some harsh words had fallen from his lips: for which he now begs pardon with an excuse absurd and inept, saying: Οὐκ ἤδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς: γέγραπται γάρ, Ἄρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς, *I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.*

Response: *a.* With respect to the *first:* 1. It is not so unbelievable that Paul simply did not know that Ananias was at that time High Priest, since the Apostle had been absent from Jerusalem, and that for a long time; neither was the High Priest by any notable sign distinguished in the Senate from the rest; and the Pontifical dignity was very desultory, bestowed at one time by the Roman Prefects, at another time by the Jewish Kings, now to this one, not to that one, and a little afterward at pleasure withdrawn from the same, so that within the space

¹ Gisbert ab Isendoorn (1601-1657) served as Professor of Philosophy, first at Deventer (1634-1647), than at Harderwijk (1647-1657).

² Petrus Montanus (1631-1679), a Dutch Reformed minister, was the grandfather of De Moor's wife, Alida Frederica Montanus.

³ Daniel Tilenus (1563-1633) was a Protestant theologian of the Academy of Sedan. Although initially a Calvinist, he embraced the Arminian teaching, and was embroiled in controversy the rest of his life.

of one year, sometimes as many as three managed the Pontificate.

2. Also, Paul was able to have heard that a voice was uttered by one of the Jews, but to have been ignorant from whom that had proceeded: at the same time, againt him that had ordered that he be struck, he warned that a punishment had been prepared by the Lord, whoever he might be: to which exegesis, whether that $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon$, *he said unto him*, verse 3, is so great a hindrance, as indeed it appears to WOLF in his *Curis Philologicis* on verse 5, I doubt.

3. Others explain *not to know* as *not to acknowledge*; whether Paul, *a.* speaks in general, *I do not acknowledge him to be High Priest*, in addition to Jesus Christ, after this latter High Priest has been made manifest and perfected through sufferings;¹ so that whoever might now carry himself as High Priest is to be held as a *whited wall*, and only bears an empty name, which is the opinion of LIGHTFOOT.² *b.* Or he also asserts concerning Ananias in particular, *I do not acknowledge this man to be High Priest*; because *this Pontifical dignity he had acquired for money*, as GROTIUS has it. Now, this Illustrious Man adds, *Paul had learned this from Gamaliel, that the Judge that gave money in order to acquire this honor is actually not Judge, nor to be honored, but to be held as an ass: as it is in the portion of the Talmud: de Synedrio.* In a peculiar manner, the Jews call such Magistrates *Gods of gold and silver*, and *deny that they are to be revered.*

4. Perhaps best of all, with our AUTHOR you might take these words ironically or sarcastically, *of a witty reproof of behavior not at all fitting, because of which Paul had not been able to identify the High Priest.* “From the High Priest,” says the Most Illustrious RIVET, *Isagoge ad Scripturam Sacram, chapter XXI, § 7, opera, tome 2, page 971a*, “Paul had not thought this voice to have proceeded, because of his authority, of which it was unworthy that so rash a sign of displeasure be displayed, and because of his at least simulated holiness, from which it was not appearing that so iniquitous a voice would proceed.” The Most Illustrious WERENFELS,³ in *Cogitationibus ad loca Novi Testamenti*,

¹ 1 Peter 1:20; Hebrews 2:10; 5:9, 10.

² John Lightfoot (1602-1675) was a minister and divine of such distinction and learning that he was invited to sit as a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. He specialized in Rabbinic learning and lore. He brought that learning to bear in his defense of Erastianism in the Assembly, and in his comments upon Holy Scripture.

³ Samuel Werenfels (1657-1740) was a Swiss theologian. He served as a member of the theological faculty at Basel (1696-1740). He was a moderate

Opuscula, page 327, calls this ignorance *legal*, when, for example, we say that we do not know that which we have the right not to know: thus, for the sake of example, it is not known that one is a Legate, until he shows letters held in trust; it is not known that one is a Prince, unless he makes known his dignity, as it is needful, and maintains it, which Ananias does not here do.

b. But with respect to the remaining words added;

1. Those things do not imply that Paul unknowingly violated that commandment concerning not cursing the Prince.¹ For this would be an inept excuse: for even if Paul had not known Ananias to be High Priest, yet he did know him to be one of the Judges: but neither was it lawful to curse a private man.

2. Now, Paul, when he said in *verse 3*, *τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε κεκονιαμένε*, etc., *God shall smite thee, thou whited wall, etc.*, by the prophetic Spirit according to the manner of the Prophets he frankly rebuked the hypocrisy of this Assessor of the Sanhedrin, and he did not in fact imprecate the judgments of God, but rather foretold them, with the event confirming the prophecy. For, according to the observation of GROTIUS, whether by Ananias' death or removal, not long after this time Ishmael ben Fabus was appointed.²

3. Therefore, Paul does not make use of an excuse in *verse 5*, in which he acknowledges fault; but he utters an apology, in which he exculpates himself, and demonstrates himself to have acted rightly. Indeed, he protests that he, well mindful of the divine Law, did not break out into these words contrary to the Law, neither did he utter abuse forbidden by the Law. Seeing that his speech is not a hot-tempered imprecation, but a just rebuke of a man not maintaining, as it is proper, his dignity, with a warning of punishment conjoined; neither did it proceed from a bad spirit, but from a better and superior principle. And thus that apology is not all unworthy of the Spirit of God. Consult WITSIUS' *Miscellaneous sacrorum*, tome I, book I, chapter XXII, § 24-27, where he defends this saying of Paul against *Le Clerc*.

Calvinist, seeking to harmonize Reformed theology and Enlightenment thought.

¹ Exodus 22:28.

² Ananias ben Nebedeus was High Priest from 46 to 58; Ishmael ben Fabus, from 58 to 62.

§ 6: The Certainty of the Inspiration and Authority of Scripture

So that the more prudent *Papists* might avoid the odium of that crude doctrine, concerning the absolute dependence of the ἀϑεντία/*authority* of the Scripture on the Church; they began to distinguish between the *Authority* of Scripture *in itself* and *with respect to us*: these acknowledge that the Scripture is Authentic and divine absolutely and *in itself*, because it proceeded from the God of truth; but they do not think that that Authority obtains relatively and *with respect to us*, except because of the testimony of the Church: see *Bellarmino*, in his *Controversiis*, tome 2, book II, *de Conciliis*, chapter XII, column 108. While our men maintain that that distinction has been contrived in order to construct a sham, rather than to explain the truth of the matter: because Authority is of the genus of relative things, and to that extent to be regarded relatively; whence Scripture is not able to be Authoritative *in itself*, without also being such *with respect to us*: for what arguments procure Authority to that *with respect to itself*, the same also ought to move us to furnish the humble compliance of faith to the Scripture as divine, so that thus it would also be Authoritative *with respect to us*. Therefore, our AUTHOR does not at all likewise suspend the Authority of Scripture with respect to us upon the testimony of the Church: but he says that as *the Divinity of Scripture*, and *the connected Authority*, flow spontaneously from *Infalible Inspiration alone*; so also he asserts that *the Faith of its Divinity*, and *the Authority of Scripture with respect to us flowing hence*, depends, α. upon the Spirit as Teacher, β. upon the engrafted Notes of Divinity as a Foundation, γ. upon the Church preserving, proclaiming, etc., as the ordinary Instrument, acting here Ministerially. A threefold Questions concerning the knowledge of the Divinity of Scripture is able to be formed, the first concerning the *argument* because of which I believe the Scripture to be θεόπνευστον/*inspired*, and myself, therefore to be obliged to receive the same by a divine faith: the second concerning the *principium* or *efficient cause*, by which I am led to believe: the third concerning the *means* and *instrument*, through which I believe. To which Questions a threefold answer is given: That is, The *Scripture* has in its Notes the likeness of an *argument* because of which I believe: The *Holy Spirit* is after the manner of an

efficient cause and principium, by which it comes to pass that I believe: But the *Church* is the *instrument* and means, through which I believe. Which we observe both against the *Papists*, concerning whom there is a painstaking treatment in § 7: and against some *Enthusiasts*, who throw the faith of the Divinity of the Scripture back upon the testimony of a private Spirit; see SPANHEIM *the Younger's Elenchum Controversiarum cum Enthusiastis*, § 2, *opera*, tome 3, column 778; compare SPANHEIM'S *Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, XVI, § 8: and against *Episcopius* and others, who trace the confidence of the Divinity of the Sacred Scripture from the constant tradition of the Church, Jewish and Christian: see SPANHEIM *the Younger's Elenchum Controversiarum cum Arminianis*, § 1, column 856, *opera*, tome 3. Röellius¹ also recedes here from the common path, when he uniquely appeals to the judgment and authority of Reason: "Who would believe," says he, "that God willed to imprint His Word, if He wished it to be on record, in such obscure characters, that, if it be weighed in the just scales of Reason, its Divinity might be doubted, and one might be able to be persuaded by no arguments certain, familiar, and above all exception? etc." And one of his disciples, whom he applauded as a dearest Grandchild born to Great things, in his *Disputazione Inaugurale* expressly writes: "The Divinity of Scripture, upon which all its Authority depends, is not able to be constructed from any other source than Reason: now, there is no reason why in this reasoning we are less able to be mistaken than in other reasonings:" see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 4, 5; JACOBUS FRUYTIER'S² *Zions Worstelingen*, third discussion, volume 1, pages 588-649. COCQUIUS, in his *Anatome Hobbesianismi*, locus III, chapter IV, pages 20-33, also takes it upon himself to refute these theses of Hobbes, whose theses deviate far from the truth in this argument:

1. Christian men are not able to know that the Sacred Scripture is the Word of God, but they only believe it to be so, because they heard those affirming it that by law were appointed to teach us, namely, parents in the home, pastors in the Churches.

2. The Canonization of Sacred Scripture pertain to him that has the highest power in the State. In his hands is the power of bringing it to

¹ Hermann Alexander Röell (1653-1718) was a Dutch Reformed philosopher (Cartesian) and theologian. He served as Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Franeker (1685-1704), and as Professor of Natural Theology at Utrecht (1704-1718).

² Jacobus Fruytier (1659-1731) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian.

pass that the Scriptures are laws. And, unless the authority of the one having the highest power be added, the Sacred Scriptures by no means have the force of Law. That the Sacred Scriptures might be the rule of faith, Christian Kings alone were able to bring to pass.

3. When we believe the Sacred Scripture to be the Word of God, our faith is terminated in the Church, in the authority of which we acquiesce.

4. When and what God might have spoken is not able to be known by those to whom no supernatural revelation has been given, except through that natural reason, whereby, for the sake of obtaining peace and justice, they submitted themselves to the authority of the highest powers. Compare BUDDEUS' *Atheismum et Superstitionem*, chapter I, § 27, pages 108, 109, 111.

1. That the Spirit ought to be considered here as *Teacher* by His Illumination, we prove, α . both *from the natural Blindness of man*, 1 Corinthians 2:14; β . and *from the operation, attributed to Him, of Illumination and Faith, whole and in particular, which is bound to the Scriptures* as divine, Psalm 119:18; John 16:13; 2 Corinthians 4:13; 1 John 5:6. And so from the Spirit is that internal persuasion of mind, which the faithful enjoy, concerning the truth and divinity of the Scriptures: for it is the persuasion of Faith, which is able to have no other author than the Spirit of God and of Faith. And, just as the light of Reason is necessary to give assent to propositions known of themselves, as that the whole is greater than a part of it, that we ought to follow good and to avoid evil, etc., which you would thrust upon a horse or mule in vain, because it is destitute of intellect: so the light of Grace and Faith is necessary to you, that you might give a decent assent unto revealed truths as proceeding from God and dictated by God's Spirit. Compare *Confessionem Belgicam*, article 5;¹ *Byvoegsel tot het Formulier van Ondertekeninge gestalt by de Classis van Walcheren anno 1693*,² article 1; BRAHÉ'S¹ *Aanmerkingen over de vyf*

¹ Belgic Confession 5: "We receive all these books, and these only, as holy and canonical, for the regulation, foundation, and confirmation of our faith; believing without any doubt, all things contained in them, not so much because the Church receives and approves them as such, but more especially because the Holy Ghost witnesseth in our hearts, that they are from God, whereof they carry the evidence in themselves. For the very blind are able to perceive that the things foretold in them are fulfilling."

² The Five Walcheren Articles (1693) were adopted by the Dutch Classes of Walcheren to resist the encroachment of the Rationalistic view of Röell and Bekker.

Walchese Artikelen, § 6-13, pages 7-24; STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS'² *Theses Theologicas inaugurales de Verbo Dei*, theses 70-72, 75, 76, pages 447-450, 454, 455; WITSIUS' *Dissertationem Epistolicam ad Huberum*,³ in which there is a calm disputation concerning the Divine Authority of Sacred Scripture, to be built upon Reason alone, pages 3-46; ULRICH HUBER'S *de Jure Civitatis*, book I, section VI, chapters I-VI.

2. That the innate criteria is the Foundation of the Faith of the Divinity of Scripture, is proven, α. *by reason of the sole and ultimate Principium that the Scripture has, which hence is not to be demonstrated from another source*: for it is the nature of first Principles, that they are known of themselves, and that they are not able to be demonstrated from another source, because otherwise the matter would regress infinitely; whence BASIL the GREAT, on Psalm 115, or more correctly 116, *opera*, tome I, page 269, Ἀνάγκη ἐκάστης μαθήσεως ἀνεξετάστους εἶναι ἀρχὰς τοῖς μανθάνουσιν, with respect to the force of each act of learning apart from inquiry, these are the principia to those learning by inquiry. Now, such a Principium is the Sacred Scripture, 2 Peter 1:19; Isaiah 8:20; Luke 16:29, etc.: see above, Chapter I, §32, 33. β. *Whence Scripture is considered as the Foundation of the Church, upon which it rests, and whence the Church borrows all its Authority, Ephesians 2:20. And indeed our AUTHOR, with CALVIN and many others, thinks it to be superior that we understand here the Real Foundation of the Church, which the Apostles and Prophets laid by doctrine, which indeed they preached by mouth, but also at the same time left written in the pages of the Old and New Testaments, so that it might not only be an infallible norm to the Church in faith and piety, but also a principium firm and confirming; in which manner the distinction, which in the text the Apostle makes between the Foundation and the Λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον, the chief corner stone, is better observed, than if with Beza, Cocceius, and others, we should think that this place treats of Christ as the Personal Foundation, and should propose the same under both metaphorical expressions, θεμελίου/foundation and λίθου ἀκρογωνιαίου, chief corner stone*: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XLIII, Part III, *Exercitationes* § 6-8.

¹ Jan Jacob Brahé (1726-1776) was a Dutch Reformed minister.

² Etienne Gausсен (died 1675) was a French Reformed Theologian. He served at Saumur as Professor of Logic and Metaphysics (1661-1664), then as Professor of Theology (1664-1675).

³ Ulrich Huber (1636-1694) was a Dutch jurist and political philosopher. He served as Professor of Law at Franeker (1665-1679, 1683-1694).

But, if the Doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets, comprehended in the Old and New Testaments, be the Foundation, upon which the Church and its individual members are built; then certainly the Church is not able to procure Authority for the Scripture either with respect to Itself, or with respect to Us: for the cause does not depend upon the effect, nor the principium/beginning upon the thing begun, nor the foundation upon the edifice. *They take exception:* Both things are able to be true, that the Church borrows its Authority from the Scripture, and the Scripture in turn from the Church; in the same way as John the Baptist gave testimony to Christ, who also Himself gave testimony to John. *Response:* It is one thing to give testimony to someone as a Minister, as John witnessed concerning Christ, that δι' αὐτοῦ, *through him*, not δι' αὐτὸν, *because of him*, the Jews might believe, John 1:7; it is another thing to procure Authority for him as a Lord, which Christ did for John. And so Scripture, which is the Law of the highest Prince, the Testament of the heavenly Father, the fixed Rule of faith, does no more borrow its Authority from the Church than the Law from the heralds that promulgate it, the Testament from the notary to whom it was committed, the carpenter's Rule from the artisan that makes use of it: but it fetches that Authority from the highest Lawgiver speaking there, from the will of the Testator sealed therein and confirmed by His death,¹ and from its own innate perfection. γ. A fallible and human testimony, of which sort is the Testimony of the Church, is also never able to establish a divine Faith, which also is able only to rest upon the only infallible Word of God. δ. Neither is the divine Codex to be brought down below human writings; but if, therefore, *other Authors are best discerned from their own Writings*, much more is this to be held concerning the *Holy Spirit, on account of the sufficiency*, by which He is efficacious beyond all human Writers *to distinguish His own*. And hence, ε. the Scripture is compared to various things, which are the object of the Senses, whether of sight, 2 Peter 1:19; Psalm 119:105, or of taste, Psalm 19:10; 1 Peter 2:2, or of touch, Jeremiah 23:29. Now, just as objects of the Senses, applied to faculties well disposed, are immediately differentiated and known without any other external argument, for example, light by its own splendor, food by its own sweetness, burning by fire, and the blow of a mallet by its own feel and dolorous sense: so also the divine Scripture sufficiently manifests itself by its own *innate*

¹ See Hebrews 9:16, 17.

Criteria. Which, *a.* nevertheless, do not shine equally nor in the same degree in all the books of Scripture: but, as star differs from star in light and splendor, so some books in this heaven of Scripture emit brighter and more plentiful rays of light and brilliance than others: it is sufficient that in all the books there are those arguments of verity and majesty that prove of themselves that the books are divine and authentic; or at least that nothing is found in them that is able to render their *αὐθεντίαν/ authenticity/authority* doubtful. *b.* Neither is it necessary that all those Notes occur in every pericope and verse of a Canonical book, or in the individual parts of Scripture separated from the whole: it is sufficient that they are given in the divine Writings, as they are considered conjointly and according to the whole. *c.* And, although *Faith* rests upon the authority of Testimony, and not upon scientific demonstration; nevertheless, it is able by arguments furnished by art to be helped from then on, especially in fortifying the Principium of Faith; for Faith, before it believes, ought to hold as evident the divinity of the Witness, whom he ought to believe, by certain definite notes, which he finds in him, otherwise he is not able to believe him as such a Witness.

Now, these *Criteria* are several, which our AUTHOR seeks either from the less principal *Authors* or *Writers*, or from the *Argument*, or from the *Manner of Delivery*, or from the *Effects*, or from the *Adjuncts*: each of which demonstrates far more powerfully than the last; hence in the proving of the Divinity of Scripture one particular note is not to be separated from all the rest, but rather all at the same time are to be set before the eyes, that they might efficaciously convince of the divine origin of the Scripture: see STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS' *Theses Theologicas inaugurales* 13, pages 377, 378.

α. If you might wish to obtain these things from the *Sacred Writers*, it is easy to show, either that all historical Faith is to be denied to human Writers, or that sufficient evidences of *ἀξιοπιστία/trustworthiness* are discovered in the Sacred Writers also, which evidences at the same time render us more confident concerning the divine origin of these Writings. 1. We accept the testimony of men, because we hold those witnesses to be trustworthy. But, that the Sacred Writers are of that sort above others, no one would call into doubt; if you regard their extraordinary *Holiness*, everywhere revealing itself; their unaffected *Modesty*, on account of which they have not passed over their own *ἡττήματα/failures*, blemishes, and imperfections: let Moses, Jeremiah, Jonah, the Evangelists stand as examples. Hence it is proven that they,

as urged by the Spirit, aimed solely at the Glory of God, and did not seek their own honor. They did not write for the sake of their own advantage and profit: on the contrary, by their doctrine, delivered and written, they exposed themselves to the hatred and vexations of the world; neither did they decline to confirm their faith in the doctrine by their own blood: which sort of things you would seek in vain from impostors. And they themselves were not deceived by another, whether by God, who cannot lie;¹ or by a good Angel, for they stood immovable in the truth; or by evil angels, from whom a doctrine, composed especially for the destruction of the kingdom of the devil, is not able to proceed; or by other men, upon whose testimony they did not rest especially or principally, and whose eyesight the delivered doctrine in many things surpasses: neither did they deceive themselves, because they were eye- and ear-witnesses of a great many of the things that they deliver. Therefore, these witnesses have more *ἀξιοπιστίας τεκμήρια*, *sure marks of trustworthiness*: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Christianæ Religionis*, book III, § 5, 6. 2. It occasions confidence in a history, when it relates matters conducted, not in secret, but in the public theater of the world. Numa,² Muhammed, and similar men, were able easily to impose upon people, by feigning revelations delivered to themselves secretly. But the miracles and matters conducted that Moses relates have myriads of witnesses; neither would the Hebrew people, unless thoroughly conscious of the divine Revelation and Legislation, have readily submitted their necks to a yoke so *δυσβαστάκτω*, *grievous to be borne*.³ The whole Evangelical and Apostolic history was confirmed by so many miracles, and was also conducted publicly before those in whose lifetime they were consigned to letters; hence the Writers would have soon been convicted of falsehood, if they had strayed from the truth. 3. It augments the *ἀξιοπιστίαν*/*trustworthiness* of Writer, when his testimony is confirmed by other *ὁμοψήφοις*/*concurring* witnesses. But thus the traces of the history of Moses, Joshua, and the Judges appear here and

¹ See Titus 1:2; Hebrews 6:18.

² Numa was the legendary second king of Rome, purported author of many important Roman political and religious institutions. He is said to have had a relationship with the nymph Ægeria, receiving from her the wisdom to legislate skillfully.

³ Matthew 23:4: “For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne (*δυσβάστακτα*), and lay them on men’s shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.”

there in the mythical history of the Gentiles. The Gentile historians also made mention of Moses: Justinus,¹ Tacitus,² Diodorus Siculus,³ and Dionysius Longinus⁴ also. GROTIUS, *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book I, § 15, 16, gathered many testimonies of foreigners for the confirmation of the authority of the Mosaic history. Similar documents for the truth of the remaining history of the Old Testament you may find in *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book III, § 16, pages 166-174. Suetonius,⁵ Tacitus,⁶ and Pliny⁷ also make mention of the Evangelical and Apostolic history: but even Josephus himself, the Jewish historian, confirms the truth of it: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book II, § 2-4; book III, § 14; STAPFER'S⁸ *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section XVIII, § 1237; BUDDEUS' *Prolegomena Historiæ ecclesiasticæ Veteris Testamenti*, § 8, pages 7, 8. 4. But, if the Sacred Writers have so many signs of ἀξιοπιστία/*trustworthiness*, as those that neither were deceived, nor were willing or able to deceive others; then the θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* of those Writers is proven of itself, since they expressly assert the same, 2 Timothy 3:16; 2 Peter 1:21; 2 Samuel 23:2, and so often make mention of their divine mission to publish and write down such things: especially since the eminent miracles, which

¹ *Historiarum Philippicarum*, book XXXVI. Junianus Justinus was a Roman historian of the third century. He wrote *Historiarum Philippicarum libri XLIV*, an epitome of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiæ philippicæ et totius mundi origines et terræ situs*, written in the early years of the first century AD.

² *Histories*, book V. Cornelius Tacitus (c. 56-c. 117) was a Roman historian. The information that he preserves about his era and its emperors is invaluable.

³ *Bibliotheca Historia*, book XL. Diodorus Siculus (c. 90-c. 30 BC), a Greek historian, wrote the massive *Bibliotheca Historia* in forty books. Unhappily, only fifteen books have survived.

⁴ *On the Sublime*, probably written in the first century AD, is an anthology of literary exemplars (more than fifty authors, writing over the course of more than a thousand years). Moses is honorably mentioned. During the Middle Ages, this treatise was attributed to Dionysius Cassius Longinus (a Hellenistic rhetorician [c. 213-273]), but its true authorship is shrouded in mystery.

⁵ *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars* "Claudius" 25; "Nero" 16. Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (c. 75- c. 130) was a Roman historian.

⁶ *Annals* 15:44.

⁷ *Epistolæ* 10:96, 97. Pliny the Younger (61-c. 113) was the Roman governor of Bithynia, and was involved in trials of Christians.

⁸ John Frederick Stapfer (1708-1775) was a Swiss Reformed divine of the first order. He served as a Pastor in the canton in Berne. His *Institutiones theologicæ, polemicæ, universæ, ordine scientifico dispositæ* ranks among the best elenctic theologies.

Moses, Joshua, the Prophets, and the Apostles wrought for the confirmation of their doctrine, were not able to be done except by divine power; while the Magicians were not able to imitate the same,¹ neither are things similar in multitude and magnitude ever remembered to have been wrought by diabolical power.

β. The very *Argument* of Sacred Scripture, and the doctrine delivered therein, supplies even more powerful arguments. In it occur: 1. the *Most Ancient beginnings* of all *things*, the Creation of the World, the history of Integrity and of the Fall, the origin of the Division of the Peoples and of the diversity of Tongues, the first founders of so many nations, etc.; all which were truly ἄδηλα/*unknown* to the Gentiles, and without the history of Moses would have remained such forever: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book I, § 16, page 46. 2. A *Sublimity* of Doctrine, seeing that nature itself relates certain rudimentary principles concerning God, Creation, and Providence; but we learn all the things more worthy of God from the Sacred Scripture, inasmuch as it teaches that God is Triune, and it sets Him forth to be contemplated in the work of Creation and Providence. In the mystery of Redemption occur additionally those sublime doctrines of the Incarnation, and of Satisfaction and Justification. And, just as the fourfold State of Man, ordained beforehand with specificity, contains hidden things not to be revealed from any other source; so with an admiration especially appropriate is expected the Resurrection, which shall cause the happiness of man to be brought perfection, but unknown ἄτερ γραφῆς, *apart from the Scripture*. Certainly all those are necessary to be known and believed for salvation, but they are not to be revealed by flesh and blood:² compare STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section XII, § 975-994; and GISBERT BONNET'S³ *Orationem de Fidei Mysteriorum revelatam Religionem adstruentibus*. 3. If Scripture alone relates *the true Doctrine of Salvation* and *that Worship pleasing to God*, and the same things be sought elsewhere altogether fruitlessly; you may not unjustly judge that these have been revealed by God Himself in Sacred Scripture. But, *a.* Scripture alone relates the doctrine of the true God that agrees with His infinite perfection, and the Worship of God alone and agreeable to the Majesty of the same. *b.* Scripture alone relates a

¹ See Exodus 8:18, 19.

² Matthew 16:17.

³ Gijsbert Bonnet (1723-1805) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1761-1804).

manner θεοπροπιῆ, *meet for God*, of Reconciliation of a sinner with an angry God. c. You will nowhere find a Holier and more Perfect rule of Life, fixing Laws even to the innermost thoughts; see Matthew 22:37-39; 5:48, 22, 28; etc.: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book II, § 11-16; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section XII, § 975-994; chapter III, section XIII, § 995-1046; STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS' *Theses theologicæ inaugurales*, theses 49-53, pages 422-427, who in particular from the sublimity and perfection of Evangelical Ethics contrives an argument for the Divinity of Scripture. 4. Perhaps no argument draws more powerfully than the *definite Fulfillment* of the so many *Prophecies* found in the Sacred Books, concerning matters coming to pass that must find fulfillment at last after centuries: to publish prophecies of this sort belongs to the omniscient and omnipotent God alone, comparing Isaiah 41:22, 23; but compare now Joshua 6:26 with 1 Kings 16:34; 1 Kings 13:2 with 2 Kings 23:15, 16; Isaiah 44:28 and Jeremiah 25:11, 12 with 2 Chronicles 36:21-23. And the prophecies, so many and so express, concerning Messiah and all the circumstances that have regard to Him, by the greatest distance surpass all human industry, all which prophecies, nevertheless, received the most exact fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, as we shall see in *Chapter XVIII*, § 8-13. TERTULLIAN, *Apologeticum*, chapter XX, "A suitable testimony of divinity, I suppose, is the truth of divination." This argument for the Divinity of Scripture is set forth nervously and abridged by JAN VAN DEN HONERT in his *Præfatione ante Expositionem Theologicam Anglorum in Jesaiam*, pages 23-32; add GERDES'¹ *Prælectionem de Usu Prophetiarum ad demonstrandam Scripturæ Sacræ Divinitatem*, *Exercitationum Academicarum*, book III, pages 623-642; GAUSSENUS' *Theses theologicæ inaugurales*, theses 55-63, pages 429-440; compare also GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book I, § 17, pages 72, 73, book III, § 8; BUDDEUS' *Atheismum et Superstitionem*, chapter III, § 4, pages 166-172; PHILIP DODDRIDGE'S² *Academische Lessen*, volume 2, lessons 128-132, pages 172-201.

¹ Daniel Gerdes (1698-1765) was a German Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Duisburg (1726-1735), Professor of Theology at Groningen (1736-1765), and Professor of Church History at Groningen (1752-1765).

² Philip Doddridge (1702-1751) was an English Nonconformist pastor, professor, and hymnwriter. He served as Professor of Theology at Daventry (1723-1751).

γ. In addition, from the *Mode of Delivery* the ray of Divinity shines forth. 1. Notice the *Majesty of the Style* of the Prophets, who boldly say that they follow their own divine mission: $\text{פֹּה נִאֲמַר יְהוָה יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת}$, *thus saith Jehovah of hosts, the Lord God*, etc.; and with such פָּרְשִׁיטָה /*frankness* Kings and Princes in the same manner as the little men of the common people do they instruct, rebuke, and dauntlessly threaten, as the examples of Moses,¹ Nathan,² Elijah,³ Micaiah,⁴ Jeremiah,⁵ and Daniel⁶ show; so that without θεοπνευστία /*inspiration* you would say that they are men hardly in possession of a sound mind, indeed, liable to offended majesty, who were bold to speak in this manner before their King. 2. Consider the *Holy* and the not-in-the-least affected *Elegance of Style* in the rest of Scripture, compared with which all human adornment of speech seems mean: whether you have regard unto the ordered brevity of Moses the historiographer in relating the beginnings of all things; or the consummate perfection of the Laws, which prescribe to man his duty, in the ten Words,⁷ indeed in the two Precepts;⁸ or the fashioned compendium of all the things that we hold are to be sought from God, in six exceedingly brief Petitions, with an altogether suitable address and conclusion added:⁹ whether you attend to the heavenly Hymns, marvelously restoring and consoling the pious soul; or unto the holy simplicity of the Gospels, in which at the same time something of the divine shines forth. 3. Moreover, the *Marvelous Harmony* of the Sacred Writers, who wrote from such different perspectives, ages, places, and styles, concerning matters so sublime, stands as a proof that all those were moved by the same Spirit, and that the God of truth led them into all truth. While various things that occur in the Sacred Writings as ἐναντιοφανεῖαι /*paradoxes* render us all the more certain that the sacred history was not fabricated by imposters colluding among themselves: this, on the ἐναντιοφανῆ /*paradoxes*

¹ For example, Exodus 9:1-4.

² 2 Samuel 12:1-14.

³ For example, 1 Kings 17:1; 18:18.

⁴ 1 Kings 22; 2 Chronicles 18.

⁵ For example, Jeremiah 26.

⁶ For example, Daniel 2; 4; 5.

⁷ Deuteronomy 4:13: “And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments ($\text{עֲשֵׂרֵת הַדְּבָרִים}$, *ten words*); and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.”

⁸ Matthew 22:34-40.

⁹ Matthew 6:9-15.

occurring in the four Gospels, CHRYSOSTOM learnedly observes, in *homily I, on Matthew II, page 5, from the Benedictine edition, tome 7*, Ἀλλὰ κἄν τέσσαρες οἱ γράφοντες ὡσι, μήτε κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καιροὺς, μήτε ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τόποις, μήτε συνελθόντες καὶ διαλεχθέντες ἀλλήλοις· εἶτα ὡσπερ ἀφ' ἐνὸς στόματος πάντα φθέγγονται, μεγίστη τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξις τοῦτο γίνεται· καὶ μὴν τουναντίον συνέβη, φησί· πολλαχοῦ γὰρ διαφωνοῦντες ἐλέγχονται· αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο μέγιστον δεῖγμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστίν· εἰ γὰρ πάντα συνεφώνησαν μετὰ ἀκριβείας, καὶ μέχρι καιροῦ, καὶ μέχρι τόπου, καὶ μέχρι ῥημάτων αὐτῶν, οὐεὶς ἂν ἐπίστευσε τῶν ἐχθρῶν, ὅτι μὴ συνελθόντες ἀπὸ συνθήκης τινὸς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔγραψαν ἅπερ ἔγραψαν· οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τῆς ἀπλότητος τὴν τοσαύτην συμφωνίαν. νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐν μικροῖς εἶναι διαφωνία, πάσης ἀπαλλάττει αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, καὶ λαμπῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρόπου τῶν γραψάντων ἀπολογεῖται. εἰ δέ τι περὶ καιρῶν ἢ τόπων διαφόρως ἀπήγγειλαν, τοῦτο οὐδὲν βλάπτει τῶν εἰρημένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὡς ἂν ὁ Θεὸς παρέχη, πειρασόμεθα προϊόντες ἀποδειξαι, etc., *But if there be four that write, not at the same times, nor in the same places, neither having met together and conversed one with another, and then they speak all things as if from one mouth, this becomes a very great demonstration of the truth: But the contrary (it may be said) has come to pass, for in many places they are convicted of discordance: On the contrary, this very thing is a very great evidence of their truth; for, if they had agreed in all things exactly, even as far as time, and place, and the very words, none of our enemies would have believed but they had met together and written what they wrote by some human compact; because such entire agreement as this cometh not of simplicity: But now even that discordance, which seems to exist in little matters, delivers them from all suspicion, and speaks clearly in behalf of the character of the writers: But, if there be anything concerning times or places, which they have related differently, this nothing injures the truth of what they have said; and these things too, so far as God shall enable, we will endeavor, as we proceed, to point out, etc.: consult GROTIUS' de Veritate Christianæ Religionis, book III, § 13.*

δ. Another argument follows from the *Effects* or *Efficacy* of Sacred Scripture, with the supernal power of the Holy Spirit added, *to convert the soul of man*; which HOORNBECK confirms in his *Theologia Practica, book I, chapter III, pages 51-53*, by the examples of Justin Martyr (concerning whose conversion see also GERARDUS GULIELMUS AB

OOSTEN DE BRUYN'S *de Philosophia Gentile Doctrinæ moralis*, pages 135, 136), Cyprian, Augustine, and also Franciscus Junius, formerly an Epicurean Atheist, but after a marvelous conversion an eminent Light, illuminating the Church and the Academy. But this is insufficient, if you compare the *Conversion* to the faith of Christ of nearly the whole *World*, of so many peoples, and of nations, *without any compulsion*, by the preaching of the Gospel alone, done by unarmed men, some by nature unlearned, common; *indeed, against all the power of Satan*, the declamations of Orators, the sophisms of Philosophers, and the persecutions of Jews and Gentiles: hence TERTULLIAN discusses this in such a fine manner, *Libro adversus Judæos*, chapter VII, "For, upon what other have all nations believed, but upon Christ, who is already come? For whom have other nations believed, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and those that inhabit Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia; and they who dwell in Pontus, and Asia, and Pamphylia; those tarrying in Egypt and in the region of Africa which is beyond Cyrene; Romans and sojourners; then, in Jerusalem Jews,¹ and all other nations; as at this time, the varied races of the Gætulians, and manifold confines of the Moors; all the limits of the Spains, and the diverse nations of the Gauls, and the haunts of the Britons, inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ, and of the Sarmatians, and Dacians, and Germans, and Scythians, and of many remote nations, and of provinces and islands many, to us unknown, and which we are able hardly to enumerate? In all which places the name of the Christ, who is already come, reigns." I shall not repeat more parallels from these Fathers. Which things certainly serve as a demonstration of the divine virtue of the Sacred Scripture, as joined to the Word of God Himself: consult GROTIUS' *de Veritate Christianæ Religionis*, book II, § 18, 19, pages 131-140; MARCKIUS' *Orationem de Christianismi propagati Admirandis*, after *Historiam Paradis*. Indeed, Muhammed, certainly with incredible speed also, forced vast regions and mighty peoples to embrace his false doctrine. But making use of force, loosing the clasp on pleasures, and promising honors and riches, and forbidding all disputation concerning controversies of religion; see JAKOB ELSNER'S² *Grieksche Christenen in Turkyen*, chapter *nieuwste Beschzyving van de VII*, § 10, note c, pages 381, 382; GROTIUS' *de Veritate Christianæ Religionis*, book VI, § 2, 7. But all things were otherwise in the Christian Religion, which was requiring that the flesh be mastered, the

¹ Acts 2:9, 10.

² Jakob Elsner (1692-1750) was a German Lutheran theologian.

lusts crucified, the cross taken up, etc.; to such an extent that only by heavenly power is the preaching of the Gospel of Christ able to be made victorious: consult STEPHANUS GAUSSENIUS' *Theses Theologicas inaugurales de Verbo Dei*, thesis 73, page 451; PETER CONRAD'S *Sermonem Academicum de stupendo Euangelii, ab Apostolis per orbem prædicati, Successu, Christianæ Religionis Veritatem extra omnem dubitationis aleam collocante*.

ε. If we go on to consider the *Adjuncts* of Scripture, these offer themselves: 1. *An Antiquity greater than all human writings*, of which, indeed, a definite acquaintance or memory survives. The most ancient genuine writings of the Chaldeans, Phœnicians, and Egyptians are said to be later than the Mosaic writings by more than a century. The most ancient writers of the Greeks, Homer and Hesiod,¹ are comparable only to the Kings and Prophets of Israel. So, when Moses and Joshua, in an age yet rude and to such an extent illiterate, so neatly and ornately consigned to writing matters of great moment and divine, and that with clarity, one may conclude that they were led by a greater and divine Spirit in the composition of their records. Even more than Clement and Cyril of Alexandria, TERTULLIAN urges this argument, beginning chapter XIX of his *Apology* in this way, "Their high antiquity claims the first authority for these documents: among yourselves, too, it is as good as religion, to ground confidence upon antiquity. Consequently, all the substance, and all the materials, the origins, successions, and supplies of each of your ancient compositions, most nations likewise, and cities eminent and ancient of history, and finally the very forms of your letters, themselves the witnesses and keepers of events, nay (I think that we yet speak within the mark), your very gods, your very temples, and oracles, and sacred rites, are surpassed by the roll of a single Prophet by centuries; in which is found a gathered literary store-house of the entire Jewish religion, and thence of ours also." While the *Same* elsewhere asserts that *the first is also the truest*. 2. With Antiquity is to be joined the *extraordinary Preservation* of the Scriptures, by which to the present day they survive whole and entire, even though an eminent part of those was consigned to writing by Moses three thousand years ago: while so many books, annals, etc., even of much more recent memory, voracious old age devoured long ago, to such an extent that either there is nothing left,

¹ Hesiod lived around the turn of the seventh century BC. In his poetry (particularly, *Theogony*), he preserves a most ancient form of Greek mythology.

or only small fragmens of the same are found today: it is all the more fitting to be amazed concerning the Sacred Scripture, because the enemies of the truth, with Satan instigating, have tried so many times to put an end to this most precious *κειμήλιον*/*treasure* of the Church: The King of the Babylonians, Nebuchadnezzar, burned the temple,¹ in which the *αὐτόγραφον*/*autograph* had been accustomed to be kept:² Antiochus Epiphanes³ devoted the Sacred Books, as many as he found, to flame: Diocletian⁴ compelled the Christians by force to deliver their copies of the Sacred Books to be burned. In the time of prevailing Antichristianism, the Bible, and its use, were made exceedingly rare, especially in its Original languages. Notwithstanding, the divine books endured uninjured, and God manifestly demonstrated that He diligently preserves the same as His own peculiar treasure. Indeed, while Franciscus Nadasti, a Hungarian Count,⁵ in the preceding century was burning various Protestant books, it is said that God preserved entirely uninjured the Latin Codex of the Bible in the midst of the flames, in spite of the fact that it was cast in a second time (see the Eminent NIEUWENTYT'S⁶ *Cosmotheoriam*, chapter XXII, § 31, page 522), and thus He willed to preserve the divine books by a miracle, which books were formerly *confirmed* by so many *Miracles*: which *Miracles* here, 3. are also able to come into the account, to confirm the Divinity of the Sacred Books, since the veracious God would never have performed so many eminent and irrefragable demonstrations of His own Omnipotence to confirm falsehood and deceive the human race: neither is it able, with any appearance of truth, challenged to magical power; nor did false Prophets ever undertake with such *παρρησία*/*boldness* to promise and perform miracles of this sort: see Numbers 16:28-35; 1 Kings 18:24,

¹ 2 Kings 25:9.

² See Deuteronomy 31:26; Joshua 24:26; 1 Samuel 10:25; 2 Kings 22:8, compared with 2 Chronicles 34:14.

³ Antiochus Epiphanes was the King of the Seleucid Empire from 175-164 BC. He is remembered for his attempt to abolish Jewish religious rites, leading to the Maccabean revolt.

⁴ Diocletian was Roman Emperor from 284 to 305. Diocletian's persecution of Christians lasted from 303-324, initiated by himself, but continued by others.

⁵ Ferenc Nádasdy (1555-1604) was a Hungarian nobleman, of a wealthy and influential family.

⁶ Bernard Nieuwentyt (1654-1718) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and Cartesian philosopher.

30-40; 2 Kings 1:10. One may see this argument solidly deduced and abridged by JAN VAN DEN HONERT in his *Præfatione ante Expositionem Theologicam Anglos in Jesaiam*, pages 7-23; similarly by STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS in his *Thesibus theologicis inauguralibus*, theses 55-63, pages 429-440; compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Christianæ Religionis*, book III, § 7.

All which Criteria abundantly suffice to stop the mouths of *Atheists*, and, with the illumination of the Spirit added, to engender Faith in the Divinity of Sacred Scripture. For, even if the Scripture perhaps does not have in all things *Mathematical* certainty, which belongs to principia, known of themselves, and conclusions demonstrated from the same, as that the whole is greater than its part, which sort of certitude gives rise to Science/ Knowledge, not Faith: nevertheless, the certitude of the origin and divinity of Scripture is not merely *Moral*, which depends upon evidences only more probable, just as it is held as certain that the *Aeneid* was written by Virgil; for thus Faith in the divinity of Scripture would not be more certain than the historical assent that we give to human writings: but *Theological* certitude belongs to the Scripture with respect to its divine origin, which sort of certitude rests upon divine revelation, manifesting itself with luminous evidences, and lays the foundation of a *Faith truly divine*. But if, therefore, any should not acknowledge the Divinity of the Scripture, it is not for this reason, that the object is not known or knowable; but because they are destitute of a well-disposed faculty, 2 Corinthians 4:3: see STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS in his *Thesibus theologicis inauguralibus*, theses 69-77, pages 446-456; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section XIX, § 1355-1359, 1363-1369; and especially SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica*, book IV, exercitation II, which is concerning the Certitude of divine Faith, pages 646-657. For proving the Divinity of Sacred Scripture from its innate Criteria, consult SPANHEIM the *Younger's Orationem de divina Scripturarum Origine et Auctoritate contra Profanos*, which is found in his *Miscellaneis Sacrorum Antiquorum*, book X, Oration I, opera, tome 2, column 1333-1356; LELAND'S¹ *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, chapter 15, pages 513-574; BUDDEUS' *Atheismum et Superstitionem*, chapter VII, § 7, compared with § 4, 5, pages 474-487, 437-457; add what things are added concerning the truth of the Christian religion, § 6, 458-474. While on behalf of the θεοπνευστία/inspiration of the New Testament

¹ John Leland (1691-1766) was an English Presbyterian minister. The focus of his authorship is the opposition of Deism.

in particular argues PHILIP DODDRIDGE in a *Dissertation*, which, translated into the Dutch language, is found *before exegesis Theologorum Anglorum in Euangelio Matthæi*: and the Infallibility of the Apostles in teaching WITSIUS vindicates *against Spinoza* and *Le Clerc* in *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXII; whom DINANT follows closely in his tractate called *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 21-34, pages 405-453, after he had argued for the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /inspiration of the Old Testament in § 12-20, pages 373-404. The $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /inspiration of the Mosaic Pentateuch, recently asserted with excellence, HENDRIK LUSSING has presented in his *Necessitatis Religionis in genere, et Certitudinis Christianæ in specie, vindicatæ*, part II, dissertation VI; but also of the rest of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament in *dissertation VII*, which the same promises that he is going to furnish in the *third* and following *part* with respect to the Books of the New Testament.

The Divinity of Sacred Scripture is to be held against *Atheists*, see STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter VI, § 20: likewise against the *Deists*, see STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter VII, § 12: against *Philosophical Naturalists*, who, when they admit Natural Religion alone and suppose the same to suffice, and cast off all *Revealed Religion*, the *Mysteries* contained in the Sacred Books, the *Miracles*, and the *Prophecies* occurring therein, hence reject the *Sacred Scripture* and its *Authority* and *Divinity*; as STAPFER, out of *Tindal*¹ and *Collins*,² confirms, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 7-13, pages 886, 902, who, on the other hand, in § 98-101, contends that the divine Revelation of that Religion uniquely saving to man as sinner, which Religion is not able to be free from Mystery, is truly contained in the Sacred Scripture, pages 944-947. Then *Stapfer* looses the Objections of the Naturalists against the Divinity of the Scripture, sought:

1. From the universal Corruption of the New Testament through the infinite variant Readings, § 136, pages, 974-976, § 137-139, pages 980, 981 (add tome 3, chapter XI, section I, § 336, pages 273-275; and below in this work, chapter II, § 9.

¹ Matthew Tindal (1657-1733) was an English "freethinking" philosopher and deist; his writings were heavily influential in the early days of the Enlightenment. His *Christianity as Old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature* has been regarded by some as the "Bible" of Deism.

² Anthony Collins (1676-1729) was an English philosopher and deist, intimate friend of John Locke.

2. From the Obscurity of the Sacred Scripture, *Theologicæ polemiciæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 136, pages 976-980, § 140-152, pages 982-987.

3. From the disagreement of sects, variety of Religions, and controversies of Theologians, § 153-156.

4. From the necessity of the repetition of Revelation, if the Revelation be necessary, even in our times, § 157-159.

5. From Truths not all at the same time revealed to man from the beginning, § 160-164.

6. Relatively:

a. To the *Old Testament*:

a. From the ceremonial Worship, little agreeing with the divine Wisdom and Spiritual nature, § 165-172.

b. From the many things occurring in the Sacred Books that most clearly contradict the Law of Nature, § 173-198, pages 999-1013.

c. From men praised in the Old Testament as most holy, that committed the greatest crimes diametrically opposed to the Law of Nature, § 199-211.

d. From this, that many things were ascribed to God in the Old Testament, than which nothing could be less worthy of Him, § 212-218.

e. From passages of the Old Testament, which would occasion ideas little worthy of God, unless help be provided by an agreeable interpretation from those very principles of Reason, § 219-232, pages 1024-1034.

f. From Contradictions appearing in matters Historical, Chronological, Genealogical, Geographical, and Mathematical; in which the Anti-Scripturists think that either the author of the book deceived or was deceived, or corruption is to be admitted, § 233-277, pages 1034-1067.

g. To overthrow the Divinity of the Prophecies, from this, that either the Prophecies thus spoken were consigned to writing only after the matter was conducted; or they were set forth so obscurely and equivocally that a manifold sense is able to be attached to them; or those things that were predicted were never fulfilled; or such things are contained in them, which are able to be predicted by human sagacity also; or the Gentiles also had their oracles and prophecies, etc; in which manner they busy themselves to show that

the argument taken from the Prophecies comes to nothing in proving the Divinity of Sacred Scripture, § 278-332, *pages* 1067-1095.

h. To weaken the argument from the authority of Miracles to uphold the Divinity of Sacred Scripture, from this, that they either explain Miracles by natural effects, or deny that they have happened, or judge the witnesses of them to have been deceived by trickery, or finally assert that such were wrought by false Prophets also; which difficulties against Miracles and the force of proof taken from thence, out of Spinoza, Tindal, and the author of the French Epistles *sur la Religion essentielle à l'homme*,¹ STAPFER relates in § 333, *pages* 1095-1100, and resolves in § 334-373, *pages* 1100-1116, *tome* 2.

β. To the *New Testament*:

a. From the doctrines found therein, not agreeable to reason and plainly obscure; they indicate the Mysteries, § 375, 376.

b. From the person of Jesus of Nazareth, who indeed gave excellent precepts, but was not therefore sent from heaven; concerning whom many true things are indeed related, but other things were added out of the simplicity of the disciples; and what things more tending to this, that they claim that Jesus Christ was merely an Imposter: the contrary of which is prolisly demonstrated from Christ's sublime Doctrine, truthful in Prophecies; a most pious Life uniquely breathing love of the divine glory; Miracles placed beyond all doubt, among which the greatest was His own Resurrection, the truth and efficacy of which allows not contradiction to the proof of that Doctrine; not even the external meanness of Christ, while He was dwelling on the earth, being opposite to the dignity of His divine Person, § 377-474, *pages* 1119-1172.

c. From the form of the New Testament, that is, because Evangelical Doctrine is not there reduced into any System, § 477-481.

d. From the obscurity of the Writings of the New Testament, easily leading away into errors, § 482-484.

e. From the pompous and hyperbolical phrases, of which the Writers of the New Testament love to make use, § 485-487.

f. From those sayings, in which God is

¹ The *Lettres* were composed by Marie Huber (1695-1753), a Swiss author, translator, and editor. She was a universalist.

described as the author of evil, § 488.

g. From this, that in the Books of the New Testament some things are found that are contrary to Ethical Law, to Natural Law, to Polical Law, § 489-507.

h. From the error of the Apostles, that they everywhere inculcate, that the final Advent of Christ was already at the door, § 508-512.

i. From the Gospels entirely emended and remolded at the order of the Emperor Anastasius;¹ which comment of Victor² is exploded, § 513-516. The same thing at greater length is treated by WESSELINGIUS³ in his *Dissertatione ad Victorem Tunnunensem*, where, in *chapter* I, he evinces that the narrative of Victor concerning the emendation of the Gospels at the command of Anastasius is a made up fable; into the origin of which fable he inquires in *chapter* II, appealing also to BENTLEY'S⁴ *Epistolam in Collinii Libertatem cogitandi*, and to PFAFF'S *Primit. Tubing.*; after *Diatriben de Judæorum Archontibus*, pages 110-147.

STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 3, *chapter* XI, *section* I, argues the same against the *Jews*, that the Evangelical History does not rest upon less certainty than the Mosaic History, *proposition* VII, § 159-172, pages 73-82. That the Christian Religion, no less than the Jewish, is confirmed by Miracles, *proposition* VIII, § 173-181, pages 82-88. That the Christian Religion and the Jewish are equally confirmed by Prophecies, *proposition* IX, § 182-189, pages 88-92. That the Religion taught in the Books of the Old Testament in no way contradicts that which Christ and the Apostles taught; but that there is the greatest agreement between them, *proposition* X, § 190-234, pages 92-127. He then removes those things that the *Jews* except and mutter against the Miracles of Christ, § 286-291, pages 185-200; and also against the truth of the Resurrection of Christ, § 303-327, pages 209-260; likewise against the trustworthiness of the Apostles, § 328-330, pages 260-264; moreover, against the very Books of the New Testament, for example, that they were not written in the Language of the *Jews*, nor *θεοπνεύστως*, by *inspiration*, as *Luke*

¹ Anastasius I was Byzantine Emperor from 491 to 518.

² Victor (died c. 570) was bishop of Tunnuna in North Africa. His *Chronicon* runs from the creation of the world to 566 AD, focusing upon matters pertaining to the Church.

³ Petrus Wesseling (1692-1764) was a German philologist and jurist.

⁴ Richard Bentley (1662-1742) was an English classical scholar and theologian. He served as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

himself testifies, Luke 1:1-3; that more Gospels were lost, and those that survive have been corrupted in a remarkable manner, § 331-336, *pages* 265-275. Finally, he resolves the difficulty drawn from passages in which either the Writers of the New Testament appear to contradict each other, or the Apostles are thought by the Jews to cite, to explain, or to apply, some of the sayings of the Prophets incorrectly, § 338-344, *pages* 276-281.

Against the *Atheists* and *Deists*, for the authority and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /*inspiration* of the Sacred Codex, with Stapfer compare that massive work of THEODOR CHRISTOPH LILIENTHAL, a Theologian among the Augustans at Königsberg,¹ which work, translated also into Dutch, went forth in fifteen volumes in octavo form, under the title, *Oordeelkundige Bybelverklaring of de Eere en Waarheid der godlyke openbaringe van het Oude en Nieuwe Verbond tegen derzelve vyanden bewezen en gehandhaaft*.

Among the *Deists*, LELAND, in his *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, *tome* 1, *epistle* 4, *page* 87, makes mention of Toland² in his *Christianity not Mysterious*, especially as one denying all Mysteries. He derides the *Spirit of Prophecy*, and compares it with Enthusiasm; neither does the *Earl of Shaftesbury*³ in his *Characteristics* put any value upon the testimony of *Miracles* for the Divinity of Sacred Scripture, as LELAND relates in his *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, *tome* 1, *epistle* V, *pages* 113, 114, 128. Morgan⁴ treats the same in *The Moral Philosopher*: see LELAND, *epistle* IX, *page* 233, and what things he here teaches in opposition out of *John Chapman*,⁵ *pages* 244-246, similarly *pages* 247, 248, 252-256. The argument for the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /*inspiration* of the Old Testament and truth of the Christian Religion taken from *Prophecies*, LELAND vindicates against Collins, *epistle* VI, *pages* 143-163. LELAND, *epistle* XII, *pages* 372-377, defends $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /*inspiration* of the Old Testament against Chubb.⁶ In a similar manner, the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /*inspiration* of the New Testament, *pages* 378-388, and *epistle* XIII, *pages*

¹ Theodor Christoph Lilienthal (1717-1781) was a German Lutheran theologian.

² John Toland (1670-1722) was an Enlightenment philosopher and freethinker.

³ Anthony Ashley Cooper (1671-1713) was an English politician, philosopher, and Deist. Toland had a hand in the publication of some of his works.

⁴ Thomas Morgan (died 1743) was an English Deist.

⁵ John Chapman (1704-1784), an English churchman and scholar, wrote a rebuttal to the first volume of Morgan's *The Moral Philosopher*.

⁶ Thomas Chubb (1679-1747) was an English Deist.

389-411. Then, LELAND vindicates the argument for the Divinity of the Old and New Testaments sought from *Prophecies*, pages 411-418; from *Miracles*, pages 419-428; from the *Conversion of the World* through the Christian Doctrine, pages 429-431. He denies that the Apostles changed their Doctrine, pages 431-434, or sought temporal gain in the proclamation of the Gospel, pages 434-438. Again, the argument alleged from *Prophecies* and *Miracles* LELAND gives, *epistle XIV*, pages 467-469, *epistle XV*, pages 521-533, 542, 543; and he frees the Writers of the New Testament from the charge of Enthusiasm and fraud, pages 558-561. In what manner *Bolingbroke*¹ hisses at the Writings both of Moses and of Paul, LELAND relates, *tome 2, chapter 1, epistle V*, pages 162-165, 177, 178. Then, he defends the Writings of the Old Testament as *ΘΕÓΠΝΕΥΣΤΑ*/inspired against the criticisms of *Bolingbroke*, *tome 2, chapter 2, epistles XI-XIII*, pages 406-576: equally the Writings of the New Testament, the doctrine of Paul, and the Christian Religion, LELAND defends against the calumnies and affronts of the same, *epistles XIV-XVI*, pages 577-731. Again, the Histories and Writings of the Old Testament the same LELAND defends against the Objections of *Bolingbroke*, *Aanmerkingen op de Brieven van Lord Bolingbroke over het lezen en gebruyk der Geschiedenissen*, *volume 2, chapter 1*, in *volume 3 of Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, pages 190-253, compared with pages 185-189. Similarly, the Gospel Histories and the divine authority of the Christian Religion, *second division*, pages 254-322. BUDDEUS makes mention of Atheists and Naturalists impugning the Christian Religion, *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, *chapter III, § 6*, pages 176-180; and also of those that undermine the divine authority of Sacred Scripture, § 7, pages 181-184. Against whom BUDDEUS and LULOFS² assert the truth of Religion, both Mosaic, *chapter VII, § 6*, pages 455-458, 462-468, and Christian, pages 455, 458-464, 468-471; and also the divine authority of Sacred Scripture, § 7, pages 471-481. Concerning the argument, customarily sought from *Miracles*, for the Divinity of Sacred Scripture, the illustrious LULOFS observes in *ad Buddeum, on the place cited*, § 5 (343), page 454, "It is not to reckoned, as if a vicious circle be committed in the

¹ Henry St. John, First Viscount of Bolingbroke (1678-1751), was an English government official and political philosopher. In spite of his Deism, he was a proponent of conformity and a supporter of the Church of England.

² Johannes Lulofs (1711-1768) was a Dutch astronomer, mathematician, and physicist. He wrote *Annotationes upon Buddeus' de Atheismo et Superstitione*.

demonstration, if we should desire to prove the truth of Doctrine from Miracles, and the heavenly origin of secondary Miracles from Doctrine: for Miracles do not demonstrate the truth of Doctrine, but rather the divine mission of those that were Preachers of that Doctrine; in such a way that they were Legates of God Himself, and did not set forth dogmas by their own authority, but as most true in themselves.” And again *on* § 7 (369), *page* 480, “Miracles certainly do not directly demonstrate that the books in which they are narrated are of divine origin and authority; writings, furnished by other men that were not inspired by the divine Spirit, were also able to contain a history of Miracles, and that altogether true: but Doctrine ought to be of Divine origin and authority, which in all things accords with the dogmas of those that in Miracles, accomplished by themselves, or rather by God Himself for their sake, were furnishing proofs beyond all exception, that they were sent by God Himself; insofar as He, in a manner in keeping with His holiness, beneficence, and veracity, was not able to furnish a public testimony for men that were preaching false Doctrine, or Doctrine easily to be drawn out and demonstrated by just anyone by force of reason: in which case Miracles or testimonies of this sort would be either detrimental, or superfluous. Therefore, Miracles indirectly prove the divine authority of the sacred Books, since they demonstrate indirectly the truth of the doctrine, but directly *the divine mission* of those that were proclaiming that doctrine as altogether true, which was sustaining the most rigorous examination of reason, as doctrine most agreeable to the divine perfections, and which, disclosing new truths unknown by the light of reason, and putting known truths in a brighter light, as it were, was pointing out the true way of salvation and reconciliation to those that were offenders and hostile to the supreme Judge, and that, left to themselves, and not having been illuminated by this doctrine, would never have been able to find that way. Now, in this place it is not agreeable to inquire against *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*,¹ most ingenious but unto his own hurt, *whether we necessarily require Miracles that faith might be applied to the Evangelical doctrine*: this doctrine so commends itself in every respect, that its truth is also able to be demonstrated in other ways and more directly, with Miracles, indubitable witness of the divine mission, set aside for the present.” That a threefold thesis is to be

¹ Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was a Genevan philosopher. His thought has been heavily influential in politics, sociology, and education. He was deistic in his religious views.

proven distinctly against the *Deists*, GISBERT BONNET advises, in his *Præfatione* before *section II, part I*, of Leland's *de Utilitate et Necessitate Revelationis Christi*: 1. the historical ἀξιόπιστίαν/*trustworthiness* of the Books of the Sacred Scripture; 2. the Divinity of revealed Religion, which the Sacred Scripture relates; to which end he looks to regard Miracles and Predictions, but also the way, manifested to man as sinner, of Reconciliation with God and of perfecting his moral State, sought in vain elsewhere; 3. the divine Inspiration of those Books of the Old and New Testaments, which deliver to us this Religion, and which we are wont to call the Word of God; to which end he believes the ἀξιόπιστα/*trustworthy* Testimonies, the Style of Sacred Scripture, some Peculiarities occurring in Sacred Scripture, tend, but also the Testimony of the Christian Church concerning the genuineness of these Books.

3. Nevertheless, we do not deny that the *Ministry of the Church*, manifold indeed, but only a Ministry, in teaching and proving the Divinity of Scripture intervenes. That is, the Church is, α. the keeper of the oracles of God, Romans 3:2; β. the Finger that points to the Scripture and leads by the hand to it, Isaiah 30:21; γ. the Defender that looks after it and separates the genuine books from the counterfeit, perhaps hence called the ἐδραϊώμα τῆς ἀληθείας, *ground/support of the truth*, 1 Timothy 3:15; δ. the Herald that promulgates it, Romans 10:15; 2 Corinthians 5:19, 20; ε. the Interpreter that searches out and opens up its true sense, Nehemiah 8:9. But above these ministerial offices the Church does not rise. Therefore, it is a means, with which intervening we are able to be led to the recognition and belief of the Scripture and its confirmation; but in no way is it the foundation, upon the authority of which our faith rests. This matter is wont to be illustrated by the ministry of the Samaritan woman to her fellow-citizens. "For the Church," says the Most Illustrious PICTET,¹ in his *Theologia Christiana*, book I, chapter IX, § 4, "fulfills the same office for us that the woman performed for her fellow-citizens: for, as the Samaritan woman led the Samaritans to Christ, whom, having been recognized, they embraced because of Himself, not because of the testimony of the

¹ Benedict Pictet (1655-1724) was a Swiss Reformed theologian, and cousin of the great Francis Turretin. He served as a pastor in Geneva, and was appointed Professor of Theology in 1686. He is a transitional figure, having been influenced both by Genevan theological orthodoxy and by some measure of Enlightenment philosophy. Among other works, he wrote *Theologiam Christianam* and *Morale chrétienne*.

Samaritan woman, as they themselves assert in John 4:42; so the Church leads us to the Scripture, and delivers it into our hands: but, as long as we hesitate here, our faith is merely human, or a step unto faith rather than faith itself, until we arrive at the Scripture and embrace it because of itself." *Let us follow those*, says AUGUSTINE in his *contra Epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant Fundamenti, chapter XIV, opera, tome 8, column 115, that invite us first to believe what we are not yet able to perceive, so that, having been made stronger by this very faith, it might be granted to us to understand what we believe, not now by men, but by God Himself illuminating and confirming our mind inwardly*. Certainly, as it has already been seen in part above, α . *Christ does not receive testimony from man, not even from John himself, other than ministerial testimony, which does not procure authority for Him: for thereupon He appeals to the testimony of the Father, and of His own works, and of the Sacred Scripture, John 5:34, 36, 37, 39.* β . *Since the Church has its strength from Scripture, the Church is not able in turn to procure authority for Scripture by Circular reasoning, Ephesians 2:20.* γ . *The entire Church is fallible; and to that extent its testimony is not able to be the principium unto which we appeal, or the foundation upon which our faith rests: it is also without the power to engender faith, which is the work of the divine Spirit alone, with the Word acting as means.* δ . *Finally, the Church is subject to Scripture, and the Law does not receive its authority from subordinates or heralds; no more than does a candle, a testament, food or drink, inasmuch as their light, authority, force or taste depends upon those that by hand bear, open, or serve up, these things.*

Compare with this whole § CALVIN'S *Institutionem Christianæ Religionis, book I, chapters VII, VIII*; SPANHEIM'S *Decadum Theologicarum II, § 3-7, opera, tome 3, columns 1201-1203*; WERENFELS' *Syllogem Dissertationum theologicarum, dissertation III, which is de Præstantia Religionis in Sacra Scriptura revelatæ, hujusque Revelationis Necessitate; and dissertation VIII, which is de triplici Teste de Verbo Dei testante, Opuscula, pages 65-78, 155-183*; PETRUS DINANT'S, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter II, pages 118-344, in which he defends the alleged Divinity of Sacred Scripture, even especially against Spinoza, § 98-114, pages 305-339.*

§ 7: The Authority of Scripture and the Testimony of the Church

The *Papists* maintain the *Contrary*, namely, that the authority of Scripture depends solely or principally upon the Testimony of the Church: Whether they maintain that *the Testimony of the Church concerning the Divinity of the Scriptures is the sole Foundation of their authority*, without which it is to be compared with *Livy, Æsop's Fables*, the *Koran*, etc.; thus *Hosius*, in *book III contra Brentium*,¹ asserts that it can be said in a pious sense that “the Scriptures would be valued only to the extent of *Æsop's Fables*, if they had been destitute of the authority of the Church.” *Eck*,² *de Auctoritate Ecclesiæ*: “The Scripture is not authentic, except by the authority of the Church.” *Baile*,³ in *tractate I of Catechismi, question 12*, professes, “Without the authority of the Church, he is not going to give any more credit to Saint Matthew than to *Titus Livy*.” *Andradius*,⁴ in *book III of Defensionis Tridentinæ fidei*, belches: “There is no Divinity in the Sacred books, neither is it found in them, which would religiously constrain us to believe what things are contained in them; but such is the power and greatness of the Church that no one is able to oppose it without the greatest mark of impiety.” In the works of *Bellarmino*, you may read in *book IV of de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, Controversiis, tome I, column 213*, “It is necessary to recognize that some truly divine books are extant, which certain recognition is able to be had in no way from the Scriptures. For, even if the Scriptures should say that the books of the Prophets and Apostles are divine, yet certainly I would not believe this, unless I had previously believed that the Scripture that says this is divine. For even in the *Koran* of Muhammed we everywhere read that the *Koran* itself was sent by God from heaven, and yet we do not put our faith in it.

¹ Johannes Brenz (1499-1570) was a German Lutheran theologian and reformer. He served as Professor of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew at Heidelberg (1519-1522).

² Dr. Johann Maier von Eck (1486-1543) was a German Catholic theologian and opponent of Protestantism. He served as Professor of Theology at Ingolstadt.

³ Guillaume Baile (1557-1620) was a Jesuit theologian.

⁴ Diogo de Paiva de Andrade (1528-1575) was a Portuguese theologian. He was active at Trent, and afterwards, against the Protestant Reformation.

And so *this doctrine, so very necessary, namely, that there is a certain divine Scripture, is not able sufficiently to be had from Scripture alone.* Hence, since faith rests upon the Word of God, *unless we have a Word of God not written, there shall be no faith to us.*” Or they at least hold the Testimony of the Church as the *Principal Argument for faith*, which sounds a little less harshly. Thus elsewhere Bellarmine, in *book III de Verbo Dei, chapter X, regarding argument 13, Controversiis, tome I, column 197*: “We do not deny, indeed we defend against those who deny, that the Word of God, furnished through the Apostles and Prophets, is the first foundation of our faith. Therefore, we do in fact believe whatever we believe because God revealed it through the Apostles and Prophets. But we add that, besides this first foundation, another, secondary foundation is required, namely, the testimony of the Church. For we do not with certainty know what God may have revealed, except by the testimony of the Church.” And in *book VI, de Gratia et libero Arbitrio, chapter III, Controversiis, tome 4, column 878*: “Catholics believe what they believe because God has revealed it: but they believe that God has revealed, because they hear the Church thus saying and declaring.”

They argue these things to bring the Scriptures down, and to extol the authority of the Church: compare SPANHEIM’S *Xenia Romana-catholicorum, dilemma XI, opera, tome 3, columns 1137, 1138.*

Now, *they object*: 1. against the *Illumination of the Spirit*: α . That it is *Enthusiastic*. There is a *Response* in our AUTHOR: when we require the Illumination of the Spirit, that anyone with a saving faith might admit the Divinity of the Scripture; we speak of the Spirit, who is the common Master and Teacher of all Christians, concerning whom, and not concerning an Enthusiastic Spirit, there is discussion, John 16:13; 1 John 2:20; Romans 8:14. We do not appeal to a Spirit that teaches us new doctrines outside of Scripture, and reveals singular things to singular men: but who through His illuminating grace causes us to attend to the arguments of Divinity found in the Sacred Scripture itself, and who causes us to sense the sufficient force of these Criteria to demonstrate the divine origin of the Scriptures. But an Anonymous author in an English writing, which was published in London in the year 1742 under the title of *Christianity not Founded on Argument*,¹ similarly charges us with *Enthusiasm* here, so that he might expose all Revealed Religion to derision; concerning this work see LELAND’S *Beschouwing*

¹ Written by Henry Dodwell Jr., son of the Anglical theologian and churchman, Henry Dodwell Sr.

van de Schriften der Deisten, tome 1, chapter 10, pages 269-300.

β. That a *Circular Argument* is set forth by us, with the Divinity of the Spirit proven from Scripture, and the Divinity of Scripture from the Spirit: but a *Circular Argument* is Sophistical argumentation, in which a thing is proven from itself, which spins about the same genus of cause, with a certain circuit recurring upon itself without end. But *we respond* that such a *Circular Argument* is not able to be pressed upon us here, when we prove the Scripture through the Spirit, and the Spirit from the Scripture. For here the question is diverse, and the means or genus of cause is different. We prove that the Scripture is divine through the Spirit as the efficient cause, by which we believe: but we prove that the Spirit is divine, not false and deceptive, out of Scripture as the object and argument, because of which we believe. If you ask, by what power do you believe that the Scripture is divine? I respond, through the Spirit. But if you ask, how or because of what do you believe that the Spirit which is in you is the Holy Spirit? I respond, because of the notes of the Holy Spirit, which are in the Scripture. Neither do we obtrude upon others the authority of a dictate of a Spirit dwelling privately in us, so that because of that they might admit the Divinity of Sacred Scripture. But the Papists truly set forth a *Circular Argument* here, with the divinity and authority of the Scripture proven from the testimony of the Church, and the authority of the Church from the testimony of Scripture, through the same means and same genus of cause. If you ask, Why, or because of what, do they believe the Scripture to be divine? The response is that the Church says this. If you ask again, Why do they believe the Church? They respond, because the Scripture attributes to it infallibility, by calling it the Pillar and Ground of the truth.¹ If you press: whence know they this testimony of the Scripture to be trustworthy and divine? They respond that the Church makes us quite certain of this. Thus they are turned again to the point whence they had made the beginning of their disputation, and they proceed endlessly; neither are they able to set their feet upon any credible beginning point: see HEINRICH ALTING'S² *Theologiam Elencticam novam, Locus II, in the Appendix to Controversy III with the Papists, pages 69-73*; STEPHANUS

¹ 1 Timothy 3:15.

² Heinrich Alting (1583-1644) was a German Reformed divine, specializing in Ecclesiastical History and Historical Theology. He served as Professor of Theology at Heidelberg (1613-1622), and then Professor of Historical Theology at Groningen (1627-1644).

GAUSSENUS' *Theses Theologicas inaugurales de Verbo Dei*, thesis 77, pages 455, 456; TURRETIN'S *Disputationem theologicam de Circulo Pontificio*, and his *Disputationem de Satisfactione Christi*.

2. Against innate Marks: α . *That they are not able to convince a man.* But our AUTHOR Responds rightly, 1. *That unto a saving conviction the operation of the Holy Spirit is also required by us.* Thus the rays of the sun, although they diffuse themselves most splendidly everywhere, yet will a blind man not see: in like manner in the case of those spiritually blind the internal illumination of the Spirit must be added in order to see the light of the Scripture. And, 2. much less will the bare voice of the Church be able to convince a man of the Divinity of Scripture.

β . *That no one is able to give authority to himself.* But our AUTHOR best Responds again, 1. *That especially through Real Arguments one is able to give authority to himself; neither are the testimonies of others worthy to be compared with such arguments.* That is, when the Testimonies of the matters themselves are present, there is no need of words. Therefore, although the Scripture be not able perhaps to prove itself to be divine, that is, the whole Scripture be not able perhaps to prove its entirety to be divine, by the inartificial/uncontrived argument of testimony; nevertheless, it is able by the artificial and ratiocinative argument sought from innate Marks. But also one part of Scripture procures authority to the other part, when we compare the Old Testament with the New. 2. Furthermore, it is not always necessary that whatever is proven be proven by something else; for it is the nature of first principles/principia that they are not able to be demonstrated from elsewhere: therefore, if the authority of Scripture be proven from elsewhere, the Scripture would not be the ultimate Principium of faith.

They press, a. That thus the argument is circular. *Response:* We answer in the negative, because those Criteria, like adjuncts and properties, which are shown concerning the subject, are formally contradistinguished from the Scripture.

b. That the Scripture of itself would thus be more and less known. *Response:* That is able to be much more strongly retorted against the Church.

c. That thus a thing is proven by itself, the same and equally unknown. *Response:* We answer in the negative, because those Criteria, in the formal conception contradistinguished from Scripture, as has already been mentioned, are better known to us; just as we rightly show a cause from its effects, and a subject from its properties.

3. *On behalf of the Testimony of the Church they object, α.* That it is more Ancient than Scripture. *Response 1:* We deny the Consequent, which negation our AUTHOR correctly proves by two examples, of the Israelites and the divine Law, and also of John the Baptist and Christ. 2. I acknowledge the Minor only concerning the Writing, or Scripture formally considered; I deny it concerning the Scripture regarded materially and with respect to the substance of doctrine: for in this way the Word of God was more ancient than the Church, as its foundation and seed. 3. That it is asked, not concerning the Testimony of the Church of the Patriarchs, which was before Scripture; but of today's Church, which is far more recent.

β. They appeal to 1 Timothy 3:15. *Bellarmino*, in book III *de Ecclesia Militante*, chapter XIV, tome 2, *Controversiis*, column 187, among others writes: "The Apostle, calling the Church *the pillar of the truth*, wishes to signify that the truth of faith with respect to us rests upon the authority of the Church; and the Church proves a thing to be true, and rejects a thing as false."

Response a: If this Elogium have regard to the Church,

α. the name of *Church, a.* is not able to be restricted to its Overseers, to whom, gathered in Council, and in their highest Head, the Papists attribute Infallibility and the highest Authority; but it ought to be referred especially to the Church represented and individual believers, over whom Timothy with others was placed, 1 Timothy 3:5, in order to instruct them appropriately, and whom the Papists will admit not even in the first degree unto that peak of infallibility and authority. *b.* Just as these things were written concerning the Church to Timothy, who was remaining in Ephesus, 1 Timothy 1:3; so there is no mention here of the Roman Church; indeed, on the contrary, these things, spoken of the Church without limitation, ought to have their first relation here to the Ephesian Church, lately committed to the special care of Timothy.

β. Στύλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα, *the pillar and ground*, aptly denotes a *Column* with its lowest *base*, or a *Column* and *seat*, for example, a royal seat, a throne; but an architectonic *Column* is not necessarily understood. It is also able to be understood as:

a. a *Column Political* or *Sacred*. For, the use of *Columns* is, and was for ages, various, neither was there only the one use of supporting some edifice; but also of adorning that, or of serving as a monument of some thing, or of directing in a path, or of being inscribed

or affixed with those things that are to be read publicly. There were two Columns of brass in the courtyard of Solomon's temple for the ornamentation of the edifice, 1 Kings 7:21: concerning the two Columns of the Sethites, upon which they may have inscribed their own discoveries, to be transmitted to posterity in this way, *Josephus* relates in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, book I, chapter III. THOMAS GATAKER¹ in *Cinno*, book II, chapter XX, *Opera critica*, columns 390, 391, amasses many additional things out of Dionysius Halicarnassensis,² Dio Cassius,³ Livy, and Macrobius,⁴ of Columns having either laws or covenants or exploits inscribed, which *Columns* they call *political*. JACQUES GODEFROY,⁵ in his *Dissertatione on this passage*, which has been inserted in *Bibliis Criticis*, has yet more things concerning the multitude of Columns in the Temples of the Gentiles and in their near orbit, which one may call *Sacred*, of which some indeed were holding up the edifice, but others were of various sorts and uses; accordingly upon the tops of these the likenesses of their Gods were imposed; or arms, shields, and other things were appended; or they had some inscriptions such as elegies, elogias, covenants, συνθήκας/*agreements*, historical narrations and traditions, laws and decrees, even precepts of manners or of virtue, things mystical or hieroglyphic, and finally oracles. If Paul have regard to this, he asserts that the Church is a firm and stable structure, which is consecrated to the truth, and which holds it, and exhibits it openly to others so that it might be seen and embraced; instead of μύθων σεσοφισμένων, *cunningly devised fables*,⁶ or false Gods, or feigned oracles, which were found in the Temples and on the sacred Columns of the Gentiles. Which things no one would deny to the true Church, even if the external could be pulled down, and the inscription of the truth to be read on it be obliterated.

¹ Thomas Gataker (1574-1654) was an English minister and theologian. He was in his day regarded as a critic of unsurpassed skill, learning, and judgment. On account of his great learning, he was invited to sit as a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster.

² Dionysius Halicarnassensis (c. 60- c. 7 BC) was a Greek historian and rhetorician.

³ Dio Cassius was a Roman historian of the third century AD. His *Historiae Romanae* is an important source of information concerning that period.

⁴ Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius' (395-423) wrote *Saturnalia*, a dialogue in which all sorts of historical, mythological, and linguistic curiosities are discussed.

⁵ Jacques Godefroy (1587-1652) was a Genevan jurist and statesman.

⁶ 2 Peter 1:16.

b. If it be conceded that the names of *στύλου/pillar* and *ἔδραιώματος/ground* have regard to an *Architectonic Column*:

1. It has not yet been demonstrated that the *Truth* is considered here as dependent upon this Column:

a. For *the Column and Support of the Truth* is able to mean much the same thing as *the Column and true Support*; compare Ephesians 4:24, in which is found *δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότης τῆς ἀληθείας, righteousness and holiness of the truth*. Now, the true Church of the Elect is called a *true Column* because it is firm and immovable, extended heavenward, etc.; and because through the grace of God it supports both individual believers, whom it, as a kind mother, cherishes in its bosom; but also houses, cities, regions, and the whole world, which would fall, unless it stand because of the Church, and those so truly pious be the Columns of the age. Or,

b. The Church is named the *Column of the Truth* after the foundation upon which it rests, either after the reason on account of which it was erected, or after the bond by which its parts cohere, so that it might stand firm: not after the building, which is built upon it, just as after all those some Columns are able to be denominated equally, as after the structure built. In such a manner it is found to be *ὁ θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the foundation of God*, 2 Timothy 2:19; and thus elsewhere the church is called *the superstructure built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, Ephesians 2:20.

2. But if it be altogether granted that the Church is called the *architectonic Column and Support of the Truth*, held up and confirmed by it: it is necessary to distinguish between a principal *Support*, and some imposed *Column*, which upholds the building secondarily and less principally and derivatively; likewise between the fitting *office* of the Church and its observance of the office. That is, the *Truth*, dependent upon God and His infallible revelation, the Church not only *holds*, or *exhibits* to others, but also *builds upon* as far as it is able, indeed, *fortifies* against the attacks of Satan and the world. What thing plays the part of a supporting Column is therefore able to support. Thus the Apostles come to mind as those *δοκοῦντες στυλοὶ εἶναι, seeming to be pillars*, Galatians 2:9; believers are called *στυλοὶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, pillars in the temple of God*, Revelation 3:12; and the truth of the Gospel is said *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι, to be asserted confidently*, by Doctors,

Titus 3:8,¹ to whom the Learned add more Ecclesiastical examples gathered out of the Fathers, in which either eminent Fathers, or the extraordinarily faithful and martyrs also, are called *στύλοι*/*pillars*, and also *στύλοι καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, *pillars and ground of the truth*, which they were furnishing to the others by the brilliance of doctrine, the holiness of life, or the firmness of constancy; and they were confirming the Christian faith by doctrine or example: see SUICERUS' *Thesaurum ecclesiasticum*,² on the word *Στύλος*, *tome 2, columns 1045, 1046*; DEYLING'S³ *Observationes Sacras, part I, observationem LXVI, § 3, 356*, with whom denying, nevertheless, it is able to be judged quite probable that the elogium, as it appeared to GREGORY NYSSEN, PROCOPIUS, WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH,⁴ THOMAS GATAKER, whose *Adversaria Miscellanea, book II, chapter XX, Opera critica, columns 381 at the end, 382, 383, 386-388, 392*, see, here also ought to be referred especially to *Timothy*, under an ellipsis either of the particle of similitude, *ὡς/as*, or of the participle *ὄν/being*, which are both very common, as GATAKER in the place cited gives proof by examples; so that the sense might be, *ἵνα εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι (ὡς) στύλος*, etc., *that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God (as) a pillar, etc.* or *στύλος (ὄν) καὶ*, etc., *(being) a pillar and, etc.* In any event, Paul not only made use of the same sort of speech in Galatians 2:9; but it is also able to appear not sufficiently congruous, that, since he just now had called the Church a House, he would call the same a Column: on the other hand, *Timothy* shall be optimally considered after the likeness of a Column located in this House; at what time the argumentation of the *Papists* on behalf of their Church from this passage altogether fall. WOLF, in his *Curis philologicis et criticis, on this passage*,

¹ Titus 3:8a: "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly (διαβεβαιούσθαι), that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works."

² John Caspar Suicer (1620-1684) was a Swiss theologian and philologist. He studied at Saumur and Montauban, and served as Professor of Hebrew and Greek at the University of Zurich (1660). His *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus* was invaluable in the study of the Greek Fathers, shedding light upon words and expressions untreated by lexicographers.

³ Salomon Deyling (1677-1755) was a Lutheran divine and Orientalist; he served as Professor of Theology at Leipzig (1721-1755).

⁴ William Chillingworth (1602-1644) was an Anglican churchman and controversialist. He wrote *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*.

page 447, recounts various Augustan Theologians also addicted to this opinion. But this you see in every way, that the Church by the appellation *the Pillar of the Truth* is not carried away to the summit of dominical dignity above the Truth, which with its own authority indeed hangs from it; but that only a *ministerial* work on behalf of the Truth is attributed to it: which work is incumbent upon it by *office* in such a way that, nevertheless, it is not always fulfilled in a suitable manner by the Church or its leaders, nor is it for that matter its infallible privilege, by a comparison with Malachi 2:7, 8.

β. But, although by all this method the Papists gain nothing, nevertheless it appears to preferable to others, JOHN CAMERON,¹ and his Colleagues, ANDREW MELVILLE,² and JOHANN FABRITIUS,³ and among the Lutherans ERASMUS SCHMIDT,⁴ etc., that these words, *στύλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, be referred, not to the Church previously named, but to the subjoined summary of the Gospel in *verse* 16, *καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*, etc., and without controversy *great is the mystery of godliness*, etc.

1. Because the immediately subjoined summary of the Gospel concerning Christ is deservedly called *the Pillar and Support of the Truth*: whether you have regard to *substance*; for Christ is the sole foundation, as of the Church, so also of all Evangelical doctrine, by a comparison of 1 Corinthians 3:11 and Matthew 16:18; or you attend to the *expression of the Hebrews*, who are wont to esteem the more principal and necessary heads of doctrine as worthy of the names of *Column* and *Support*: or this *Column* be distinguished from the *Truth*, that is, from other truths built upon it, by a comparison with 1 Corinthians 3:12: or the *Truth* itself be said to be like unto a *Column*, and thus in this sense *Columns of the Truth*, in which

¹ John Cameron (1580-1625) was a Protestant divine of great distinction, serving as Professor of Philosophy at Sedan, Professor of Divinity at Saumur (1608) and at Glasgow (1620). He is the father of the Amyraldian doctrine.

² Andrew Melville (1545-1622) was a Scottish theologian and scholar, heavily involved in the Reformation of his country. He served as Principal of the University of Glasgow (1574-1580), Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews (1581-1606), and as Professor of Theology at Sedan (1611-1620).

³ Johann Ludwig Fabritius (1632-1697) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology, Old, and New Testament at Heidelberg (1661-1696).

⁴ Erasmus Schmidt (c. 1570-1637) was a German Lutheran philologist. He served as Professor of Philosophy (1596-1597), of Greek (1597-1637), and of Mathematics (1614-1637) at Wittenberg.

sense Paul made mention of θεμέλιον μετανοίας καὶ πίστεως, *the foundation of repentance and faith*, Hebrews 6:1, τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, *the breastplate of righteousness*, τὸν θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως, *the shield of faith*, Ephesians 6:14, 16.

2. Because no copula connects that title with those preceding in, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, *which is the church of the living God*; whence also no necessity of connecting them is able to be established.

3. Because the Church just now came under a different similitude, *the House of God*, upon the *exposition* of which similitude Paul dwells, subjoining it after the mention of *the House of God* in a proper expression, which is *the Church of the living God*; in which exposition there does not appear to be a place for a new and more obscure metaphor, of which sort is that *Column*.

4. Because the following words are joined by a Copula to our controverted words, καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, etc., *and without controversy, etc.*: which is not an argument apodictic and demonstrative; but nevertheless probable. So that Paul teaches Timothy in preaching simultaneously what is principally and especially fundamental, and equally pious and sublime.

They say that the constant punctuation of the text, which all the Old Versions follow, hinders this exegesis. *Responses*: 1. Nevertheless, in the Basel edition of 1540,¹ a comma is read in the place of the period. 2. The corruption of a comma into a period happens quite readily and is very slight; especially when this elogium with the following period was quite eagerly received by men scraping together those things that were appearing to pertain to the dignity of the Church. 3. The received severing of the themes is certainly not to be rashly criticized; but it is not authentic, as the Most Illustrious CLOPPENBURG,² in his *Disputatione X, de Canone Theologiae*, § 13, *opera, tome 2, page 62*.

But this interpretation, as most probable, is also adopted by our Most Illustrious AUTHOR in his *Exercitationibus textualibus XLIV, Part II*.

¹ This is the second edition of Thomas Platter (1499-1582), a Swiss humanist, educator, and printer. This edition is substantially that of Erasmus' third.

² Johann Cloppenburg (1592-1652) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and controversialist. He studied at the University of Leiden, and held various ministerial posts until his appointment as professor at the University of Harderwijk (1641), and then at Franeker (1643). He was a lifelong friend of Voetius, and colleague of Cocceius at Franeker.

He is joined by the Most Illustrious Alberti,¹ in his *Observationibus philologicis in Novum Testamentum*, upon this passage, page 396. BENDEL,² in his *Apparatu Critico ad Novum Testamentum*, page 709, embraces the same distinction, with many Authors praised for the same. Most recently Johann Georg Altmann,³ *Meletematis philologico-criticis in Novum Testamentum*, tome 2, Exercise upon 1 Timothy 3:16, § 2, pages 262, 263, also subscribed to this opinion.

γ. Finally, it is not permissible for the Papists to defend themselves with the authority of AUGUSTINE, who said, in *libro contra Epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant Fundamenti*, chapter V, opera, tome 8, of the *Benedictine edition*, column III, *Indeed, I non crederem*, would not have believed, *the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church commoveret*, had moved, *me*.

1. For they err here by an invalid argument, moving from a qualified to an unqualified statement,⁴ in a twofold manner: for, *a*. from a particular they infer a universal: if Augustine did not believe the Gospel, unless moved by the authority of the Church; therefore, no one is able to believe the Gospel, whom the authority of the Church does not move. *b*. Augustine is not speaking of himself as he was at that time, an Orthodox Christian and Bishop; but of himself as a Manichæan,⁵ when he passed from heresy to orthodox Religion, at which time he acknowledges himself to have been induced by the authority of the Church to believe the Gospel. For, what he says, *crederem, I would not have believed*, and *commoveret, it had moved*, according to the observation of the learned is an African expression, sufficiently familiar to Augustine, in which they make use of *the imperfect tense* in the place of *the pluperfect*. Thus AUGUSTINE, in his *Retractionibus*, book I, chapter XXIII, opera, tome I, column 25, is going to retract what he had previously said, *What therefore we believe is ours; but what good we perform belongs to Him who gives*

¹ Johannes Alberti (1698-1762), a Dutch minister, theologian, and philologist, served as Professor of Theology at Leiden (1740-1762).

² Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752) was a Lutheran clergyman. He is remembered for his work in textual criticism and annotation of the New Testament.

³ Johann Georg Altmann (1697-1758), a Swiss theologian, philologist, and historian, served as Professor of Philosophy at Bern (1734-1757).

⁴ The fallacy of accident.

⁵ Manichæism, arising in the third century, was a form of Gnostic dualism, teaching the co-eternality of good and evil. Human history is the long process of the separation of spiritual light (the good) from material darkness (the evil).

the Holy Spirit to believers; he subjoins: *which certainly dicerem*, I would not have said, *if jam scirem*, I had then known, *that faith itself also is found among the gifts of God, which are given in the same Spirit*: that is, this *non dixissem*, I had not said, at that time, *if jam scivissem*, I had then known, what I now know. He does not maintain, therefore, that those that now believe depend upon the authority of the Church, but that those that do not believe begin by it. That this path of authority is adapted to *fools*, he elsewhere says, to whom the opportunity of inquiring is given, in such a way that by degrees they arrive at heavenly wisdom, *libro de Utilitate credendi ad Honoratum*, chapter XVI: “It is authority alone that moves fools to hasten unto wisdom.... Now, this, with reason set aside, which to understand as sincere, as we have often said, is very difficult for fools, moves us in a twofold manner, partly *by miracles*, partly *by the multitude of those following*. None of these is necessary for the wise; who denies it? But this is now done so that we might be able to be wise, that is, to adhere to the truth.”

2. Augustine does not speak of the commanding authority of law and rule, which the Papists allege here; as if Augustine had believed merely because the Church was pronouncing that it was to be believed: but of the authority of dignity, which was sought from luminous arguments of God’s providences, which were conspicuous in the Church, of which sort were miracles, antiquity, consent of the nations, etc., chapter IV, which is able to lead to faith, although it be not of the first importance in the engendering of it.

3. Therefore, the external Motive to faith is noted, but not the infallible Principium of faith, which he teaches is to be sought in the truth alone, chapter IV: compare RIVET’S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter III, *opera*, tome 2. For in other respects the Fathers rightly held that the Sacred Scripture is more useful and better known by the Authority in itself and with respect to us, than the Church is, as LEYDEKKER,¹ in his *Veritate Euangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 2, pages 136, 137.

On § 6 and 7 see WHITAKER disputing *adversus Stapletonum*² *libris III de Auctoritate Sacræ Scripturæ*, or *de controversia circa Sacramentum*

¹ Melchior Leydekker (1642-1721) studied under Voetius at Utrecht, and Hoornbeeck and Cocceius at Leiden. He was appointed Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1676).

² Thomas Stapleton (1535-1598) was an English Catholic controversialist. He was instrumental in the establishment of the English College at Douai.

*Scripturarum Approbatione per Ecclesiam, opera, tome 2, pages 1-509.*¹ On § 7 compare also DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter II, § 81-97, pages 273-305.*

¹ William Whitaker (1548-1595) was a Reformed theologian of the Church of England (albeit with strong leanings toward Puritanism). He served as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (1580-1595). His *Disputatio de Sacra Scripture* is one of the great defenses of the Protestant and Reformed view of the authority of Scripture, directed primarily against Robert Bellarmine and Thomas Stapleton.

§ 8: The Authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Originals

As the Authority of Scripture, binding everyone to faith and obedience, flows from its divine Inspiration; in what Edition of Scripture then is that Authority sought whence it might be found as Independent and *Authentic*? what text then is to be called the *Authentic* text of Sacred Scripture? In which:

I. With respect to the vocabulary *Authentic* and *Authenticity* observe that, according to BUDDEUS, in his *Commentario Linguae Graecae*, and HENRICUS STEPHANUS, in the *Index* of his *Thesauri Linguae Graecae*,¹ column 576, who both confirm their assertions with many examples; ἀθέντης/*authentēs* to the most ancient Greek Writers denotes τὸν αὐτόχειρα, one who commits murder with his own hand, similarly one who lays hands upon himself,² the same as αὐτοέντης, from αὐτὸς, *he himself*, and ἔω, *to send forth* (or, according to the opinion of LAMBERT BOS,³ in his *Dissertatione de Etymologia Graeca*, pages 18, 19, after *Exercitationibus philologicis in Novum Fœdus*, from αὐτὸς, *he himself*, and ἔνω, in the place of which then is φένω, *to kill*): but afterwards it denoted one that made anything himself, and did not depend upon another, so that an ἀθέντης might be an *author/authority*, likewise a κύριος/*lord*, a δεσπότης/*master, who acts according to his own will and authority*; ἀθεντία might be *authorship/authority, power*; ἀθεντεῖν might be *to be in control, to act imperiously*, which occurs in 1 Timothy 2:12:⁴ hence those writings are ἀθεντικὰ/*authentic* that have definite authority. Now, among the ancient Jurisconsults it intensified, that they

¹ Henri Estienne, or Henricus Stephanus (c. 1530-1598), was the eldest son of Robert Estienne, who had printed several famous editions of the Greek New Testament. Henri continued in the family printing business, editing, collating, and preparing many classical works for the press. His most famous work is his *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which was a standard work in Greek lexicography until the nineteenth century.

² That is, a *suicide*.

³ Lambert Bos (1670-1717) was a Dutch scholar. Among other critical works, he published *Vetus Testamentum, ex Versione LXX Interpretum*.

⁴ 1 Timothy 2:12: “But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over (ἀθεντεῖν) the man, but to be in silence.”

might call writing *authentic*, which were *original*, as an *archtype* or *exemplar* is to those that are generally *copies*.

II. But as far as our Question is concerned; according to that manner of speaking of the Jurisconsults just now mentioned, only the Autographs of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles are *authentic*: but, while these Autographs, having been lost long ago, deserve to be called *authentic primarily* and *originally*; so any faithful and accurate apographs¹ are able to be called *authentic secondarily* and *derivatively*.

In the disappearance of the Autographs, the divine Providence dispenses wisely: while also it ought to be held as a fable that the Pentateuch, transcribed by the hand of Ezra, is said to be preserved to this day, either at Bologna in the church of St. Dominic,² or in the city of Cairo, Egypt; see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter VIII, § 1, pages 365-368; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, page 1470b. Neither does it deserve any greater confidence that the autograph of the Gospel of Mark, and that indeed in Latin, is preserved at Venice; concerning which see BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, page 1497a.

And in this manner indeed (that is, *secondarily* and *derivately*), to the present day Theologians speak of the *Authentic* text of Scripture, making a somewhat different use of this term transferred from the court to their schools, and comprehending two things especially under the term *αὐθεντία*/*authenticity*, both the exact harmony of the apographs with their prototypes, to such an extent that they read the apographs of the Sacred Codex as if the *αὐτογράφους*/*autograph* Codices of the Sacred Writers, whether the reader have it in Manuscript transcriptions, or in printed Editions: and especially, flowing hence, that divine and irrefutable authority, by which the Sacred Codex, as the *αὐτόπιστον*/*self-authenticating* and infallible Word of God, lays down the supreme norm of faith and life, and, presiding in controversies of religion, bears the judicial and unchallengeable, decisive sentence.

And this Independent *αὐθεντία*/*authenticity* and Authority of

¹ That is, copies.

² Dominic Guzman established a convent in Bologna, Italy, in 1218. He died there in 1221. After Dominic's death, the monastic complex was expanded, and the Basilica of Saint Dominic was built and then consecrated in 1251.

Scripture *with respect to the Matters* asserted or *materially* is also in each faithful Version of Scripture: for the translation of the Word of God into other languages does not cause a loss of divine authority, since the mind of the supreme Deity does not lie in the sound of the words, but in the sense, which sense is able to be declared and expressed in whatever idiom. Whence in various and many languages the Apostles were proclaiming τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the wonderful works of God*, without any diminishment of the divine sense, Acts 2:11. But *formally, with respect to the manner of relation and the Words*, that Authority and αὐθεντία/*authenticity* is only in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek text of the New, so that to this text all Versions ought to be compared, and, if at any point they differ from it, to be corrected and emended; and to that extent all Versions are dependent upon the text with respect to Words. “As the trustworthiness of the Ancient books is to be evaluated according to the Hebrew volumes: so the trustworthiness of the New stands in need of the norm of Greek speech;” is a Canon of AUGUSTINE in GRATIAN’S *Decreto*,¹ *first part, Distinction IX, chapter VI, columns 29, 30*. So indeed AUGUSTINE has it in *book II of de Doctrina Christiana, chapter XI, opera, tome 3, column 19*: “And indeed men of the Latin language, whom we have now received that they might be instructed, have a need of two other languages for the knowledge of the divine Scriptures, namely, Hebrew and Greek, so that they might have recourse to the preceding exemplars, if the infinite variety of Latin translators occasion any doubt.” So also in *de Civitate Dei, book XV, chapter XIII near the end, opera, tome 7, column 298*. “In no way would I doubt it rightly to be done, that, when some difference is found in both Codices (the Hebrew and the Septuagint)...confidence is rather to be given to that tongue from which translation was made into another tongue by Interpreters.”

But that, in this manner, *Formally and with respect to Words, the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament and the Greek Text of the New Testament* are alone *Authentic*, we prove from this, 1. that this text is the *most Ancient*; indeed, we are now wont to have recourse to the most ancient exemplars in all doubts, as those nearest to the πρωτοτύπω/*prototype/original*: but, in addition, 2. this text is *Original* and ἀρχέτυπος/

¹ The *Decretum Gratiani* is a compilation of Canon Law, written in the twelfth century by the jurist Gratian. Johannes Gratian was a teacher of theology at the monastery of Saints Nabor and Felix in northern Italy.

archetypal, from which are all Versions, as ἔκτυποι/*ectypes* translated from the πρωτοτύπῳ/*prototype/original*. 3. Finally, this text alone is *Inspired by God through the infallible Spirit*; while all Versions, although with respect to Substance they have Authenticity, are nevertheless without that ἀθθεντία/*authenticity* with respect to Words and idioms, in which the divine matters are expressed; for the words of Versions are not θεόπνευστα/*inspired*, or immediately divine, but ἀνθρώπινα/*human*, employed by men to translate the diction and expression of the sources, but not transcending human authority. 4. Hence that text alone, the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New, was Authentic from the beginning, and no reason is able to be given as to why in the passage of time it should cease to be such: for what is sought from their corruption supposes that which is in question. 5. But if that text be not Authentic, no Edition of the Scripture will be authentic; so then there would be no end of contentions, and no rule in which there ought to be complete acquiescence: but the Scripture would be able to be turned in any direction according to the will of each one. 6. Finally, the most learned among the Papists acknowledge that in doubts recourse is to be had to these sources; which would not be fitting, unless these sources were Authentic. *Bellarmino, book II, de Verbo Dei, chapter XI, Controversiis, tome I, columns 120-122*, posits various cases in which it is fitting to appeal to these sources: 1. when there appears to be any error of the copyists in the Latin Codices; 2. when they have various readings, so that which is true is not able to be established with certainty; 3. when they have anything doubtful, whether in words, or in things; 4. when the ἐνέργεια/*force* and propriety of the terms do not appear to be sufficiently expressed.

Now, under the Old Testament, God, in putting on record the Doctrine of salvation through His Amanuenses, made use of the *Hebrew Tongue*, because at that time He was revealing His Word to the Hebrew people alone, Psalm 147:19, 20; Romans 3:2: but the native Language of this people was Hebrew: lest concerning this a doubt be able to arise again in the future to anyone, the Most Illustrious ALBERT SCHULTENS, who in his *Excursu III, chapters II-VI, pages 185-244*, gave a proof at length, represented the Hebrew Tongue to have been the vernacular before the Flood, and to have remained such among the Hebrews until the time that followed the Babylonian Captivity: compare BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period I, section II, § 11, tome I, pages 188-193*, in which he cites more authors for the same

opinion, and defends that opinion against *Louis Ellies Du Pin*, who supposes the Chaldean tongue rather to have been the primeval language. Hebrew is the native *Jewish* tongue to the Jews, over against the *Syrian* dialect, 2 Kings 18:26.¹

But some things in the Old Testament are found written also in *Chaldean* or תַּיִשְׁתִּי/*Aramaic*, as it is in Daniel 2:4,² namely, Jeremiah 10:11; Daniel 2:4-7:28; and some pericopes in the book of *Ezra*, namely, 4:8-6:18; 7:12-26; and that for the same reason on account of which the rest were written down in Hebrew. Those Chaldean pericopes apparently were written down either in the Captivity, or about the time of the Babylonian Captivity, in order to serve the needs of the Jewish captives, or of those just now returning from the Captivity, to whom that Chaldean or Syriac dialect had already proven to be very familiar. In Jeremiah 10:11, a response is furnished for the Jews, whereby to idolaters, soliciting the Jews to defect from the true God, they are able to signify their aversion to idolatry in the language of those very Gentiles. Now, *Daniel*, writing in the Chaldean tongue, discusses matters pertaining to the Chaldeans in their own tongue, so that these might also be able to be made witnesses of the truth, and be refuted out of their own things. Indeed, *Ezra* exhibits in the Chaldean tongue Chaldaïca, especially the Epistles written to king Artaxerxes, and his responses: compare the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE'S³ *Observationes philologicas de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, observation II, § 7, 23, 24, pages 108-110, 127, 128; CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter VI, § 5, pages 247-249.

Under the New Testament, on the other hand, the Sacred Writers made use of the *Greek* idiom, because, with the dividing wall now removed,⁴ they were writing for the use of all nations without distinction, according to Mark 16:15; Acts 17:30. Therefore, they were obliged to make use of the language most universal and known to the

¹ 2 Kings 18:26: "Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language (אַרְמִית); for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews' language (יְהוּדִית) in the ears of the people that are on the wall."

² Daniel 2:4: "Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriack (אַרְמִית), O king, live for ever: tell thy servants the dream, and we will shew the interpretation."

³ Otho Verbrugge (1670-1745) was a Hebraist and Professor of Theology at Groningen (1717-1745).

⁴ Ephesians 2:14.

greatest number of Gentiles: but this was the Greek Language, which, through the empire of the Greeks, most broadly extended, and hence the diffusion of the celebrated study of wisdom among them, was at that time made familiar among all the more civilized nations throughout all three parts of the known world, and was not unknown to most Jews dispersed among the Greeks; indeed, even at Rome, in the city triumphant over the word, it was a favorite. “For if anyone,” says CICERO, in his *Oratione pro Archia*, chapter IX near the end, “thinks that a lesser produce of glory out of Greek verses, than out of Latin verses, he errs exceedingly: because *Greek* is read in almost all nations, but *Latin* is restricted to its own borders, and that certainly narrow.”

A. Here our AUTHOR briefly makes mention of some Philological Questions that are wont to be moved concerning the Authentic text, especially of the Old Testament.

8. Our AUTHOR sets forth concerning the *Vowel Points* (we dismiss for the present the *Accents*, concerning which an occasion of speaking to a limited extent will yet recur in § 14: compare ALBERT SCHULTENS’ *Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguæ Hebrææ ad regulam XXI*, λ, γ, η, pages 86-89; PHILIPPUS OUSEEL’S¹ *Præfationem* before *Introductionem in Accentuationem Hebræorum Metricam*; to which are able to be added the *Epistles* of BURMANN,² RELAND,³ and VITRINGA, to Ouseel concerning this work, in *Bibliotheca Bremensi, classis VIII, fascicule V, chapter X, pages 893-899*; see also CARPZOV’S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter v, section VII, pages 242-275*) a threefold Question, the parts of which are nevertheless greatly dependent upon each other. That is, it is asked concerning the Points’, 1. *Antiquity*, whether it is to be thought to be *as old as the Letters, or later?* 2. Concerning their *Origin, whether divine from Ezra or others, or Human from the more recent Masoretes?*⁴ 3. Concerning their *Authority, whether fallible or*

¹ Philippus Ouseel (1671-1724) was a Reformed Hebraist and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Frankfurt (1717-1724).

² Pieter Burmann (1668-1741) was the Professor of History, Greek, and Eloquence at the University of Leiden (1715-1741). He also served as Librarian.

³ Adriaan Reland (1676-1718) was a Dutch scholar. He was appointed to the University of Utrecht, first as Professor of Oriental languages (1701-1713), then as Professor of Sacred Antiquities (1713-1718).

⁴ The Masoretes were mediæval Jewish scribes (laboring from the fifth to the tenth centuries AD), responsible for the preservation and propagation of the traditional text of the Hebrew Scriptures.

infallible? It is well-known that this controversy is being agitated with great zeal among the most eminent Critics: among whom on behalf of the Antiquity of the Points in the Sacred Codex, either coeval with the writing of the individual Sacred Books, or at least from the restoration by Ezra, hence on behalf of their $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ /*inspiration* and infallible authority, there are those that contended before the rest in order to defend the integrity of the Sacred Codex, great men, both BUXTORFS, both the *Father*¹ in his *Tiberiade*, and the *Son*² in his *Anticritica* or *Vindiciis Veritatis Hebraicæ, quas Ludovici Cappelli Criticæ quam vocat Sacræ opposuit*. With whom, following the Jews, only not all, with one Elias Levita excepted, who was a German Grammarian of the early Sixteenth Century,³ the entire cohort of the most eminent Theologians and Philologists, of the Reformed, Lutherans, and Papists, agree: their names are enumerated both by TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question XI, § 13*; and even more extensively by PFEIFFER,⁴ *Criticis Sacris, chapter IV, section II, question II, page 705*.

On the other hand, others have taken on the task of undermining the Antiquity of the Points; and a great many, the task of undermining the Authority of the Points. That is (let me not commemorate those that feel still less benignly concerning the Points, and refer the invention of the same to even later times), of the Jews, *Elias Levita, præfatione III, libri Masoret hammasoreth*, and after him Papists in vast numbers, besides also Lutherans and Reformed not of the least note, enumerated by PFEIFFER, *Criticis Sacris, chapter IV, section II, question II, page 705, 706*; and among the Reformed no one has treated this case with greater care and zeal than LOUIS CAPPEL, Professor of Theology and of the Hebrew Language at Saumur,⁵ both in his *Arcano Punctuationis revelato, ejusque contra*

¹ Johann Buxtorf, Sr. (1564-1629) was a renowned Reformed Hebraist, known as the "Master of the Rabbis". He served as Professor of Hebrew at Basel from 1590 to 1629.

² John Buxtorf, Jr. (1599-1664) succeeded his father as Professor of Hebrew at Basel (1629-1664), and was perhaps the equal of his father in learning.

³ Elias Levita (1468-1549) was a Jewish Hebrew grammarian, respected among Christian Hebraists such as Munster and Fagius. *Tishbi* was a lexicon presenting for the German reader seven hundred and twelve words used in the Talmud and Midrash. It was translated into Latin by Fagius.

⁴ August Pfeiffer (1640-1698) was a German Lutheran Theologian and Orientalist. He served as Professor of Oriental Languages at Wittenberg (1665-1671), and then as Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages at Leipzig (1681-1689).

⁵ Louis Cappel (1585-1658) was a Huguenot divine of broad and profound

Buxtorfium Vindiciis, and in his *Criticis Sacris*: these, I say, contend that the Codices from Moses unto the Tiberian Masters¹ did not possess the points, until at length, around five hundred years after the Birth of Christ, Jews, congregated in Tiberias, distributed the Points underneath in that manner in which they are read today. But then these are divided again into two parts. For some hold with *Elias Levita* that the modern Reading is authentic, divine, and proceeding from the very Writers of the Sacred Books, but preserved unto the times of the Masoretes by oral tradition alone: until the latter committed that Reading, preserved hitherto by the trustworthiness of Tradition, to the letters by the help of the Points, and expressed it by certain signs. Others with a great many Philologists of the Christians attribute the sound and value of the vowels, as well as their figures and signs, and to that extent the whole system of reading, to the genius of the Masoretes, and reckon it merely human; but suited to the analogy of Grammar, the genius of the Language, and the exigency of the text and sense: hence to recede from today's reading of the Hebrew text is hardly taboo to them.

The Arguments, with which this was fought by both parties, BUXTORF on the one hand, and CAPPEL on the other, are related in their great number by the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS, in his *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae*, pages 60-62: he sets the same into a fixed order, in such a way that they have regard either to the historical tradition, or to the real documents, or to reasons more or less probable: and the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus*, part V, Exercise XXVIII, or Exercise III of his *Sylloge Dissertationum ad Novum Testamentum*, balances on both sides the weight of these arguments; and he rightly sees that various arguments are proffered by one and the other party, which arguments are parried with sufficiently probable Exceptions by the opposite party in turn. And, with all duly weighed, I willingly acquiesce in the modest judgment of both Men, truly Great, just now cited, MARCKIUS and SCHULTENS: of which the former, in his *cited Dissertation* § 14, wrote: "It appears probable that, if perhaps not all the present pointing was formerly added

learning. He served as a minister of the gospel and Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Saumur. Although his expertise in the Hebrew language was beyond question, his denial of the authority of the vowel points and of the absolute integrity of the Hebrew texts was hotly contested.

¹ The Masoretes were gathered for their work in Tiberias and Jerusalem in Palestine, and in Babylonia.

by the divine hand to the letters in the writing of the Scriptures, nevertheless not all of it was entirely absent; as in certain things more and in other things less, a necessity is discerned for the fitting use and understanding of the Scriptures, on account of which the matter here is not incorrectly judged in accordance with the wisdom and goodness of God. And thus (proceeds that Most Illustrious Man) the distinction, soon evident, is sufficiently great between the Vowel Points and the Accents—since the signification of the words depends upon the former far more than upon the latter, etc. Again, as there is not at all the same necessity of all the Accents—so neither is there a reason why, in a situation clearly the same, might be found that entire Number of Vowel Points, which are called by the Grammarians long, short, and shortest, and some are judged to be of hardly any use, while others generally have a special regard to the elegance of pronunciation alone. But if it be posited that from the first beginning of Scripture itself certain marks were present, both of the Vowel sound, with which the letters, otherwise of a dubious sense, were to be uttered; and of the Tone/Accent to be exerted, and of the Sense either to be stopped or continued, according to the use of other Oriental Languages also, and the holy simplicity agreeing with the first ages and with the divine Spirit: but that, through human wisdom and prudence, whereby they might study more certainly and holily the preservation and handing on of the Scriptures, or even through human *περιεργίαν*/*over-elaboration*, whereby they might wish to augment the glory of the same, far more similar notes were added by the human hand of the Jews, by which notes, nevertheless, the received Reading was by no means changed, which is certainly no more inconsistent with the character of the Jews than of the successive embellishing among men of all ancient institutes; but if, I say, those things be posited, perhaps it might be possible in the greatest degree to be satisfied with the arguments that were previously produced by one and the other party.” When, moreover, in § 15, he urges that there is to be no light or rash withdrawal from the current punctuation. But the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS expresses his mind in his *preface* to *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae* in this manner: “I wonder how it could come to pass that the Most Illustrious BUXTORF would allow so many questions, differing by the whole heaven in nature, worth, weight, and subject matter, to coalesce with that most important and fundamental controversy concerning the origin and authority of the Vowel Points, which he had undertaken to prove

against the Most Illustrious CAPPEL: and he would have without a doubt conquered, unless he had suffered himself to be circumvented by this stratagem of his most cunning Adversary. That the Vowels, and indeed all of them, that is, the long and the short, were certainly coeval with the letters, in my judgment, could never have been drawn into contention, if only the state of the controversy had remained pure and unmixed. Is it possible to name any Language without Vowels, a, e, i, o, u, sometimes shorter, sometimes longer, being heard? No one would assert it. Is the one that first clothed the Consonant Letters, that is, the body of the Language, with figures, and with admirable artifice subjected them to the eyes, to be supposed to have neglected the soul of Language? This is inconsistent with all appearance of truth. I do not assert that he, whoever he might have been, presently added the same figure of the vowels, of which we now make use: but that were invented also with the Consonants, by this most wise inventor of writing, certain little marks and points, by which might be expressed a, e, i, o, u, the matter itself and the reason for the invention so evince that I indeed always speak of it as clearer than the noonday light, etc. At the same time, I do not deny that our Oriental Languages, especially Hebrew, are compared with sister dialects, Chaldean, Syriac, and Arabic, in such a way that in many things they are able both to be read and to be understood well, as expeditiously as possible, without Vowels inserted and subscripted. Nevertheless, I myself, after thirty-five years spent in this school, partly in learning, partly in teaching, deny and utterly reject the same, that these, our Languages everywhere lack the insertion and subscription of the Vowel points, etc. Therefore, it was displeasing in the system of Cappel, and I was supposing it to be against sounder Criticism, what was so confidently asserted: 1. that the Vowels are new, because their denominations perhaps have the character of novelty. 2. That without them the Hebrew text is everywhere sufficiently accessible and plain. 3. That the *Matres Lectionis*,¹ in any event, shine light abundantly upon the more obscure passages. 4. That all the Oriental Languages were formerly without express marks of Vowels, etc. Most of these things appeared to me to be easy to confute, from the very principia of the Oriental Languages, etc. Only somewhat of a scruple was recurring from the *Matribus Lectionis*, the feebleness of which I have now thoroughly ascertained, etc.” And then, in the same work, *page* 62, he

¹ That is, *mothers of reading*, certain Hebrew consonants (א, ה, ו, י) are also associated with vowel sounds.

writes: “The Controversy, more simply set forth, would be able to be composed without so much difficulty, if the truth alone had been sought. Take away the Question’s adjuncts, concerning the contemporary figures and names of the vowels, concerning schema, concerning the manifold number and function of the accents: then look into what appears to have the greater appearance of truth, whether the Vowels would have been present from the most ancient times, or not? further restrict this also, and discuss, whether or not at least little Vowel markings would have been inserted by the Sacred Writers, when the highest necessity was requiring it. To deny this is not very becoming: to require anything further is imprudent and hurtful to a good cause. If this quarrel should keep itself within these bounds, a concord between the Critics and Theologians will spontaneously come together, and the Vowel points will by common consent obtain that just and natural place, which to them is allotted by the character of the Hebrew Tongue, by the usage of the East, thence from a primeval origin, among the Chaldeans, Syrian, and Arabs. Those that express themselves otherwise on this matter, appear to have inquired into it without very much accuracy.” Thus far the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS.

That certain little Vowel markings were inserted from the beginning of the Consonants, from which the genuine Reading would be able to be certain, is proven:

1. From the perfection, perspicuity, and certainty of the literal Sense of the Sacred Scripture, which all depend upon the added guidance of the Points. That the Scripture is perfect and perspicuous, is to be proven below against the Papists. But, without the express addition of the Points, the Scripture would be made ambiguous in a great many passages, its Sense uncertain, and its reader left in suspense: thus, for example, if you read דבר, from this is able to be formed, דָּבַר, *he said*, דָּבַר / pestilence, דִּבֵּר, *one speaking*, דִּבֵּר, *to speak*, דִּבֵּר, *speak thou*, דְּבַר / word, etc. In this way the Septuagint translators strayed with overmuch frequency. Thus in Lamentations 3:33, in the place of, כִּי לֹא עָנָה מִלְּבָבוֹ, *God does not afflict from His heart*, they read עָנָה, *to answer*, rendering it, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτοῦ, *He does not answer from His heart*, with a sense quite incongruous. In Psalm 7:11, in the place of, אֵלִי זַעַם בְּכָל־יּוֹם: and *God is angry every day*, in the contrary sense they read אַל, and *not*, reading καὶ μὴ ὀργῆν ἐπάγων, etc., and *He is not bringing wrath*, etc. In Isaiah 33:2, in the place of, זְרָעָם, *their arm*, they read זָרְעָם,

σπέρμα αὐτῶν, *their seed*, etc.

2. An argument is sought from the men, for whom the Scripture was intended. For it is set before the eyes to be read, not only by the prudent, men learned and especially skillful in letters; but by all indiscriminately, men, women, old, young, learned and unlearned: unto this end, that thence they might derive the way of obtaining salvation, the saving knowledge of God, and faith. Who then would deny that the style of the infirm and ruder sort was adopted, not only in the manner of propounding, but also of writing, and that the writing was accommodated especially to their capacity? Now while, if you deprive the text of its Points, the true and genuine reading in a great many and very weighty passages would escape men well exercised and learned, and they would not with adequacy follow it; what would men, simple and ignorant of letters, do?

3. The universal reception of the contemporary Pointing among all Jews everywhere appears to be traced back to no other source than the divine origin of these Points, and the providence accompanying this. For, if the Biblical Pointing proceed not θεοπνεύστως, *by inspiration*, from prophetic Men, but from the Tiberian Masters not rising above the human lot, it certainly would not in any way have been received so ἀναντιρρήτως/*unanimously* by the entire race of Jews; but the emulation, which always thrived among the Scribes and Doctors, would have prevailed to such a degree that some, withdrawing from the common opinion, would have set themselves opposite to that, or censured it. But now there is agreement even among the Karaites¹ and the Rabbinical men in the same Pointing of the Codex, if you except a few things.

4. Add that, concerning the Pointing being invented of late, among the Hebrew, if you except one, Elias Levita, the silence is most profound, who nevertheless were not at all silent concerning the elaboration of the Talmud, neither concerning this great labor upon the very Scripture could they have been silent, unto the praise of the inventors and the greater commendation of the thing itself, if it had happened in a later age.

5. Neither without plausibility is this also urged at last, that in all ages the reverence of the Jews for their Law was greater than that

¹ The Karaites were a Jewish sect that adhered to the written Scripture, denying the authority of oral and Rabbinic tradition. This sect appears to have originated in the eighth century AD.

they would dare according to human pleasure to augment it with such an addition, by which solicitous care of the Masoretes they applied themselves with great vigor to prevent all mutation.

And, so that we might with brevity take away one and the other of the principal difficulties, which are wont to be moved oppositely:

They object, for example, 1. the Copies of the books, of which the Jews make use in their Synagogues for public recitations, which all are without the Vowel Points, Accents, etc., and which, nevertheless, would doubtlessly be in close conformity to the most ancient *αὐτογράφους/autograph* Codices of the sacred Amanuenses. *We respond*: α. According to RABBI BECHAI¹ in his *biour gnal hatthora*, folio 162b, the Jews omit the Pointing of the book of the Law for Kabbalistic reasons, that is, so that from one unpointed they might be able to elicit various and manifold senses. β. For public uses the Jews employ Unpointed Codices, so that correct Codices might be able to be had throughout all the Synagogues in sufficient abundance, and so that those might be available without immoderate expense. γ. It is sufficient that the precentor on the day before the sabbath commit to memory his reading according to a Pointed copy, and that the pointed Codices furnish the norm of public recitation, although that be undertaken from an Unpointed volume.

They object, 2. the Silence of the Talmudists, who neither in the Mishnah,² nor in the Gemara,³ interject mention of the Points: then of the Kabbalists, who draw their own arcane senses, never from the Points, but from the letters alone. *We respond*: α. It is a strange argument, sought from the silence of the Talmud, no less than if you should undertake to reason in this way: In the Justinian Body of Law,⁴

¹ Bahya ben Asher was a thirteen century Spanish rabbi and scholar. He produced a commentary on the Torah, which takes into account the literal meaning of the text, its logical and philosophical implications, traditional rabbinic interpretation, and a Kabbalistic/mystical interpretation of text, following Nahmanides.

² The *Mishnah* is a compilation and redaction of the Jewish oral law, ascribed to Rabbi Judah haNasi around 200 AD. It is a commentary and elaboration of the Law of Moses.

³ The *Gemara* is rabbinical commentary on the Mishnah. The Gemara and Mishnah together make up the Talmuds: The Jerusalem Talmud was published toward the end of the fourth century; the Babylonian Talmud was published around 500.

⁴ The Code of Justinian was compiled about 530 at the command of Justinian

no mention is made of letters, vowels, or punctuation: therefore, in the age in which it was composed, the letters, vowels, and punctuation, which are in use today, did not exist, or were not employed in the same manner. For the Talmud does not dwell on Grammatical precepts, nor on eliciting the sense of Scripture, but on explaining the rites and laws of the Nation. β . In the Talmud, today's Pointing is tacitly approved, when, whatever sayings of Scripture it alleges, it alleges in no other sense than what our Pointing displays. Now, it would hardly be without a miracle that the Talmudic Doctors had read the entire Codex in just the same way that the Masoretic exemplars read, if they had been directed by no Pointed Codex. Neither is it possible for you to refer this to oral tradition: for the same was equally enjoyed by the Chaldean Interpreters, being yet far superior in age to the Talmudists, and also by the authors of the Greek Version, etc.; who all, nevertheless, it is evident, strayed from the Masoretic Pointing in many places. γ . Both BUXTORFS commended many passages both of the Talmud and of the Kabbalists in favor of the Points.

They object, 3. the most ancient Translations, the Chaldean Versions, the Syriac, the Greek Versions, which on account of the want of the Points read and render the words so diversely, which according to the diverse reckoning of the Points admit various readings. Neither do the *Fathers, the most ancient and skillful in Hebrew, Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius,* make mention of the Points, although having a most convenient opportunity offered to them. *We respond: α .* The Major premise of the argument concludes nothing. For thus it has it: what sort of Codex was used neither by the Translators, nor by the Greek and Latin Fathers, such existed neither from its first beginning, nor at that time among the Jews. Pointed Codices were certainly able to exist at the same time, in which the Translators and Fathers were applying themselves to the Hebrew Scripture; but they would come at great expense, and so would not be very common; whence it happened that Unpointed Codices obtained in common use. Moreover, the Ancient Interpreters strayed no less frequently from the genuine reading of the Consonants and whole Words than from that of the Points: whence then by the same right it could be concluded also that formerly the consonant letters and entire words were read differently. β . As far as the particulars are concerned,

I. It is a selection and compilation of preceding imperial enactments and the pronouncements of Roman jurists.

1. With respect to the Greek Version of the Septuagint, Learned Men think that that ancient and genuine Version is not available to us in its entirety: indeed, a collation of the diverse Editions, for example, of the Roman and Anglican, shows that almost innumerable discrepancies of the Greek text are given by them; so that from an adulterated, corrupt, and uncertain version nothing is able to be concluded firmly against the Hebrew sources, and the possession of the points in good faith. 2. With respect to the Chaldean Paraphrases; no reason appears why their differing from the Hebrew text might argue the absence of the vowels, more than of the letters and words, since in both there is a great discrepancy from the Hebrew codex. 3. Finally, with respect to the Fathers, one may retort: *a.* That they were not so skilled in the Hebrew Language, nor furnished with an abundance of Codices; that, however they may have made use of Unpointed Codices, it nevertheless does not follow from thence that Pointed Codices were not available at that time. *b.* In accordance with the additional examples alleged by BUXTORF, JEROME by repeatedly manifest indications appears to have not been altogether ignorant of the Points. *c.* The authority of the Septuagint Version was such in the ancient Church, that hardly without danger was it to depart entirely from it. Hence fear of ill will often brought it to pass that with the Septuagint Translators they sometimes prefer to depart from the Masoretic reading, than, departing from their version, to incur suspicion of novelty and heresy. On these Questions concerning the *Vowel Points* in the Hebrew Codex of the Old Testament, see also JOHANN FRANZ BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book I, chapter IV, § 6, pages 132, 133, tome 1.*

2. With the threefold ζήτηματι/*inquiry* concerning the Points, our AUTHOR subjoins a fourth, having regard to *the Figure of the Hebrew Letters before the Captivity, whether they were the Samaritan, or the Blocked Letters of Today?* But concerning this, as concerning the Preceding Questions, he briefly adds: "The determination and solid demonstration of all these is quite difficult."

No less in this controversy concerning the Hebrew Letters, than in the other concerning the Vowel Points, it has been drawn into parties by the greatest Theologians and Philologists. That is, it is affirmed by one party, that the squared impress, by which today's written Hebrew Codices are read, with respect to their substance, were the same with that by which Moses and the Prophets set down their books in αὐτογράφοις, *their autographs*. By the other party it is held that today's

squared impress was adopted more recently, so that Ezra with his Colleagues, after the return from Captivity, transcribed the sacred Books with this impress, with the former impress repudiated and left to the Samaritans.

The Authors and Patrons of both opinions, Men of great repute on both sides, both Jews, and Christians, Papists, Lutherans, Reformed, are enumerated by CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter V, section VI, pages 227, 228, 232-234, in the notes.* PFAFF, in his *Historia Formulæ Consensus Helveticæ, chapter I, § 8,* shows that the opinion of Cappel does not satisfy today's Lutherans, who in this instance are devoted to the opinion of Buxtorf. The arguments, of which they that discuss this business on the one side and on the other make use, are summarily related by the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS, *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebrææ, pages 15 and following,* with which rightly considered, it will be evident that various arguments on both sides are produced, to which it is discovered that hardly the greatest force belongs.

The most ancient Tradition is urged on both sides, which hence we set over against each other.

Nevertheless, if we have regard to the remaining weights of reasons, the Sacred Codex of the Old Testament was at first written down in the Hebrew Letters of Squared Figure, which sort are in use at the present day; to us it appears that it is to be defend, until the contrary be confirmed by stronger arguments.

In which situation, only with reluctance are we prepared to argue with the greatest Men from the ך/*yod*, considered by the Lord as the smallest letter of the Hebrew Alphabet, Matthew 5:18, of which sort it is among the Squared letters, not among the Samaritan Alphabet, where it is written thus Ξ .¹ For others except that, 1. when Matthew relates the words of the Lord in Greek, he also has regard unto the ι/*Iota* of the Greeks, just as also John mentions α/*alpha* and ω/*omega* in Revelation.² 2. But if they have regard unto the Hebraic ך, it is able to be referred to the form of writing used in the time of the Lord's dwelling upon the earth.

Neither do we promote the argument from the confusion of the related Hebrew letters among Translators, whence others reason:

¹ A rough equivalent of the Samaritan character.

² Revelation 1:8, 11; 21:6; 22:13.

Whatever Alphabet has those related letters, by the confusion of which they poured forth evident errors into the Chaldean Versions, the Greek, the Latin, and into the Samaritan Codex, that is original to the Hebrew of the Sacred Codex. But the Squared Alphabet of the Hebrews (not the Samaritan, or any other) has those related letters, by the confusion of which they pour forth evident errors into the Versions. Therefore. For there is absolutely no force in this argument, until you evince that all those Versions, or at least some of them, surpass the age of Ezra; in which others maintain that the permutation of the Samaritan Letters with the Squared letters was made.

Rather, we reason: If the permutation of the letters, in which the Sacred Codex was written, happened in the time of Ezra, it ought not to be asserted lightly, but it ought to be demonstrated with clear and invincible proofs: 1. Because the veneration owed to the Sacred Scripture wards off from this all casual alteration. 2. Which restricts so much more, if a consideration of the Jewish Nation should be brought along side, a Nation tenacious of their ancient institutions, now already dispersed throughout the East with their Scriptures, and having in contempt the Idolatrous Nations, no less than the Samaritans: whence learned Men contend that this sort of permutation of the letters was impossible to Ezra. Indeed, if, say they, it was not able to happen either that Ezra gathered and destroyed the exemplars of the Sacred Books scattered far and wide through the world, and supplied exemplars new and written in Chaldean characters for the Jews throughout so many widely scattered parts and provinces of the world: or that in the matter of the transfer of the Sacred Books into profane and gentile characters he procured the consent of the entire nation, extended so broadly throughout the world, so stubborn, and tenacious of those things that pertain to religion and sacred rites: the conclusion is also that such things never actually happened.

An observation is also not altogether unsuitable concerning the simpler and more original figure of the Squared letters.

They object on behalf of a Permutation of the Letters made by Ezra;

1. Various reasons, which are able to be reckoned to make rather for the illustration of this thesis already proven, than for the proof of the same: of which sort is, for example,

α. The longer sojourn of the Jews in Chaldea: which brought in a change of writing no more than formerly their Egyptian

sojourn, or long afterwards the Jews' even longer lasting sojourn in the Greek world, Roman or European: and, learning the Chaldean language for their own use, the Jews were not immediately obliged to make use of its characters in their Language, much less in their $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ /*inspired Books*.

β . The easier writing of the Squared letters; but which is offset by the longer use and love of the other writing.

γ . The separation of the Jews from the Samaritans: but on account of which they were not obliged to relinquish their sacred things to them, and to conform themselves to other foreigners.

δ . Their enduring subjection under the Persians; but which does not extend itself to this point.

2. Then they produce ancient Shekels with a Samaritan Inscription, *Holy Jerusalem*, $\text{יְרוּשָׁלַיִם הַקְּדוּשָׁה}$, which were able to be made neither by the Samaritans on account of their contempt of that city, nor by the Jews after the Captivity on account of their aversion to the Samaritans, which hence they assert were struck by the Jews in the time of the first Temple. But, α . Men especially conversant in this sort of study did not make those coins to be of so much value; and some of the same think that these coins were struck only in the time of the Hasmoneans.¹ β . They observe that the letters, which these coins depict, are not the same as the Samaritan, neither are they completely foreign to the Squared letters of the Hebrews; but a stamp intermediate, as it were, between both, which LCESCHERUS notes to have been the shorthand of the Jews. For thus that learned Man, and others with him, think that, although the Hebrews did not know any other form of letters from the beginnings of the Jewish republic than that Sacred and Squared form, nevertheless by those writing swiftly there was introduced another, and that less carefully formed, which indeed was able to represent the Squared stamp; but it was far less carefully formed and less exact, and in private and profane writing it was everywhere increasing in the succession of time: while with the destruction of the Palestinian Schools it perished among the Jews, it remained among the Samaritans, continually inhabiting their original seats; where nevertheless after these things, with the cultivation of writing coming on, from that ruder method of drawing the Samaritan character at length came forth, which

¹ The Hasmonean dynasty, established by the Maccabees, reigned from c. 140 to 37 BC, when they were succeeded by the Herodians.

is in use among them today. And, that in this sense their opinion is able to be tolerated, they suppose, who attribute two sets of letters to the Hebrews, namely, sacred and profane. The Most Illustrious SCHULTENS sees things a little differently, who thinks that the conspicuous stamp on those coins is ancient Phœnician, which differs from the Squared Hebrew only in the drawing and bending of the hand. Now, he posits that this Phœnician stamp was actually derived from the Samaritans from the first beginning of their affairs, which Samaritans were pursuing neighborhood and commerce with Phœnicia. Nevertheless, he asserts that the ancient Phœnician character was simpler, just as it is also conspicuous on those coins, than the Samaritan is now wont to be depicted, augmented with new appendages and little strokes. Whatever of these you might now choose, even if you should desire to refer the age of those coins to the first temple, nothing else thence follows; than that some letters of the Hebrews were common, similar to those that afterward obtained among the Samaritans, and which they were using in private writings, coins, and shekels: others were solemn, as it were, and sacred, more like our Squared letters, of which use was made in sacred writings and perhaps public monuments. γ. In any event, from this Inscription of the Coins it is not able certainly to be concluded that the Hebrews made use of those characters only; and that these were most certainly the same in which the Law was formerly set down, and in which the remaining Sacred Books were committed to writing. Certainly from the Coins and Inscriptions of other nations anything similar would be rashly concluded.

They object, 3. That commonly the *Samaritan Letters* are called כתב עברי, *Hebrew writing*; but the *Squared letters* are called כתב אשורי, *Assyrian writing*, because it arose with the people returning from Assyria. *Responses: α.* *The mere sophistries of certain Rabbis*, says the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS. *β.* The Most Illustrious LÆSCHERUS responds that the Jews that dwelt in Chaldea and Assyria far more diligently practiced the holy tongue than those that lived in Palestine; and that the same, in preserving and with greater diligence copying the letters of their ancestors, were more painstaking than the rest, who adopted the swifter method of writing, which afterward was like unto the Samaritan method. And thence it happened that the true and most ancient letters were called Assyrian by some, especially by the Jews of preceding times: but the name of Hebrew writing remained to those deformed and shorthand letters, which the Hebrew inhabitants of

Palestine retained. γ . Now, MARCKIUS, *a.* supposes that the Samaritan Letters are able to be called כְּתָב עִבְרִי, *Hebrew writing*, by a notion, not so much proper to *Hebrew Writing*, as appellative of *Transfluvial Writing*, that is, Trans-Euphratean, that is, with respect to the Assyrians and other Oriental peoples, just as *Trans-fluvial Writing* is directly enough set over against *Assyrian*. Now, thus by the name of *Hebrew Writing* given to Samaritan letters it could not be solidly proven that the Hebrew people made use of these before the Captivity, still less of these only as peculiar to themselves. *b.* But he desires that the Squared writing be called *Assyrian*, not because it was proper to Assyria and the neighboring peoples all the way until the times of Ezra, where the captive Jews learned that first or more commonly, and whence they brought it with them in the return: but because Abraham, coming with his own from Assyria unto Canaan, thence brought this ancestral writing, and propagated it with the tongue unto his posterity, although then led away into Egypt and thence led out with a mighty hand;¹ to which also in the exodus God, publishing the Law, adhered, and Moses kept with all the Prophets, indeed even the rest of the people, in matters, not indeed always all, but nevertheless most and the principal. Clearly, just as among us letters are called *Italic*, the use of which, with the diverse wisdom of the Latins itself, was brought to us ages ago.

They object, 4. What things you may see are found in Daniel, Ezra, and the Chaldean Targums, written in today's Squared Hebrew characters. But, that formerly the Chaldean characters were diverse from the Hebrew, appears to be evident from Daniel 1:4, in which the sons of Hebrew noblemen, excelling in ability and learning, for whom neither the vernacular Hebrew tongue nor its script could be unknown, are commanded to be educated in the: וְלִשׁוֹן כַּשְׁדִּים: *Writing and Tongue of the Chaldeans*. Therefore, it is likely that today's Squared characters were the very same, ancient characters of the Chaldeans. *Response*: The Chaldean characters may formerly have been diverse from the Hebrew, but of which sort it is likewise now to us: nevertheless, from the Chaldean pericopes of the Bible and Targums written in the Squared characters, it does not follow that this is the genuine writing of the Chaldeans: instead, the Prophets in the authentic text, and the Targumists in order to please their nation, of Hebrew characters as familiar to all, rather than in Chaldean, wished to make use in expressing

¹ See Exodus 3:19; 6:1.

Chaldean words, lest the people be hindered by foreign characters: just as today you often also see Syriac and Arabic written in Hebrew characters. Except that others explain סֵפֶר here rather of those things that were committed to writing, than of the writing itself, as the DUTCH translates it *books*: CHRISTIAN BENEDICT MICHAELIS,¹ in his *Adnotationibus in Daniele*, has on this passage: “סֵפֶר/*book*, that is, learning, which is wont to be contained in books. Therefore, the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic render it rightly as *letters*; but you may comprehend under this name, not only the elements of writing, but also the cultured disciplines and liberal studies, and whatever belongs to the Chaldean Philosophy, gathered out of verse 17, where it is coordinated with *wisdom*, בְּכָל-סֵפֶר וְחָכְמָה, *in all the book*, that is, *literature, and wisdom*. From the same, one *learned, erudite*, is called a סוֹפֵר/*scribe*, who handles letters and books, Isaiah 33:18.”

Objects, 5. BASNAGE, in his *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans*,² year 1709, *January, article IV, pages 65 and following*, that the Israelite Priest, who, having been sent from the Captivity to the new colony of Samaria, brought the book of the Law,³ brought it undoubtedly written in the same letters, in which it, having been written before this devastation of the nation and from antiquity, was read: and that hence it is evident that the Samaritan characters were those in which the ancient copies of the Law were written, and which the Samaritans afterwards continually retained. *Response*: Although the former is able to be admitted, nevertheless we deny the consequence. α. For the exemplar, brought by the Priest in the Squared character, afterwards was able to be transferred into another form by the Samaritans. For from the volume of the Law that Priest did not wish to instruct them in the writing of letters, but in the sense of the Law: and these colonists did not adopt immediately the same system of letters, which obtained in the codex of that Priest. β. With no less ease were the Samaritans able to converted the Squared characters into another; than the Jews are supposed to have changed the Samaritan characters into the Squared. γ. But that Israelite Priest is not expressly remembered to have brought an entire Pentateuch

¹ Christian Benedict Michaelis (1680-1764) was German Orientalist and Evangelical Lutheran theologian.

² Henri Basnage de Beauval (1657-1710) was a Huguenot historian and lexicographer. He was the editor of the periodical *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans*.

³ 2 Kings 17:27, 28.

Manuscript with him. δ . Although this would have been better, it is probable that he by oral tradition alone taught the Cuthite peoples, ignorant of the Hebrew tongue and addicted to idolatry, the worship of the God of Israel: whence they were easily able to refrain from copying the sacred Codex, until afterwards Manasseh crossed over unto their camp and reformed the sacred rites of the Samaritans;¹ at which time and thereafter the Samaritans, now accustomed to the Phœnician characters, were also able to copy the Pentateuch in those characters for their own uses: compare HUMPHREY PRIDEAUX'S² *History of the Jews*, book VI, column 476.

They object, 6. who maintain that the Hebrew writing was changed by Ezra, the authority of EUSEBIUS, *Chronicon on Olympiad LXXX*, and of JEROME, *Prologo galeato ad libros Regum*, who both expressly testify to this. *Response*: α . The words of EUSEBIUS regarding this indeed appear in ancient Latin Codices; but neither in the Greek, nor in the Latin, of the edition of SCALIGER, who does not even alert us concerning the reading of these things in others. Now, that the same were spurious and added by a more recent hand to the text beyond the confirmation of the Ancient Codices, contends EZEKIEL SPANHEIM,³ *de Præstantia et Usu Numismatum antiquorum*, *Dissertation II*, *tome I*, page 63, with CARPZOV bringing this to notice. β . THOMAS BANGIUS⁴ wrote an entire dissertation against the testimony of JEROME, which is the third dissertation of *Cæli Orientis*, page 209; and lest we should be moved too much by his authority, it is to be understood that Jerome understood Hebraica no further than he had learned it from his Teacher, a Tiberian Jew: and so that testimony of Jerome only demonstrates that his teacher among other Jews was in this heresy also.

See at greater length this controversy concerning the Figure, whether Samaritan or Today's Squared, of the Hebrew Letters before

¹ *Jewish Antiquities* 11:7:2; 11:8:2. Josephus records that Manasseh, a Jewish priest, married the daughter of Sanballat. When the Jews threatened to deprive Manasseh, he went over to the Samaritans, Sanballat having promised to build him a temple at Gerizzim.

² Humphrey Prideaux (1648-1724) was an Anglican churchman and orientalist.

³ Ezekiel Spanheim (1629-1710), eldest son of Friedrich Spanheim the Elder, was a Swiss diplomat and scholar.

⁴ Thomas Bangius (1600-1661), a student of Sixtinus Amama, was a first-rate Orientalist, and he served as Professor of Divinity at Copenhagen.

the Babylonian Captivity, thoroughly treated by our AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus textualibus* XXVII, Part V; by ABRAHAM CALOVIUS,¹ *Bibliis Illustratis*, tome I, in the *Præloquio in Libros Veteris Testamenti*, pages 25-27; by JOHANN GOTTLÖB CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter V, section VI, § 10, pages 225-242, and many others whom he cites here, and likewise part III, chapter V, pages 917-922; by JOHANN FRANZ BUDDEUS, *Historia ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, pages 803-814, and *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book I, chapter IV, § 6, tome 1, pages 131, 132, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1456, 1457a; by ALBERT SCHULTENS, *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae*, pages 15-20, 7; by SEBASTIANUS RAVIUS,² *Exercitatione philologica quarta ad Houbigant Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacram*, chapter III, article I, pages 3-24. Consider also SALOMON DEYLING, *Observationibus Sacris*, part III, *Observation* XXV, § 10-20, pages 234-251; FREDERIC SPANHEIM, *Historia Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, epoch VIII, chapter III, § 5, column 416.

B. Our AUTHOR next in his *Compendio*, before he concludes this §, professes that he rejects the opinions,

8. Concerning the GOSPEL of MATTHEW WRITTEN in HEBREW; concerning which the Most Illustrious GOMARUS' *Dissertatio*, *Opera*, tome 3, pages 313-316, stands out, in addition to which LEUSDEN'S³ *Philologus Hebræo-Græcus*, *Dissertation* XVII, § 11-13, is also able to be consulted; and also SPANHEIM'S *Exercitatio de Historiæ Euangelicæ Scriptoribus*, § 8, 9, in the *Appendix* of book II of *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquitatum*, *opera*, tome 2, columns 271-273, and also in book III of *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquitatum*, *Disseration* III, part III, § 10, *opera*, tome 2, column 359; but also BUDDEUS' *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, pages 1494b-1496a. Certainly, that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, is related everywhere by the Ancients, *Papias*,⁴ *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*,

¹ Abraham Calovius (1612-1686) was a champion of Lutheran orthodoxy. He served the University of Wittenberg as Professor of Theology, and later as general superintendent. He opposed Socinians, Roman Catholics, and Calvinists, denying the possibility of the salvation of any of these. His *Systema locorum theologicorum* stands at the apex of Lutheran scholastic orthodoxy.

² Sebald Rau (1724-1818) was a German Orientalist and Reformed theologian.

³ Johannes Leusden (1624-1699) was a Dutch Reformed Orientalist; he served as Professor of Oriental Languages at Utrecht (1650-1699).

⁴ Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis circa 100. His *Exposition of the Sayings of*

Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact; you have the words of each in GOMARUS, *in the place cited*: which Gospel was then translated into the Greek Language either by James, the brother of the Lord, according to *Athanasius*, or by John, according to *Theophylact*. The experience of the Fathers is added, among whom JEROME testifies that that Gospel was not only extant in his age at the Library of Cæsarea, but he also received the same from the Nazarenes, who were using this volume, so that he might copy it, which he translated into the Greek and Latin tongue.

Nevertheless, that our Greek Gospel of Matthew was not translated out of Hebrew, we hold with our AUTHOR, 1. Because of the translation, not only of an individual word, but of an entire Hebrew pericope into Greek speech: thus in Matthew 1:23 it is, *And they shall call His name Ἐμμανουήλ, ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνευόμενον, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us*; and in Matthew 27:46, Ἥλί, Ἥλί, λαμὰ σαβαχθανί; τοῦτ' ἔστι, Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*; These translations would certainly have been wanting in the Hebrew text: with what fidelity, then, were they added by the Translator? Neither are the Versions of the Septuagint and Latin to be summoned for help, in which in some places something similar, yet still quite different, is found; neither do those Versions have authenticity with respect to words, as indeed the Greek text of Matthew is acknowledged to be authentic.

2. If God had taken care that the Gospel be written down by Matthew in Hebrew θεοπνεύστως, *by inspiration*, He would have preserved for us copies in the original Language, no less of this than of the other Canonical Books, written down for the perpetual use of the Church: which, nevertheless,

α. At this time are not extant. Indeed, even today *Hebrew Gospels of Matthew* are circulated, one by MUNSTER,¹ another by MERCERUS,² rendered in Latin; but, 1. *as these were unknown to all*

the Lord is preserved only in fragments.

¹ Sebastian Munster (1489-1552) was a German scholar of great talent in the fields of mathematics, Oriental studies, and divinity. He joined the Lutherans, became Professor of Hebrew at Basil, and produced important early Reformation commentaries on the Old Testament (*Annotationes in Vetus Testamentum*) and on Matthew (*Annotationes in Matthæi Evangelium Hebraicum*).

² John Mercerus (died 1562) began his career as a Roman Catholic scholar.

antiquity, so, says GOMARUS, by the evidence of their style, by certain additions and omissions, and by the especially great variety among themselves, they sufficiently show that they were translated by Jews, diverse and unequal in erudition, from Greek or Latin: which he confirms by the judgment of MERCERUS, which is worth reading. 2. If Matthew had written to please the Jews, he would not have written even in Hebrew, but in Syriac, of which dialect at that time the Jews were generally making use, while Hebrew speech had become the language of the Learned.

But, β. neither in the time of JEROME was there extant a Gospel written by Matthew in Hebrew: for the Gospel, of which JEROME speaks was a *Gospel*, not of Matthew in Hebrew, but according to the Hebrews, written in the Chaldean and Syrian language but in Hebrew letters, which was used by the Nazarenes and Ebionite heretics:¹ but which readily betrays its own νοθεΐαν/*spuriousness*, 1. by various additions, which are patched on to the Greek text; 2. by importation of some histories from other Gospels, with some things changed, and with other things patched on that are extant nowhere else; 3. by the unsuitable and impious opinions found in this Gospel; 4. by the mutilation of the Genealogy of Christ: all which are confirmed by GOMARUS, *Dissertatione, Opera, tome 3, pages 314, 315*, from examples selected out of EPIPHANIUS and JEROME. Hence also among the Fathers,

a. EPIPHANIUS contradicts himself; when in *Hæresi XXIX* he spoke of the Gospel of Matthew as *written down and rendered in Hebrew*, in *Hæresi XXX* he calls the same *mutilated and corrupt*. JEROME also, in his *opera, tome 2, Dialogorum adversus Pelagianos, book III, page 297*, speaks hesitatingly and according to the opinion of others concerning this Gospel as written by Matthew: “In the Gospel, says he, according to the Hebrews...of which unto this day the Nazarenes make use, as according to the Apostles, or, as most assert, according to Matthew.”

He was one of the sixteenth century's greatest experts in Hebrew, and he served as Professor of Hebrew and Chaldean in the Royal College, Paris (1549). Roman Catholics lamented his conversion to Protestantism.

¹ The Ebionites were a second century Judaizing sect, who insisted upon the keeping of Jewish religious rites and laws. They denied the Deity of Jesus Christ. The existence of a second century heresiarch by the name of Ebion is a matter of some dispute. Unlike the Ebionites, the *Nazarenes* held orthodox views concerning the person of Christ, but they tenaciously held to the ceremonial law of Moses. Remnants of this sect seem to have survived into the twelfth century.

CHRYSOSTOM likewise hesitates as one in doubt, in whose *homilies on Matthew I, opera, tome 7, page 7*, is read: Matthew *is said* to have written a Gospel in Hebrew, Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ματθαῖος, —τῆ τῶν Ἑβραίων φωνῆ συνθεῖναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

b. So that we might state the situation as it is, all the Fathers of the Church were misled by PAPIAS, from whom Irenæus related that, and from both these Origen; hence the rest. But,

a. Papias, according to EUSEBIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica, book III, chapter XXXIX or the end*, was σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν, *furnished with very mediocre talent*, as one might conclude from his λόγοις/*writings*: nevertheless, to a great many Ecclesiastical Writers after him, τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιον γεγονέναι, *the sharing of the like opinion*, is referred in the same place, or the furnishing of the occasion of the same error with him, inasmuch as they were supporting their own opinion by the antiquity of Papias, while he passes down to posterity many things fabulous, groundlessly believed.

b. Then, if you will believe Papias, what then shall be the authority of the Greek Codex of Matthew? since Papias not only related the Matthew wrote in the Hebrew tongue; but he also added that ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος, *each one interpreted these things* (that is, τὰ λόγια, *the oracles*) as he was able, in EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica, book III, chapter XXXIX at the end*. But no greater confidence is due to him in this concerning the alleged translation of Matthew, than in the principal thesis, in which he confused the Gospel according to the Hebrews with the Gospel originally written in Hebrew. Which error there the remaining Fathers were able more easily to adopt, since most were ignorant of the Hebrew Tongue, and so they were not able to examine that Gospel.

Neither by the Subscript of the Gospel in the Syriac and Arabic Versions is the opinion concerning the Gospel of Matthew written in Hebrew able to uphold itself; when in the *Syriac Version* we read of Matthew, that *he preached the Gospel in Hebrew in the region of Palestine*. But in the *Arabic Codex* it is asserted that it was *Written in the land of the Philistines in Hebrew*. For,

α. Those Subscripts are not of divine authority, which are not even in the original Greek text, nor in other Versions.

β. The Syriac Subscript asserts only that Matthew *preached in Hebrew*, not that he thus wrote.

γ. In the Bible Polyglots, not this, but a far different Subscript is subjoined to the Arabic Version of the Gospel of Matthew, namely this: “By the help of the Most High God is finished the Gospel of Saint Matthew, preacher of eternal life. May His blessings surround us, Amen!”

2. Our AUTHOR rejects the opinion concerning the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS WRITTEN IN HEBREW. Of course, almost all Antiquity was inclined unto this opinion also. That Paul wrote to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and that the Evangelist Luke translated this Epistle into Greek, was the opinion of CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA, according to EUSEBIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VI, chapter XIV. That Paul wrote this Epistle in Hebrew, but that CLEMENT of ROME¹ acted as translator, was suggested by a statement of EUSEBIUS, καὶ πολλοῦ ἄλλοῦ τῶν θεοφόρων πατέρων ὁμίλου, and of another large crowd of God-bearing Fathers, as Stephanus Gobarus² proposes in PHOTIUS' *Bibliotheca*, columns m. 903, 904; for thus also JEROME, THEODORET, and many others. Neither do the Neoterics deny that this Epistle was written in Hebrew, Baronius,³ Bellarmine, Ribera;⁴ but also Zanchius,⁵ Hyperius,⁶ and Tossanus:⁷ see SPANHEIM'S *de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*,

¹ Clement of Rome served as Bishop of Rome from 92 to 99.

² Little is known about Stephen Gobarus. He wrote in the sixth century, and is called a “tritheist” by Photius.

³ Cesare Baronio (1538-1607) was an Italian Cardinal and Vatican librarian. He is remembered primarily for his work in ecclesiastical history, *Annalibus Ecclesiasticis*.

⁴ Francis Ribera (1537-1591) was a Spanish Jesuit scholar, most remembered for his commentary on Revelation in which he advances the Futurist scheme of interpretation. His work on his *Commentario in Epistolam ad Hebræos* was interrupted by death; it was finished by other hands.

⁵ Girolamo Zanchi (1516-1590) was an Italian Reformed theologian. At the age of fifteen, he entered the monastery of the Augustinian Order of Regular Canons. He came under the personal influence of Peter Martyr Vermigli; and the writings of the Reformers, especially Calvin, had a profound impact upon his thinking. Zanchi served as Professor of Old Testament at Strassburg (1553-1563), and Professor of Theology at Heidelberg (1568-1577).

⁶ Andreas Hyperius (1511-1564) was a Flemish Protestant theologian. He endeavored to mediate between Reformed and Lutheran theology, and so holds an important position in both traditions. Hyperius served as Professor of Theology at Marburg (1541-1564).

⁷ Daniel Tossanus, Sr. (1541-1602) was a French Reformed pastor and theologian. He served as Professor of New Testament at Heidelberg (1586-1601).

part III, chapter II, or *Miscellanea Sacrorum Antiquorum*, book II, opera, tome 2, columns 245 and following, from whom one may now briefly select what things are able to make for the refutation of this opinion of the Ancients.

Namely, 1. you might observe that the Style in this Epistle is nothing less than ἑρμηνευτικὸν/*hermeneutical*, whereby translation might be made from word to word, and which, therefore, would be everywhere τῆ ἑρμηνεία ἐβραΐζων, *Hebraic with respect to interpretation*. For it is, as ORIGEN rightly observes, an Epistle συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα, *Hellenistic in the composition of its style*.

2. Paul would have written either purely in the Hebrew tongue, or in the Syriac and mixed tongue of those times. *a.* The *former* does not appear to be correct, because it was no longer in use by the people. Outside of the Sacred Codices, a new Syrian dialect was obtaining. *b.* But neither does the latter appear to be correct. For that Syrian dialect was not known by all Hebrews, who were holding ancestral seats outside of Palestine in Greece, Asia, or Egypt.

3. How does it happen that the Hebrew text of this Epistle is not mentioned as having been read by any of the Ancients, or even seen? Where has that treasure been hidden? How was it so quickly lost? For those which today are read in Syriac and Hebrew were translated from the Greek.

4. *Spanheim* observes that many Idioms of the Greeks in this Epistle are not thus consistent with the Hebrew language.

5. The Learned note that Paul cites all the passages of the Old Testament in this Epistle, not from the Hebrew sources, but from the Greek codices.

6. The Author of this Epistle, no less than Matthew, translates Hebrew terms into Greek, when of *Melchizedek* and *the King of Salem* he speaks in Hebrews 7:2, πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὃ ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, *first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace.*¹

7. Note that for the most part from one, namely, CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA, all that tradition flows. For what he said of *Luke* as translator, afterwards others said of CLEMENT with EUSEBIUS and

¹ מֶלְכִּי־צֶדֶק/*Melchizedek* signifies *King of Righteousness* (מֶלֶךְ/king and צֶדֶק/*righteousness*). מֶלֶךְ עֵינָם signifies *King of Peace* (מֶלֶךְ/king and עֵינָם/*peace*).

JEROME. Besides whom, all the rest for the most part set this matter forth, relating the opinion of those going before, with, as it were, implicit faith, by appealing not obscurely to those more ancient, who had related this matter.

But now, what then was the foundation for those great Men handing down these things?

1. The Agreement of Style of this Epistle with the history composed by *Luke*, that the speech's τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν εὐρίσκεσθαι, *very skin is discovered to be according to translation*. But, *a. Spanheim* convicts this thesis of falsehood. *b.* That very affinity of speech may tell against translation: for the Greek diction of a man learned in Greek is must differ in every respect from that diction which has been faithfully portrayed out of Hebrew or Syriac. With which difference not here coming between the Epistle and *Luke*, the suspicion of translation vanishes. *c.* The same militates against *Clement* as translator, whom *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, and *Æcumenius* name, because the Epistle to the Hebrews τούτου σώζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα, *preserves his stamp*. But *Clement* had drawn up his own in Greek, even in a Style diffuse and elegant: if the character of our Epistle be very similar to it, it is not possible that that was translated verbatim from Hebrew.

2. They had conjectured that Paul had written in *Hebrew*, because he had written *to Hebrews*: EUSEBIUS out of CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VI, chapter XIV, καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν, Παύλου μὲν εἶναι φησὶ, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, *the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul, and it is written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue*. But this account is mistaken: *a.* Because the Epistle has regard unto all the faithful of the *Hebrews*, not unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem or of Palestine alone. But by then, with the Hebrews living beyond the borders of Palestine, Greek was commonly their native and more familiar language. *b.* At that time, neither were the *Palestinians* themselves ignorant of Greek, especially those that were of some note. *c.* In whatever way it may have been inscribed to the *Hebrews*, nevertheless it had to be common to all Nations, and its use had to be extended also then to the Churches of the *Greeks*. And the Apostle understood that it was to be placed into the Canon with the rest. *d.* Peter, James, and John also wrote to the Hebrews, yet in Greek.

3. No less false is that hypothesis of the Ancients, especially of *Jerome*, namely, that Paul was more eloquent in Hebrew than in Greek:

so that from the eloquence of the Epistle it is possible to judge that the same was written in Hebrew. But just how greatly in this matter also they are deceived, *Spanheim* clearly shows.

λ. That the FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER was also written in Hebrew is to our AUTHOR a tradition similarly to be repudiated: concerning which the Most Illustrious WOLF in his *Curis Philologicis et criticis, præfatione ad hanc Epistolam*, writes: "That it was written in Hebrew, but translated into Greek by Mark, one, unless I am mistaken, *Baronius*, without appearance of truth, supposes in his *Annalibus ad Annum Christi 45, n. 28, 37.*" Notwithstanding, *Baronius* appeals to JEROME, *Epistolis CXLV, question XI, ad Hedibiam, opera, tome 3, page 151*, "Thus far," says he, "concerning the Epistle of Peter; which without any doubt was always received with the consent of the entire Catholic Church; and which was translated out of Hebrew by the Evangelist Mark, as *Jerome* appears to affirm, while, after he treated of the Gospel written by Mark, but received from Peter, he says these things: *Finally also the two Epistles, which are said to be of Peter, differ from each other in style and character, and in the arrangement of words. From which we understand, according to the necessity of these things, that he made use of diverse interpreters.*" And besides *Baronius* the Illustrious SALMASIUS¹ is here able to be reckoned, who in the place cited in MARCKIUS' *Exercitationibus textualibus, Part II, Exercise XXXVI, § 5, page 625*, instead of the gift of tongues granted to the Apostles on Pentecost, a gift clearly temporary, urges the example of Peter, who, while the gift of tongues was remaining, would not have needed a translator of Greek letters, whom all the Ancient Fathers assign to him, and to whose translation he says that it is likewise lawful to attribute the first catholic Epistle of Peter, which he believes to have been dictated by Peter in the Galilæan or Syriac tongue of that time.

But whatever else might thus be said concerning the writing of this Epistle, I willingly grant to the Most Illustrious *Wolf* that it was done *without the appearance of truth*, and that a tradition of this sort is no less easily rejected, than it is rashly affirmed. That the gift of Tongues remaining among the Apostles, of which, for the propagation of the Gospel and the erection of the kingdom of Christ among all nations, they had daily need; MARCKIUS in the place cited confirmed against

¹ Claudius Salmasius, or Claude Saumaise (1588-1653) was a French Protestant scholar of classical antiquity. He succeeded Joseph Scaliger in the professorship at Leiden.

Salmasius: and so also Peter himself may have written in Greek, or may have dictated to be written this former Epistle no less than the second: both of which he indeed wrote to the Jews, but especially to those dispersed through Asia Minor, whose native language hence had already been made Greek instead, and with whose assembly converted *Greeks* had been intermixed; compare 1 Peter 2:10. The inept gloss of *Baronius* and of *Simon* concerning the former Epistle of Peter written by the Apostle in Hebrew, but translated into Greek by Mark as Peter's Translator, SPANHEIM also proscribes, in his *Exercitationibus de Historicis Evangeliorum Scriptoribus*, § 17, *opera*, tome 2, column 279; whom see.

7. Moreover, our AUTHOR rejects the tradition of THE GOSPEL OF MARK, and THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS, written in Latin.

That Mark had written his Gospel in *Latin* for the satisfaction of the Romans, and indeed at Rome, *Baronius* contends in his *Annalibus* on 45 AD, § 38-41, *columns* 390, 391, appealing to the Pontifical of Damasus¹ on the Life of Peter; and especially making use of this reasoning, 1. that there was no reason on account of which Mark as the translator of Peter, writing for the satisfaction of the Romans and Italians, would write in Greek rather than Latin; especially since by the authority and example of the Emperor Tiberius² the Greek language was already dying out at Rome among the most estimable, and the Latin language was claiming for itself the principal place among all. 2. That Mark, taking his Gospel from the preaching of Peter, since Peter would have addressed Roman men only in the Roman tongue, in no way could be presumed to have written those things that he heard in Latin, writing to Latins, in Greek: while, even if Peter had made use of Greek or Hebrew idiom, inasmuch as he would have discharged the office of a Translator, he would have been obliged to render those things into Latin. Neither is *Bellarmino* averse to this opinion, *book II, de Verbo Dei, chapter VII, Controversiis, tome 1, column 105*: "But, that the book of Mark," says he, "was written by Mark himself in Latin at Rome, and then converted into the Greek tongue by the same at Aquileia,³ teaches

¹ Damasus I (c. 305-384) was bishop of Rome from 366 until his death. He is noteworthy for leading the Church through the Apollinarian and Macedonian controversies, and for the encouragement that he gave to his personal secretary, Jerome, to undertake the translation of the Scriptures into Latin.

² Tiberius was Roman Emperor from 14 to 37 AD.

³ Aquileia was a town in northeastern Italy.

Adrianus Finus, *book 6, Flagelli Judæorum*, chapter 80, and *book 8, chapter 62*, and Petrus Antonius Beuther, who followed Finus, *annotationibus 8 and 9 ad sacram Scripturam.*” But also SELDEN,¹ *Commentario in Eutychiei Origines Alexandrini*, pages 152, 161, expressly relates: “Now, that Mark wrote in Latin, testimonies are indeed at hand, as that the Gospel was said to belong as much to Peter as to Mark.” But, on the other hand, one may be permitted to observe the vanity of the traditions that here come together, and which the Most Illustrious SPANHEIM diligently laid out, *Dissertatione de Historiæ Euangelicæ Scriptoribus*, § 14 and *following*, which he makes an *Appendix to book II of Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquorum, opera, tome 2*, in which place see *columns 277-284*.

1. He thinks it beneath the Apostolic dignity, that the Apostles needed *Translators* properly so called, of which sort they imagine Mark was to Peter, Titus was to Paul. But also that it little agrees with the dignity of the Writers of the Evangelical history, that they only performed the office of Amanuenses and Translators. That out of Papias the rest also gather that this title of *Interpreter of Peter* was given to Mark. But that this was not the mind of Papias or Irenæus, of which sort an inferior age affixed to them, even JEROME himself understood, *ad Quæstionem XI Hedibiæ, opera, tome 3, pages 151, 152*. That they meant nothing other than that Mark narrated the history that he had received from him, who was an *αὐτόπτης καὶ ὑπηρέτης τοῦ λόγου*, *eyewitness and minister of the Word*, of which sort was Peter, with that well-grounded *πληροφορία/assurance/certainty*, which is *ἄνωθεν*, *from the very first*, which Luke also narrates concerning himself.² Therefore, Mark was an *Interpreter*, that is, of the same matters, of the same Gospel, which Peter with living voice had announced to the Hebrews, and had frequently confirmed in Mark’s hearing, when he was for a while a companion to him in Judea and Egypt. “For it is not to be supposed that Mark had

¹ John Selden (1584-1654) was a learned English jurist and philosopher, and scholar of Jewish law.

² Luke 1:1-4: “Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed (*πεπληροφορημένων*) among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word (*αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου*); it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first (*ἄνωθεν*), to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.”

received his Gospel from the dictation of Peter,” says VALOIS on EUSEBIUS’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter XXXIX, “but that, when he had heard Peter preaching the Word of God to the Jews in Hebrew, Mark studiously digested in the Greek language all the particulars that pertained to Christ.” Least of all was Mark said to be an *Interpreter* of Peter, as if Peter, being ignorant of Greek, had been in need of an Interpreter. *a.* Thus the gift of Tongues would have been of little use to him. *b.* Mark himself was a Jew with respect to nation, an ἑβραΐζων, *Hebrew speaker*, rather than an ἑλληνίζων, *Greek speaker*, equally with Peter. Therefore, why was Peter not found ἑλληνίζειν, *to speak Greek*, in like manner to Mark, his son or disciple?

2. That Mark had written *at Rome*, with the Romans entreating him, a great many of the ancients indeed related after Papias, certainly after Clement of Alexandria, concerning whom see EUSEBIUS’ *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, book II, chapter XV, compared with book II, chapter XXXIX. But, *a.* of this tradition (*altogether vain* according to SPANHEIM, *Dissertatione de Historiæ Euangelicæ Scriptoribus*, § 20, column 282, *opera*, tome 2) there is no other origin than that of Papias in Eusebius, hence of Clement of Alexandria, and also of Tertullian, that *Mark was the Interpreter of Peter*, as a ἀκόλουθον/*follower*, and, what things he had heard from Peter, *he retained in memory* and afterwards committed to *writing*. From this, as tradition is wont to arise, Mark was believed *to have been Peter’s amanuensis*, with Peter *dictating*, or to have written his Gospel with him *commanding*. Hence nothing was remaining except that supposedly the First of the Apostles founded the first Church, that is, the Roman Church, that it was written at *Rome*, and indeed in the *Latin* language. At the same time, the Most Illustrious SPANHEIM gave a prolix and most learned *Dissertationem de ficta Petri Protectione in Urbem Romam* (found in book III of *Miscellaneous Sacrorum Antiquorum*, *Dissertation III*, *opera*, tome 2, columns 331-338, whose argument, contracted into a compendium, read below on Chapter XXXIII, § 7), in which he renders it quite doubtful whether Peter visited Rome: with which foundation undermined, the whole structure of tradition mentioned above comes to ruin. *b.* GREGORY NAZIANZEN, who in *Oratione XXV*, *opera*, tome I, page 438, reckoned that Mark had preached and written in *Italy*, nevertheless supposed that he consigned his Gospel to writing in *Greek*. But CHRYSOSTOM did not even approve that, that Mark had written at Rome, or at the request of the Romans; but ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, τῶν μαθητῶν παρακαλεσάντων

αὐτὸν, in *Egypt*, with the disciples requesting it, *homilia I*, in *Mattheum*, page 7, *opera*, tome 7. ISIDORE *Hispalensis*,¹ in his *Chronico*, relates that Mark wrote at Alexandria, where he was teaching, and that in Greek. Thus the *Chronicon Vetus*, published at *Oxford* in 1692,² relates that Mark wrote his Gospel in *Egypt* in 47 AD, and in that same passage that he died at Alexandria in 63 AD. And indeed it is not unlikely that Mark wrote to Alexandrian Jews and others of that same nation dispersed in Egypt, Palestine, Asia, and everywhere in the Roman Empire, and consequently in Greek, not Latin.

Therefore, what *Baronius* presses beyond measure by his own ratiocinations is not so. Neither is the *testimony of Damasus* advantageous to him, which is so fabulous that no confidence can be had in it: for also in the same place he adds that Peter (who according to common opinion obtained the honor of martyrdom under Nero) read and approved the Gospels of the others and also of John.

Neither is there anything in the appeal others make:

1. Either to the Latin name of *Mark*, which no more implies that Mark had written in Latin than Paul.

2. Or to certain Latin words in this Evangelist turned into Greek. For, *a.* this also occurs in other Writers of the New Testament, neither is this strange since they were living under Roman domination. *b.* To these Latin words one may oppose pure Hebraisms no less found in Mark.

3. Or to the Subscript of this Gospel in the Syriac Version, where you read of Mark, that *he spoke and preached in Latin at Rome*, but not that *he wrote his Gospel in Latin*; besides which, those Subscripts, as already cautioned above, are of very slight authority: consult SPANHEIM'S *Dissertationem laudatam de temere credita Petri Profectione Romam versus*, part III, § 11-16, *opera*, tome 2, columns 360-363. And his *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century 1, chapter VII, § 3, column 547, *opera*, tome 1; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4,

¹ Isidore (c. 560-636) was Archbishop of Seville and a bright and shining light of learning in the intellectual darkness of his age. He presided over the Second Council of Seville (619), which ruled against Arianism, and the Fourth Council of Toledo, which required bishops to establish seminaries in their principal cities.

² The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is a collection of annals, chronicling the history of the Anglo-Saxons. It was commissioned by Alfred the Great (reigning from 871 to 899). It begins with Cæsar's invasion of Britain in 60 BC, and continues to the time of its composition.

tome 2, pages 1496b, 1497a.

7. It is no more firmly proven that THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS WAS WRITTEN IN LATIN: thus the *Glossator* on *Gratian's Distinction IX, chapter VI*, "The whole New Testament was written in Greek, except the Gospel of Matthew, and the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, which was written in Latin." This is followed by *Salmeron*,¹ who maintains that this one Epistle was written in *Latin*, 1. because Paul wrote it to Latins: 2. because his amanuensis was *Tertius*, Romans 16:22, which is a Latin name. On the other hand,

1. Chrysostom and the rest of the Greeks, indeed all Interpreters, both Greek and Latin, hold the Greek text of this Epistle to be authentic and original, to which, when the reading is doubtful, they are wont to appeal. 2. Learned men observe that this Epistle abounds in Grecisms. 3. That the Latin Version sometimes appears to have been translated verbatim from the Greek text. 4. At that time the Greek tongue was sufficiently familiar to the Romans; and Paul, writing at the same time unto converted Jews and Greeks that were living at Rome was able to choose no other Tongue more agreeable to both, than the Greek: in addition to the fact that this Epistle passed into the Canon and use of the entire Church. 5. The best of the Papists hence acknowledge that this Epistle was written in Greek, as does *Bellarmino*, when, in *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter VII, Controversiis, tome I, column 105*, he writes: "It is evident that the New Testament was written in Greek...with only the Gospels of Matthew and Mark and the Epistle to the Hebrews excepted." CORNELIUS À LAPIDE also supports this, in his *Argumento* of this Epistle, *page 26*, where he has among other things: "He writes from Greece, where he had already become accustomed to the Greek tongue; and therefore he writes in Greek also to the Romans, because to these, as also to others, the Greek tongue at that time was familiar and elegant. Therefore, Paul does here, just as any French or Belgic man might write from France into Belgium unto Leuven or Antwerp in French."

¹ Alfonso Salmeron (1515-1585) was a Catholic priest, and one of the first Jesuits. He wrote sixteen volumes of New Testament commentary, including expositions on Acts and the Pauline Epistles.

§ 9: The Authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Originals Defended

What our AUTHOR taught in the preceding § concerning the Independent Authority and Authenticity of Scripture, found only in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament and Greek Text of the New Testament, he now further defends, especially against the *Papists*, who for this *Purpose*, that they might establish the authority of their Vulgate Version, argue that the Founts are Corrupted: thus Stapleton, Lindanus,¹ Cano, Coton,² Jean Morin,³ Perronius,⁴ and the like. While others among them, not a few, whom they call *Hebraizers*, acknowledge and openly defend the Purity of the Founts; of which sort are Sixtus Senensis,⁵ Bannes,⁶ Andradius, Driedo,⁷ Arias Montanus,⁸ Bonfrerius,⁹ Simon de Muis,¹⁰ etc. These latter men follow the determination of

¹ William Damasus Lindanus (1525-1588) was Bishop of Roermond; he vigorously implemented measures of the Counter-Reformation in the Low Countries.

² Pierre Coton (1564-1626) was a French Jesuit and royal confessor.

³ Jean Morin (1591-1659) was born to Protestant parents, but converted to Roman Catholicism, probably under the influence of Cardinal du Perron. His work in Biblical scholarship included editions of the Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum; he followed Louis Cappel in criticism of the Masoretic Text.

⁴ Jacques Davy Duperron (1556-1618) was a French cardinal. By his learning, eloquence, and zeal, he did much to withstand the advance of Calvinism in France.

⁵ Sixtus of Siena (1520-1569) converted from Judaism to Roman Catholicism. He was one of the great Dominican scholars of his age, excelling in particular in Biblical scholarship.

⁶ Domingo Báñez (1528-1604) was a Spanish Dominican and Thomistic theologian.

⁷ Johannes Driedo (c. 1480-1535) was a Roman Catholic theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Leuven. Driedo's writings were influential at the Council of Trent.

⁸ Benedict Arias Montanus (1527-1598) was a Spanish Benedictine Monk. He attended the Council of Trent, and he was heavily involved in the production of the Polyglot Bible.

⁹ Jacobus Bonfrerius (1573-1642) joined the order of the Jesuits in 1592. He enjoyed a long tenure as a professor of the Scriptures and Hebrew at Douay, France.

¹⁰ Simon de Muis (1587-1644) was one of the most learned Hebraists of his

Canon Law, which our AUTHOR mentions, namely, that found in the *Decreto* of GRATIAN, part I, *Distinction IX*, chapter VI, *As the trustworthiness of the ancient books is to be weighed from the Hebrew volumes, so the trustworthiness of the new requires the norm of the Greek language*; and in *Distinction LXXVI*, chapter VII, out of Jerome on Zechariah 8, *We are compelled, therefore, to have recourse to the Hebrew books, and to seek the verity of knowledge from the fount, more than from rivulets*. In a certain middle way Bellarmine proceeds, book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter II, where in column 86 he writes: “The Heretics of this time, out of hatred for the Vulgate Edition, attribute too much to the Hebrew edition. For Calvin, and also Chemnitz¹ and Georgius Major,² maintain that all things are examined and emended according to the Hebrew text, which they frequently call the purest fount. Which opinion is most manifestly false.” He adds in column 87, “It appears that there are others, who with zeal indeed good, but I do not know whether according to knowledge, wholeheartedly contend that the Jews out of hatred of the Christian faith have studiously depraved and corrupted many passages of the Scriptures.” He concludes in column 92, “Therefore, with these two opinions refuted, a third remains, which I think to be altogether true, which is that of Driedo and others, who teach that the Hebrew Scriptures have not been entirely depraved by the labor and malice of the Jews; but that neither are they altogether whole and pure, but have certain errors of their own, which partly crept in by the negligence or ignorance of the scribes, etc. Moreover, the errors of this sort are not of great moment, etc.” Compare BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1458b, 1460a. To the Papists are to be added the Socinians, who either out of the error or malice toward the Jews and Ancient Heretics complain of Corrupted Founts: with this Purpose, that they might obtain the license to evade certain, most compelling passages, especially of the New Testament, such as 1 Timothy 3:16; 1 John 5:7; etc.: see what things are cited out of Socinus’ *libro de Auctoritate Scripturæ*, chapter I, pages 26, 27, 29; out of Volkelius’ book V, *de Religione*,³ chapter

day. He served in both the academy, as Hebrew Professor of the Royal College of France, and in the Roman Church, as Canon and Archdeacon of Soissons.

¹ Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586) studied under Luther and Melancthon, and rose to become a theologian and churchman of some prominence.

² George Major (1502-1574) was a Lutheran theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Wittenberg (1545-1574).

³ Johanns Völkel (c. 1565-1616) was a German Socinian. His *De vera*

V, page 376; out of the *Catechesi Racoviensi*, chapter I, “de Scriptura”, page 6, by HOORNBECK in his *Socinianismo confutato*, tome I, book I, chapter II, pages 29, 30. To these are to be joined a good number of *Pseudo-Critics*, Spinoza, Pererius,¹ Louis Cappel [see BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1460-1462], Isaac Vossius² [see BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1462b, 1463, where, as agreeing with Isaac Vossius, especially as far as Chronology is concerned, he joins Paul Pezron³], Richard Simon, Marcus Meiboom,⁴ Jean Le Cleric [see BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1463b, 1464a; who before the others reviewed by me records also on page 1460 Joseph Justus Scaliger as preferring the Alexandrian Greek Version to the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament; whom Claudius Salmasius, Hugo Grotius, and others followed, lest they should appear to symbolize with the rabble], and others, who in as many Passages as possible complain that the Sacred Text, especially the Hebrew, has been Corrupted, by injury of time, by the carelessness of scribes, etc., to be restored unto integrity by the comparison of Versions, especially the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch, or even by critical conjectures. Who thus either maliciously, or unwarily, but nevertheless quite certainly, detract from the divine and unimpaired authority of the Sacred Codex. I would not now mention the *Mohammedans*, who indeed partly acknowledge, but also partly reject, Sacred Scripture and its authority, both on account of narrations in the Koran contrary to Scripture, and because of Christ’s prophecy, deleted out of the New Testament, concerning the coming of Mohammed as Apostle and Prophet, and because of its ἐναντιοφανῆ, supposedly contradictory character, blindly raked up; see HOTTINGER’S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book I, chapter II, question IV, pages 125, 126;

religione was the first major systematic presentation of Socinian doctrine published at the Racovian Academy.

¹ Isaac La Peyrère (1596-1676) was born into a Huguenot family, but later converted to Romanism. He is most remembered for his Millenarian view and the Pre-Adamite hypothesis.

² Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), son of Gerhard Johann Vossius, was a Dutch scholar and manuscript collector.

³ Paul-Yves Pezron (1639-1706) was a Cistercian monk and Doctor of Theology at St. Bernard in Paris.

⁴ Marcus Meiboom (1630-1711) was a Danish general scholar. He was a historian of music of great repute, and a philologist of some ability.

HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book III, pages 104-111, where the accusation of Corruption directed by Mohammedans at our Codices *Hoornbeeck* likewise refutes, 1. by pointing out, that this was not able to be done by Christians, nor by Jews, still less by both conspiring together, without this outrage being quickly detected by others. 2. That pure Codices more ancient than Mohammed, or Commentators on the Bible, ought to be brought forward, from which this Corruption might be proven. 3. By asking, if it had seemed right to Christians to mutilate the Scriptures for the deceit of the Mohammedans, why would they not have crammed in other, more weighty things, against them in the same work? 4. By adding, if you once urge that the Founts are Corrupted; whence are you going to prove that the same are not corrupted in other things, which, for example, are adduced as true in the Koran itself? 5. That thus rashly Mohammed to such a degree commended the Scripture elsewhere. Now, to the Objection concerning the deletion from the Scripture of the name of Mohammed and of the prophecy of his coming, *Hoornbeeck in the same place* responds, 1. They are obliged to prove this accusation from ἀξιόπιστοις/*trustworthy* documents. 2. Let them bring forward the passage in which these things were formerly read, so that we might examine the text and Ancient Codices, to see whether there be any indication of corruption. 3. Or whether even one Codex or Ancient Commentator survive, in which these things might be found, or which had made mention of this corruption. 4. The contrivance advances itself in this, that Mohammed himself complains of this matter in the Koran: but how would Christians before the birth or death of Mohammed have removed the prophecy concerning him so completely from the Sacred Codices? 5. Therefore, it is such as any imposter is able easily to allege: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book VI, § 3; and see, if you would, VOETIUS' *Disputationem de Insolubilibus (ut vocant) Scripturæ, Disputationum Selectarum*, volume I, pages 47 and following; WALCH'S¹ *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 9, 10, pages 154-156; HENDRIK LUSSING'S *de Necessitate Religionis in genere, et Certitudine Christianæ in specie, vindicata*, part I, dissertation V, § 581-611, pages 454-482.

What Adversaries *Object* against the authority of the Hebrew and Greek Founts is not so; namely,

¹ Johann Georg Walch (1693-1775) was a German Lutheran theologian, serving as Professor of Rhetoric and Poetry (1719-1724), and then as Professor of Theology (1724-1775), at Jena.

1. *Ignorance of these Languages.* For,

a. My *Ignorance* of a Language, in which some Book has been written, does not detract from the Authenticity of that Book, neither does it cause it to be that the text of that Book is of less authority.

b. That ignorance in *Teachers* is by all means to be blamed, and is to be removed by sedulous industry.

c. The *Unlearned* are to be assisted by a faithful Translation as an instrument, not as the foundation, of faith: and the very smallest part of those are skilled in the Latin language.

2. That thus our *faith is suspended upon the tradition of the Rabbis.* *Response:* by denial; although, *a.* from the Commentaries of the Rabbis we do indeed to some extent draw an exposition of the Hebrew Words, as from profane Writers we draw the signification of Greek words: but not the explication of the Sense of Scripture. *b.* Also concerning both a judgment is able to be rendered from Context and Parallels. *c.* Neither are other helps from cognate Oriental dialects wanting. On Objections 1 and 2 compare DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter IV, § 49-52, pages 658-675.

3. That these Founts are *founts of contentions* on account of the variety of the *Points, Readings, and Interpretations.*

Responses: *a.* These contentions do not arise from the Founts by defect of those Founts, but of those who misuse these, not understanding them, or twisting them to their own principles.

b. The contentions are often also put to rest by an examination of the Founts.

c. If the Hebrew and Greek Founts be not Authentic on account of the contentions arising thence, then no edition of the Bible at all, whether Latin, or whatever other, would be Authentic: for there is no version of the Bible in whatever language that through intervening corruption of human nature, and the imperfect measure of our knowledge, is not able to furnish material for contention.

4. That the *Autographs* were formerly *Lost.*

Responses: *a.* By conceding the Minor, and acknowledging the wisdom of God in this dispensation with JOHANN FRIEDRICH MAYER,¹ *Dissertationibus Selectis* XIX, § 12, page 566. He

¹ Doctor Johann Friedrich Mayer (1650-1712) was a German Lutheran pastor and theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Wittenberg (1684-1687), at Kiel (1688-1701), and at Greifswald (1701-1712). Mayer was a champion

says, “We believe that this was done by the most wise counsel of God, lest our minds, cleaving to the external husk of the letter, should more negligently hold the sense of the Holy Spirit, and, being seduced by a superstitious admiration of the Prophetic and Apostolic hands, should be too little solicitous concerning the finger of God, the virtue of which in these writings one may sense.” He also adds this, that the matter would have been conjoined with perpetual emulation, since to only one particular Church the possession of so eminent a treasure would have been conceded, but out of the largesse of the same the rest would have been obliged to seek the credit of their own copies: moreover, that one Codex could easily have been corrupted, and drawn unto the sense that the possessors of it were holding; but if that depraved Codex should afterwards be set forth as genuine, an immense Corruption of the copies would flow from thence.

b. But we deny the Consequence. Since, 1. the Copies in the same language very closely agree with the Autographs: and, 2. the certain and immoveable trustworthiness of our Copies is no more able to be called into doubt than the Copies of the writings of Cicero, Livy, Virgil, and Ovid are called into doubt, in spite of the fact that not a single Autograph of any one of these or of similar authors survives: how much less when our Codices with respect to the Old Testament are authenticated by the Lord and His Apostles; with respect to the New Testament, by the Ancient Church: and the credit of these is evident both from the reverence of the Jews concerning the Sacred Codex of the Old Testament, and from the consensus of the Codices printed and Manuscript, which, although written at very different times, agree in all things with a most agreeable harmony. 3. In any event, the loss of the Autographs is able to procure for no Version authenticity above the Hebrew and Greek Copies, since all Versions proceed from Copies rather than the Autographs.

5. But principally to evade the Authenticity of the *Founts*, they allege that the same now are actually *Corrupted*, either by the injury of time, or the scribes' liability to error, or even, as Galatinus,¹ Pezron, Whiston,² and others maintain (see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris*

of Lutheran orthodoxy, and vehemently opposed to Pietism.

¹ Petrus Galatinus, or Pietro Colonna Galatino (1460-1540), was an Italian Franciscan, theologian, and Orientalist. With Reuchlin, he was an advocate for the authority and authenticity of the Hebrew original.

² William Whiston (1667-1752) was an English mathematician, historian, and

Testamenti, part I, chapter III, § 6, number 2, page 109, and part III), deliberately, out of the hatred of the Jew toward the Christians and their faith; which Corruption they try to prove by various examples, also reported by our AUTHOR.

But, before we examine these examples, it is helpful to observe the following things in advance.

We concede some Corruption of the Founts, but of what sort? α. Accidental, β. of some Exemplars, γ. of one Point or Letter or another, δ. always correctable from Parallels.

But *we deny Corruption, α. done deliberately by the Jews, β. universal, of all Codices, γ. of the whole Context, δ. frequent, and, ε. irreparable, through which, if by then it be nearly universal, the sense would thus be injured, inasmuch as the sense would no longer be able to be discovered in the Context or by Parallels. We demonstrate this negative assertion:*

*α. From the Providence of God, which by a singular kindness has so watched over our Codex that it might not at any time take in anything defective, according to Isaiah 40:8, compared with 1 Peter 1:25. But, if the divine Providence willed as much to preserve for the Church the Canon perpetual, as to preserve for the Canon its integrity, it follows that today's Canon of Scripture is uncorrupted: otherwise God would not have achieved His goal. But divine Providence willed as much to preserve for the Church the Canon perpetual; for to this end God granted to the Church θεόπνευστον/*inspired* Scripture, so that thence it might be certain of the will of the Divine Being and the way of pursuing salvation, and have an immovable foundation and norm for faith and worship: as to preserve for the Canon its integrity; for God keeps the same will still today, even toward the Church, to be saved through the Word, and concerning the Scripture, as the means of salvation, which will He was fostering when He first delivered to the Church the same Scripture in writing. Therefore, even today the Canon of Scripture is uncorrupted.*

β. From the Zeal of the Jews for the Law, which zeal, 1. PHILO¹ commends, in his libro de Egressu filiorum Israel ex Aegypto, cited by

theologian, most remembered for his translations of Josephus and his Arianism.

¹ Philo was a first century Jewish scholar of Alexandria, Egypt. In him, one finds a synthesis of Platonic philosophy and Hebrew exegesis and theology.

EUSEBIUS in *book VIII of Præparationis Euangelicæ, chapter VI, page 357*, where he asserts, “All the way unto these times, through a space of time greater than two thousand years, not even a word was changed in the Law of the Hebrews, and every Jew would rather die a thousand times than allow the Law to be changed in anything.” And also JOSEPHUS in *book I, contra Apionem, pages 1036, 1037, Δῆλον δ’ ἔστιν ἔργῳ, πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἰδίῳις γράμμασι πεπιστεύκαμεν· τοσοῦτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρωχηκάτος, οὔτε προσθεῖναι τις οὐδέν, οὔτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν, οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν· πᾶσι γὰρ σύμφυτον ἔστιν εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως Ἰουδαίῳις ὀνομάζειν αὐτὰ Θεοῦ δόγματα, καὶ τούτοις ἐμμένειν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰ δέοι θνήσκειν ἠδέως*, *but it is evident by our actions how firmly we have given credit to our books; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has dared either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews immediately, from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain Divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them.* 2. Is proven by the care of the Masoretes or תרומה בעלי, *Men of Tradition*, inasmuch as they set in array the מִסֹּרֶת or מִסְרָת, *Masorah*, that is, *the Tradition*, or the Critical Doctrine concerning the fabric of Sacred Scripture, in which all the verses, words, and letters are enumerated, and all, even the least, variety of reading or writing is indicated, so that it might be a מִסְרָת לְתוֹרָה, *fence to the Law*, a bulwark of its undiminished integrity. 3. And which *Paul acknowledged*, Romans 3:1, 2, *τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου; ἢ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; Πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον· Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God: concerning which deposit, if they had kept it poorly, the Apostle would have warned us, neither would he have so commended the Jews on account of this privilege. But, while God willed the Scriptures to be preserved for the Christian Church, to be delivered by the ministry of those to whom He entrusted His oracles, He also instills that purpose in them, that they might prove themselves faithful in preserving this treasure.*

γ. *From the Multitude of Exemplars scattered everywhere*, both formerly among the Jews, and then after the times of Christ and the Apostles among Christians; whence the universal Corruption of Codices, to be undertaken by the Jews, was altogether impossible.

δ. *From the principal Prophecies concerning Christ preserved both in the Text, and in the Chaldean Paraphrases.* Now, what madness of the Jews would this have been, to have corrupted the Scripture passages Chronological, Genealogical, and of lesser moment, from which they seize no advantages against Christians; but to have passed over those things intact, in which as master-strokes Christians establish the foundation of Evangelical truth? *Bellarmino* himself, in *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter II, Controversiis, tome I, column 88 at the end*, acknowledges this, observing, "If the Jews had wished to falsify the Sacred Scriptures out of hatred of the Christians, doubtlessly they would have removed the principal prophecies: but they did not at all do this, and the Hebrew Codices sometimes vex the Jews more than the Greek and Latin Codices."

ε. *From the lack of any Censure of Christ or the Apostles brought against the Jews in this matter;* who certainly blame them with the diverse depravations of the doctrine and sense of the Law introduced by them, hypocrisy, and contumacious unbelief with respect to the Writings of Moses and the Prophets: but never accuse them with the Corruption of the Codices and books of the divine oracles; concerning which the disciples, professing faith in Christ, would certainly have had to be warned, lest they should readily suffer themselves to be led away into error through the falsified Codices of the Jews.

ζ. On the other hand, they *themselves* actually commend frequently the *Old Scriptures*, John 5:39; 2 Timothy 3:15, 16; 2 Peter 1:19. Indeed, unto Scripture, as unto the principium of faith and the norm of things to be believed and to be done, indeed as unto the means of pursuing eternal salvation, as much to be read, as to be searched and investigated, Christ and the Apostles sent not only their own hearers, but also the hearers of all times; it is necessary that it be uncorrupted and whole in every age. For who would believe that Christ sent men, anxious over their salvation, to a norm, 1. corrupted and contaminated with pervasive defects, 2. requiring the emendations of men, 3. and to that extent slippery, concerning which no one might be certain in what place he might read incorrectly, in which place rightly; likewise, when he alights on a fault, in what way it might be restored unto integrity?

ζ. The eminent word of the Lord in Matthew 5:18 agrees with what has now been said, in which passage the certain fulfillment of those things that are contained in the Law and Prophets, fulfillment promised in *verse 17*, He confirms by a more general argument from the invariable

stability of Scripture, saying, Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἧ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.* Whatever Scripture, by its immutable duration, is actually being set over against the heaven and earth, which shall perish; and, thus continuing to endure without any corruption, it is asserted by Christ, that it is not going to admit the loss or change of any point or letter; that, uncorrupted unto this day, sets itself forth. But the Old Testament is Scripture. Therefore, etc.

From all which it is proven that the Jews neither were willing to corrupt their Codices, nor were able; neither before the times of Christ and the Apostles, nor after those times. So that this last might yet be more clearly evident,

η. We observe that after the times of the Apostles the Universal Corruption of the Codices was Impossible,

1. By industry, *a.* From the dispersion of the Jews throughout the whole world, who, it could be proven by no witness worthy of confidence, conspired as one, from all parts of the world, to falsify the Codex. *b.* From the most diligent caution and vigilance of the Christians, by which the most approved exemplars of the faith were preserved in libraries, and were afterwards employed to prepared printed editions. *c.* From the abundance of the exemplars of the Bible, diffused throughout the whole world, by all which, in entirely the same manner, no defect was able to be introduced without the knowledge of the Christians.

2. By accident: for only by a stupendous miracle could it have happened that in all the same passages, in altogether the same manner, all the Codices of all the ages, by some accident, with no one, Jewish or Christian, noticing, taking precautions, or warning of such misfortune, suffered corruption.

θ. So that I might make an end of speaking, I warn with our AUTHOR that if *we concede the Corruption of the Original Text, other Editions of Scripture will be supposed freely and falsely to have greater integrity:* where then will you find a firm and infallible foundation for faith?

GROTIUS comes against the Charge of a mutated Scripture of the *New Testament, de Veritate Christianæ Religionis, book III, § 15;* similarly against the Charge of a mutated Scripture of the *Old Testament, book III, § 16, pages 174-178.*

But let us see what then *they might Object*: these are, for example,

α. *The Mutilation of entire Sentences*, examples of which our AUTHOR has from Exodus 2:23 and Romans 3:10-18.

More specifically, 1. in Exodus 2, after *verse 22*, is inserted in the Vulgate Version a little verse, which according to the observation of the Most Illustrious BOS also appears in some Manuscripts and Editions of the Septuagint, but which is not found in the Hebrew Codex, saying: “But he begat another: whom he called Eliezer, saying: For the God of my Father is my help, and He has rescued me from the hand of Pharaoh.” *Bellarmino*, in *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter II, page 87*, sets forth this passage as an objection. But concerning this BUXTORF *the Younger* responds in his *Anticriticis adversus Cappellum, part II, chapter XI, page 801*: “This little verse was copied out of the Septuagint by the Vulgate and inserted here. Now, the Septuagint transferred this here from Exodus 18:4. But, since it appears here in no reliable Hebrew Codices, it is to be pricked with a critical mark.”

2. From Romans 3:10-18 it is not able to be proven that Psalm 14 today is mutilated and deprived of several verses. For what things Paul cites *in this place*, were not only sought out of Psalm 14, but out of several texts of the Old Testament contracted into one, as they stand according to the order of the words that occur in Paul, Psalm 14:1-3; 5:9; 140:3; 10:7; Isaiah 59:7, 8; Psalm 36:1, which is the observation of JEROME, *præfatione in libro XVI, Commentario in Jes., opera, tome 5, page 210*. And so, what things are found in Psalm 14 after *verse 3* in the Septuagint and Vulgate Versions do not argue a defect in the Hebrew text, but rather the imprudence of those that cram these things from the words of the Apostle in Romans 3, which were drawn from diverse other passages of the Sacred Codex, into the Greek Version.

β. *They object the Changes of certain words*. Thus they maintain:

1. That in Psalm 19:4 ׀ִיִּר, *their line*, was written in the place of ׀ִיִּר, *their sound*, for Paul in Romans 10:18 translates it, εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, *their sound went into all the earth*: thus *Bellarmino*, *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter II, column 87*. But, *a*. Paul does not allege this passage in a strict manner: but what things the Psalmist speaks concerning natural Theology, acquired from the daily Providence of God, the Apostle adapts to the proclamation of a supernatural Gospel, and has regard to the sense rather than to the words. *b*. The word ׀ִיִּר, *their voice*, had just now preceded at the end

of *verse 3*; perhaps it would have been more injurious to euphony immediately to repeat the same word in *verse 4*, whence for the sake of variety the Psalmist was able rather to use here the word קִנְיָהּ, *their line*: at the same time, Paul was able in turn to take words partly from *verse 3* and partly from *verse 4*, and in the language of φθόγγος/*voice/sound* to have regard to the word קוֹלָם, *their voice*, which concludes *verse 3*, while the rest were taken out of *verse 4*. *c.* Nevertheless, perhaps the words φθόγγος/*voice/sound* and קִנְיָהּ, *their line*, are able to be reconciled to each other also in signification: since φθόγγος denotes, not only a *Sound*, but also a *Letter* in the work of Plutarch¹ on Fabius,² with a *Diacritical mark*; specifically upon a *Vowel*, as the signification of the composite word διφθόγγου/*diphthong* is known from the double *Vowel*. Now, a *Letter* is not only what is pronounced with the voice, but also what *is written*. Similarly it is able to be observed that קוֹ/*line* does not only denote an extended line or plummet, but also a *written line*, or letter, in which elementary boys are instructed; in which sense perhaps it is able to be taken, which is said relatively to the infantile rudeness of the people of God, Isaiah 28:10, 13, concerning *precept after precept*, and *line after line*, קוֹ לְקוֹ לְקוֹ לְקוֹ לְקוֹ. And thus both in Psalm 19 and in Romans 10 mention shall be made of *Letters* instructing, and of *Words* that are composed of letters. Whence the Septuagint was also able to translate קוֹ by φθόγγον/*voice/sound*, and the Apostle to follow these.

2. That in Psalm 22:16 כַּאֲרִיּוֹן, *like a Lion*, is written in the place of כַּרְוִי, *they pierced, my hands and my feet*. This is also an Objection of Bellarmine in the place cited. In which place Genebrard³ and Bellarmine, book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter II, column 88, think that the Corruption happened accidentally because of the great affinity of ׀ and ׀; but Scaliger, *de Muis*, Hugh Broughton,⁴ Junius, Forster,⁵ and Hunnius

¹ Mestrius Plutarchus (c. 46-127) was a Greek historian.

² "Fabius Maximus" in *Roman Lives*.

³ Gilbert Genebrard (1535-1597) was a French Benedictine scholar, specializing in Oriental studies. He served the Roman Church as a professor of Hebrew at the Collège Royal, and later as Archbishop of Aix. He is especially noteworthy for his commentary on the Psalms and his translation of rabbinic works into Latin.

⁴ Hugh Broughton (1549-1612) was an English divine, sympathetic to the Puritans. He developed an international reputation for his Hebrew scholarship.

⁵ Johannes Forster (1495-1556) was a German Lutheran Theologian and Hebraist, author of *Dictionarii Hebraici*.

maintain that this passage was intentionally interpolated by the Jews.

Responses: α. If the passage be Corrupt, the Corruption is not entire, but כְּאַרִי, *like a lion*, and כָּאֲרוּ, *they pierced*, are able to be held as various Readings; since the *marginal Masorah* on Numbers 24:9 observes that in certain ancient Codices was read כָּאֲרוּ, *they pierced*, in the text, כְּאֲרוּ כְּתִיב.¹ Thus *Jacob ben Hayyim*² in the *Masorah Magna* testifies that in certain accurate or correct exemplars he found כְּאֲרוּ, *they pierced, written*, but in the margin כְּאֲרִי, *like a lion*, read. *Johannes Isaac*, a convert to Christianity from Judaism,³ testifies *against Lindanus*, that he found the same in his grandfather's Psalter: see OTHO VERBRUGGE'S *Observationes philologicas de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, *Observation* I, § 37-39, *pages* 40-44; SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum cum Judæis*, § 33, *opera, tome* 3, *columns* 982-984, where he at length commends the reading, כָּאֲרוּ, *they pierced*, with an epenthetic א⁴ from the *Matres Lectionis*,⁵ or כָּרוּ. Therefore, a slight change in other Codices will be made of the ו into a ך'.

β. But neither shall it be so senseless and Judaic, as indeed *Junius*, *Scaliger*, and *Cappel* think, to retain the received Reading even today; which we do so much the more willingly, since almost no Codex today is able to be produced that reads כְּאֲרוּ, *they pierced*, and that word does not come into the record of the קריין וכתובין, *Qere and Kethib*, indeed the *Masorah* observed that at this place כְּאַרִי, *like a lion*, is to be read: see the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE'S *Observationes philologicas de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, *Observation* I, § 39, *pages* 43, 44, § 58, *pages* 62, 63. Now, thus:

a. With learned men, among whom are the Most Illustrious JACOB ALTING,⁶ in his *Fundamentis Punctuationis Linguae*

¹ Numbers 24:9a: "He couched, he lay down as a lion (כְּאַרִי), and as a great lion: who shall stir him up?..."

² Jacob ben Hayyim (c. 1470-c. 1538) converted to Christianity from Judaism. He worked as a printer, and was engaged as a corrector of Bomberg's edition of the Hebrew Old Testament. An expert in the Masoretic notes, he produced a Rabbinical Bible, which supplied the Masorah.

³ Johannes Isaac (1515-1577) was Professor of Hebrew at Cologne (1551-1577).

⁴ That is, the addition of a sound to the interior of the word.

⁵ That is, *mothers of reading*, certain Hebrew consonants (א, ה, ו, י) used to indicate vowel sounds.

⁶ Jacob Alting (1618-1679) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Hebraist.

Sanctæ, canons LXXI, CLXXVII, pages 99, 383, and in Heptadibus VII, Dissertation V, which is de Integritate vocis פְּאַרִי, opera, tome 5, pages 214-220; and JOHANN GOTTLÖB CARPZOV, in his Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part III, pages 838, 839: כאַרִי is able to be thought to be the present participle, plural and masculine, in the Qal, not from the root פָּרָה, to dig through or bore, but from the unusual root פּוֹר, of the same signification; whence פּוֹר is a smelting-pot, a furnace, or a vessel for melting metals, and כּוֹר is a cor, a measure of dry goods; both words mean digging out or hollowing out: in the same way that דוֹם, to whisper, and דָּמָה, to mumble or be silent, are of similar signification. Now, in this participle, כאַרִי, a twofold anomaly ought to be noted, but, as those learned Men believe, it is not unusual: 1. for א, according to the interchangeability of the letters א, ה, ו, and י, here supplies the place of ו, as among the Arameans in the present participle, with a quiescent ו in the midst, ו is wont to be shifted into א; which they also in the Hebrew text wish to obtain, when you read, for example, רַאֲמָה in the place of רַמָּה, from רוֹם, to be high, Zechariah 14:10.¹ 2. An Apocope of the final ם in the masculine plural shall obtain here, according to the rule of Rabbi David Kimchi,² There are plurals that are used with the hirek (יִ) alone; which they strive to confirm by various examples. If these things be admitted, their truth, with the learned men instructing, will be consistent with this place of the Masorah, namely, that כאַרִי occurs twice with the same spelling, but with diverse signification, namely, here and in Isaiah 38:13:³ here it shall be a participle, in Isaiah a noun with a prefix; here it shall denote those piercing, in Isaiah as a Lion. And thus, with every difficulty removed, the Versions shall best answer to the text, both the Septuagint, which has ὄρουσαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας, they bored my

At Groningen he served as Professor of Hebrew (1643-1667), and then as Professor of Theology (1667-1677).

¹ Zechariah 14:10: "All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem: and it shall be lifted up (רַאֲמָה), and inhabited in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's winepresses."

² David Kimchi (c. 1160-1235) was a famous Spanish Rabbi. He wrote a commentary on the entire Old Testament and a Hebrew grammar, as a result of which he has long been respected for his profound scholarship.

³ Isaiah 38:13: "I reckoned till morning, that, as a lion (פְּאַרִי), so will he break all my bones: from day even to night wilt thou make an end of me."

hands and feet, and the Syriac and Arabic, which similarly judged that the כָּאֲרִי is to be translated by *they dug*. Indeed,

b. It is not fitting to have recourse without necessity to an uncommon root, and a manifest double anomaly in the same word. The Most Illustrious SCHULTENS, in his *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebrææ ad regulam CLXXVII*, consequently observes: “Learned Men maintain that כָּאֲרִי in Psalm 22:16 was formed from כָּוַר, *to dig*, so that it might be *those digging*, with the ׀/Mem of the plural omitted. To me the analysis always seemed safer in deriving the word from אָרִי, so that it might be *as a Lion*.” Who in *the same place on regulam LXXI* advises: “It is not to be admitted, what the great Grammarians relate concerning the absolute, plural ending, upon the long hirek (ִ) without the ׀/Mem. The examples which are wont to be adduced convey something else; and the form of the same is undoubtedly singular.” The same opinion the Most Illustrious OTHO VERBRUGGE tries, with great pains, to establish, *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, pages 1-102, where in his first observation he asserts, pages 1, 2, “Common indeed, but erroneous, is the opinion that states that the letter ׀/Mem in nouns of the plural number, absolute, is cut off by the Hebrews by apocope.” And he adds, “As I think, all these are actually nouns of the singular number, which either end in י/Yod, or have י/Yod as an inseparable pronoun affixed to the end. Nevertheless, if anyone should think that in one and another example a paragoric י/Yod is given, I would not will to disagree vehemently with him.” Thus, in § 40-60, pages 44-65, in particular he contends that כָּאֲרִי in Psalm 22:16 is conflated from the prefix כ/Caph/as, which thrusts out the *emphatic* ה/He, and the substantive noun אָרִי/Lion, so that it might be written in full, כָּהֲאָרִי, and might signify *after the likeness of that Lion*,¹ that is, after the likeness of a great or excellent Lion. With which Most Illustrious Men, after VOETIUS in his *Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, pages 52-59, MARCKIUS in his *Analysi Exegetica* of Isaiah 53, § 56-59, and others, I believe that the common exposition of the Jews is not wrongly retained, JUST AS A LION *my hands and my feet: whether they handled, bruised, pierced, bit*, be understood from elsewhere besides; ellipses of

¹ When an inseparable preposition, like כ, is prefixed to a word with the definite article ה, the ה disappears, but there is a compensatory lengthening of the vowel to a Qametz (ִ).

words of this sort, especially in complaints, through aposiopesis,¹ are very common: or from the preceding part of the *verse*, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ,² the word הִקְפוּנִי, *they have inclosed me*, be understood, either in the sense of *enclosing, surrounding*, which sense, from יָקַף, in the prior member of the *verse* this word appears to have from a comparison with the conjoined verb סָבְבוּנִי, *they have compassed me*; when in this *compassing* the comparison of *the wicked men* with a *Lion* nevertheless implies the goal of *piercing*, which follows of its own accord from the *compassing* ascribed to a rending *Lion*: or the same word here, repeated here, is able to be reckoned unto another signification than a little previously admitted, from נָקַף, denoting *shattering, excision, piercing, concussion* with a blow so powerful that marrow is spattered all around: unless this latter signification be now admitted in the former member of the *verse* also, and we translate this phrase: *Dogs compassed me about; the assembly of the wicked pierced me after the likeness of that Lion in my hands and my feet*; with the use of the Verb נָקַף in the Piel in Job 19:26³ compared, and, as some maintain, in the Hiphil also in Leviticus 19:27,⁴ which opinion the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE prefers to the others, *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero, Observation I, § 40, pages 44, 45*, while concerning the sense of the verb נָקַף are worthy to be consulted the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS in his *Originibus Hebræis, book I, chapter XII*, and *Vindiciis, Section XIII*; likewise also the Most Illustrious VRIEMOET in his *Adnotationibus ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti, tome 3, chapter XVII, pages 343, 344*. Certainly this interpretation of the word כְּאֵרִי, *as a Lion*, with one supplement added or another only named, 1. will be the simplest. 2. Thus our passage will agree so much better in sense with Isaiah 38:13, with which, with respect to the phrases, it has great agreement, כְּאֵרִי בְּנִי יִשְׁבֵּר כָּל-עַצְמוֹתַי, *as a lion, so will he break all my bones*. 3. Comparison with a *Lion* is not unusual in this Psalm, comparing verses 13 and 21. 4. Thus an elegant gradation obtains here, from the similitude of encircling *Dogs* to *Lions* more powerful and fierce. 5. And, with mention made of a *Lion* in addition, the ferocity of the

¹ The rhetorical breaking off of a sentence, as if through an inability or unwillingness to proceed.

² That is, two clauses having a word in common.

³ Job 19:26: “And though after my skin worms struck off (נִקְפוּ) this, yet in my flesh shall I see God”

⁴ Leviticus 19:27: “Ye shall not round (תִּקְפוּ) the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard.”

enemies and the savageness of the piercing beyond the piercing itself is powerfully signified. Unless in this *Lion* there be thought concerning Messiah himself, as it seems right to the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE, *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, *Observation I*, § 60, pages 64, 65, “What? that the similitude of a *Lion* beautifully agrees with this passage, *whether* you think that that cruelty is indicated, with which enemies were someday going to destroy the Messiah, and were going to pierce His hands and feet, as in a similar manner Messiah speaks in verse 13, *their mouth against me they gaped, after the likeness of a tearing and roaring lion: or*, which I greatly prefer, you think that in verse 16 regard is had to a *Lion* captured and slaughtered by hunters, the cadaver of which, with spikes driven through the anterior and posterior feet, would be suspended in this manner, as it was customary for hunters to suspend wild animals from walls or trees. Certainly, if you so take it, the punishment of the Cross, which was not in use among the ancient Hebrews, is so artfully depicted in this prophecy, that, if you diligently peruse the Gospels, which narrate the death of Jesus, that *Lion of Judah*, the most elegant answering of the event to this prophecy is as clear as clear can be.”

Neither are the scruples, moved against this exegesis, of any moment; for example, a. that כ/like/as in כְּאַרִי, *like a lion*, is not a servile letter, because it is pointed with a Qametz (◌ֻ). *Response*: The same obtains in Isaiah 38:13, and it is the indication of the emphatic ה having been thrust out: compare VERBRUGGE, *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, *Observation I*, § 41-43, pages 45-48.

b. That the preceding הִקְיָפוּנִי, *they have inclosed me*, is not able to be drawn to this, on account of the intervening *Athnah* accent (◌ֻ),¹ and the difference of number between that verb and the noun *Lion*. But, a. the disjunction introduced by the *Athnah*, which often is not so great, does not hinder the relation of the Verb, הִקְיָפוּנִי, to the following words, or the repetition ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ² of the same verb, or the ellipsis of another: compare the use of the *Athnah* in *verse 13*³ and Genesis 1:1;¹

¹ Psalm 22:16: “For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me (הִקְיָפוּנִי): they pierced my hands and my feet.” The *Athnah* is the strongest disjunctive accent within a verse.

² That is, two clauses having a word in common.

³ Psalm 22:13: “They opened upon me their mouth (פִּיָּהֶם), a ravening and a roaring lion.”

and see VOETIUS in his *Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, page 53. *b.* *Lion* is set down in the singular to signify only this genus of animal, and *הִקְיִפּוֹנִי*, *they have inclosed me*, does not necessarily have to answer to *אַרְיֵ*/*lion*, but either to the plural *מְרַעִים*, *the wicked*, or to the word *עֵדָה*/*assembly* taken collectively; compare the construction in *verse 13*: see again VERBRUGGE, *in the place cited*, § 44-47, pages 48-52.

c. They appeal to the *Masorah*, which says that this word, *כֹּאֲרִי*, is to be explained in this place differently than in Isaiah 38:13: but, *a.* its Authority is human, and, especially when it treats of the interpretation of words, fallible. *b.* As the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE observes, the *Masorah* nowhere teaches that *כֹּאֲרִי* in Psalm 22:16 is to be explained by *פָּרַו*, *they pierced*, or to be explicated of *piercing*; neither is it duly proven from the *Masorah* that *כֹּאֲרִי* is to be taken differently in Psalm 22:16 and Isaiah 38:13, but the *Masorah*, everywhere *כֹּאֲרִי* occurs, wants it to be taken as a composite word, from the *כ* of similitude and *אַרְיֵ*/*Lion*, so that *א* and *ר* might be the first two radical letters of this composite word. Now, as far as the dual notion of the word *כֹּאֲרִי* observed by the Masoretes is concerned, they understood this, according to the judgment of the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE, only of a simple or emphatic notion: since *כֹּאֲרִי* occurs twice with the Patach (◌) under the *כ*, namely, in Numbers 24:9² and Ezekiel 22:25;³ and twice emphatically with the Qametz (◌) under the *כ*, as an indication of the *ה* having been thrust out, namely, in Isaiah 38:13 and Psalm 22:16: see VERBRUGGE, *in the place cited*, § 48-58, pages 52-63, where he explains various places in the *Masorah*, and from the Final *Masorah Magna* he tries to remove the error of Isaiah 38:13 substituted in the place of Numbers 24:9.

d. They urge the Version of the Septuagint.⁴ *Response*: They perhaps read it differently, or had regard unto the sense, not unto the word.

¹ Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning God created (בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים) the heaven and the earth.”

² Numbers 24:9a: “He couched, he lay down as a lion (כְּאַרְיֵ), and as a great lion: who shall stir him up?”

³ Ezekiel 22:25a: “There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion (כְּאַרְיֵ) ravening the prey; they have devoured souls...”

⁴ Psalm 22:16: “For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet (ὠρυσαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας, *they pierced my hands and feet*).”

The opinion, in which we thus acquiesce, is also embraced by the Most Illustrious VRIEMOET, *Thesibus scripturarum*, DVI, DVII, which reads thus: “The exceedingly vexed word, כָּאֲרִי, in Psalm 22:16, has nothing that might argue any corruption of the sacred Text. For, what some codices read as כָּאֲרוּ by ׀, it is evident from the Masorah itself and from elsewhere that it is not so ancient; neither is it able to be elicited out of the Viralis Septuagint Version...or others, nor out of the testimonies of the Fathers, who attribute to this word the signification of *piercing*. But optimally and most simply, and with both *verse* 14 and the related expression in Isaiah 38:13 supporting, כָּאֲרִי is able to be rendered *after the likeness of a Lion*; only interpret the preceding הִקְיִפוּנִי, *they have inclosed me*, not from קוּף, *to go round*, as elsewhere, but from the verb נִקְף, *to surround*, or *to strike off* or *wound*, with the first ׀/Nun missing.”

Reverend OUTHOF, *Bibliotheca Bremensi, classis V, fascicle III, chapter II, pages 407-417*, set forth and busied himself to commend a new exposition of the word, כָּאֲרִי, in which he holds כָּרִי with an epenthetic א¹ *in this place* for a verbal adjective from the verb כָּרָה, which denotes *to bore*, *to transfix*; so that the sense might be, *they encircled me* (now affixed to the cross), *having been pierced in my hands and feet*, or *with respect to my hands and feet*. But this opinion the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE, *in the place previously cited*, § 20-36, *pages 23-40*, refutes chiefly from this, that, as the Most Illustrious JACOB ALTING has already previously observed also, in his *Heptadibus VII, Dissertation V, § 42*, no term is given in the Hebrew tongue, in which, if one derives the origin from a *Verb with a quiescent ה* *in the third radical*, the second letter of which is not an א, an א is placed by epenthesis after the first letter of the root, and a Qametz (◌ִ) and a Hateph-Pathah (◌ֵ) are added, of which sort none is produced by *Outhof*: Indeed, in all the examples alleged by him, *Verbrugge* shows no term to be given, in which properly speaking an *epenthetic א/Aleph* occurs; but that always it is either a radical א, or an א that has been exchanged with a radical letter, or an א that pertains to the very form of the word. Hence too rashly does the Most Illustrious T. DE HAZE, *in notis ad Outhovii Observationes, in the place cited of Bibliothecæ Bremensis, pages 412, 413*, confess that he had all but been drawn unto assent by *Outhof*, unless the unique authority of *John* had hindered, following in the citation of Psalm 22:16 the Septuagint Version, which rendered כָּאֲרִי

¹ That is, the addition of a sound to the interior of the word.

as ὤρουξαν, *they pierced*: while nevertheless the Apostle John in his writings nowhere appeals to Psalm 22:16, neither does he relate the words of this verse; see VERBRUGGE, *in the place cited*, § 21, pages 24, 25.

3. What corruption is able to be inferred from יִקְרָאֵהוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ, *and he shall call His name*, Isaiah 9:6, in the place of, *and it shall be called*, as it is in the Vulgate, I for my part do not see: since it is a well-known observation on the Syntax of the Hebrew tongue that verbs of the third person are frequently used indefinitely, and, as it were, impersonally, with no nominative expressed; which, by multiple examples, among which also is this text, the elder BUXTORF illustrates, *Thesouro Grammatico*, pages 417, 418. *And he shall call* signifies *each one shall call*, which is equivalent to the impersonal, *and He shall be called*.

And so *Bellarmino* holds himself up to ridicule, *book II de Verbo Dei*, chapter 2, column 86, when, so that he might prove that the opinion of the fundamental purity of the Hebrew text is most manifestly false, argues in this manner: “For in the first place Calvin contends that Isaiah 9 is to be read, *and it shall be called wonderful*, etc.: but the Hebrew text simply does not have *it shall be called*, that is, יִקְרָאֵהוּ,¹ but *he shall call*, יִקְרָאֵהוּ;² and Calvin was not ignorant that in this place the Vulgate edition is better than the Hebrew.”

γ. *They object* the great number of *Variant Readings* in the Sacred Text.

Response: These are not hurtful to the unspoiled integrity of the Sacred Text, since we assert the purity of the Founts, not in all and every copy, but in the more approved and exact; and those, not individually, but taken conjointly.

א. *The Variant Readings* of this sort in the Hebrew Text are, 1. Either יִמְדַּנְהוּאֵי וְיִמְדַּנְהוּאֵי וְיִמְדַּנְהוּאֵי, *Variations that come between Western and Eastern Codices*. The *Western* take their origin from the *Palestinian Codices*; the *Eastern*, from the *Babylonian Codices*. Now, of what age and of what authority the index of these variant Readings may be, is unknown. Two hundred and sixteen Various Readings are enumerated, all which, with two exceptions, have to do with letters and words: but they are quite trivial, neither do they at all damage the sense. The *Masoret*es followed the Reading of the *Western Codices*, and the

¹ In the Niphal conjugation.

² In the Qal conjugation.

Palestinian and European Jews all prefer this to the other. Or, 2. חלופין שביין בני אשר ובין בני נפתלי, *Dissensions that arose between the sons of Asher and the sons of Naphtali* concerning the reading of the Sacred Codex. Rabbi Aaron ben Moses of the tribe of Asher and Rabbi Moses ben David of the tribe of Naphtali are said to be the Collector of these; the former of whom is set forth as having taught in the Tiberian Academy of Palestine,¹ whence the other, ben Naphtali, is believed to have flourished in Babylon.² [Indeed, GIULIO BARTOLOCCI,³ in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica Magna*, tome I, page 93, maintains that both Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali lived in Babylonia, with BUDDEUS likewise informing, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1468b; but, as CARPZOV has it, where he discusses these Variant Readings, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter VII, § 7, number 2, pages 359, 360, thus BARTOLOCCI judges, supported by no adequate testimonies: while also another error of BARTOLOCCI concerning these same Variant Readings, after WOLF, CARPZOV notes in the same place.] These Various Readings have to do, not with letters and words, but only with the Vowels, long or short, and the Accents minor, etc., so that neither the form nor the signification of a word is changed one whit by the same. They are numbered at eight hundred and sixty-four. All the European copies both of the Jews and of the Christians follow the reading of Ben Asher. To which two, 3. the Indices of the various Readings, which are from time to time made by Christians from the observed diversity in the published Bibles, agree. But especially, 4. in the Hebrew Bible are to be noted the differences between the *Qere* and *Kethibh*, or what is *Read* and what is *Written*, or קִרְיָן וְכִתְבֵּן, of which sort of Readings *Elias Levita* enumerates eight hundred and forty-eight. Concerning which, so that I might study brevity, I will only mention the *hypothesis* of CARPZOV, painstakingly discussing these many in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter VII, pages 328-364; which hypothesis, according to the Most Illustrious SCHULTENS, in his

¹ Rabbi Aaron ben Moses ben Asher (died c. 960) was a Jewish scribe, expert in the Tiberian system of Hebrew vocalization. His edition of the Masoretic Text is generally recognized as the most accurate.

² Rabbi Ben Naphtali (flourished c. 890-940) was a Jewish scribe; his edition of the Hebrew Text differed from that of Ben Asher in some things, mostly in accentuation.

³ Giulio Bartolucci (1613-1687) was an Italian Cistercian and Hebraist. He published a four-volume *Bibliothecam Magnam Rabbinicam*, the first, grand attempt to provide an accounting of Jewish literature.

Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae, Section II, § 25, page 98, is conceived and deduced with great judgment. CARPZOV reckons, *a.* that a comparison of the Best Codices, reading in a disparate manner in this places, furnished the first origin and occasion of the קֶרֶן וְכֶתִיב, *Qere and Kethibh*, to which, a little afterwards, or even at the same time, which is left an open question, a reading of honest words in the place of obscene, and one or another interpretation of the Rabbis, is added, even critically, but with the utmost brevity. But this work, *b.* if any time is to be assigned to it, he thinks to have been undertaken and completed thence from 164 BC and onward, since, after worship and the ancestral religion were restored from the profanation of Antiochus Epiphanes, pious and holy men of the Jews under the auspices of Judas Maccabæus would have expended serious care of the sacred Volumes, and the Churches, having been liberated from the tyranny of enemies, would have made provision for new copies of the Books: unto which end he maintains that they sent for the most excellent Babylonian exemplar and compared it with the Jerusalem, noted the Various Readings observed from the comparison, so that it might exhibit the reading of the Palestinians as כְּתִיב/*Kethibh/written*, but the Babylonian as קֶרֶן/*Qere/read*. Within the Text they were preserving the written כְּתִיב, which they discovered in the most approved, ancestral Codices; but the Babylonian reading was placed in the margin, so that the Palestinians might be taught how the word was to be pronounced within the *reading*. At the same time, they also exchanged the points, and referred the superscripted marks of the textual reading to the margin, with the points from the marginal reading admitted under the כְּתִיב/*Kethibh*, removing neither completely nor causing them to be passed over in silence: whence it appears why strange points were subjoined to the כְּתִיב/*Kethibh*. *c.* With respect to the nature and character of the קֶרֶן וְכֶתִיב, *Qere and Kethibh*, CARPZOV observes that those are able to be referred to three sorts, so that, *α.* some relate the Various Readings of the Codices, as there are many of these, which have to do with the letters אֵהוּ¹ either abounding, or wanting, or transposed: *β.* Others are indices of the genuine Reading, in places that argue a manifest lapse on the parts of the scribes, as they are read and not written, written and not read; likewise places in which

¹ The *Matres Lectionis*, certain Hebrew consonants (א, ה, ו, י) used to indicate vowel sounds.

a metathesis¹ of letters produces a fault, as when אָל/lo/not erroneously crept in for לוֹ/lo, for him, and vice versa: γ. Others relate the Rabbis' εὐλάβειαν/*discretion* and modesty before the public assembly, where they substituted things more chaste in the place of things obscene, not because they thus read it in the other Codex of the Text, but so that they might look to the modesty of the delicate, and more oppose the shamelessness of the impudent.

From the things said, it is evident that the Qere and Kethibh, no more than the other Collections of Variant Readings, make to prove the Corruption of the Hebrew Text; but that a careful observation of the Variant Readings of this sort makes to protect the integrity of the Text from corruption.

It is only left to ask, whether the genuine and authentic Reading is to be sought in the כְּתִיב/*Kethibh*, what is written, or in the קֶרֶי/*Qere*, what is read? α. The Jews, and with them Avenarius,² Hackspan,³ Schickard,⁴ Hottinger, and Amama,⁵ judge that it is to be fixed solely to the קֶרֶי/*Qere*. β. There are those who, with the קֶרֶי/*Qere* rejected, defend the one and only כְּתִיב/*Kethibh*, like Danzius⁶ after Voetius: from whom SCHULTENS, does not much recede, writing in his *Institutionibus ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae*, page 98: "In general I am able to say that the כְּתִיב/*Kethibh*, as it is more ancient, so it is generally more genuine than the קֶרֶי/*Qere*, which I previously suggested to have emanated from most diverse founts." γ. CARPZOV rightly admonishes that no Codex is to

¹ That is, a *transposition*.

² Johann Habermann (1516-1590) was a Lutheran pastor and theologian. He served as Professor of Hebrew at Jena (1573-1574), and Professor of Theology at Wittenberg (1574-1576).

³ Theodoricus Hackspan (1607-1659) was a Lutheran divine and eminent Oriental scholar. He served at Altdorf as Professor of Hebrew (1636-1654), and Professor of Theology (1654-1659).

⁴ Wilhelm Schickard (1592-1635) was a Lutheran pastor, Hebraist, and theologian. He served at Tübingen as Professor of Hebrew (1619-1631), and Professor of Astronomy (1632-1635).

⁵ Sixtinus Amama (1593-1629) was Professor of Hebrew at Oxford (1613) and at Franeker (1618), succeeding John Drusius. He is remembered for his skill in Oriental languages and his defense of the ultimate authority of the original texts of Scripture.

⁶ Johann Andreas Danz (1654-1727) was a Lutheran Orientalist and theologian. He served at Jena as Professor of Oriental Languages (1685-1710), and Professor of Theology (1710-1727).

be deprived of the קרי/Qere; but that, with both Readings of קרי/Qere and כתיב/Kethibh duly recorded, the weights, which militate for each, are to be rightly weighed out to the Interpreter, and finally that which overcomes the other by analogy of sense, of parallel places, and of the language, is to be held as authentic; with these Canons employed: 1. In Passages, which put more honest vocabulary in the place of the obscene, the כתיב/Kethibh is to be insisted on expressly. 2. In those, where there is a manifest distraction of the copyist, the קרי/Qere is to be preferred. 3. In those, where the sense of each Reading is indeed disparate, yet reconcilable and suitable; let that Reading be chosen and held as divine, which agrees more exactly with the context, the analogy of the Language, the accentuation, and the parallel places. 4. In those, where a contrary sense emerges, affirmative and negative at the same time, that one Reading is only to be held that outweighs the other in all matters rightly considered: compare VOETIUS' *Disputationum Theologicarum*, volume I, pages 35-37. One may read the opinions of several others concerning the קרי/Qere and כתיב/Kethibh, reviewed in CARPZOV'S *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter VII, with commentary. Also the Most Illustrious VERBRUGGE briefly set forth his opinion concerning this matter in *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, observation I, in which place see § 74, 75, pages 79-81.

ב. Similarly, against the Authenticity of the Greek Text of the New Testament a difficulty is moved both by *Naturalists* and by the *Jews*, from the immense number of *Variant Readings* found there: but which one may see entirely removed by STAPFER, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 136-139, pages 974-976, 980, 981, and tome 3, chapter XI, section I, § 336, 273-275; BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, pages 1499b-1502a; PETRUS DINANT, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, § 120-129, pages 975-994.

δ. That I might add this one, *They object* against us the *authorities of the Fathers* also, who do not conceal that the Codices in their time were corrupted to a remarkable degree: how they appeal to *Epiphanius*, *Theophylact*, *Ambrose*, *Jerome*, *Augustine*, *Suidas*¹ on *Lucian the Martyr*,²

¹ Suidas was the compiler of the *Suda*, an encyclopedia containing more than thirty thousand entries concerning the ancient Mediterranean world. It was probably composed in tenth-century Byzantium.

² Lucian of Antioch (c. 240-312) was an elder, theologian, educator (founding a school at Antioch), and martyr. He is credited with a critical recension of the

compare with *Johann von Wovern's*¹ *de Polymathia*, chapter XVIII, § 7; consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter III, § 6, number 12, page 123, while *Bellarmino*, *de Verbo Dei*, book II, chapter II, column 89, *Controversiis*, tome I, cites other testimonies of the Fathers concerning the Corruption of Scripture, namely, *Justin*, *Eusebius*, *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, and *Jerome*.

Responses: 1. The Fathers everywhere complained of the Corruption, not of the Hebrew Text, but of the Septuagint Greek Version...vivalis; and Jerome sometimes also concerning the Corrupted Latin Versions, which were circulating among the common people at that time, and which he was recalling to the Hebrew founts. Thus *Bellarmino* himself, in the very same column, answers, "*Justin* and *Eusebius* nowhere wrote that the Hebrew text was corrupted by the Hebrews, but rather the Greek text of the Seventy Interpreters.... *Origen* also clearly speaks of the corruption of the Septuagint Version.... Moreover, *Chrysostom* speaks of the Jewish Translators, namely, *Aquila*,² *Symmachus*,³ *Theodotion*,⁴ etc.... Concerning which *Jerome* also speaks in an *Epistle to Augustine*.... But *Jerome* in the commentaries cited doubts, does not assert, the same. But in his *Commentariis Jesaiæ*, which he wrote afterwards...he openly ridicules those that think that the Hebrew Codices were falsified."

2. But if some in the Ancient Church detracted somewhat from the Hebrew Codex, the error arose from the ignorance of the Hebrew Tongue, and the fabulous prejudice concerning the Septuagint Version, miraculously produced and ἀναμαρτήτω, *without error*.

Concerning the Ancient Heretics as Corruptors of Sacred

Septuagint and Greek New Testament, used by later Greek Fathers.

¹ Johann von Wovern (1574-1612) was a German philologist and churchman.

² Aquila of Sinope produced his Greek version of the Old Testament in the second century of the Christian era. Aquila's translation champions the cause of Judaism against Christianity in matters of translation and interpretation. The product is woodenly literalistic.

³ Symmachus (second century) produced a Greek translation of the Old Testament, which survives only in fragments. Symmachus' work is characterized by an apparent concern to render faithfully the Hebrew original, to provide a rendering consistent with the rabbinic exegesis of his time, and to set forth the translation in simple, pure, and elegant Septuagint-style Greek.

⁴ Theodotion was a linguist and convert to Judaism, who translated the Hebrew Scripture into Greek in the middle of the second century AD. His translation appears to be an attempt to bring the Septuagint into conformity with the Hebrew text.

Scripture, consult WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book III, exercitation VIII, § 7, pages 739, 740.

To the whole of § 9 compare also CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter III, which is *de Puritate et Integritate Codicis Hebræi*, pages 90-132; and also GERHARD'S¹ *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, where in thesis II he proves against the Papists that *the Hebrew Edition of the Books of the Old Testament have not been corrupted*, pages 77-104, in thesis III that *the Greek Edition of the Books of the New Testament have not been corrupted*, pages 104-123; PETRUS DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, § 87-119, pages 904-974, where he especially disputes against Meiboom and Simon. In particular, against MARCUS MEIBOOM'S *Specimen Emendationum et Interpretationum Biblicarum*, see JACOBUS TRIGLAND *the Younger's*² *Dissertationem, quæ continet Integritatis Codicis Sacræ adversus Nuperas in eum censuras Defensionem*, in *Sylloge Dissertationum*, pages 293-408. Against rashly attempted emendation of the Sacred Text, and against some specimens of the criticism of this sort of Tan. Fabri and Bentley concerning the Greek Text of the New Testament, see MOSHEIM'S³ *Observationes sacras*, book I, chapter I, § 20-22, pages 78-102. Read similarly JAKOB HASE'S⁴ *dissertationem de Glossematibus quorundam locorum Novi Testamenti*, written with the same intention, *Bibliotheca Bremensi*, volume I, fascicule V, chapter III, pages 687-738.

¹ John Gerhard (1582-1637) was an eminent Lutheran divine. He held the position of Professor of Divinity at Jena (1616), and he was four times the Rector of the same. He wrote copiously in exegetical, polemical, and dogmatic theology. His *Loci communes theologici* (1610-1622) was the largest Lutheran dogmatic text that had been produced to date.

² Jacobus Trigland the Younger (1652-1705) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian. Beginning in 1686, he served as Professor of Theology at Leiden.

³ Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693-1755) was a German Lutheran church historian. He is especially remembered for his *Institutionum historiae ecclesiasticæ*.

⁴ Jakob Hase (1691-1723) was Professor of Philosophy at the Bremen gymnasium.

§ 10: Against the Authenticity of the Vulgate

After our AUTHOR *positively* taught that the Independent and Authentic Authority of the Sacred Scripture, not only with respect to Matter, but also with respect to Words, is found only in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament and Greek Text of the New Testament, and vindicated the assertion against those thinking otherwise: he proceeds *Negatively* to teach that that Authenticity is not found, 8. *In the Vulgate Latin Version*, § 10; neither, 2. *In the Samaritan Pentateuch*, nor, 3. *In the Greek Version of the Septuagint*, § 11.

The Latin edition has thus been called the *Vulgate*¹ from antiquity, both because it had no certain author, and because it was taken, not from the Hebrew fount, but from the $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\eta$ /*Koine* or from the Septuagint translation. The Latin Version, which is to this day circulated under the name of *Vulgate*, the *Papists* maintain to be *Authentic*, according to the *Tridentine Council, Session IV, Decree II, page 32b*, which reads thus: “Moreover, the same Sacred Synod, considering that no small utility might be able to accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which out of all the Latin editions of the sacred books now in circulation *is to be held as Authentic*: ordains and declares that this same *Old and Vulgate Edition*, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved in the Church, *be*, in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, *held as authentic*; and that no one is to dare, or presume, to reject it *under any pretext whatever*.”

Which Canon, says our AUTHOR in his *Compendio, the more learned Papists wish to mitigate, explaining it in opposition, not to the founts, but to other Versions*, etc. That in the Tridentine Council itself there was much debate back and forth, and that the Doctors were divided into various opinions, before the now mentioned Canon had come to be stamped, CARPZOV shows, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, § 6, number 1, pages 692, 693*; compare PETRUS SUAUIS POLANUS’ *Historiam Concilii Tridentini*,² *book II, pages 174-177, 179*,

¹ In Latin, *vulgatus* means *common*.

² Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623) was a Venetian prelate, historian, and canon lawyer. Although a Roman Catholic, he defended the liberties of Venice against Papal

182. Then there is disputation among the Doctors of the Roman Church concerning the intention of the Canon, and whether the Vulgate Version is preferred only to the other Latin Versions, or to the Original Text itself, as you may see in *Carpzov's Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, § 6, number 2, pages 694-696*. Bellarmine, Serarius,¹ Salmeron judge here more moderately, whom NATALIS ALEXANDER² praises, and to whom he joins himself with several others, *Selectis historicæ ecclesiasticæ capitulis, Century IV, Dissertation XXXIX, article V, pages m. 441, 442*, proving their opinion with arguments, when he says: "But that the Vulgate is not in that sense authentic, as if of equal authority with the primitive Text, two arguments especially prove: 1. That it is not in the power of the Church to make a Version authentic in this sense, just as it is not in the power of the Church to make a book Canonical; but only to declare that a Version is faithful and agreeable to the founts: or, if errors had crept in, to correct them, and to order its use in the public offices of the Church. 2. That, if the Vulgate alone be authentic, it would follow that the Eastern Churches, which make use of the Greek or Syriac or Æthiopic Version, have not true Scripture." And so he maintains that the Vulgate Version is only called *Authentic*, because it contains nothing repugnant to faith and good morals, and because it is a certain rule of faith as it is approved by the Church, and *as far as it agrees with the original Text*. He adds, "But it is not called Authentic, as if it were to be preferred or even to be made equal to the Hebrew and Greek founts. Consequently, the Tridentine Synod only prefers our Vulgate to the other Latin Versions, with the originating Texts left in the same state in which they were previously." But others pass to the opposite opinion, such as *Cano, Valentia*,³ *Gordonus*,⁴ *Gretser*,¹ *Suarez*,² *etc.*, who maintain

intrusion, and was a proponent of the separation of church and state. His *History of the Council of Trent*, published under the name *Petrus Suavis Polanus*, was highly critical of the Papal Curia's involvement in the Council.

¹ Nicholas Serarius (1555-1610) was a Jesuit scholar. He served as Professor of Theology at the University of Mentz. He wrote commentaries on many Biblical books.

² Noël Alexandre (1639-1724) was a French Dominican. He taught philosophy, theology, and canon law at the Sorbonne.

³ Gregorius de Valentia (1549-1603) was a Jesuit scholar, originally from Spain. He served as Professor of Theology at Dillingen (1573-1575) and at Ingolstadt (1575-1592).

⁴ This may be a reference to James Gordon (1541-1620), a Scottish Jesuit. Gordon entered the Society of Jesus at Rome in 1563, and taught philosophy, theology, and Scripture at Pont-à-Mousson, Paris, and Bordeaux. He returned

that the Vulgate Version was declared to be absolutely Authentic by the Tridentine Council, so that a better is not able to be given, and it is to be preferred to all Editions of whatever language, from which indeed the original Codices, as corrupted, are to be corrected. Thus *Lejay* expressly asserts in his *præfatione* to his *Paris Polyglott*,³ “Therefore, it ought to be held among us as certain and indubitable that the Vulgate Edition, which is circulated in the common tongue of the Catholic Church, is the true and genuine fount of Sacred Scripture; that this is to be consulted everywhere, and thence the dogmas of the faith are to be sought. But inasmuch as we think that this is to be referred, less to the Hebrew and other texts, than to the Vulgate Version, no one in any event may convict us of error, etc.” But *Sixtus V* in a Bull, which he prefixed to his own edition of the Vulgate Version,⁴ averred that “the indignation of the omnipotent God and a prohibition against entering the Church, indeed even excommunication, he publicly declared against any that would presume to change, to add, or to subtract, the least particle in the Books corrected by himself.” And that by the Canon of the Tridentine Council the Vulgate Edition is certainly preferred to the very Hebrew and Greek Text, is proven from the conclusion, *that no one might dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatsoever: if under no pretext, then not under the pretext of the Hebrew Codex*, which *Hart* acknowledged in the *Colloquium with Rainolds*.⁵ Hence also the *Expugatory Index*,¹ when *Mariana*² in *libro de*

to Scotland as a missionary, and wrote of the controversies between Roman Catholicism and Calvinism.

¹ Jakob Gretser (1562-1625) was a German Jesuit theologian and controversialist. He served as Professor of Philosophy (1589-1592) and Professor of Theology (1592-1615) at Ingolstadt.

² Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) was a Spanish Jesuit, esteemed by some as the greatest scholastic philosopher-theologian since Thomas Aquinas. Suárez’s interests included international law, metaphysics, and theology. In the field of international law, he was a forerunner of Grotius, who speaks of him with the highest respect.

³ *Biblia Hebraica, Samaritana, Chaldaica, Syriaca, Græca, Latina, et Arabica*, was edited by Gui-Michel Lejay (1588-1674), a French scholar, expert in Oriental languages, and sponsored by Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle.

⁴ After the Council of Trent, Pope Sixtus V (1585-1590) endeavored to establish a standard text of the Vulgate. The Sistine edition of 1590 was soon superseded by the Clementine of 1592.

⁵ John Rainolds (1549-1607) was an Oxford academic and churchman. He was Puritan in his views, and played an important role in initiating the Authorized Version. In the early 1580s, Rainolds met Jesuit John Hart (died 1586) in disputation.

Vulgata Versione, in the same manner as we heard concerning *Natalis Alexander*, pronounced that this is of no less authority than the fount, when it agrees with the founts; listed these words, *when it agrees with the founts*.

Our AUTHOR adds, *They adduce Similitudes unsuitable for this, for example, that of the Two Thieves crucified with Christ*. That similitude is found in the *Præfatione* of the *Complutensian Polyglot* of Cardinal Ximénez,³ the Author of which affirms that he placed the Latin Text in the middle between the Hebrew and the Greek, as between the Synagogue and the Eastern Church, like the two Thieves on this side and on that side, but Jesus in the midst, that is, the Roman or Latin Church. Nevertheless, whether this *Præfatio* proceeded from Cardinal Ximénez himself, one may doubt; since, 1. Ximénez himself was not able to bring this splendid edition of the Bible to the public, being prevented by death just before the end of the impression, November 8, 1517; and, 2. Ximénez, in the dedication of the work to Pope Leo X, manifestly holds the contrary, desiring a return to the Hebrew founts, wherever there is a variety of Latin Codices, or suspicion of a corrupted reading. Hence that preface to the Reader, although committed to writing under the name of Ximénez, perhaps proceeded from the hand of another.

But, while the Roman Church busies itself to acquire Authenticity for the Vulgate Version, their *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, *fundamental error*, is that the Founts are Corrupt. The *Scope/Goal*: to help the ignorance of the Roman Clergy, to decline the force of the Original Text, to seek out of the Vulgate a defense for errors, to subject all things to the Roman Church.

Our AUTHOR places opposite, besides the things mentioned in § 8 already: 1. *the Uncertain Origin of this Version (it is not known, says he in his Medulla Theologiæ, by whom that whole was prepared); with a great*

¹ Books on the *Index Expurgatorius* are only allowed to Roman Catholics in a censored, “expurgated,” form.

² John Mariana (c. 1536-1624) was a Spanish, Jesuit scholar. He wrote annotations on the Scripture. His *magnum opus* was the thirty-book history of Spain, *Historiæ de Rebus Hispaniæ*.

³ The Complutensian Polyglot (taking its name from the university in Alcalá [Complutum, in Latin]; 1514) contained the first printed edition of the Septuagint, Jerome’s Vulgate, the Hebrew Text, Targum Onkelos with a Latin translation, and the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament. The labor of the scholars was superintended by Cardinal Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros (1436-1517).

many Papists agreeing, that it is to be traced as a whole to the times of Tertullian, or to Jerome himself, but only as mixed from various, from the times of Gregory. That is, according to the observation of HOTTINGER, *Thesaurο Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section III, page 387, Stapleton childishly attempts to show the use of today's Vulgate Version in the time of Tertullian. While, that also other and completely different Versions, like the Itala or Old Vulgate, were well-worn by the hands of the Fathers, it is everywhere understood out of Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and others. Bellarmine, book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IX, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 108, relates that Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus¹ and Giovanni Pico Mirandola,² in their books published on this topic, contend that today's Vulgate in its entirety is to be attributed to JEROME; Masius,³ Petrus Sutor,⁴ and others of the Papists agree. But most Writers of the Papists maintain that it was conflated from two, the Old Itala or Vulgate (translated from the popular Septuagint Edition) and the new Vulgate of Jerome, in the time of *Gregory I*, that is, just before the end of the sixth century. Thus *Baronius*, *Annalibus Ecclesiasticis*, on AD 231, § 47, tome 2, column 394, "Now, it happened in the time of Gregory (but in what year, or by what author, remains uncertain), that, since there were at the same time two Vulgate Editions, the Old and the New, sometimes ministering occasion of dissensions and contentions, in this matter the faithful were pulled from one another into diverse parties, while some were following the Old, and others the New; and each for his own (as it is common) was arguing contentiously, provoking commotions, etc. But, with the Deity inspiring, it was foreseen, and thoroughly considered, that for common Ecclesiastical use one should be conflated out of the two that were in use in all the Churches, which, being *Common* and *Vulgate* to all, by all might be called by one name, with

¹ Eugubinus, or Agostino Steuco (1496-1549), was the bishop of Kisamos in Crete and prefect of the Vatican Library. He was skilled in linguistics and antiquities.

² Giovanni Pico Mirandola (1463-1494) was an Italian Renaissance philosopher.

³ Andrew Masius (1516-1573) was among the most learned Roman Catholic scholars of his age and in no field is that more evident than in the field of Oriental languages. He also served as Counselor to William, Duke of Cleves.

⁴ Petrus Sutor (1475-1537) was a French Carthusian theologian. In 1525, he published his *De translatione Bibliæ*, in which he argued that the reading of the Scripture by the laity, far from being a means unto salvation, was positively harmful. For which reason, he was very much opposed to vernacular translations.

that nomenclature of Old and New being exploded. And the matter fell out according to the decision, etc.” And it appears that it is certainly to be said, that today’s Vulgate Version,

α. Is not in its entirety to be attributed to JEROME: for,

a. *Jerome’s* version was exactly conformable to the Hebrew Text in all things, as far as possible: but today’s Vulgate turns from thence many times and much.

b. That Version in both Testaments reads much differently than the Jeromian emendations suggest.

c. Today we have in the *operibus Hieronymi* a Version of the Psalter freshly embellished by him, from which the Vulgate far recedes. However,

β. Today’s Vulgate, although it be not the same in all things with Jerome’s, yet is not altogether different and diverse from it. And so today’s Vulgate Version has arisen,

a. From the most ancient *Common* or *Itala Version*, which was made by an unknown author from the Septuagint.

b. From the tireless study of *Jerome*, who,

a. While yet a youth, from the Greek Text of the New Testament and the Septuagint Version, partly emended the Vulgate Version, and partly made it new.

b. Then, having acquired the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, he prepared a new Version from the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.

c. From that Old, and this new, and other Versions, mixed together, emended and corrected each by the other.

Nevertheless, the *Vulgate* was not for this reason rendered into today’s form by a collation of Versions conducted by public authority, at one and the same time, as *Baronius* maintains without any proof from approved Writers: but, since all Antiquity is silent concerning this matter, it appears to have happened gradually and by degrees, as a result of the promiscuous use and tacit consent of a number of centuries, rather than by the express agreement of all Churches. Whatever the case may be, in any event it was prepared by human industry.

2. Our AUTHOR sets in opposition that this Version was *never held as Authentic, not even after* the Tridentine Council; *as Sixtus V and Clement VIII indicate, beyond their private Glosses, by so many hundreds of changes to it.*

α. That before the Tridentine Council this Version was

not Authentic, is proven out of a great many Papists, who acknowledge and freely refute such a great number of this Version's errors; these Papists include *Lyra*,¹ *Paul of Burgos*,² *Jerome de Oleastro*,³ *Cajetan*,⁴ and others. *Sixtus Senensis*, book VIII of *Bibliothecæ Sanctæ* on the last page, writes: "We frankly admit that many errors were corrected by Jerome in the old translation, and that similarly in this our new edition were found some blemishes, solecisms, barbarisms, transpositions; and many things translated with little suitability, and not well-expressed in Latin, construed obscurely and ambiguously; and likewise some things superadded, other things omitted; certain things transposed, changed, and corrupted by the vice of the writers, which things Sanctes Pagninus,⁵ Thomas Cajetan, Franciscus Forerius,⁶ and Jerome de Oleastro, most learned men of the Dominican order, point out in their interpretations and explanations." Especially *Isidore Clario*,⁷ who testifies that he noted eighty thousand errors in the Vulgate Version, according to HOTTINGER, *Thesaurus Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section III, page 383; and

¹ Nicholas de Lyra (1270-1340) was born to Jewish parents, but he converted to Christianity. He entered the Franciscan Order and became a teacher of some repute in Paris. His *Postilla in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* demonstrate remarkable ability and a commitment to the literal sense of the Scripture.

² Paul of Burgos (1351-1435) was a Spanish Jewish scholar, converted to Christianity, and rising to become archbishop of Burgos. He wrote the *Additiones* to Lyra's *Postilla*.

³ Jerome Olivier (or de Oleastro) was a Portuguese Dominican monk who flourished during the mid-sixteenth century. He was widely esteemed within his order for his abilities in theology, Greek, and Hebrew.

⁴ Thomas Cajetan (1469-1534) was an Italian Dominican. He was a theologian of great repute, and a learned proponent of a modified Thomism (Neo-Thomism). Due to his considerable talents, he was made a cardinal. Cajetan proved to be one of the more able opponents of the Reformation.

⁵ Pagnine (1466-1541) was an Italian Dominican. He was gifted as a Hebraist, exegete, and preacher. He was commissioned by Pope Leo X to produce a new Latin translation of the Scripture.

⁶ Franciscus Forerius (1523-1581) was a Portuguese Dominican theologian. He was a delegate to the Council of Trent, and was secretary to the committee to continue the *Indicem librorum prohibitorum*. He wrote commentaries on Isaiah, the wisdom and poetic literature of the Old Testament, and the Gospels.

⁷ Isidore Clario (1495-1555) was a Benedictine monk. He served as the Prior of the Monastery of St. Peter in Modena, in northern Italy (1537), and as the Bishop of Foligno, in central Italy (1547). He was present at the Council of Trent. His *Annotationes in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* is included in the *Critici Sacri*.

TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question XV, § 4*: but, according to CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, page 687*, *Isidore Clario*, in the *præfatione Bibliorum*, published by himself in Venice in 1542, testifies that *eight thousand* places were corrected by himself: which verily appears to be consistent with the words of the *Præfationis* of *Isidore Clario* himself, and with the words of *Richard Simon*, out of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of JACQUES LE LONG,¹ *tome 1, pages 598-601*; add GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, page 152b*. Therefore, *Clario* boasts that he had emended eight thousand, not eighty thousand, places.

β. Neither after the Tridentine Council is this Version able to be called Authentic; because, as we previously heard *Natalis Alexander* confessing, no Council is able to render any writing Authentic, which is not such of itself because of its divine origin. The Church is able only to declare that a certain Version is faithful and like unto its source: or, if errors have crept in, to correct them, and to order its use in the public services of the Church. Hence we saw that the more learned of the Papists thus explain the Tridentine Canon, as if this Version were only pronounced Authentic to the extent that it agrees with the founts. Afterward, in the year 1590, by the care of Pope *Sixtus V*, an Edition of the Vulgate Version finally came forth *corrected as accurately as was able to be done*, as *Sixtus* himself says; and he says that “without any doubt this is to be supposed the very Vulgate Edition that was received as Authentic by the Tridentine Council.” But was the Council, in April of 1546, at which time the above mentioned Decree was hammered out in favor of the Authenticity of the Vulgate Version, able to impart Authenticity to an Edition that at length came forth forty-four years afterward? And, although *Sixtus* pronounced at that time the indignation of God and excommunication from the Church against any one that might presume to add, subtract, or change the last particle in his Edition: nevertheless, *Clement VIII* two years afterwards undertook to recall the Sixtine Edition to the anvil and to emend it, under the amusing pretext that the Bull prefixed to the Sixtine Bible was not affixed to the doors of the Church of St. Peter, whence it is evident that *Sixtus did not speak ex Cathedra* there, and that therefore it was in *Clement's* power to change and to determine in the Sixtine Edition whatever seemed right to him.

¹ Jacques Lelong (1665-1721) was a French bibliographer. His *Bibliotheca Sacra* was an index of editions of the Bible.

THOMAS JAMES, the Proto-Librarian of the Oxford Library,¹ in his *Bello Papali*, published at London in 1606, demonstrates through the individual books of the Sacred Codex, going in order, how much and in what things the Clementine edition departs from and corrects the Sixtine; and besides the other things which he observes, he shows that *two thousand* readings, which Sixtus, by Apostolic authority, had confirmed against the Hebrew and Greek verity, were reformed and remolded to the founts by Clement, exercising the same authority. Now, in the *title* and *preface* of the Clementine Edition comes a twofold fraud, not so pious, but worthy to be noted: 1. That in the title this Edition was treated as if it were the Sixtine and, being thus authorized according to his counsel, is inscribed: 2. That the many errors that crept into the prior Sixtine Edition are said to be typographical, but are here corrected, which Sixtus himself had proposed to himself to arrange, except that he was prevented by death. However, *a.* these Editions differ immensely. *b.* The Bull of Sixtus, so severely forbidding all alteration, reveals him to be of a quite different mind. *c.* It will be readily apparent to anyone comparing both Editions that the *errors* are not only *typographical*, in which correction was here made. However, that this Clementine Edition, even after so many emendations of former editions, still teems with innumerable errors, AMAMA, CALOVIUS, and others demonstrate: but even the very *Preface* of this Bible acknowledges this, when *this Edition* is said to have been corrected with as much diligence as possible, yet it is difficult to affirm it to be pure in all its parts on account of human weakness. Indeed, in this Edition, as even Bellarmine, who was among the Correctors, admits, many things were deliberately left unchanged for good reasons, which after all appear to require correction; see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book I, chapter III, section III, page 395. But, in the final analysis, in what manner is such an Edition of the Scripture to be called Authentic?

3. The *Barbarisms* and *Solecisms* greatly vex, which are acknowledged by *Sixtus Senensis*, in the place just cited from book VIII of his *Bibliothecæ*, examples of which our AUTHOR reckons in words *pessimandi/injuring*, *implanandi/misleading*, *alleviandi/lightening*, etc.; and in phrases *delivering in the hands of enemies, of kings ruling over them*, etc. Thus occurs the word *pessimare, to injure*, Ecclesiasticus 11:24, and what

¹ Thomas James (1573-1629), an expert in manuscripts and forgeries, was the librarian of the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

by *this* pessimabor, shall I be injured?¹ and Ecclesiasticus 36:9, *whoever* pessimant/injures *thy people, let them find perdition*:² the word *implanare, to mislead*, Ecclesiasticus 15:12, *say thou not, He implanavit/misled me*;³ and Ecclesiasticus 34:10, *he that implanatus est, is misled, shall abound in wickedness*:⁴ the word *alleviare, to lighten*, Isaiah 9:1, *at the first time the land of Zebulun alleviate est, was lightened*;⁵ Acts 27:38, *alleviabant, they were lightening, the ship, casting the wheat into the sea*;⁶ James 5:15, *and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord alleviabit, shall lighten, him*.⁷ Similarly the phrase *delivering in the hands* is found, Exodus 33:31, *I will deliver in your hands the inhabitants of the earth*;⁸ Leviticus 26:25, *and ye shall be delivered in the hand of enemies*.⁹ And also *dominari alicujus, to rule over someone*, Luke 23:25, *the kings of the Gentiles dominantur eorum, rule over them*;¹⁰ Psalm 106:41, *dominati sunt eorum, they ruled over*

¹ Ecclesiasticus 11:24: “Again, say not, I have enough, and possess many things, and what evil shall I have hereafter (καὶ τί ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κακωθήσομαι; *et quid ex hoc pessimabor, in the Vulgate*)?”

² Ecclesiasticus 36:9: “Let him that escapeth be consumed by the rage of the fire; and let them perish that oppress the people (καὶ οἱ κακοῦντες τὸν λαὸν σου εὐροισαν ἀπόλειαν; *et qui pessimant plebem tuam inveniant perditionem, in the Vulgate*).”

³ Ecclesiasticus 15:12: “Say not thou, He hath caused me to err (μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι αὐτός με ἐπλάνησεν; *non dicas: ille me implanavit, in the Vulgate*): for he hath no need of the sinful man.”

⁴ Ecclesiasticus 34:10: “He that hath no experience knoweth little: but he that hath travelled is full of prudence (ὁ δὲ πεπλανημένος πληθυνεῖ πανουργίαν; *qui implanatus est abundabit nequitia, in the Vulgate*).”

⁵ Isaiah 9:1: “Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali (יְזַבְּלוֹן וְנַפְתָּלִי; *primo tempore alleviata est terra Zabulon et terra Nephthali, in the Vulgate*), and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations.”

⁶ Acts 27:38: “And when they had eaten enough, they lightened the ship (ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον; *alleviabant navem, in the Vulgate*), and cast out the wheat into the sea.”

⁷ James 5:15a: “And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up (καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος; *et alleviabit eum Dominus, in the Vulgate*)...”

⁸ Exodus 23:31b: “...for I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand (וְנָתַתִּי בְיַדְכֶם אֶת יְשֵׁבֵי הָאֲרָץ; *tradam in manibus vestris habitatores terrae, in the Vulgate*); and thou shalt drive them out before thee.”

⁹ Leviticus 26:25b: “...and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy (וְנָתַתֶּם בְּיַד־אֹיְבֵי; *et trademini in manibus hostium, in the Vulgate*).”

¹⁰ Luke 22:25: “And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them (οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν; *reges gentium*

those, *that hated them*.¹ Add the phrase also enumerated by our AUTHOR, *faciendi per ter, doing through three times*, which you may read, Acts 10:16, *this factum est per ter, was done through three times*;² and again Acts 11:10, *but this factum est per ter, was done through three times*.³

4. But the *innumerable*, graver *Errors* of this Version are more repugnant to its Authenticity, a quite lengthy series of which CARPZOV exhibits, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, pages 675-683*; for *elliptical Errors* see *Carpzov, Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, page 677*, thus, for example, in Romans 11:6, after these words: “But if by grace, then not of works; otherwise grace is no more grace;” an entire sentence, which is found in the Greek text, is missing: “But if of works, then it is no more grace, seeing that then work is no more work.” Thus in 1 Corinthians 6:20, after *in your body*, the words are wanting, *and in your spirit, which are God’s*. No fewer *pleonastic Errors* occur here; see *Carpzov, Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, page 678*, thus, for example, in Luke 10:1, *seventy-two* is read in place of *seventy*; in Romans 4:2, *by the works of the Law* is read in place of *by works*. *To the Proverbs of Solomon* entire spurious *γνώμῃαι/maxims* are inserted: add the errors *imposed upon the founts*, in *Carpzov’s Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter VI, page 676*; for example, in the place of, “he went forth, going and returning,” in Genesis 8:7, the Version has, “he was going forth and not returning;”⁴ in Genesis 49:24, in the place of, “and the arms of his hands strengthened,” the Version has, “and the chains of his arms and hands were unloosed;”⁵ etc. And let me not mention the errors *Chronological, Topographical, and Historical*, neither is

dominantur eorum, in the Vulgate); and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.”

¹ Psalm 106:41: “And he gave them into the hand of the heathen; and they that hated them ruled over them (ׁוְיִשְׁׁלְוּ ׁוְיִדְבְּקוּׁם; *et dominati sunt eorum qui oderunt eos*, in the Vulgate).”

² Acts 10:16: “This was done thrice (τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς; *hoc autem factum est per ter*, in the Vulgate): and the vessel was received up again into heaven.”

³ The same as Acts 10:16.

⁴ Genesis 8:7: “And he sent forth a raven, which went forth to and fro (ׁוְצִוָּא ׁוְשׁוּבׁוֹ; *qui egrediebatur, et non revertebatur*, in the Vulgate), until the waters were dried up from off the earth.”

⁵ Genesis 49:24a: “But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong (ׁוְיִצְׁוּ ׁוְיִרְעִי יָדָיו; *et dissoluta sunt vincula brachiorum et manuum illius*, in the Vulgate) by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob...”

it even free from *Dogmatic* errors, when, for example, in Genesis 3:15, it reads, *and she is going to crush the head of the Serpent*, that is, *the woman herself*; by whom then they do not understand *Eve*, unto whom, nevertheless, the speech in that place is expressly directed, but *Mary*: while according to the Hebrew text it is to be read, *him*, that is, the *seed* of that woman, אִהָּ/ *he*, not אִהָּ/ *she*; which is altogether inconsistent with the context, since a masculine verb, הַשִּׁיָּ, *he shall bruise thee*, immediately follows, and then a masculine suffix on הַשִּׁיָּ, *thou shalt bruise him*: see MARCKIUS' *Historiam Paradisi*, book IV, chapter V, § 6, and Chapter XV, § 18, of this *Compendii*, together with *Bellarmino's de Verbo Dei*, book II, chapter XII, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 122, 123. Luke 2:14 in the Vulgate is asserted to be *men of good will*, as if it were read in the text, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας, and as if men were not the object, but rather the subject of this εὐδοκίας, *good will*; see MOSHEIM'S *Observationes Sacras*, book I, chapter II, § 7, pages 117-121: instead of God's εὐδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *good will among men*; by which version they are then put to it to defend the power of the free will of fallen man: neither does this passage allow the remedial treatment of the healthier interpretation that *Bellarmino* tries to apply to it, *de Verbo Dei*, book II, chapter XI, column 121. Thus in Hebrews 13:16, with the sacrifices of beneficence God is said *promereri*, *to be won over*, in the place of εὐαρεστεῖσθαι, *to be well pleased*, which he makes to establish the merits of works. In Genesis 14:18, the Vulgate reads concerning Melchizedek, *for he was a priest*, instead of *and he was a priest*,¹ by which they try to establish the bloodless sacrifice of the Mass. In Genesis 48:16, *let my name be invoked upon them*, instead of *let my name be named among them*,² by which they strive to prove the religious worship of creatures: and more.

Of no moment are those things which the *Papists Object*:

1. That it is the most ancient Version, of which the Church made use through many ages; see *Bellarmino's de Verbo Dei*, chapter X, column 115. But our AUTHOR rightly Responds: α. That the Original Text is even more Ancient; as are also, β. other Versions, for example,

¹ Genesis 14:18: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest (וְהָיָה כֹהֵן; *erat enim sacerdos*, in the Vulgate) of the most high God."

² Genesis 48:16a: "The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them (וְיִקְרָא בְּהֵם שְׁמִי; *et invocetur super eos nomen meum*, in the Vulgate), and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac..."

the Greek of the Old Testament, and the Syriac; especially if you have regard to *today's Vulgate*, and not to the *Itala*, which is no longer prominent; add, γ . That Antiquity might be able procure Authority for a Version, but not Authenticity: which, *with respect to Substance in a Version*, does not depend on its antiquity, but on its agreement with the founts; and, *with respect to Words*, obtains only in the original, divinely inspired Text.

2. *They object that the Dignity of the Latin Church requires an Authentic Text in that language:* thus, indeed, argues *Bellarmino, de Verbo Dei, book II, chapter X, column 116*: “The Hebrews had authentic Scripture in their language: the Greeks also had authentic Scripture in Greek; that is, the Old Testament according to the Septuagint Version and the first founts of the New Testament: therefore, it is fair that the Latin Church, in which is the seat of Peter, and in which the Christian faith was going to abide perpetually, should have authentic Scripture in its own language: but it did not have any other than that for nearly a thousand years; therefore, that is to be considered authentic.” Compare *PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS' Historiam Concilii Tridentini, book II, page 176*.

Responses: α . The argument for the Roman Church, taken from the Hebrews and Greeks, does not follow, for the rationale of each is not the same: it is agreed that God through $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ /*inspired* men bestowed the Hebrew Codex of the Old Testament and the Greek Codex of the New Testament: but who would argue that the authors of the Latin Version were $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ /*inspired*? β . Therefore, the Roman Church should not arrogate to itself a privilege not conceded by God: but the grace of the Gospel, proclaimed in the languages of the Romans and other nations, should be sufficient for all them, with the ancient founts given, unto which they are able to betake themselves by industry. γ . That more eminent dignity of the Roman Church beyond all others is rashly supposed. δ . The *Latin Tongue* is not the vernacular of the Roman Church today, but rather the *Italic*: Therefore, they ought to hold, not the Latin, but the Italian Edition of the Bible to be authentic.

Moreover, concerning the Vulgate Version consult *GERHARD'S Confessionem catholicam, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II*, where in *thesis V* he undertakes to prove that *the Author of the Latin Vulgate Version is not Jerome, pages 130-134*; in *thesis VI* he asserts that *the Latin Vulgate Version is not authentic, pages 135-171*: *TURRETIN'S Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question XV, pages 144-148*: *HOTTINGER'S*

Thesaurum Philologicum, book I, chapter III, section III, pages 378-398: BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 6, tome 2, pages 1531-1538: CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter VI, pages 664b-698, and more whom *Carpzov* cites on page 664b.

§ 11: Against the Authenticity of the Samaritan and Septuagint

With respect to the SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH, of which our AUTHOR makes mention at the beginning of this §, from which text, *to be assessed readily from that most deplorable state* (as they say) *of that most corrupt Nation*, he likewise removes Authenticity: that Hebrew-Samaritan Pentateuch, that is, the Hebraic, but written in Samaritan characters, which is now read, first of all printed by the care of JOHN MORINUS¹ in *Bibliis Polyglottis* published at Paris, but then also inserted into the *Bibliis Polyglottis* published at London; formerly lay hidden, but finally in the last century was brought from the East into Europe. Concerning its origin, age, and authority the Learned differ much.

1. Negatively, there can be no agreement here with JOHN MORINUS, *Presbyter of the Congregation of the Oratory*,² who thought this Pentateuch to be Authentic, transmitted from the age of Moses to Jeroboam, and to the Samaritans of afterages, and on that account to be set far ahead of the Hebrew Codex of the Jews. He is also joined by others, who attribute to the Samaritan alphabet the greatest antiquity. But as we saw in § 8 that their hypothesis is supported by exceedingly slight supports; so Morinus, perhaps too happy over the discovery of the treasure of this Pentateuch, set a value upon it far above its worth. Whence to the Canonical αὐθεντία/*authenticity* of this Pentateuch, rashly asserted by John Morinus, the Most Illustrious JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER with great industry opposed his own *Exercitationes Anti-Morinianas, de Pentateucho Samaritano, ejusque uidentica αὐθεντία*.

2. Certainly, although the first origins of this Pentateuch lie in

¹ John Morinus (1591-1659) was born into a French Protestant family, but converted to Roman Catholicism. He was a great Oriental scholar, and he was a proponent of the priority of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint over the Hebrew text.

² The Congregation of the Oratory of Jesus and Mary Immaculate was founded in Paris in 1611 by Pierre de Berulle. In response to the declining spirituality of the clergy, the Congregation of the Oratory was established as a society of priests, seeking to devote themselves completely to the spiritual functions of priestly ministry.

blemishes, with which this Codex is burdened, and its dissent from the Hebrew text, are brought to light both by HOTTINGER in his *Exercitationibus Anti-Morinianis*; and by WALTON in his *Bibliis Polyglottis*, even making use of the labor of EDMUND CASTELL¹ and JOHN LIGHTFOOT (see *tome 1* in WALTON'S *Apparatu Biblico, prolegomena XI, pages 74 and following*, and *tome 6* in *Animadversionibus Samaritanis in Pentateuchum*); and also by CARPZOV in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter IV, pages 604, 611*: whence all Authenticity is easily refused to this Codex, if attention be given, *a.* to its innumerable errors, to which the similar writing, or sound and pronunciation, of certain Hebrew letters, supplied the origin and occasion: *b.* to those passages which clearly reveal malicious corruption in favor of Samaritan superstition; to which end the fraudulent replacement of mount *Ebal* with mount *Gerizim*, Deuteronomy 27:4, had regard, which, so that they might maintain the corruption of the text, they did not fear to sew on to the Decalogue entire strips under the pretense of an Eleventh Commandment, which are found in this Pentateuch both in Exodus 20 and in Deuteronomy 5: *c.* to the examples of this sort, in which the Samaritan Text recedes equally from the Hebrew text and from all Versions; in which no credible reasons appears as to why we, with all the others abandoned, should follow the one Samaritan Codex: *d.* to the manifest glosses introduced into the text. To which, finally, *e.* one may add that this Samaritan Codex never had that authority in the Church, either Jewish or Christian, that with the Jewish it might be either treated equally, or preferred before it, or that the Jewish might be corrected and emended by it.

It is not fitting that, after these things have been distinctly observed, the *Versions* of this Pentateuch should detain us:

1. The *Chaldeo-Samaritan Version*, likely prepared for the help of the Samaritan race, which was not sufficiently acquainted with Hebrew, so that they might be able to read the Pentateuch in a dialect made more familiar to them. But this version was still of somewhat lesser note than the Hebræo-Samaritan Pentateuch.

2. The *Arabic Version*, which is thought to have been composed only after the Year of our Lord 900. To which some add,

¹ Edmund Castell (1606-1686) was an English orientalist. Castell helped Walton in the preparation of the *Polyglott Bible*. His great work was the *Lexicon Heptaglotton Hebraicum, Chaldaicum, Syriacum, Samaritanum, Æthiopicum, Arabicum, et Persicum*.

3. The *Greek Version* of this Pentateuch, especially on account of the citation made of the *σαμαρειτικοῦ/Samaritan Version* among the Fathers: upon which Greek Version, it is nevertheless certain, no one among the more recent learned men ever laid eyes. And others conclude that the Fathers, being ignorant of the Samaritan tongue, sought from the Samaritans themselves just how their Codex had these things, and cited these things more from their relation than by the very reading of any Codex: except the interpretation of *Symmachus* comes to be understood through the *Σαμαρειτικὸν/Samaritan Version*, which is the observation of the Most Illustrious FABRICIUS in his *Bibliotheca Græca*; but which does not appear to make sense, not only on account of the examples of difference between the Samaritan Codex and *Symmachus*; but especially because *Symmachus* out of a hatred for the Samaritans, from whom he had departed, is thought to have forged his Version: if therefore by the *Σαμαρειτικὸν/Samaritan* the Fathers indicated the Version of *Symmachus*, they were able so to call it, not because it was translated from the Samaritan Codex, but because its author was previously a Samaritan: see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter III, page 568, compared with chapter IV, pages 619, 620. However, HOTTINGER affirms that a Greek Version of the Samaritans truly existed, *Thesaurο Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section III, question I, page 285. See CARPZOV painstakingly discussing the Samaritan Pentateuch, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter IV, pages 585-620, and the many whom he cites there, pages 585, 586; likewise part III, *contra Pseudo-critica Whistoni*, chapter VI, pages 922-931: add SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, epoch VIII, chapter X, § 5, columns 430, 431; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1457, 1458a; SEBASTIANUS RAVIUS' *Exercitationem philologicam quartam ad Houbigant Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacram*, chapter III, article I, pages 24-43.

What is now to be found concerning the Authenticity of the GREEK VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, which is commonly called the SEPTUAGINT—VIRALIS, ought to be stated: concerning which CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, pages 481, 482, exhibits an entire catalogue of learned Men that are able to be consulted; to which Men add GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, thesis IV, pages 123-130; SPANHEIM, *Dubiis Euangelicis*, part I, doubt XXIII, § 21, pages 164-168; BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, pages

1517-1525a: while CARPZOV himself discusses this Version in *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter II, pages 481-551*.

Speaking of this Greek Version, our AUTHOR asserts that it is commonly called the Septuagint—*Viralis* (but from a fable, it is added in his *Medulla Theologiæ*). That name has been drawn from the narration of ARISTEAS in an *Epistle to his brother Philocrates*, which is found after the works of Josephus in the Edition published at Cologne, and also printed separately, and of which the one related by Walton, Carpzov, and others is the best. Demetrios of Phaleron, superintendent of the Library of Philadelphus, King of the Egyptians, enlarging it to an enormous extent with books selected from all over, relates to the King that he also discovered that the Laws of the Jews are altogether worthy to be transcribed, and to be preserved in his library; only they should be translated out of the vernacular Language of the Jews into Greek. These things the King takes upon himself, that he is going to write unto the High Priest of the Jews, that those things that were proposed might be accomplished. At this point Aristeas, as royal minister, opportunely intervenes, advising his lord that, being about to send Legates to the High Priest, he first release all the Jews that had been led away into captivity by his Father as free men unto their country. The King gives his assent, and, after he understood that there were more than one hundred thousand Jews bound to servitude in Egypt, he redeems the individual captives from their masters for twenty drachmæ, and releases them unto liberty, so that the sum of the λύτρον/*ransom* grew beyond six hundred and sixty talents. With these things accomplished, he commands Demetrios to publish in writing his purpose concerning the transcription of the books of the Jews; who urged the King that he ask for himself from the High Priest of the Jews both an exemplar of the Law, and six Translators from each tribe, excelling in honesty of life, experience and expertise in their laws, so that the translation of many might more readily obtain confidence. Therefore, the King sends two Spokesmen, among whom also was our Aristeas, furnished with splendid gifts and royal letters; who, having dwelt at Jerusalem most honorifically, easily obtain their request. Indeed, seventy-two choice Elders, highly skilled in Hebrew and in Greek, Eleazar joins as companions to the spokemen, and sends, together with an Epistle and parchments, which contained the Law written in golden letters, to the King. The King most kindly receives the Legates, and in awe of the Law bows seven times; and, because at the same time he won a naval victory

against Antigonus, he announces that it was going to be a solemn day and feast yearly; and, refreshing those Elders with a banquet of seven days, he tries each with difficult and weighty questions, who, answering most wisely, demonstrate their prudence to the King, each receiving from him a gift of three talents. Three days afterward, the Elders are escorted by Demetrios to the nearby island of Pharos, and they, having been put in a splendid house, give themselves to translation unto the ninth hour, with Demetrios discharging the office of Scribe. And so, with the exemplars compared, they, having been gathered together, complete the translation in the space of seventy-two days. Demetrios read the entire translation to all the Jews then present, who both honored it with the highest praises, and with common consent utter dire curses upon any that would add or take away anything to this Version, or would dare to change anything in it. The King, when he had heard the recitation, marveled at the wisdom of the Lawgiver, and sent the Elders home with most ample gifts and offerings, intended for Eleazar the High Priest. This is a summary of the narration of Aristeeas, whence the name, the Septuagint—*Viralis*, has adhered to this Version. Excerpts of this narration are also given by EUSEBIUS, *Præparatione euangelica*, book VIII, chapters II-V.

When our AUTHOR in his *Compendio* adds concerning this Version, *both such as what exists today principally from the Fourfold Edition, and such as formerly in the beginning was prepared*; in a word he was pleased to note that formerly there existed the *Septuagint Version*, which they were calling *κοινήν*/*koine/common* or *Vulgate*, vitiated to a significant degree, which ORIGEN accordingly purposed to emend and to publish a more accurate edition, whence the *Origenian Edition* of this *Version* arose, found in the fifth column of his *Hexapla*. JEROME thus relates in his *Epistola CXXXI, opera, tome 3, page 80, ad Suniam et Fretelam*: “Now, the *Κοινή/Koine*, that is, the common edition, is the same as the Septuagint. But this is the difference between them, that it is an edition of the *κοινής/Koine*, corrupted according to the times and places, and according to the inclination, of the Old Scribes. But this, which is found in the *ἑξαπλοῖς/Hexapla*, and which we translate, is the same as the uncorrupted and immaculate translation of the Seventy Interpreters, which is preserved in the books of the learned.” ORIGEN’S Tetrapla and Hexapla, although they vanished after his death for nearly fifty years,

finally were found by PAMPHILUS¹ in the Library at Cæsarea, or were from elsewhere, perhaps from Tyre, transferred there, while Pamphilus was restoring the Library, who with EUSEBIUS (who afterwards was Bishop of Cæsarea, and to whom on account of familiarity *Pamphilus* gave his name²) corrected the $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tilde{\eta}\nu$ /*Koine* Version out of the Hexapla of ORIGEN, and bequeathed this emended Version to the Churches of Palestine: whence this Edition of the Greek Version, which was the same with the Origenian, was thereafter also called that of *Pamphilus* and *Eusebius*, likewise also the *Palestinian*, because there it was found, and prepared anew, and bequeathed to the Churches there for the first time, and was used by them. Moreover, the Version of the Septuagint, called $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tilde{\eta}\nu$ /*Koine*, was reviewed, and both with the help of copies more ancient and of approved fidelity, and unto the norm of the Hebrew text, was purged from numerous errors, which had crept in over a long stretch of time, by LUCIAN, a presbyter of Antioch, learned in Hebrew, martyr under Diocletian and Maximian, flourishing at the end of the Third Century. At nearly the same time, HESYCHIUS, an Egyptian Bishop, and martyr in the tenth persecution according to EUSEBIUS' *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, book VIII, chapter XIII, pages 307, 308, gave himself, as did Lucian, to the correction and emendation of the copies of the Greek Septuagint: and this edition JEROME cites under the title of *Alexandrian exemplars*, because the Churches of Alexandria and of all Egypt embraced it. And this thrice corrected Edition of the Septuagint—Viralis in the time of JEROME was getting the upper hand everywhere in the Church, according to that distribution which he points out, in *Epistle CIV ad Chromatium*, which is the preface upon the book of *Chronicles*, opera, tome 3, page 19: "Alexandria and Egypt, in the matter of the Septuagint, commend the author Hesychius. Constantinople, all the way to Antioch, approves the exemplars of Lucian the martyr. The middle provinces between these read the Palestinian Codices, which, having received the labors of Origen, Eusebius and Pamphilus published. And the whole world by this threefold difference is agitated within itself."

Now, *today's Fourfold Edition*, of which our AUTHOR makes mention is:

¹ Pamphilus of Cæsarea (fourth century) was a presbyter of the church at Cæsarea. He was teacher and colleague to Eusebius, and together they defended the orthodoxy of Origen.

² Eusebius is sometimes called *Eusebius Pamphili*.

1. The *Complutensian*, under the auspices of Cardinal Ximénez, first published in the Complutensian Polyglot in the Year 1515, and afterwards republished a number of times: but in which the Editors supplied what things were in the Hebrew text, if they were wanting in the Septuagint, from another translation; but what things were superfluous in the Greek, they often trimmed off; indeed, from the collated exemplars both of the Biblical Books and of Greek commentaries, when various Readings were presenting themselves, they approved and retained that which more nearly approaches to the Hebrew. Whence this Edition recedes some distance from the ancient Greek Version.

2. The *Venetian* or *Aldine*, which went forth, together with a Greek New Testament, published at Venice in the Year 1518, from the press of Aldus Manutius,¹ prepared from a collation of the most ancient exemplars: but of the Codices, of which they made use in the preparation of this edition, no reason is given.

3. The *Roman*, more excellent than either of the preceding, which, modeled after the most ancient Codex of the Vatican Library, was published at Rome in the most elegant type, under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V, but by the care and labor of Cardinal Antonius Carafa,² in the Year 1587, with excellent annotations added.

4. Finally, the *Anglican* Edition has carried a somewhat dubious first place above the Roman exemplar, both published in the London Polyglot,³ and by the study of John Ernest Grabe, at Oxford in folio and octavo form beginning in the Year 1707, and copied from that most ancient and famous Codex Alexandrinus, sent to King Charles I of England as a gift.⁴

Unto which fourfold Edition all the others, which today are extant, are to be recalled as copies.

Now, concerning this *Greek Version*, both as it is now read, and as it existed formerly and was first prepared, it is asked, whether it is to be held as infallible and authentic, and whether an independent authority is

¹ Aldus Pius Manutius (1449-1515) was a Venetian humanist and printer.

² Antonio Carafa (1538-1591) was an Italian Cardinal. He was a collector of ancient manuscripts, and he served briefly as the Librarian of the Holy Roman Church.

³ Published in 1657 by Brian Walton.

⁴ Cyril of Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, gave Codex Alexandrinus to King James I for support in his political struggles. James died before the manuscript reached England, so it was received by Charles.

to be attributed to it?

This many *Papists* maintain, among whom, with respect to the first preparation of this Version, *Bellarmino*, in *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter VI, Controversiis, tome I, column 102*, writes: “The Seventy Interpreters translated optimally, and in a peculiar manner had the assistance of the Holy Spirit, lest they should err in anything, so that they might appear to have been, not so much translators, as Prophets.” Gretser teaches that these things are to be understood in such a way that we believe that after the manner of the Canonical writers they did not so much act as were acted upon.

The *Scope* of the *Papists* is to prejudice against the Hebrew text, and to support the Latin Version.

The *θεοπνευστία*/*inspiration* of this Version is also asserted by ISAAC VOSSIUS everywhere in his *libro de translatione LXX Interpretum*; and he contends that from the same, as far purer, the Hebrew Codices, where dissonant, are to be corrected. Thus in *chapter XXV* among other places he asks, yet with no sufficient argument adduced: “If there be any Version that deserves to be called *θεόπνευστος*/*inspired*, is there any other to be sought besides that which the Seventy Interpreters, Men by far the most skillful in the Hebrew Tongue, as native to themselves, and agreeing among themselves, prepared in accordance with ancient and untainted Codices, whose labor was approved and followed by the Apostles, the universal Christian Church, and even the more ancient Jews?” And here and there elsewhere he extols that Version with extravagant praises. Compare BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, page 1446*.

On the contrary, we, with our AUTHOR, deny Authenticity to this Version.

α. For what Version was prepared by human art and labor is not Authentic: but the Septuagint—Viralis Version was prepared by human art and labor. The reason for the Major is that nothing human is able to be Authentic in divine things, as things which depend upon the authority of God alone. The Minor is proven, 1. from this, that the Seventy lived after the age of Malachi according to tradition; but Malachi was the last of the Prophets, with whom Prophecy expired, as even the Jews acknowledge in *Seder Olam Zuta*,¹ and here and there elsewhere; see *Seder*

¹ *Seder Olam Zuta*, compiled in the early Middle Ages (with a final redaction in 804), is a chronicle composed of two parts: a record of the generations from Adam to Jehoiakim; and thirty-nine generations of Davidic exilarchs,

Olam Zuta, page 109, out of the edition of the Most Illustrious MEYER,¹ and his *Notes on that passage*, page 1144; Reverend BEELS² *Bybeloeffeningen*, pages 21, 22, in the *Notes*; that there were no Authentic Books published after the times of Artaxerxes, JOSEPHUS acknowledges in *book I contra Apionem*, page 1036. 2. The *History of Aristeas*, which is brought forward to extol this Version with praises, also speaks against the θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* of the same: a. For there you read that the Interpreters consulted among themselves, disputing and discussing among themselves concerning whatever matter, until they all finally agreed: which things they rendered, as they were able, most learnedly and elegantly: so that what things were disposed by the consent and counsel of all were delivered into the hand of Demetrios, pages 97, 98. But, as BRIAN WALTON, *Prolegomeno IX in Bibliis Polyglottis*, § 8, pages 57, well observes, *If they conferred among themselves, they did not prophesy. For the sacred writers never conferred with others, disputing concerning whatever matter they wrote; but, as they were taught by the Holy Spirit, without any inquiry or delay they committed all things to writing.* b. Also, if they, inspired by the Holy Spirit, wrote, that number of Interpreters, mentioned by Aristeas, would have been superfluous, since one would have been sufficient. Neither, c. would men distinguished with respect to learning, and expert in the Hebrew and Greek languages, have been necessary, if without human study and helps the Version might have been prepared.

But, moreover, β. as our AUTHOR argues, *the super-abounding Errors of this Version are evident, in its less suitable expression of the sense, addition, subtraction, mutation, through an incorrect reading of the letters, through incorrect punctuation, signification of the words, inverted construction of the words, etc.*, just as Bellarmine himself, in *book II de Verbo Dei*, chapter VI, *Controversiis*, tome I, columns 102-105, acknowledges, and demonstrates that this Version is now corrupted in a variety of ways, and that it is no longer extant in its integrity; so that it is not now safe to emend the Hebrew or Latin texts out of the Greek codices. But a consideration of those errors, which defile this Version, teaches that a great part of those is to be ascribed to the Interpreters themselves; to which, nevertheless, far more were able to be added thereafter by injury of time, ἀβλεψία/*blindness*

beginning with Jehoiachin. *Seder Olam Zuta* asserts that, with the passing of Malachi, the age of prophecy ceased, and period of the wisemen began.

¹ Johannes Meier (1651-1725) was Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages at Harderwijk (1684-1725).

² Leonard Beels (1674-1756) was a Dutch Reformed minister.

and sleepiness of scribes, etc. See this Version's entire forest of Faults, reduced unto certain classes, both in CHAMIER'S *Panstratia Catholica*, tome I, book XIII (which wholly treats of the Greek Septuagint—*Viralis Version of the Old Testament*), chapters VIII-XI, pages 230-242; and in HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurο Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section III, question 15, pages 354-377; and in CARPZOV'S *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 4, 6, pages 501, 504, 513-521. But whatever Version now fails to harmonize and agree in words or substance with the Hebrew Edition of the Old Testament is not Authentic: for all the confidence and authority of a Version consists in its *συμφωνία*/*harmony* and agreement with the Original Edition. But the Septuagint—*Viralis* fails to harmonize in substance and words with the Hebrew Edition of the Old Testament. Therefore.

They object, 1. that, not only the *Hellenistic Jews*, but also the *Ancient Christians* and *Fathers of the Church* made use of this Version with great Elogies.

Response α. I acknowledge that the *Hellenistic Jews*, living outside of Palestine and dispersed throughout Egypt and other quarters of the world, to whom the Greek tongue was native, or at least well known by use, that Version, because they understood and knew how to read it, extol with great praises, and suppose to have been composed in an all but miraculous manner and by the singular assistance of the Holy Spirit: nevertheless, 1. they do not make it altogether equal with the Founts; even supposing that they were reading this Version aloud in their Synagogues, yet they did not read it alone (according to the opinion of the most reputable Men), but in conjunction with the Hebrew text; so that the Greek Version, having been added to the Hebrew Scripture, was merely serving in the place of a support to help those that were not understanding the text previously read in Hebrew. 2. Indeed, after the beginning of the second Century from the Birth of Christ, the same Jews began to call into doubt the authority of this Version, as not sufficiently true to, and not quite consonant with, the Hebrew text. The reason was that Christians were wont to fetch weapons against the Jews from this Version: so that they might avoid these darts, the Jews were appealing from this Version to the Hebrew text. And only thus were they appreciating that some things that were found in the Greek were wanting in the Hebrew, and other things were altogether incompatible with the Hebrew text. Whence this translation began to be disparaged and to come into contempt among the Hellenistic Jews also. 3. Moreover, it is

well known that the *Palestinian Jews* and however many were untutored in Greek letters judged even less benignly concerning this Version. These were indignant that their Law and the mysteries of their religion were divulged to the Gentiles in this manner; wherefore they were hurling abuses upon it, and were studiously noting its blemishes and errors. Indeed, this Translation was so hated by them that in the *Talmud* they compare its preparation with the $\mu\omicron\sigma\chi\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, *making of the calf*, when they write in *Masekhet Soferim*,¹ chapter I, *halacha* 7, והיה היום קשה, לִישְׂרָאֵל כִּי־וַיִּשְׁנַעֲשֶׂה עִגְלָה, *and that day was grievous to Israel, like the day on which the calf was made*: but they also proclaimed a solemn Fast because of the making of this Translation, falling on the eighth day of the month Tevet, which answers to our December; as it is said in *Magillat Taanit*,² page 50, column 2, where it is at the same time added that at that time also, when the Version was finished, וההשך בא לעולם שלשה ימים, *darkness came upon the world for three days*. That these three days of darkness were improperly to be understood of the Fast continued for three days, JOHANN BENEDICT CARPZOV³ drives home out of *Rabbi Gedaliah, ad Schickardi Jus regium, chapter II, theorem V, page 107*. And although *John Morinus, Hody*,⁴ but also the Most Illustrious WOLF in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica, part II, pages 443, 444*, call the very Fast itself into doubt and refer it unto the fables of the more recent Jews; JOHANN GOTTLÖB CARPZOV, on the other hand, judges in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter II, § 7, page 525*, that there is no sufficient reason to deny this, and to oppose the many witnesses of this event among the Jews.

Response β. With respect to the *Christians*, I likewise acknowledge that these esteemed the Version τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα, *of the Seventy*, to be of such great value that AUGUSTINE, in *book XVIII de*

¹ *Masekhet Soferim* (“The Tractate of the Scribes”) is one of the minor tractates from the Tannaitic period, dealing with topics for which there is no tractate in the Mishnah. *Soferim* deals largely with the preparation of holy books, and regulations for the reading of the Law.

² The *Megillat Taanit* (composed in the first century AD) chronicles thirty-five glorious events in Jewish history, which were celebrated as feast days.

³ Johann Benedict Carpzov II (1639-1699) was a Lutheran theologian and Hebraist. He served at the University of Leipzig, first, as Professor of Moral Philosophy (1665-1668), then, as Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages (1668-1684), and, finally, as Professor of Theology (1684-1699).

⁴ Humphrey Hody (1659-1707) was an English scholar and theologian, recognized for his expertise in the Septuagint.

Civitate Dei, chapter XLIII, *opera*, tome 7, column 397, testifies of the Greek Church, “Although there were other interpreters also, that translated those sacred oracles out of the Hebrew tongue into Greek, such as Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, etc.: nevertheless, the Septuagint, as if it were alone, the Church thus received, and of it the Greek Christians make use, the majority of whom is ignorant whether there be any other.” The Latin Church also until the times of Jerome made use of various Latin translations of the Bible, among which the *Itala* or *Vulgate* was preeminent, which all were translated from the Septuagint—*Viralis* Greek Version. And with such great praises the *Fathers of the Church* everywhere extolled this Version unto heaven, and clearly treated it as *θεόπνευστον*/*inspired*; this is evident in the passages of their writings cited by BRIAN WALTON in his *Apparatu Biblico*, *Prolegomena* IX, § 8, page 57; HOTTINGER in his *Thesauro Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section III, question 12, page 342; HODY in his *de Versione LXX—Viralis*, chapters III, IV, VI-VIII. But, on the other hand, we note: 1. that the Church, both Greek and Latin, however excessively it was extolling this Version, nevertheless made use of it freely; to such an extent that even the most ancient Doctors of the *Greek Church*, and among those IGNATIUS, departed from this Version. They made no less use of the *Version of Theodotion*, to such an extent that ORIGEN has almost conflated the two into one in his *Hexaplis*, which the Greek Churches received with applause. The *Latin Church* also admitted Jerome’s correction of their Version translated from the Septuagint—*Viralis*; indeed, JEROME testifies that the Version of Theodotion upon Daniel was admitted into more common use by the Churches. 2. The *Fathers* that were the greatest admirers of this Version were ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, and so blind judges were giving sentence concerning colors. They were relying on a false hypothesis concerning the making of that Greek Version by divine miracle, according to the common narration: but *undermine that support*, etc. Those same Fathers that are the most illustrious proponents of this Version, as often as that Version is considered *ἀπλῶς*/*frankly*, nevertheless speak cautiously, when these rivulets are compared to the Hebrew founts. Thus AUGUSTINE, *book XV de Civitate Dei*, chapter XIII, *opera*, tome 7, column 298, discussing the discrepancy between the numbers in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint Version, writes: “I would in no way doubt it rightly to be done, that when anything diverse is found in both codices, indeed, when both are not able to be true to the integrity of the matters

conducted, confidence is rather to be given to that tongue from which translation is made into the other through interpreters.” In the Commentaries of the Fathers even they often prefer other Greek Versions as better and more accurate. Only they were unwilling that a new Version should replace that of the Septuagint in public reading before the Christian congregation, to prevent the scandal of novelty and commotions arising hence; thus AUGUSTINE, *Epistle LXXXII, ad Hieronymum, chapter XXXV, opera, tome 2, column 153*, “Now, therefore, I desire that thy translation from the Septuagint be read in the churches, that...they might understand, but not thy translation from the Hebrew, lest we, as preferring anything new against the authority of the Septuagint, perturb the people of Christ with great scandal, whose ears and hearts have become accustomed to hear that translation, which was also approved by the Apostles.” 3. It is especially evident from ORIGEN and JEROME that even they, either conforming to their time and place, or before they were instructed in the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, spoke honorifically enough concerning the Septuagint—Viralis Version; but that nevertheless in the exposition of the Scripture they always had a better regard for the Hebrew founts. Hence ORIGEN reviewed once again the Septuagint—Viralis Version, and, where either it was falling short or was receding somewhat further, undertook to recall it to the Hebrew founts. Now, a youthful JEROME did indeed correct the Vulgate Version of the Old Testament from the Septuagint Version: but later he forged a new Version of the Bible from the Hebrew founts; thus, because he dared to recede so much from the Greek Version received in the Church, he kindled great hatred toward himself.

They object, 2. that the *Apostles and Writers of the New Testament* made use of this Version also.

Response: α. I concede that the citations of the Old Testament in the New Testament quite frequently agree with the Septuagint—Viralis Version, even in passages of this sort, where the Greek Version appears to turn from the Hebrew verity: for example, Acts 13:41, where out of the Septuagint is read οἱ καταφρονηταί, *despisers*, and in the place of ׀גִּבְּ, *among the nations*,¹ the translators appear to have read ׀גְּיָב, *those acting treacherously*; thus in Acts 15:17 is read οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the residue of men*, while the Hebrew has ׀דָּוָן יִתְּשָׁוּ׀, *the*

¹ Thus Habakkuk 1:5.

remnant of Edom,¹ where in the place of **דִּי־עֵדוֹם**/*Edom* the translators appear to have read **דָּן**/*man*.

β. Yet this is not consistent, since the Apostles in the Version of Passages of the Old Testament sometimes recede somewhat both from the Hebrew text and from the Septuagint Version: often also, with the Septuagint—Viralis Version abandoned, they adhere closely to the Hebrew text: thus in Matthew 2:15 it is **ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου**, *out of Egypt have I called my son*, as the text of Hosea 11:1 has **יְנִיָּהּ**, *my son*; but in the Septuagint Version it is **μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ**, *I have summoned his children*. In Matthew 8:17, it is likewise in accordance with the Hebrew text, **Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν**, *Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses*:² but in Isaiah 53:4, the Septuagint has it quite differently, **οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται**, *He bears our sins, and is pained for us*. And thus in other passages also.

γ. When the Writers of the New Testament follow the Septuagint, they do not do it so that they might procure **αὐθεντίαν**/*authenticity* for this Version; but so that in the same sense, and with the substance adduced more than the words, or words not fit for the scope, they might accommodate themselves unto the common usage and tongue: and so that they might turn from the minds of their hearers that suspicion that they either impose upon the cited oracles, and twist them unto their own opinion; or that the Version is not anywhere correct and is to be altogether rejected, of which Version they had been making use to that time, and from which alone they had drawn the mysteries of religion. “*It is to be noted*,” says FREDERIC SPANHEIM, in his *Dubiis Evangelicis, Part III, Doubt XIX, § 3, on Matthew 3:3, pages 48, 49*, “that the Evangelists followed the Septuagint Version in a great many things, which was both of the greatest authority among the Hellenists, and at the disposal of many, *when it was able to be done with the substance of the Prophetic words unharmed*, both so that they might show their liberty, and so that they might not in a matter trivial and indifferent furnish any occasion of scandal to the weak, and of cavils to the wicked.”

δ. Finally, some even deny that the Apostles in citing the

¹ Thus Amos 9:12.

² Isaiah 53:4: “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows (**וְהָיָה הוֹאֵל וְנֶאֱסָף וְנִמְכָּר יְהוָה וְנִלְחָץ וְנִלְחָץ וְנִלְחָץ וְנִלְחָץ**): yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.”

oracles of the Old Testament made use of this or any other Version, contending that they rather translated the passages of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek: and although αὐτοψία, *the testimony of one's own eyes*, relates that in such a great number of Passages there is an exact agreement of the New Testament with the Septuagint-Viralis Version, they conclude that some introduced those expressions from the New Testament into that Version: indeed, thus it is supposed by LAMBERT DANÆUS,¹ *Responsione ad Bellarmini Disputationes theologicas, controversy I, book II, chapter VI*; by JOHN OWEN,² in *Theologoumenois, page 401, § 3* (who expresses his mind in these words: "Especially pleasing is the opinion of those that affirm that the Holy Spirit, the Author of the entirety of Scripture, expressing His own mind according to His own will, translated the testimonies from the Old Testament into the New, making use of the words that pleased Him; but that the Christian copyists of the Greek Version gradually inserted those very words into it"); by the anonymous Author of *dissertatiunculæ subjectæ Ludivici Cappelli Criticæ Sacræ, pages 489-506*; likewise by TACO HAJO VAN DEN HONERT,³ *Viis Dei veris, book VI, chapter IV, § 31, page 1199, lines 4-7*. Indeed, in favor of this opinion more than one reason appears to fight:

1. This might appear to be beneath the dignity of the θεοπνεύστων/*inspired* men, to consult in their proofs a human Version.
2. It is not necessary that the Apostles, in making use of the Septuagint Version, accommodated themselves to those that were using the Septuagint Version, so that thus they might more easily procure for themselves authority and acceptance: for even those that made use of the Greek Version in the Synagogues were employing it only by way of Translation, always reserving the greater reverence for the Hebrew Codex, which they willed to be recited in the first place in the Synagogues. In those to

¹ Lambert Danæus (c. 1530-1596) was a French minister and theologian. He labored as a pastor and Professor of Divinity at Geneva, and then at Leiden.

² John Owen (1616-1683) sided with the Parliament during the Civil War. However, he did not embrace the Presbyterianism of the Westminster Assembly, preferring Independency. He won the esteem of Oliver Cromwell, and Cromwell made him Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (1651) and then Vice-chancellor (1652). He lost the deanery at the Restoration. After the Restoration, Owen would suffer the vicissitudes that accompanied his convictions, but his was the most persuasive and respected voice for Independency and toleration.

³ Taco Hajo van den Honert (1666-1740) was a German Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Leiden (1714-1740).

be converted, the Spirit Himself was exciting due reverence for the preaching of the Apostles as *λόγῳ Θεοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων*, *the word of God and not of men*,¹ an even greater reverence than any Version of the Old Testament was able to have among them. But if Apostolic authority and urging were not able to drive Reprobates to faith, a human Version would not accomplish it. 3. If the Version, called the Septuagint—Viralis, exists today from the conflated Version of Lucian, Hesychius, and Origen; which also the last mentioned published from the κοινῆ/*koine/common* Edition, corrected both according to the Hebrew text, and from a comparison with the Version of Theodotion: in what manner shall it be proven that the Passages, in which the citation of the Writers of the New Testament agreed with this Version, was already formerly thus read, and not rather that the Greek translation of the Old Testament was corrected out of the New Testament in various places, because the Apostolic translation was infallible? But, that this was not done in all the passages cited in the New Testament out of the Old, this is able to be attributed to a carelessness of this sort among the correctors. Otherwise, we imagine our θεοπνεύστους/*inspired* Men copying a human writing, in a similar manner as we in Latinity propose Cicero or Terence to be worthy of imitation by us.

On the other hand, WALTON, in his *Apparatu Biblico, Prolegomena in Bibliis Polyglottis* IX, § 38, page 66, calls this opinion, *a completely pitiful flight and an indication of a desperate cause, and a vain fabrication*. Now, he brings forth to the contrary, 1. *That not in all passages, but only in some, was this alteration made; while the cause was the same that it might be done so in all.* 2. *That it is completely unbelievable that all the Greek Codices throughout the entire world, which were either in the hands of the Jews, or in the hands of the Christians, were quickly made agreeable to some such Codex.* 3. *That the Jews would have brought this as a reproach against the Christians, that they falsified the Septuagint Version; when they, disputing against them, alleged passages from the Septuagint Version, while the Jews read otherwise in their Codices.* To which, 4. it can be added that in multiple passages, where the Writers of the New Testament with the Septuagint recede from the Hebrew Reading, one is able to smooth out the human failing in one closely related Hebrew letter read in the place of another, or in the order of the same being changed. Let the prudent reader consider diligently, and judge concerning the same χωρὶς

¹ See 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

προκρίματος, *without prejudice*.

They object, 3. that this Version is not only the *Most Ancient*, but *inspired by a heavenly Miracle*.

Response: α. With respect to the Antiquity of this Version, 1. We are unwilling to protest against the more common opinion of learned Men, who everywhere admit that this Version is the Most Ancient of all, so that the Chaldean Paraphrases are roughly three centuries later than this, and similarly this Septuagint Version leaves the other Greek Versions several centuries after itself. Neither do they acknowledge the traditions *either of Aristobulus*¹ in CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA'S *Stromata*, book I, page m. 342, and in EUSEBIUS' *Præparatione euangelica*, book XIII, chapter XII, page 664, concerning a more ancient Greek Version, even before Alexander and the Persian Empire; *or the Jewish tradition concerning the Chaldean Version*, which might reach the age of Ezra himself: *nor the conjectures of the Learned of the more recent age*, concerning some other, more ancient Greek Version, which conjectures are built upon too slight a foundation by FRANCIS JUNIUS, in *Bellarmini Controversiam* I, book II, chapter V, *opera*, tome 2, column 449; and by JOHN WEEMS,² in *The Christian Synagogue*, written in English, chapter V, § 2; likewise by GOUSSET,³ in *Commentariis linguæ Hebraicæ*, page 823a: consult HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book I, chapter III, section III, question I, pages 282-285; PRIDEAUX'S *History of the Jews*, part II, book I, columns 743, 752, 753, 761; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome II, page 833b; and also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, page 1516; and CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 8, pages 490, 501, 520, 521, 544, chapter III, page 552.

¹ Aristobulus of Paneas (flourished c. 200 BC) was a Jewish philosopher, seeking to reconcile the Hebrew Scriptures and Greek philosophy. He argues that the early Greek philosophers derived many of their philosophical concepts from the Hebrew Bible.

² John Weems (c. 1579-1636) was a Scottish minister and scholar. In his studies and writings, he gave particular attention to the study of Hebrew and the history of Rabbinic thought, and was even favorable to allowing Jews to settle in Christian lands.

³ Jacques Gousset (1635-1704) was a French Reformed philologist and theologian. He studied under Louis Cappel at Saumur, and was ordained to the ministry at Poitiers. He left France in 1685, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and served as Professor of Greek at Groningen (1691-1704).

2. But from the Antiquity of this Version its Divinity does not follow: even if we should also admit the tradition of the Ancients concerning this Version, that is, with respect to its *Beginning*, which gave the occasion for the preparation of this Version, namely, the recommendation of Demetrios and the curiosity of the King; with respect to the *Choice of the Translators*, made by Eleazar; with respect to the *Helps ἐμπειρίας τοῦ νόμου*, of acquaintance with the law, and of expertise in both tongues; and also with respect to the solitary *Place* sought out for this work; all which savor of something human, rather than divine.

3. Apart from the fact that these and like circumstances were first obtained from the singular narration of *Aristeas*, whom our AUTHOR not without reason calls *Pseudo-Aristeas*: for, a. It is indeed able to be admitted that the Epistle of Aristeas, which is read to this day, is ancient enough, and perhaps reaches to the times of the Ptolemies in Egypt. b. That also the Greek Version of the Bible was prepared about those times at Alexandria, and was also brought to the Alexandrian Library of the Ptolemies. c. Nevertheless, not without reason do the Learned assign the tradition of Aristeas to the *fables*, fabricated by a Jewish Hellenist under the name of Aristeas, so that he might obtain greater authority for this Version. Upon which matter, learned Men observe, a. That that book by manifest indications argues a Jewish Writer, one also devoted to the Jewish rites; not a Greek Writer, embracing gentile superstition. b. That this Aristeas openly conflicts with other Historians of good faith; which is demonstrated both by many other instances, and also from this, that he is not able to be reconciled with the ancient manners and testimonies of the Jews, as Pseudo-Aristeas relates, following Josephus, page 20, and in the octavo Oxford edition, page 57, that ἐγγεγραμμένους τοὺς νόμους χρυσοῖς γράμμασι, the Law written with letters of gold was sent by the High Priest through the Elders. Consult HODY'S *Dissertationem contra Aristeam*, chapter XIX, § 4, pages 284-286. c. That those vast expenses, which Ptolemy is said to have laid out in order to obtain the Law, undoubtedly smell like a fable: see ARISTEAS' *Historiam LXXII Interpretum* in octavo, pages 5-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21-30, 102. Which things see, at length derived and confirmed by CARPZOV in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, pages 487-491: compare TRIGLAND'S¹ *Syllogen Dissertationum; Dissertationem*

¹ That is, Jacobus Trigland the Younger.

de Librorum Apocryphorum Appellatione, § X, pages 24, 25.

4. Hence the various circumstances to learn Men remain so much the more *Uncertain*, in which ancient tradition also varies: for example:

a. With respect to the *Time*, in which the Version was prepared, whether under Ptolemy Lagus,¹ as it is in IRENÆUS, *book III contra Hæreses*, chapter XXV or XXI, page 215, cited by EUSEBIUS, *book V Historia Ecclesiastica*, chapter VIII, pages 173, 174; or under Philadelphus his son,² as it is everywhere related; while CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, as uncertain, hesitates between the two opinions, *Stromata*, book I, page 342; or under Ptolemy Lagus and Philadelphus at the same time, as it is furnished for gathering out of EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VII, chapter XXXII, page 287. And certainly this quarrel could be composed in such a way that this Version might be said to have been completed within that two years, in which Ptolemy Philadelphus reigned with his Father;³ but this work was especially ascribed to Philadelphus, either because the management of the whole work was left by the Father to the prudence of Philadelphus, or because after the final departure of his Father the Version was carried on to its completion: see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum philologicum*, book I, chapter III, section III, question 2, pages 285-288; VALESIIUS' *Annotationes in Eusebii Historia ecclesiastica*, book V, chapter VIII, page 94b; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 3, pages 495, 496; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 14, tome 2, pages 902b-904a.

b. With respect to its first *Extension*, whether to all the Scripture, or unto the Law only? of which the first is affirmed by *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Eusebius* out of *Aristobulus*. The latter is confirmed out of *Aristeas*, *Josephus* in the *preface* to his *Jewish Antiquities*, *Jerome*, and the *Talmud* of the Jews: to what extent the testimonies of some may appear to vary or may be doubtful because of the broader or stricter acceptance of the word νόμου/*Law*, consult VALESIIUS' *Annotationes in Eusebii Historia ecclesiastica*, book V, chapter

¹ Ptolemy I Soter I (c. 367-c. 283 BC) was one of Alexander the Great's principal generals. After Alexander's death, Ptolemy became ruler of Egypt (323-283 BC), and progenitor of the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt.

² Ptolemy II Philadelphus (309-246 BC) succeeded his father, Ptolemy Lagus, and reigned in Egypt from 283 to 246 BC.

³ That is, c. 285-c. 283 BC.

VIII, page 94b. Now, the latter opinion, which maintains that at first only the Pentateuch was translated into Greek, appears to agree most nearly with the truth, if you attend to the conspicuous difference of style that is manifest between the Translators of the Pentateuch and of the remaining Books. With which it agrees that, in the time of Ptolemy Lagus and Philadelphus, only the Mosaic Law was read publicly in the Synagogues; to which a public recitation of the Prophets was at last added under Ptolemy Philometor:¹ see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum philologicum*, book I, chapter III, section III, question 6, pages 310-316; LAMBERT BOS' *Prolegomena in Versione LXX Interpretum*, chapter I; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 3, pages 497-500.

c. "With respect to the *Seventy-two Translators*, sent to Ptolemy in equal number from all the tribes, with all the circumstances." Certainly that number is matched to the character of the Jews, and it betrays that the composition of Aristeas has, not a Gentile, but a Jewish author; while it relates that Demetrios of Phaleron was the proposer/author to the King, that he send for Seventy-two elders at Jerusalem, six from each tribe: whether that number was actually derived only from the number and distinction of the tribes, or at the same time was fabricated in accordance with the example of the Great Sanhedrin, which commonly was believed to have consisted of Seventy-two men.

See ARISTEAS' *Historiam LXXII Interpretum*, pages 14, 16, which Seventy-two Interpreters, six chosen from each tribe, and sent by Eleazar the High Priest into Egypt, were also in that place reckoned by their names one after another, pages 19-21.

Out of the *Jerusalem Talmud* in tractate *Sopherim*, chapter I, § 7, opposite testimony is produced, where this Version is called, *מעשה בחמשה זקנים*, the work of Five Elders, who for Ptolemy transcribed the Law into Greek. With regard to which the Learned sweat over the complex reconciliation of so diverse a number of Translators: see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 2, pages 491, 492; indeed, the Most Illustrious RELAND'S *Antiquitates Hebræorum*, part I, chapter X, § 9; and also the Most Illustrious BOS' *Prolegomena upon Versionem LXX Interpretum—Viralem*, chapter I, verso *3: they maintain that this Version

¹ Ptolemy VI Philometor (c. 185-145 BC) reigned over Egypt from 180 to 145 BC.

was called the Septuagint—*Viralem* because, when it was completed, the Seventy Translators delivered the same to the *Virali/Noble Alexandrian Sanhedrin* to be reviewed and examined, by whom it would then be approved: which was able to provide a surname to this Version, in much the same way that the Princes' commendation of the New Dutch Version caused the name of *Staten-Bybel* to adhere to this Version.¹ Consult NICOLAAS HINLOPEN'S² *Historie van de Nederlandsche Overzettinge des Bybels*, page 176. From which opinion RICHARD SIMON, in his *Historia critica Veteris Testamenti*, book II, chapter II, page 191a, differs only in this, that in the place of the Alexandrian *Sanhedrin* he names that of *Jerusalem*, by which this Version was approved and hence thereafter denominated. It would doubtlessly be safest at this point ἐπέχειν, *to reserve judgment*: unless it might be agreeable at least to affirm this as certain, that the selection of elders from whatever tribe does not particularly agree with the condition of those times. For, even if some from the other tribes were dwelling in Judea with the men of Judah and Benjamin; nevertheless, the remaining tribes were not rooted so distinctly in their ancient and ancestral seats, inasmuch as the greatest part of those tribes were already formerly deported, neither are they mentioned to have returned out of captivity into their own country in great numbers afterward; whence Elders are not related to have been received in equal number from each tribe into the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem in the time following the Babylonian Captivity: consult HODY'S *Dissertationem contra Aristeam*, chapter XIX, § 2, pages 273-278.

β. If after all these things you should ask concerning the *Divinity* of this Version, 1. Above we saw that collapse through the diverse circumstances, which occur in the narration of that *Pseudo-Aristeas*. 2. Neither is faith in its Divinity supported, unless you without good reason believe the miraculous circumstances of the preparation of this Version, for example, a. That, within the space of seventy-two days, according to the number of Translators, this Version was completed. b. That the Seventy-two Translators were shut up in separate Cells, where each separately discharged the whole work of this Version within the aforementioned space of time. c. But that, when the Translations of all were thereafter compared among themselves, such and so marvelous a

¹ At the request of the Synod of Dort, the States-General of the Netherlands commissioned a new translation of the Scriptures into Dutch, the first from the original languages. The *Staten-Bybel* was published in 1637.

² Nicolaas Hinlopen (1724-1792) was a civil servant at Hoorn.

consent among all was discovered, that all to a man made use everywhere of the same phrases and words. However,

a. Although the *First* of these concerning the swift preparation of this Version is found also in Aristeas, *page* 99, it is certain that such a work was not able to be completed within such a small amount of time; but, if the Translators enjoyed the inspiration of the divine Spirit, doubtlessly they would have been preserved immune from the commission of so many and so great errors, from which they are not able to be excused. And, since the work of Aristeas was proscribed above as spurious, it deserves no further confidence among us in its narrations.

b. The *Second*, which is said concerning the seventy-two Cells, *a.* Is opposed to the narration of Aristeas, *pages* 97-99, and Josephus; neither is it mention by Philo the Jew, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Eusebius, or others; who, when they relate the many miracles of this Version, would not have passed by those little lodgings, if they had believed that there really had been such. *b.* JEROME openly ridicules those Cells with greater frequency, for example, in his *prologo in Pentateuchum, epistolam* CI, *opera, tome* 3, *page* 14, he says, *I do not know who was the first author to fabricate the lie of the Seventy cells in Alexandria, separated in which they wrote the same things: since Aristeas, the ὑπερασπιστής/champion of the same Ptolemy, and Josephus much afterwards, relate no such thing: but they write that they, congregated in one basilica, conferred, but prophesied not.* Whom the more learned among the Papists also follow in this matter. AUGUSTINE, *book* II *de Doctrina Christiana, chapter* XV, *opera, tome* 3, *part* I, *column* 21, speaks doubtfully concerning this matter. *c.* And so this tradition is due to the fraud of the Egyptian Jews, who, so that they might obtain authority for their Version, added this fable to the rest; by whom JUSTIN MARTYR allows himself to be imposed upon, who in *Parænesi ad Græcos, chapter* XIII, *opera, page* 14, writes that the vestiges and rubble of these little dwellings, which survived, were shown to him on the island of Pharos¹ by the inhabitants: whose narration CYRIL *of Jerusalem, Catechesibus* IV, *chapter* XXI, *page* 65, and some others, follow; and a quite similar tradition is found in the *Jerusalem Talmud*, see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum philologicum, book* I, *chapter* III, *section* III, *question* 8, *page* 320; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part* II, *chapter* II, § 2, *pages* 491, 492. *d.* But EPIPHANIUS differs, who indeed makes mention of distinct Cells, *libro de mensuris et ponderibus, chapter* III, *opera, tome* 2, *page*

¹ A small island, just off the coast of the Nile Delta's western limit.

161, but he relates that two Translators were shut up in each; and so he maintains that there were only thirty-six little dwellings.

c. Finally, the *Third*, concerning the singular and altogether miraculous Consent of all the Translators among themselves, is indeed handed on by Philo the Jew, and is acknowledged by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others, many of whom hence prove the divine inspiration of this Version. But, *a.* this is an appendix of the fabricated tradition concerning the Seventy-two Cells; and, *b.* it is manifestly opposed to the narration of Aristæus concerning the mutual comparison and disputation of the Translators congregated in one place, until finally in this manner they all agreed to one. *c.* Not without acumen is the conjecture of DANIEL HEINSIUS,¹ in which, in *Aristarcho Sacro, chapter X, page 795, 796*, he repeats the origin of this tradition from the Greek Version, Exodus 24:7; where in verse 7 Moses is said to have brought forth the book of the covenant, and to have read certain things from it before the people, which the Hellenists translate, καὶ λαβὼν τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης ἀνέγνω, and, taking the book of the covenant, he read: then in verse 9 ἑβδομήκοντα τῆς γερουσίας Ἰσραὴλ, seventy of the council of elders of Israel, are said to have gone up with Moses and others; when in verse 11 it follows, לֹא־יָצַח־לְאֵלֹהִים אֶת־יָדוֹ, and upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand, in the place of this the Septuagint miraculously has, καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἷς, and of the chosen of Israel not one disagreed. And because it is said of them, οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἷς, not one disagreed, but the reading in the book of the covenant had preceded, hence he maintains that the exact ὁμόνοιαν/unanimity of these Translators was chiseled out. And because the word אֶלֹהִים/nobles occurring there also denotes κειχωρισμένους, or those separated; hence he thinks that the history concerning these Translators being separated from each other, and each translating the Law separately, derived its origin. Consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter II, § 2, pages 485, 486*; HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum philologicum, book I, chapter III, section III, question 3, pages 292, 293, questions 8, 9, pages 318-327*.

γ. Therefore, with those trifles dismissed, thus learned Men

¹ Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655) was an eminent Dutch scholar. He edited many Greek and Latin classical works, distinguished himself for his poetic talents, and contributed to the Elzevir edition of the Greek New Testament.

began to establish that the dispersion of the Jews among the Nations, under Alexander the Great and his successors, especially in Egypt and Asia, furnished the first occasion for the preparation of this Version; with the Greek language being used at that time everywhere, and hence not a few Jews forgetting by degrees the language of their country. In order to assist them, pious and prudent men, whether under the public auspices of some Sanhedrin or only private, undertook about the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus to translate the Hebrew Bible into Greek speech. That this was a work undertaken, not by Palestinian, but by Egyptian Jews, appears from the fact that the Alexandrian dialect is everywhere conspicuous in this Version. But that at first only the Pentateuch was translated, inasmuch as its use was more constant and solemn, even because of the public reading of this alone in the Synagogues; from the manifest difference of style between the Translation of the Pentateuch and the other books, the Learned easily convince themselves. Nevertheless, to these Books of Moses the rest also would have been gradually added, for from the times of Antiochus Epiphanes on the Prophets also began to be read publicly in Palestine; while the rites of the Palestinian Jews in worship the Egyptian Jews indiscriminately imitated. But, lest this Greek Version of the Alexandrians should readily be set aside, they believe that the Hellenistic Jews alleged all those fables, received too eagerly *by the Fathers* by reason of their ignorance of the Hebrew tongue. In which like things are asserted with our AUTHOR by CARPZOV in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, pages 492-500; and also by the Great SPANHEIM in his *Historia Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, epoch VIII, chapter VII, columns 424, 425; by BUDDEUS in his *Historia Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, pages 840, 841; by HODY in his *de Bibliorum Linguis originalibus, Versionibus Græcis*, etc.

And so I would that everyone, for the sake of public opinion, would always abstain from the mention of the *Septuagint*; since we have now seen the entire trustworthiness of the *Septuagint* to totter exceedingly: when this Version is to be cited, it is able to be called *The Greek Version of the Old Testament* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *par excellence*, or *The Old Greek Version*. Which, although it is disgracefully stained with errors and polluted with fables, to the present day is not without its manifold uses, of which CARPZOV makes mention in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter II, § 10, pages 543-551; neither was it formerly of less utility, inasmuch as it was able to be said that it paved the way for the

preaching of the Apostles, and in this Version the Gentiles, in a tongue known to them, were able to read those things that were preached by the Apostles, that were formerly preached by the Prophets: while many that had already previously read the Books of Moses and of the Prophets, having in a certain measure been prepared in this manner, were more easily receiving what was announced by the Apostles.

§ 12: The Instrumental Cause of Scripture: The Amanuenses

From the Genus of the Definition of *Scripture*, which was the *Word of God*, we proceed now to a consideration of the Difference of Species, which in the first place is sought from the Efficient Instrumental Cause, or the *Amanuenses*, the *Prophets* and *Apostles*.

God in the writing of Scripture made use of *Amanuenses*, who might perform the act of writing with their own hand and produce the Scripture as an effect, and to such an extent cooperate with the Holy Spirit in producing that joint finished product; whence the Gospel of God¹ is called the Gospel of *Paul* himself, Romans 2:16, and the writings of the Hebrew Canon are attributed to *Moses* and the *Prophets*, Luke 16:29. Nevertheless, adding nothing beyond the external ministry of writing and also the internal ministry of meditating, which very thing was also at the same time subject to singular and intimate divine direction, they were in any event *Amanuenses* of the Holy Spirit and ministerial causes; neither were they adding anything to the θεοπνευστίαν/*inspiration* of the Scripture, but in any event were writing letters and words, which were animated by the θεοπνεύστω/*inspired* Word of God: whence what things *Moses* wrote, God Himself testifies that He wrote, Hosea 8:12: compare § 5 of *this Chapter* above. Hence there was no difference, although these, with respect to natural Gifts (for example, temper mild or more fervid, ability in doctrine developed or not), and with respect to State, both Common and Ecclesiastical, were diverse, since with respect to Infallible Inspiration they were equal.

But these *Amanuenses* of the Holy Spirit did not always *write* with their own hand, but sometimes they in turn made use of *Amanuenses*, to whom they would *dictate* the words of the Holy Spirit, Jeremiah 36:4; Romans 16:22; hence it is right to distinguish between the man θεόπνευστον/*inspired*, and the man writing θεοπνεύστως, *under inspiration*, that is, with an θεοπνεύστω/*inspired* man dictating, assisting, and directing: these *Amanuenses* were indeed fallible and without inspiration; but on the other hand, their writing, received either

¹ See Romans 1:1.

from the mouth or from the archetype of their Masters, was infallible and truly divine, and was not at all inferior to the other monuments of the Canonical Writers. Nevertheless, the account of these Amanuenses, and of the following copyists in turn, is dissimilar. The writing of the former is free from blemish and error, but the copies of the latter are not devoid of all fault: the writing of the former was directed by the *ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΙΣ*/*inspired* Men dictating during the writing, and was recognized and approved by the same after the writing; but the writing of the latter was left to human fragility, and was not free from all errors.

These Amanuenses of the Holy Spirit are commonly called *Prophets* and *Apostles*, out of Ephesians 2:20, where, 1. by *Apostles* understand, *a.* the primary Ministers of the New Testament properly so called; *b.* under the same comprehend their first extraordinary co-laborers, whom under the name of *Evangelists* Paul conjoins with them, Ephesians 4:11, and who propagated the Gospel with them throughout the world, not only by mouth, but also by pen: *whether* the denomination be now taken from the superior part, seeing that Paul, indicating the first Ministers and Writers of the New Testament, names *Apostles*, comprehending the others synecdochically under these; *or* the term *Apostle* be extended more broadly, as in Acts 14:14, in which *Barnabas* is also called an *Apostle*. 2. Now, by *Prophets*, out of Ephesians 2:20, and also in Ephesians 3:5 and 4:11, Ministers of the New Testament equipped with the gift of explaining the old Prophecies, indeed also of predicting future things in consequence of the beginnings of it, are understood by those that have only scarcely admitted that the Old Scriptures and the New Testament teach the same doctrine, so that this text might be less of a hindrance to this their hypothesis: thus *Socinus*, *Smalcus*,¹ *Slichtingius*,² *Crellius*,³ whom some of the *Remonstrants* also follow; but also, at a distance from every perverse hypothesis, COCCEIUS thus explains this text. Nevertheless, it is far more

¹ Valentinus Smalcus (1572-1622) was a German Socinian theologian. He translated the Racovian Catechism into German (probably having had a hand in the Catechism's original composition), and the Racovian New Testament into Polish.

² Jonas Schlichting (1592-1661) was a theologian of the Socinian Polish Brethren. He wrote commentaries on most of the books of the New Testament.

³ Johannes Crellius (1590-1633) was a one of the Polish Brethren and an influential Socinian theologian. His son and grandson were also proponents of Socinian views.

common that the name of *Prophets* refers to extraordinary Ministers of God under the Old Testament, who at that time prophesied by mouth and pen even of Christ's advent and grace, among other things: just as the *Papists*, following the *Greek Fathers*, commonly expound this text; and there is in this matter among *Our Men* nearly a universal consensus, which, following our Most Illustrious AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus Textualibus* XLIII, Part III, § 2-5, we think is not easily to be abandoned:

α. Because by *Prophets* it is the most common and proper use of this word in the New Testament to understand those Ministers of the Old Testament: a just reason for receding from which occurs in Ephesians 3:5 and 4:11, but not in Ephesians 2:20.

β. Because the Old Prophets, more than the New, are and were celebrated in the Church, even on account of the divine Writings, which they left behind for the perpetual use of the Church, and on account of their absolute infallibility in teaching, which they had in common with the Apostles, who entered into the labor of the Prophets, and confirmed their own sayings from their prophecies: whence the *Foundation* of the Church is more rightly and gloriously denominated from those Old Prophets, than from the new.

γ. In the progress of the text, *Jesus Christ* is called the λίθος ἀκρογωνιαίος, *cornerstone*, of the Foundation of Apostles and Prophets; which is viewed as having two sides divided between the Apostles and the Prophets and coming together into one Christ: whence these seem to be referred to altogether distinct times and distinct proclamations of Christ future and Christ present. It is no hindrance that:

a. The *Prophets* are placed after the *Apostles*: for,

a. The Apostle was equally able to ascend from the present time to the past, as to descend from the past to the present.

b. With the order of time disregarded, the Apostles are able to be set before the ancient Prophets with respect to their nearer relation to us, or to their dignity or renown: compare Matthew 11:9, 11.

b. But, that it is falsely said that the Prophets of the Old Testament are unable to be the Foundation of the Christian Church, shall be opened in § 18.

But, as it is fitting to comprehend under the *Apostles* their Apostolic co-laborers; so also one may include under the *Prophets* men of the Prophetic Spirit, or moved by Him formerly under the Old Testament, in setting forth to the Church matters other than the

prophetic strictly so called.

Indeed, God Himself desired first *to sanctify Writing by His own example* in Legislation, and to obtain authority for this mode of revelation by so noble an example, of which you read in Exodus 32:16, upon which place see *Chapter 11*, § 25 below. But our AUTHOR makes mention of a threefold reason on account of which God thereafter *committed all the Writing to Men*: namely, α. *so that He might treat more familiarly with us*, inasmuch as He sees to it that, through men, who were ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἡμῖν, *of like passions with us*,¹ the doctrine of salvation is committed to writing for us. β. *So that He might impede superstition*: for, if any αὐτόγραφον/*autograph* of the Sacred Volumes, written by the Lord Himself, had existed, with how great superstition would that have been received by men? At the same time, what would the advantage have been, if in the passage of time the divine αὐτόγραφον/*autograph*, no less than that of the *Law*, had perished (concerning which consult JOHANN FRIEDRICH MICHAELIS' *Dissertationem de Tabulis Fœderis prioribus*, § 22, and *Dissertation de Tabulis Fœderis posterioribus*, § 23, in HASE'S² and IKEN'S³ *Thesaurum Novum Dissertationum in Veterem Instrumentum*, pages 361, 362, 377), and nothing other than the human ἀπόγραφα/*copies* had remained? γ. Thus the Lord willed *to signify His greater Dignity and Efficacy in the writing of His Word in the heart* by omnipotent power, while it belongs to His ministers only to commit the divine words to paper. On account of which, and similar reasons also, the Son of God is thought to have abstained from the external administration of Baptism, by a comparison of John 4:2 with Matthew 3:11. That *the Head dictated what the members wrote*, Augustine observes concerning Christ, *book I de Consensu Evangelistarum*, chapter XXXV, *opera*, tome 3, part 2, columns 18, 19: "Moreover, through the man which He assumed, He stands to all His disciples as a head to its members. Therefore, when those wrote things that He showed and spoke to them, it ought not by any means to be said that He did not write; since His members have wrought that which they became acquainted by the dictation of the Head. For whatever He willed that we should read concerning His own doings and sayings, *this He commanded to*

¹ See Acts 14:15; James 5:17.

² Theodor Hase (1682-1731) was a Reformed theologian and philologist. He served as Professor of Theology at Bremen from 1708 to 1731.

³ Conrad Iken (1689-1753) was a Reformed theologian and philologist. He served as Professor of Theology at Bremen from 1723 to 1753.

be written by them, as if they were His own hands. Whoever apprehends this partnership in unity and this *ministry of united members under one head* in diverse offices, will no otherwise receive what he reads in the Gospel through the narratives of the disciples, *than if he were witnessing the very hand of the Lord, which He bore in His own body, writing.*”

And so our AUTHOR discredits what things have been set forth as if written by Christ, of which sort are:

1. CHRIST’S EPISTLE TO ABGARUS or *Agbarus*, King or Phylarch of Edessa, a nation on the other side of the Euphrates, in which Epistle, namely, He answers the letter of that King, who was oppressed with disease and was soliciting by letter the help of the Lord; and He gives hope to him that after His departure to the Father He was going to send one of His disciples to Edessa to heal the King. Both Epistles, together with those that followed for the execution of this dominical promise, EUSEBIUS exhibits from the records of the Church of Edessa, translated from Syriac into Greek, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book I, chapter XIII. But those Epistles of Agbarus and of Christ, together with the rest of the history related by Eusebius, by the many instances of *νοθείας/spuriousness* and falsehood, are manifestly convicted by SPANHEMIUS *the Younger*, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century I, chapter XV, § I, columns 578, 579, who believes that these things were boasted of by the Edessenes in order to lift up their Church, but that these were fabricated according to the bent of the Syrians, who are inclined to fictions; and that these are to be reckoned in a similar category with the *θεοτεύκτω*, *divinely made*, Image of Christ sent by the Lord to Agbarus, concerning which EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS:¹ see also JOHANN ALBERT FABRICIUS’ *Codicem apocryphum Novi Testamenti*, part I, pages 316*-320*, and part III, pages 513-516; likewise PRITIUS² *Introductionem in Lectionem Novi Testamenti*, chapter II, pages 7-11; RUMPÆUS³ *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § XIX, pages 40-43.

2. Of similar chaff are the BOOKS WRITTEN BY CHRIST TO PETER AND PAUL, *as they are indicated in the epistolary title*, and which

¹ Evagrius Scholasticus (sixth century) was a Syrian scholar and lawyer. He wrote a six-volume *Ecclesiastical History*, treating the period from the First Council of Ephesus (431) to the author’s time (593) under the reign of Maurice.

² Johann Georg Pritius (1662-1732) was a German Lutheran Theologian and Minister.

³ Justus Wesselius Rumpæus (1676-1730) was a Lutheran Theologian and Schoolman.

books purport to contain the magical arts by which the Lord was wont to accomplish His miracles. AUGUSTINE mentions books of this sort read by some according to narration of those; but at the same time he ridicules and cries them down, *de Consensu Euangelistarum*, book I, chapters IX-XI, *opera*, tome 3, part 2, column 6. Concerning these and similar books and writings ascribed to Christ, see also FABRICIUS' *Codicem apocryphum Novi Testamenti*, part I, page 303 and following.

Next, our AUTHOR observes that *it is not necessary for us to know the names of the individual Writers of the individual Books*; as in the case of several Historical Books of the Old Testament and various Psalms the authors remain uncertain: since *the authority of the sacred Books depends, not upon the Amanuenses, but upon God*, the principal author; just as upon the King depends the authority of a certificate of safe passage which he publishes, whence it makes no difference whether I know by what Secretary he arranged to have such a certificate written and published, or not. GREGORY THE GREAT, *præfatio expositionis in Jobum*, chapter I, *opera*, tome 2, column 5: "It is quite unnecessarily inquired who wrote these things, since the author of the book is earnestly believed to be the Holy Spirit. Therefore, He wrote, who dictated these things to be written." It suffices that at that time, in which the individual Books were added and received unto the same, it was evident to the Church, and especially to those that presided over the collection of the Canon, that by the Holy Spirit the authors of those Books enjoyed the gift of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ /inspiration in the writing of them, and that those Books were intended by the same Spirit to enlarge the Canon; neither are those destitute at this day of the Marks of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ /inspiration: see HARTMAN'S *Huysbybel in Epistolam ad Hebræos*, pages 225, 226.

Nevertheless, it is to be held without wavering that *those are the Writers of the Books* (as our AUTHOR proceeds), *that are set forth to us in the Books themselves, or in the Scripture of the New Testament, as such*, if confidence in the divine Word has not given way altogether: compare GROTIUS' *de Veritate Religionis*, book III, § 2.

And our AUTHOR desires it to be observed *against the Atheists of our time, who, so that they might subvert Scripture by subterranean tunnels, maintain that only Fragments of the Old Writers survive for us today* (compare BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, pages 827, 829b—831a), and *thus they have the audacity to teach even concerning the PENTATEUCH of MOSES* (compare STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter VI, § 19, 219, who

then proves against the *Atheists*, 1. that Moses was not an Imposter, § 224-255; 2. that, what Books are circulated under the name of Moses, were not written in a later age but by Moses himself, § 256-265: *The same*, in his *Theologicæ polemiciæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 233-277, pages 1034-1067, vindicates the truth of the Mosaic History over against that of Foreigners against the charges of the *Naturalists*). Here they have regard to the opinion of:

1. *Hobbes*, who contends that they were thus called the books of Moses, not after their author, but after their object; although he does admit it to be possible that it happened that he wrote those things that in these books are related to have been written by him, *Leviathan*, part III, chapter XXXIII: COCQUIUS comes against this hypothesis, in *Anatome Hobbesianismi*, locus III, chapter V, pages 43-45, who, in *Anatome Hobbesianismi*, locus III, chapter V, pages 46-48, repudiates Hobbes' similar rubbish concerning several other Books of the Sacred Codex. See also LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, epistle 3, pages 62, 63.

2. The *Author* of the opinion of the *Pre-Adamites*,¹ who, in his *Systeme Præadamitarum*, book IV, chapter I, maintains that the books written by Moses have perished, and that now only certain excerpts and randoms pieces of writing composed upon emergent circumstances. *Charles Blount* among the Deists heartily follows this in his *Oraculis Rationis*; see LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, epistle 4, pages 84, 85.

3. *Spinoza*, who, in his *Tractatu Historico-politico*, chapter VIII, maintains that Ezra was the writer of the Pentateuch; but of his labor applied to this matter he speaks very contemptuously and shamefully: compare WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 3, pages 146, 147.

4. *Richard Simon*, who, in his *Historia Critica Veteris Testamenti*, book I, chapters II, V, contends that the argument of the books of Moses was first committed to writing by Scribes and public notaries, whose records were then entered into a briefer register by one ignorant; which comes to us in a very disordered state from disjointed volumes poorly stitched together: see WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 8, pages 153, 154; MILL'S² *Orationem de Fatis Theologicæ exegeticæ*, pages

¹ Namely, Isaac La Peyrère.

² David Mill (1692-1756) was a Dutch Orientalist and Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Oriental Languages (1718-1727), and as Professor

XLII-XLIV, in *Miscellaneis Sacris*.

5. *Jean Le Clerc*, who, in his *Sententiis Theologorum quorundam Batavorum super Simonii historia Critica*, pages 128 and following, ridicules Simon's Scribes indeed; but he no less absurdly celebrates that Israelite Priest, sent from Babylon so that he might instruct the new inhabitants of Palestine in the ritual by which the God of that nation was fond of being worshipped, 2 Kings 17, as the author of the Pentateuch. However, *Le Clerc* thereafter, with his opinion changed for the better, acknowledged Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch and tried to build upon it in *Dissertatione* III, which he set before his *Commentario in Genesin*: compare WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, preface, § 8; *Brieven van eenige Joden aan de Voltaire*, part II, epistle VIII, § 3, pages 195-198, compared with epistle II, page 73. That *Le Clerc* discusses the writing of the Pentateuch no less irreverently in a different regard, in the cited *Dissertation*, § 2, 6, 7, CARPZOV observes in his *Introductione ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter III, § 2, page 41, § 8-10, pages 46-50.

Against whom we hold that the Pentateuch was written by Moses himself, and that it survives intact to the present day.

We urge, 1. That the author of *Genesis* is the same as the author of the remaining books of the Pentateuch: for no one denies that this book was delivered to the Israelites at the same time with the rest; it is cited by the same appellation of Moses and תורה/*Law*, both in the Old Testament and in the New, Luke 24:27, 44; Galatians 4:21, 22; it was also received by the Israelitish Church with the same reverence; indeed, it is the basis and foundation of the rest of the books; while the connection of the history between *the end of Genesis* and *the beginning of Exodus* is all too evident.

2. We infer that the remaining Books, from Exodus onward, are most certainly of *Moses*, even from the infallible citation of the New Testament: for example, *Exodus* from Mark 12:26 compared with Exodus 3:6; *Leviticus* from Romans 10:5 compared with Leviticus 18:5; *Numbers* from John 3:14, for these are among those things which the Lord elsewhere affirms that *Moses wrote concerning Him*, John 5:46, but are found in Numbers 21:6-9: compare WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 18-24, pages 165-172. So also Moses himself expressly states, Numbers 33:2, *Now, Moses wrote their goings out unto their journies by the determination of Jehovah*. *Deuteronomy* from Mark 12:19 compared with Deuteronomy 25:5, 6; indeed, *the entire Pentateuch*

according to Acts 15:21; 2 Corinthians 3:14, 15; Luke 16:29; John 1:45.

3. Moses wrote *Laws*, Exodus 24:4, 7; 34:27, not only all those that are the norm of uprightness and government and are extant in Deuteronomy, according to Deuteronomy 31:24-26 compared with Joshua 1:7, 8 and 2 Chronicles 17:9; but also the ceremonial Laws scattered throughout the other books, according to 2 Chronicles 23:18 and Ezra 6:18 compared with Numbers 3; 8. But he also wrote *Prophecies*, Deuteronomy 28-31, from which last chapter observe *verses* 19, 22; and from these a certain pericope is commended as Mosaic, Nehemiah 1:8, 9;¹ and the testimony of the Lord is express, John 5:46, 47, *for had ye believed Moses, etc., for he wrote of me, etc.*, in which manner it is easily proven that Moses wrote of Christ through all five of his Books. Finally, he also wrote *Histories*; not only those few, Exodus 17:14; Numbers 33:2, etc., but a great many, no less worthy of commemoration, without which other things, certainly written by him, would not be able to be understood; it was necessary to join with the Laws the history of the wonderful works of God, and whatever motives were able to lead Israel to render obedience to the Law. But these things constitute the argument of the whole Pentateuch.

4. At all times, that Pentateuch stood forth as Mosaic, next in the time of *Joshua*, Joshua 8:34, 35, of David, 1 Kings 2:3, of Amaziah, 2 Chronicles 25:4: the αὐτόγραφον/*autograph* of this Pentateuch was found in the age of Josiah, 2 Chronicles 34:14; JOSEPHUS does not deny that this discovered book was τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους τὰς Μωυσέως, *the holy books of Moses, Antiquities, book X, chapter V.*

In support of the Mosaic autograph of the Pentateuch being found in the time of Josiah, see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, epoch VI, chapter III, § 14, 16, column 384*; MEYER'S *de Temporibus Sacris et festis Diebus Hebræorum, part II, chapter IX, § 106-122, pages 216-225*; DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter V, § 13, 96, pages 761, 925, 926*; LUNDIUS'² *Joodsche Heiligdommen, book I, chapter XVI, tome I, pages 121-125, book II, chapter X, page 437, compared with chapter VIII, page 430*; LUSSING'S *de Noodzekelykheid van den Godtsdienst in 't gemeen, en de*

¹ See Deuteronomy 28:64; 30:1-4.

² Johannes Lundius (1638-1686) was a Lutheran pastor and Hebraist, and expert on the Jewish Temple and worship.

Zekerheid van den Christelyken, part II, dissertation VI, chapter IV, § 744, 745, pages 178-184; PRIDEAUX'S Het Oude en Nieuwe Verbond aan een geschakelt, Dutch Edition, in folio, columns 51, 574; yet not from this history, which came to pass in the time of King Josiah, by deduction of the consequence, which PRIDEAUX thence elicits, Het Oude en Nieuwe Verbond aan een geschakelt, column 54, following the similar argumentation of VITRINGA in the place cited by MEYER in the pericope cited above.

Nevertheless, by *the Book of the Law found in the House of Jehovah* in the time of Josiah, others understand as only *the last Chapters of Deuteronomy*, from *chapter 27* onward perhaps; which opinion the Reverend HERMANN WESSEL, afterwards a most worthy Pastor of the Church of Leiden, snatched away from us by a most untimely death, commended by various arguments in his *Dissertatione*, publicly defended at Lugduno-Batava¹ in 1739: while BUDDEUS thinks, on the other hand, that this discovered *Book of the Law* is to be taken in a broader sense, *Historia ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti, period II, section IV, § 26, tome 2, pages 447, 448. Daniel* in the captivity cites the same, Daniel 9:11, and the same is extolled soon after the captivity as the ancient standard of religion, Ezra 3:2; 6:18.

5. The ἀρχαιότης/*antiquity* of the Pentateuch is also proven,

α. From the antiquity of the Jewish Church and commonwealth, from the first beginnings of which and the entrance into Canaan the Laws written in the Pentateuch and the truths related there were the basis of the faith and polity of the Jews.

β. From the argument of the history of the creation, of the flood, of the covenant with Abraham, of the institution of the Levitical worship, the belief of which was thereupon always the same in Israel. Which were drawn from the Books of Moses, and without which they would have been consigned to oblivion, disregarded, etc.

6. Christ and the Apostles esteemed our Pentateuch as truly Mosaic, extolling the same, Luke 24:27, 44; John 5:46, 47; Acts 15:21, not merely as an epitome of the same, or as the composition of a later age; of which there is no evidence. Contrariwise, they cite texts as express from Moses: they even have regard unto the particular phrases in the Pentateuch, their words and emphasis; compare Mark 12:26; Galatians 3:10, 12, 13, 16, etc., indeed, the Lord said in Matthew 5:18,

¹ That is, Leiden.

Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.* And, although Christ and His Apostles did not come into the world to teach the Jews the art of Criticism; neither did they come so that they might foster vulgar errors and fortify them by their authority: but they were teachers of truth, in whom we have far greater confidence than in a thousand Spinozas, Hobbes, Simons, and Le Clercs, who scarcely have any foundation for their conjectures than Critical audacity, and against whose rash and hardly pious assertions we suppose that enough has been said in the preceding observations. So that it is not necessary in addition to appeal to the consent of all Jews of whatever Sect in the time of Christ and the Apostles, by whom the oracles of God were at that time believed.

Neither is this hindered by, *α. certain Briefer Writings included in the Pentateuch*, for example, Exodus 24:4, 7; 34:27; 17:14; Numbers 33:2, etc.; which certainly *do not exclude a larger Writing*: but, 1. that Moses thus committed again and again the Laws successively received to writing, even at the command of God; until finally, after all the commandments of God were set forth, he brought them together in one volume, to be deposited by the side of the ark, for a testimony against Israel, Deuteronomy 31:24-26: but in this volume Prophecies were also inserted, comparing Deuteronomy 31:19, 22. 2. From the commandment in Exodus 17:14, one may reason from the lesser to the greater; if God expressly willed that this history concerning the Amalekite war be written, no less by His will were written the many, far more memorable (as it seems) Historical matters: neither was the history of this war, if it should be understood, able to be written alone; but it supposes that many more things were also to be written at the command of God regarding the history of the Israelites. But when in Numbers 33:2 we read, *Now, Moses wrote their goings out unto their journies by the determination of Jehovah, etc.*, it is not credible that Moses wrote the journeys of the Israelites in the desert in such a way that he did not at the same time write those things which very notably happened to them; and of which the memory was infinitely more worthy of conservation than of the bare journeys. 3. Many more things are expressly cited in the New Testament as having been written by Moses, than of which we read that he received from God a commandment to write: but, while Moses is

praised in Hebrews 3:5 as he that was πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων, *faithful in all His house as a servant*, he is to be supposed to have committed to writing neither these things, nor the other things conjoined, without the commandment of God. And so the positing of the one here is not the exclusion of the other.

β. Neither is this any more hindered by the fact that *Moses speaks of himself in the Third Person and with such a high Opinion*, for example, Exodus 6:26, 27; etc.; Numbers 12:3; etc. But *the former* is found to obtain among many sacred Writers; take, for example, *John*, John 19:35; 21:20, 23, 24: neither is *the latter* out of accord with the style of the sacred Writers; in that Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah narrate great things concerning themselves, and, while glorying in the Lord, Paul also, in 2 Corinthians 11; 12, and in other passages, narrates what things could make for his own commendation. One may do even this, when it tends toward the glory of God. Indeed, this is a proof of the honesty of the Sacred Writers, and among them of Moses also; in that he no less openly acknowledges his vices and infirmities.

γ. Finally, *certain Additions, either Parenthetical, or Attached at the end by some subsequent Prophet*, do not constitute the Principal Work, nor take the same from Moses. For those Parenthetical Additions are not so numerous as indeed they are sometimes imagined: and from all the examples carefully gathered by *Le Clerc*, Men, erudite and pious, acknowledge no more than four in which there may be evidence of a parenthetical addition inserted later or of a name changed; for example, Genesis 14:14, in which Abraham is said to have pursued his enemies *unto Dan*, which is a later name of a city more anciently called *Laish*;¹ although we are not compelled necessarily to acknowledge that any change was made in the name *Dan*, see BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period I, section III, § 2, tome I, page 210*; which LILIENTHAL equally concerning *Hebron* and *Dan*, *Oordeelk Bybelverklar, chapter XV, § 11, 12, part 8, pages 20-24*. Thus several times in the place of *Kiriath-Arba* is substituted *Hebron*,² which name was at length given to the city by Caleb.³ Thus in Deuteronomy 3:14, *unto this day* appears to have been added to the text later, where there is talk concerning the name of *the villages of Jair*. To learned men what in Exodus 16:35 is narrated concerning the forty years, through which the

¹ See Judges 18.

² See, for example, Genesis 13:18; 23:2, 19; 35:27; 37:14.

³ See Joshua 14:13-15; 15:13, 14.

gift and use of the Manna continued, appears to be of the same stamp; since that did not cease before the death of Moses, who less aptly also, as it has appeared to some, would have next added here, at the first giving of the Manna, its duration. However, MARCKIUS judges that this conclusion is not necessary, since Moses lived with Israel for almost the entirety of those forty years of the giving of the Manna, until the eleventh, or perhaps the twelfth, month of the fortieth year: which forty years of lodging in the desert God had expressly determined, after which the Manna would no longer be necessary. Therefore, Moses, shortly before his death, was able, so that the entire history of the Manna might be exhibited here, to add this concerning the duration of the giving of it by prolepsis; equally also what things are mentioned in *verses* 33 and 34, concerning the placing of the Manna before the testimony for safe keeping, were added here by prolepsis: see MARCKIUS' *Exercitationes textuales* I, Part III, Exercise XI, § 18, page 237, 238. But, although JOSEPHUS, in *Antiquities of the Jews*, book IV, last chapter, thinks that the very death of Moses in Deuteronomy 34 was written by Moses by way of anticipation, which opinion ORIGEN also supports, book II of *contra Celsum*, page 93, *Spencer's edition*; nevertheless, I should think that it is able to be admitted without difficulty that the argument of that Chapter 34 concerning the Death and Burial of Moses with its consequences was added to the Principal Book in the form of a Conclusion or Appendix by another, but with the Spirit of God impelling:¹ which, no more than a brief prologue or epilogue added to any book, makes for the denial of the writing of the entire Pentateuch to Moses. This is also related by our DUTCH interpreters as the most common opinion in their *Marginal Notes*. The Most Illustrious SPANHEIM the Younger not without reasons asks in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, column 265, at the beginning: "Because the last things, death, burial, and commendations of Moses were added at the end of Deuteronomy, whether by Josua, or by Eleazar, or by Ezra the Scribe and Priest (just as the supplements of that sort at the end of Joshua and Nehemiah, so also on the Commentaries of Cæsar, etc.), shall it be concluded from this that the book of *Deuteronomy* is not Moses'; a book so frequently to be read to the people, to be inculcated, with blessings and curses, Deuteronomy 27 and 28, and with its prophetic Song, Deuteronomy 32?" For *Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch* consult SPANHEIM, in the beginning of his *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Veteris Testamenti*, columns 260-270, and *Epoch IV*, chapter VII,

¹ 2 Peter 1:21.

§ 1-4, columns 329-332; GULIELMUS SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica*, book I, *Exercitation* II; WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome I, book I, chapter XIV, and *Præfationem* § 7; MARCKIUS' *Commentarium in præcipuas quasdam partes Pentateuchi ad Deuteronomium* 31:9, 24, § VIII, XXI, pages 726-729, 752, 753; DEYLING'S *Observationes Sacras*, part I, observation II, pages 8-17; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section I, § XI, pages 425-436, and *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, pages 1442-1447; likewise *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter VII, § 6, page 456; LULOFS' *Annotationes ad eum* (350), pages 465, 466; JOHANN GOTTLOB CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter III, § 2-10, pages 38-50, chapter IV, § 2, 3, 6, pages 57-64, 71-73, chapter V, § 2, 4, pages 83-86, 88, 89, chapter VII, § 2, 4, pages 121-125, chapter VIII, § 2, pages 136-139; LUSSING'S *de Noodzekelykheid van den Godtsdienst in 't gemeen, en de Zekerheid van den Christelyken in't byzonder beweert*, part 2, dissertation 6, chapters I, II, pages 4-69. For the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch and the ἀξιопιστία/*trustworthiness* of the argument of these Books against *Bolingbroke*, read LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 2, chapter 2, letter 11, pages 406-476. Concerning the Holy Writers of the Books of the Old Testament in general, against *Spinoza* and *Richard Simon*, JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER discourses at length, *Exercitationibus Biblicis*, VIII, pages 213-244. The same disputes in favor of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, *Exercitationibus Biblicis*, IX, pages 244-275. He asserts the Divinity of the Pentateuch, *Exercitationibus Biblicis*, X, pages 275-350. He similarly vindicates the remaining Books of the Old Testament from the calumnies of *Spinoza* and *Simon*, *Exercitationibus Biblicis*, XI, pages 350-389.

Just as in the Old Testament our AUTHOR claimed the Pentateuch for Moses, so also in the New Testament he lays claim to the writings which are found in the Canon under John's name for JOHN, and the Epistle to the Hebrews for PAUL.

Among the ἀναμφισβήτητα/*undisputed* writings of the Apostle JOHN, ever ascribed to him by the unanimous judgment of the orthodox Church, is his *Gospel*; concerning which very tardily and on account of petty reasons the Alogi heretics about the beginnings of the third Century stir up doubts, whom therefore EPIPHANIUS, in *Hæresi* LI, chapter III, *opera*, tome I, page 423, 424, calls *Alogi*, because they were not receiving the books of John, or that λόγον/*Word*, that was proclaimed

by John:¹ see LAMPE'S *Prolegomena in Joannis Euangelium*, book II, chapter I, pages 133-148.

Equally also, by the consent of all antiquity, *the first Epistle*, although the text does not have the name of the Evangelist added, was ascribed to John; see LAMPE'S *Prolegomena in Joannis Euangelium*, book I, chapter VII, § I, page 104; WOLF'S *Prolegomena in I Johannis Epistolam in Curis philologicis et criticis*, page 242.

Concerning the SECOND and THIRD EPISTLES, whether they belonged to the Apostle JOHN, we read that there was doubt in the third Century; for which, it appears in the view of some, it furnished an opportunity that the writer simply calls himself the *πρεσβύτερον/elder*;² whence conjecture arose as to whether these Epistles were to be ascribed to another John, who is said to have been appointed as Bishop of Ephesus by the Apostle, and who is distinguished from the Apostle by the name of *Elder*. Nevertheless, it is demonstrated that these two Epistles also belong to the Apostle John, 1. from the manifest agreement of these with the first Epistle, 2. from the more general consent of the Fathers, even of those that lived in the second Century, namely, Irenæus,³ Clement of Alexandria,⁴ and Tertullian.⁵ Neither does the title of *πρεσβυτέρου/elder* hinder, which both because of his age, on account of which he was venerable, and because of his authority, whereby he delighted in his office, was applicable to the Apostle, seeing that the Apostle Peter also calls himself a *συμπρεσβύτερον/fellow-elder*, 1 Peter 5:1. And indeed perhaps the Apostle John was known emphatically by the name of the *πρεσβυτέρου/elder* throughout the Churches of Asia, to such an extent that he did not regard it as necessary to make use of any other name in the Inscription of his Epistles. But the whole matter that is narrated concerning the other Presbyter John, whose sepulcher was shown at Ephesus, depends upon a tradition of slight credit, a tradition of only one, even Papias; but even if it be already granted, it would still not prove that these Epistles are to be ascribed to him. Perhaps it would not be far from the truth, if we should say that the rigor, with which the Apostle teaches in these Epistle that

¹ See, for example, John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word (ὁ λόγος), and the Word (ὁ λόγος) was with God, and the Word (ὁ λόγος) was God."

² 2 John 1; 3 John 1.

³ *Against Heresies* 1:13; 3:18.

⁴ *Stromata* 2.

⁵ *The Prescription of Heretics* 33.

one is to proceed against Heretics, caused some annoyance among the heretical men, and, therefore, they, the first of all, tried to render the Apostolic authority of these Epistles, acknowledged by the Church, controversial: LAMPE'S *Prolegomena in Joannis Euangelium*, book I, chapter VII, § 5-9, pages 107-111; GOMARUS on *2 John*, opera, part II, pages 480, 482-484; WOLF on *2 John* in *Curis philologicis et criticis*, pages 320-322.

Finally, that the APOCALYPSE was written by the Apostle JOHN, before doubts were moved concerning this book in the third Century, α. was even acknowledged by four eminent Doctors of the second Century, Justin Martyr,¹ Irenæus,² Apollonius against Montanus³ as cited by Eusebius,⁴ Theophilus to Autolycus.⁵ β. Tertullian affirms that this was the common sentence of the Church from his time back to the first beginning of the Bishops, while it belonged to the heretic Marcion⁶ to reject the Apocalypse.⁷ γ. Neither unto anyone, than unto John, do those things better agree, which the Author of this Book attributes to himself in the Argument; who not only calls himself *John* five times, but also in Revelation 1:1, 2 calls himself δούλον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the servant of Jesus Christ*, which, that the Apostles attributed to

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho* 81:4.

² *Against Heresies* 4:20.

³ Apollonius of Ephesus (late second century), thoroughly versed in the history of the church at Ephesus and of the Phrygian Montanists, undertook to vindicate the claims of orthodoxy against Montanism. His work against the Montanists, praised in its day, has been lost. The Montanists were a second century sect; they were followers of the heretic Montanus, and were known for their ecstatic utterance in the name of the Holy Spirit.

⁴ *Ecclesiastical History* 5:18.

⁵ Theophilus (died c. 183) was bishop of Antioch. His *Apology to Autolycus* is extant. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 4:24, relates that Theophilus cited John's Apocalypse in his work *Against Hermogenes*.

⁶ Marcion (c. 85-160) was a Gnostic heretic from Sinope, Turkey. He was very influential in the early Church, in spite of being excommunicated. Marcion asserted that the God of the Old Testament was a lesser demiurge, a God of law, strict justice, and wrath. The God of the New Testament is a God of love and grace, revealed in Jesus Christ, and purely preached by Paul. It is not surprising that Marcion rejected all of the Old Testament, and the New Testament books that speak favorably of the God of the Old Testament. Marcion's canon consisted of an expurgated edition of Luke and ten of Paul's epistles.

⁷ *Against Marcion* 4:5.

themselves with singular emphasis, the writings of Paul,¹ James,² Peter,³ and Jude⁴ prove. *In the same place*, he says that “he bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw;” in which words he has regard to his Apostolate, and to what things he delivered to the Church, both by word, and in the rest of his writings, comparing John 1:14; 19:35; 1 John 1:1, 2. He writes this book to the seven Churches of Asia, *verse 4*, which were not only the singular object of this Apostle’s care, but over which also a certain general authority was able to agree to no one except the Apostle. Moreover, he testifies that these revelations came to him while he was dwelling *on the Isle of Patmos because of the Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ, verse 9*; but, that John was banished to the isle of Patmos for the sake of the Gospel, is evident from the unanimous suffrage of the ancient Church. Neither will I add anything concerning the title Θεολόγου/*Theologian* in the Inscription, which began about the fourth Century to be given preeminently to the *Apostle John*, and apparently about the time was added to the other words in the Inscription of this book; so that by such an epithet, whereby the Apostle John at that time was wont especially to be distinguished from all others, it might be signified that this book also was to be ascribed to the Apostle, and not to another John.

And perhaps there was no other reason why doubt arose in the third Century concerning the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse, than that heretics, cherishing impure thoughts concerning some millenarian kingdom abounding with worldly and carnal pleasures, unto this purpose abused Revelation 20; some, not being able to explain its genuine sense, denied that this book was written by the Apostle John, and feigned that it was forged under the name of John by Cerinthus,⁵ or at least interpolated. While others, acknowledging the Inscription of the book to be genuine, in which it was called ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, *The*

¹ Romans 1:1.

² James 1:1.

³ 2 Peter 1:1.

⁴ Jude 1.

⁵ Cerinthus (*circa* 100) was a heretic: Like the Ebionites, he taught his followers to keep the Jewish law for salvation, and denied the divinity of Jesus (believing that the Christ came to Him at His baptism); like some Gnostics, he denied that the Supreme God made the world, and believed that the bodyless, spiritual Christ inhabited the man Jesus. He also anticipated a millennium of earthly pleasures after the Second Coming but before the general resurrection.

Apocalypse of John, yet began doubtingly to speak about the other John, perhaps that Ephesian Presbyter: who in the meantime were producing slighter reasons for their opinion than that they might be able to cause the weakening of the common faith/confidence of the Church. For, 1. insofar as John in the Apocalypse several times inserts his own name, which in his other writings he is not found so to do: that is able to be attributed to the prophetic argument of this book, since Prophets are often found to do the same, by which so much the more confidence is obtained for their revelations and writings: therefore, it is not able to be changed into a fault in John, that he inserted his name five times in this book, while the Prophet Daniel named himself sixty times in his book, indeed the Prophet Jeremiah named himself more than one hundred and twenty times. 2. What things they were setting forth concerning the difference of style in the Apocalypse from the Gospel and Epistles, those things we are easily able to concede with the argument varying to such a degree. See the Most Illustrious JOHANNES ENS¹ in his *Diatribæ de Librorum Novi Testamenti Canone*, chapter VI, § 27-29, pages 174-176, chapter XII, § 28, 30, 32-34, pages 401, 403, 404, 406-409; and the Most Illustrious LAMPE'S *Prolegomena in Joannis Euangelium*, book I, chapter VII, § 17-29, pages 115-130; add BEZA'S *Prolegomena in Johannis Apocalypsin*; GOMAR'S *explicationem capituli prioris Apocalypsos*, opera, part II, pages 489-492; WOLF'S *Prolegomena in Apocalypsin in Curis philologicis et criticis*, pages 370-373; TWELLS'² *Vindicias Apocalypsos apud Wolfium*, *Prolegomena in Apocalypsin in Curis philologicis et criticis*, pages 387-429; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, pages 1486b-1488a; and what things I had suggested above in Chapter I, § 2.

Finally, our AUTHOR lays claim to the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS for PAUL, on behalf of which opinion especially the Great SPANHEIM the Younger in his *Exercitationibus de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos* taught that many reasons, not easily repudiated, militate, which *Exercitationes* constitute book II *Miscellaneous Sacrarum Antiquitatum* in tome 2 of his *operum*. And we argue for this opinion with our AUTHOR,

α. First and foremost from that Petrine passage, 2 Peter 3:15, 16, from which various instances are able to be drawn out for this purpose:

1. For here Paul is expressly said to have written an

¹ Johannes Ens (1682-1732) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht from 1720 to 1732.

² Leonard Twells (c. 1684-1742) was an Anglican churchman and Biblical critic and scholar.

Epistle to converted Jews: for he is asserted to have written to the same men unto whom Peter was writing this second Epistle, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, *even as our beloved brother Paul also hath written unto you*. But Peter was now writing this second Epistle unto the same men, unto whom he had sent the first Epistle, according to 2 Peter 3:1, Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, *this second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you*. And Peter's First Epistle was imparted to ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας, *elect sojourners of the diaspora, of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia*, 1 Peter 1:1, by whom it is evident that converted Jews are understood, comparing James 1:1 and Acts 2:5, 9-11. Neither was this Epistle of Paul, indicated by Peter, imparted to converted Jews together with others, as indeed in the case of the other Churches unto which Paul was writing, the penitent Jews were mixed with converted Gentiles: but this Epistle sent by Paul *to the Hebrews* Peter distinguishes from all the rest, καθὼς—Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν· ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, *even as Paul hath written to you; as also in all his epistles*: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part I, chapter II, columns 176-183.

2. Paul wrote in this, his Epistle to the Jews, of the same argument as Peter, λαλῶν περὶ τούτων, *speaking of these things*, which *in particular* is able to be referred to the immediately preceding exhortation, verses 14 and 15, to which a similar is found in Hebrews 10:22-24, together with a similar motive from the coming of the Lord for the fulfilling of this admonition, verses 25, 36, 37. But *in general* this is also able to have respect to the principal occasion that is treated, which in either Apostle's Epistle, of which we speak, is also the same, namely, the confirmation of the Hebrews in the faith, with irreparable misery also carefully considered, which awaits those having voluntarily lapsed from, and those without, faith, concerning which both Peter speaks, 2 Peter 2:20-22, and also Paul, Hebrews 6:4-8; 10:26-31: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part I, chapter III, columns 183-187.

3. Peter says that Paul wrote this Epistle to the Jews, κατὰ τὴν αὐτῷ δοθεῖσαν σοφίαν, *according to the wisdom given unto him*. For Paul had indeed acquired this wisdom by his own zeal, Galatians 1:14; but he had to a greater extent received it as a gift from

the Lord of the Church, Galatians 1:12; he himself declares that he speaks this divine Wisdom, 1 Corinthians 2:6, 7; but in none of the Pauline Epistles do the beams of heavenly wisdom so shine as in this Epistle *to the Hebrews*, whether you have regard unto the majesty of the thoughts, or unto the sublimity of the mysteries, or unto the force of the arguments taken from the history, prophecies, and types: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos, part I, chapter IV, columns 187, 188.*

4. It no less squares with this Epistle, what Peter adds concerning certain *δυσνοήτοις*, *things hard to be understood*, in the Pauline Epistles, *ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν*, *which the unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction*. For this is demonstrated by the commentaries of all the Interpreters, greatly laboring in the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews; moreover, the Apostle himself indicates that he is going to set forth that sublime doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedec: for he writes of this argument, Hebrews 5:11, *περὶ οὗ πολλὸς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, *of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered*. But both the Novatians¹ and the Arians abused this Epistle, and twisted its argument unto the support of their errors: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos, part I, chapter V, columns 188-191.*

All these things taken together hardly leave any doubt that Peter, in 2 Peter 3:15, 16, commended the Epistle that we have, entitled *to the Hebrews*, as written by Paul.

β. A second argument is sought *from the constant Tradition of the Greeks, approved by many of the Latins*; inasmuch as SPANHEIM gathered thirty or more testimonies of the Greeks to this purpose, with whom agree of the more ancient Latins Clement of Rome, Cyprian or the Author of the book *de Cardinalibus operibus Christi*,² Arnobius, and Marius

¹ Novatian (c. 200-258) was a priest and scholar. He argued against readmission to the church for those that had lapsed during persecution, and this brought him into conflict with the Roman Bishop Cornelius. Novatian was excommunicated. The Novatians broke away from the Catholic Church, even rebaptizing converts.

² *De Cardinalibus operibus Christi* was printed in the Leiden edition (1555) of Cyprian's works, but it was probably the work of another, and may have been written at a significantly later date.

Victorinus Afer,¹ while the rest do not have sufficient reasons for doubt: But in the fourth Century this Epistle was acknowledged in the Third Synod of Carthage, in the year 397,² as divine and Pauline, at which Augustine was present. Paulinus also, *σύγχρονος*/contemporaneous with Jerome and Augustine, several times cites this Epistle as Pauline: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part I, chapters VI-VIII, columns 191-213.

γ. Moreover, we argue *from Affection of Paul unto his own nation*, to which he testifies with such feeling, Romans 9:1-3; 10:1; but this does not appear to allow that the Apostle might be said to have been so forgetful of the Jews that he would not write unto them separately even one Epistle. He was indeed the Apostle to the Gentiles, just as Peter was the Apostle to the Circumcision, according to Galatians 2:7-9. But this ought not to be extended to such an extent that by reason of office no care of the Gentiles touched Peter, and no care of the Jews touched Paul: one may discern the contrary, Acts 15:7; Romans 11:13-15: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter VI, § 6-8, columns 230, 231.

δ. One may also undoubtedly argue *from reasons incorporated in the Epistle, which are supplied by*:

1. *The Conclusion*, which is altogether Pauline, whether you have regard unto the prayer, Hebrews 13:20, 21, compared with 1 Thessalonians 5:23; etc.; or unto the greeting, almost perpetual in Paul, Hebrews 13:24; or unto his customary seal, by which all things are brought to a conclusion, Hebrews 13:25, ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Ἀμήν, *Grace be with you all: Amen*: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter III, columns 223, 224.

2. *The State of the writer*, who sends his Epistle *from Italian bonds*, from which, nevertheless, he hopes to be released shortly; see Hebrews 10:34; 13:19, 23. But unto whom do these things agree more than unto the Apostle Paul, and his first Roman imprisonment, from which he wrote so many Epistles, in which he is not at all forgetful of his τῶν δεσμῶν, *bonds*, as it is evident from an inspection of the Epistles to the Ephesians,³ Philippians,¹ Colossians,² and Philemon;³ and

¹ Gaius Marius Victorinus (fourth century) was a Roman rhetorician who converted to Christianity late in life, possibly under the influence of Augustine.

² The Third Council of Carthage issued a canon on the Scripture.

³ For example, Ephesians 3:1; 4:1.

also from 2 Timothy,⁴ but which is referred to the last imprisonment of Paul by the best Interpreters; while also elsewhere he expresses a hope for his imminent release from bonds, Philippians 1:26; Philemon 22: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter IV, columns 224-227.

3. *The Place of Writing, from Italy*, Hebrews 13:24, to which place we read, in Acts 27 and 28, that Paul was taken as a prisoner, and from which it is evident that several letters were written by him: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter IV, columns 224-227.

4. *The Mention of Timothy*, as a sharer in his journeys and bonds, Hebrews 13:23, which is customary in all the Epistles of Paul, with Galatians and Titus alone excepted; whom also, as here, he is wont to call *brother*, 2 Corinthians 1:1; Colossians 1:1; 1 Thessalonians 3:2: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter V, columns 227, 228.

5. *The Scope/goal of the doctrine*, which is to draw the Jews from the ceremonies by a consideration of the person, offices, and benefits of Christ, and of the present Gospel economy, and to exhort them to conversation worthy of the Gospel, afflictions notwithstanding: which, whether you have regard unto the argument, or unto the method, wholly breathe the Pauline genius and style; than who no one ever acted with greater courage and zeal, that he might draw both Jews and Greeks from ceremonies to the grace of Christ; to which the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Colossians bear witness: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter VI, § 1-5, columns 229, 230.

It is not necessary to heap up further arguments, since the things that we have recited far outweigh those that are moved to the contrary:

α. For what diversity of Style between this and the other Pauline Epistles they imagine here, 1. that could be attributed to a measure of diversity of argument, but it is really not so great: indeed, 2. contrariwise, the Most Illustrious SPANHEIM'S, in his *Exercitationibus laudatis*, part II, chapters I, II, columns 217-223, demonstrates at length that the Pauline genius of speech is easily able to be observed in this

¹ Philippians 1:7, 14, 16.

² Colossians 4:18.

³ Philemon 1, 9, 10.

⁴ 2 Timothy 1:8; 2:9.

Epistle, if you compare, *a.* the Phraseology of this Epistle with the other Epistles of Paul, in which occur not only very similar modes of speech, but also words used only by Paul, of which sort are πληροφορία,¹ and μεσίτης/*mediator*,² an elogium of Christ. *b.* If you attend to the several elogia, with which Paul is wont to distinguish Christ, which you also find here: if you attend to certain sayings of the Old Testament, which Paul is wont to cite, which are also cited here: and if you attend to the custom of Paul according to his wisdom to apply certain obscure oracles and histories of the Old Testament to Christianity, which he especially did in this Epistle most of all: see also SPANHEIM, in his *Exercitationibus laudatis*, part III, chapter I, columns 241-245.

β. They add that this does not touch the argument from the omission of an Inscription, to this effect: What Epistle does not have the name and office of Paul prefixed after the manner of the Pauline Epistles, the same does not appear to be Paul's. But of such a kind is that controverted Epistle to the Hebrews. Therefore. But this consequence does not follow; which, 1. is demonstrated from a similar example: in the two latter Epistles of John we find ἐπιγραφὴν, *an inscription*, ἀσπασμὸν, *a salutation*, ὑπογραφὴν, *a conclusion*, but in the former all these things are wanting. 2. The error is made through a false hypothesis, as if Paul had fixed this for himself as a perpetual rule, that he would set his name at the head. 3. If there be here anything new and singular, singular reasons for that also were not wanting to Paul. Never in the other Epistles was his business immediately with the Hebrews: but, *a.* of what name should Paul, in writing to them, make use in his Inscription? he would have inscribed himself as either *Paul*, or *Saul*. He did not wish the *latter*: *a.* because he had previously disregarded that name, *b.* because some time before he had become known to the

¹ Hebrews 6:11: "And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance (τὴν πληροφορίαν) of hope unto the end..." Hebrews 10:22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance (πληροφορία) of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Colossians 2:2: "That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance (τῆς πληροφορίας) of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ..." 1 Thessalonians 1:5: "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance (ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ); as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake."

² Hebrews 8:6; 9:15; 12:24; Galatians 3:19, 20; 1 Timothy 2:5.

Churches under the name of *Paul*, c. because perhaps a suspicion would have arisen among the Gentiles that he had returned to Judaism as a result of the resumption of his Jewish name. Neither did he wish the *former*, which name of *Paul*, as Roman, Gentile, and assumed among the Gentiles, unto a certain despite of his Hebrew name, he would have recognized to have been hateful to the Hebrews, and not naturally suited for capturing their goodwill or attention. *b.* He wanted to move the Hebrews to agreement, not so much by the authority of his name, as by the holiness of his doctrine, agreeing with Moses in all respects. *c.* Moreover, Paul was not an Apostle of the Circumcision: therefore, he, writing to the Hebrews, did not desire to set his name at the head of the Epistle, lest he should offend the Apostles of the Circumcision, or appear further to limit their Apostolate, or ambitiously to raise himself above the others. Now, he appears to write to the Hebrews, more on account of the *circumstance* and *occasion* of the afflictions with which the Hebrews were pressed, than on account of the authority of his office. And hence he asks for permission to write, as it were, since he was not their Apostle in particular, Hebrews 13:22. 4. Paul, just like any other Writer, was able to pass over his name in silence: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part III, chapters III and IV; *Miscellaneorum Sacrarum Antiquitatum*, book II, columns 253-259.

γ. Equally invalid is the argument from Hebrews 2:3, upon which passage CALVIN in his *Commentario* wrote: "Moreover, this passage is an indication that the Epistle was not composed by Paul: for he was not wont to speak so humbly as to admit himself to be one of the disciples of the Apostles."

Responses: 1. This is to set in opposition what things are able to be set together, and to separate what things are to be conjoined. Paul as an Apostle was indeed immediately taught by Christ the lofty mysteries of the faith, but at the same time concerning those he was able *to be confirmed*, βεβαιωθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, *to be confirmed by them that heard*; not so much that he himself was *to be confirmed*, as the doctrine of salvation, ἥτις (that is, σωτηρία) ἐβεβαιώθη, *which (that is, salvation) was confirmed*; not ἡμῖν, *to us*, but εἰς ἡμᾶς, *properly unto us*; consult WOLF'S *Curas philologicas et criticas* on Hebrews 2:3. And so he learned from Christ what things he was obliged to know: the same were *confirmed* to him for the sake of a more abundant certainty by eyewitnesses, comparing Galatians 1:18, 19; 2:2. Neither does Paul exclude himself ἀπλῶς/*absolutely* from the number of τῶν

ἀκουσάντων, *those that heard*, but only κατὰ τὶ, *relatively*: that is, Paul was not of the number of τῶν ἀκουσάντων, *those that heard*, Christ on the earth and in the state of humiliation, from whom hence he was able to distinguish himself: subsequently he himself was also a ἀκούσας/*hearer* and θεωρήσας/*eye-witness*, but miraculously, after the exaltation of Christ.

2. But Paul is also able to be said to proceed by speaking through ἀνακοίνωσιν/*anacœnosis*,¹ so that salvation was confirmed *to us*, to the greater part of *our men*, to you, believers, the Church, and unto you. a. For thus Paul spoke *in the beginning of the verse*: πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας, *how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation*; but also in verse 1, δεῖ ἡμᾶς προσέχειν, μήποτε παραρρυῶμεν, *we ought to give heed, lest at any time we should let them slip*. But Paul was so very far from the danger of that dreaded punishment, or of negligence, or of falling away. b. The use of that ἀνακοινώσεως/*anacœnosis*, is quite common in our Author, Hebrews 6:1, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, *let us go on unto perfection*; Hebrews 10:26, ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν, *if we sin willfully*. c. This also is especially common to Paul elsewhere, 1 Thessalonians 4:17, ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, *we which are alive*; 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52; etc. d. Here Paul is no less able to be reckoned as one to be included among τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, *those that heard*, although he appears to distinguish himself from them; as *Jude* is to be reckoned among *the Apostles*, from whom he could nevertheless appear to distinguish himself also, Jude 17, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου, etc., *by the Apostles of the Lord, etc.* For, just as *Jude* was of *the Apostles*, so also Paul was of the immediate *hearers* of the Lord. e. Now, the Apostle speaks by ἀνακοίνωσιν/*anacœnosis*, so that he might more easily persuade, and so that he might all the more insinuate himself and his own among the Hebrews: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part III, chapter V, *Miscellaneous Sacrarum Antiquitatum*, book II, columns 260-262.

δ. Finally, they that deny Paul to be the author of this Epistle argue from the uncertain traditions of certain Latins, dependent upon mere conjecture.

¹ That is, a form of address that demonstrates the common interest of the speaker and hearers.

1. Thus, *according to some*, this Epistle was *credited to Luke* the Evangelist, with this being mentioned by ORIGEN in *Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VI, chapter XXV, at the end, and by JEROME in his *Catalogo Scriptoribus illustribus*, on Paul, opera, tome I, page 267; neither does CALVIN differ from our men on Hebrews 13:23. But nothing is brought forward for Luke that has not already been adduced by us for Paul with much greater right conjoined with far more reasons: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter VII, § 1-5, columns 231, 232.

2. To some others it seems right to assign *Clement of Rome* to this Epistle as author, with this being related by ORIGEN and JEROME in the passages cited, and also PHILASTRIUS in his *Hæreseos* LXXXIX; ERASMUS also subscribes to this opinion, on Hebrews 13:24. But no probable reason is produced for *Clement* as author of this Epistle, except the agreement of speech between this Epistle and *Clement's* Epistle to the Corinthians: but concerning this everyone judges according to his own inclination. On the other hand, against *Clement*, there is, *a.* that *Clement* is enumerated among Ecclesiastical, not $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ /inspired, writers. *b.* That he appears to have been a Roman man and a foreigner, not so involved in the matters of the Hebrews. *c.* That Hebrews 13:19 does not square with him, for how is it that he was hoping from Italy to be brought back to the Hebrews? see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter VII, § 6-12, columns 233, 234.

3. TERTULLIAN, *libro de Pudicitia*, chapter XX, with JEROME also making mention of the matter in *Catalogo Scriptoribus illustribus*, on Paul; and with Tertullian others of the Ancients, with JEROME in his *Epistola ad Dardanum*, opera, tome 3, page 68, and PHILASTRIUS in his *Hæreseos* LXXXIX, relating this, ascribe the Epistle to *Barnabas*; which opinion has been renewed by JOHN CAMERON, question 2 in *Epistola ad Hebræos*, opera, pages 369, 370. But, *a.* it is not certain that *Barnabas* was in Italy, still less in chains: *b.* As it is not certain that *Timothy* was a companion of *Barnabas*, after that separation treated in Acts 15:39. *c.* *Barnabas' zeal* for Christian liberty was not so great as is here demonstrated, by a comparison with Galatians 2:13. *d.* If the other Epistle truly belongs to *Barnabas*, which survives to the present,¹ that Epistle to the Hebrews differs from *Barnabas' far rougher*

¹ The Epistle of *Barnabas* (circa 100), although of doubtful authorship, has been traditionally ascribed to the *Barnabas* of Acts.

and much more βαρβαρίζοντι/*barbarous* speech: see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter VIII, columns 234-239.

4. Finally, I do not even make mention of *Apollos*, since not one of the Ancients ascribed any Epistle to him, much less this one, so that the more recent opinion of LUTHER is destitute of all authority, who on Genesis 48:20 admits his judgment that *Apollos* is the author of this Epistle to be arbitrary. Although, if it is to be withdrawn from Paul, it is not to be denied that probable reason especially militates in favor of *Apollos*: since he was a Hebrew, eloquent, to whom some of the Corinthians adhered more than they did to Paul, mighty in the Scriptures, fervent in spirit, and disputing frequently with the Jews:¹ see SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, part II, chapter IX, columns 239, 240. Hence it is not so strange that Luther also found some followers of his opinion, namely, HEUMANN,² LAURENTIUS MULLERUS,³ and JEAN LE CLERC, with WOLF relating, but at the same time enervating, that opinion, *Prolegomenis in Epistolam ad Hebræos*, pages 590, 591, whom consult with additional material concerning the AUTHOR of this Epistle, *Prolegomenis in Epistolam ad Hebræos in Curis philologicis et criticis*, pages 583-590.

Even recently, against the arguments of PHILIP VAN LIMBORCH,⁴ *Prolegomenis ad Commentarium in Epistolam ad Hebræos*, and JEAN LE CLERC, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century I, on the year LXIX, § V, numbers 1-3, Reverend NICOLAAS HARTMAN claimed the Epistle to the Hebrews for Paul, *Huysbybel in Epistolam ad Hebræos*, pages 226-229. Now, since the Arminian Writers just cited hardly have anything new that, it ought to be concluded, has not already been sufficiently addressed by Spanheim; and since the argumentation of Hartman likewise also only makes for the greater confirmation of those things that were formerly alleged by Spanheim, even indeed more copiously according to his custom; in striking down the arguments of Limborch and Le Clerc we do not much linger. For example,

They object, 1. that this Epistle was written in a Style diverse

¹ Acts 18:24-26; 1 Corinthians 1:12.

² Christoph August Heumann (1681-1764) was a Lutheran divine, and Professor of Theology at the University of Gottingen.

³ Lorenz Joachim Müller (1716-1771) was a German Lutheran theologian and teacher.

⁴ Philip van Limborch (1633-1712) was a Dutch Remonstrant pastor and theologian, and Professor of Theology at Amsterdam (1667-1712).

from the Pauline and more polished and elegant.

But see how *Objection α* above was answered by Spanheim. Hartman replies: 1. I do not presume to judge for myself concerning this matter: but would οἱ ἐξ ἑναντίας, *those of the opposite side*, say, that they sincerely believe that Paul was lacking the ability to write an Epistle in a style of this sort? or was lacking a reason for making use of this style? 2. The Greek Church was formerly in a better position to judge of the Greek style of this Epistle, which Church with unanimous consent claimed the Epistle for Paul, doubtlessly brought to this by indisputable reasons; than after so many ages one or the other learned man, who as proof of their eminent erudition sometimes peddle that which is indebted rather to their audacious temerity for its origin.

They object, 2. that Paul did not record his *Name*, nor anywhere in this Epistle make mention of his *Apostleship*.

But see again the response of Spanheim to *Objection β* above. 1. This can strike us as strange, says Hartman, but only if we ignore the rationale. This was certainly not so that the author might lie hidden, who through the courier or in some other manner was most certainly known to those to whom this Epistle was sent, and who through the arguments and evidence incorporated in the Epistle, especially at the end of *chapter 13* in the conclusion of the Epistle, manifestly enough revealed himself. 2. These things do not make for the removal of this Epistle from Paul against the constant tradition of the Greek and Oriental Church, to which this Epistle was sent in the first place, and unto a special portion of which he was most nearly having regard. 3. What then would become of the Epistles of John, on which also he did not set his name, and only described himself by the more common title of Πρεσβυτέρου/*elder*? What shall we think of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, the writers of which similarly did not express their names, nor make mention of their authority as Apostles or Evangelists? 4. Neither is it to be said that by someone other than Paul Timothy was also able to be described in such a way as it is done in Hebrews 13:23. For, although this is able to be done, it is asked whether it was thus done elsewhere by any other than Paul; and whether or not this circumstance, conjoined with all the others occurring here, leads us surely to Paul more than any other?

They object, 3. that the Writer of this Epistle expressly distinguishes himself from the Apostles, and numbers himself among their disciples, Hebrews 2:3.

But besides those things that were mentioned out of Spanheim on *Objection* γ, and which abundantly suffice for the blunting of the force of this arrow: Hartman is not at all able to tolerate these things, inasmuch as Limborch, after he had pled this with all effort, that not the Apostle Paul, but rather some disciple of the Apostles, is held as the writer of this Epistle; nevertheless, in the end asserts that *it is probable that this same Epistle was written by one of the companions of Paul, even indeed with Paul being aware, and was drawn from the doctrine of Paul: indeed, it is evident, not only that the divine authority of this Epistle is to be acknowledged, but that the authority is even the same with the many others which were written by the Apostles, on account of which he considers giving preference to the excellence of the argument.* In which manner Hartman thinks that Limborch indulges too much in contradictory conjectures; inasmuch as from the style he had concluded that the Epistle does not belong to Paul; but from the argument he again infers that Paul furnished the material for it: and he thinks that a strange idea of the *Apostle* he forms for himself, who judges that a man that is not the Apostle is equal to writing a more excellent Epistle than what might proceed from the Apostle himself.

They object, 4. If this Epistle, which was written in Italy, be Paul's, the Italian Churches, especially the Roman, and again the rest of the Latin Church, would have been aware of this matter: consequently, this matter would not have been doubted in the Latin and Western Church.

Responses: 1. Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, *they of Italy*, certainly knew that this Epistle was written, and recognized its author, at the time when it was written; for through him they greet the brethren to whom it was sent: but this does not prevent this matter from being able to be doubted in the time following. 2. This argument is able to be turned back. The author of this Epistle, written in Italy, and through which Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, *they of Italy*, greet the others, was undoubtedly known in Italy at the time of the writing: hence its author, whoever he may have been, was thereafter never able to come into doubt, nor to be doubted, whether it was Luke, or Clement, or Barnabas. However, we know that this happened. Whatever they that move this objection might give in response, might also be repeated back to them. But if that doubt of some Latins be not obstacle to the divinity and canonical authority of this Epistle, which they maintain to be air-tight; neither will it be an obstacle to the acknowledgement of Paul as its author.

But we so much more willingly stand for PAUL as the *Author* of the Epistle to the Hebrews, because thus the *authority* of the Epistle is more easily established also. BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, page 1484, cites a fair number that could be consulted in favor of Paul as author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and he himself adds: *Now, today it is a position beyond doubt, that Paul is the author of this Epistle, and that proven by such powerful arguments that he who would deny this is going demonstrate his mind to be set upon calling the clearest evidences into doubt:* consult also AUGUSTUS LUDOVICUS ZACHARIÆ on Hebrews 13:16 in *Bibliotheca Bremense nova*, classis VI, fascicle III, chapter II, § 2, page 221.

§ 13: The Canon of Scripture

From the Efficient, Instrumental Cause, or the Amanuenses, we proceed with our AUTHOR to the *Material of Composition*, or the Books of which Sacred Scripture consists. These Books are called ἐνδιάθηκοι, *committed to writing*, and *Canonical*. The Canonical Books EUSEBIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter III, calls ἐνδιάθηκοι, *committed to writing*, that is, properly *Testamentary* or *Federal*, because they are contained in the Old or New Testament, concerning which denomination shortly. Otherwise they are called ἐνθιάθετοι γραφαὶ, *writings laid up*, for example, in *Dialogo contra Marcionitas*, which is commonly attributed to ORIGEN, Section V, page 136, because ἀνετέθησαν ἐν τῇ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτῷ, *they were laid up in the ark of the covenant*, according to WETTSTEIN,¹ in his *Notis in Dialogo contra Marcionitas*, column 85, because the exemplar of the Canonical Books, laid up in or next to the Ark of the covenant, was of old kept, with EPIPHANIUS² and JOHN OF DAMASCUS³ compared: while this denomination shall properly have regard only to the Books of the Old Testament. But according to SCALIGER, *ad Eusebii Chronicon ad Annum 1584*, the ἐνδιάθετοι γραφαὶ are simply the Canonical Scriptures, the Scriptures that are in the Canon, gathered into the Canon; because διατιθέναι is *to constitute a Canon*, ἐνδιατιθέναι *to put into the Canon*.

The Books of Sacred Scripture are called *Canonical*, because they have been gathered by the Ancient Church within a *Canon* of θεοπνεύστων/*inspired* Books, designed for the perpetual use of the Church, which Books alone prescribe *Canon*, the rule and norm of the universal Church's faith and manners. Κανὼν/*Canon* properly is the *tongue* on a balance, which is above the scales and makes them level; see HENRICUS STEPHANUS' *Thesaurum Linguae Graecae*. And since from its inclination unto this or that side it is known what weighs more; thence it appropriates to itself the signification of a *rule* and *norm*, unto which something is compared. Thus as a *rule* it is made use of as a guide for

¹ Johann Rudolf Wettstein the Younger (1647-1711) served as Professor of Theology at Basel from 1685 to 1696.

² *De ponderibus et mensuris*, page 534.

³ *Of the Orthodox Faith*, book 4, chapter 18.

faith and manners, by which all things in faith and practice are to be proven, Galatians 6:16;¹ Philippians 3:16.² Unless in these places a metaphor in the language of ΚΑΝΩΝ/*canon* is chosen from the rulers and lines of architects in building houses; or from the line or rule in the starting lines of the stadium, on which they were standing on a level, until they received the signal to run, and which is also wont to go by the name of ΚΑΝΩΝ/*canon*: both are especially accommodated unto the present matter, to denominate thence the Books as *Canonical*: see LYDIUS'³ *Agonistica sacra*, chapter VII; ADAMI'S⁴ *Observationes Sacras*, chapter V, § 21, pages 399-402; WOLF'S *Curas philologicas et criticas* on Galatians 6:16. The ΘΕÓΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΙ/*inspired Books* alone constitute that Canon of faith and manners: hence the index or catalogue of the same, even the assembled body of the same, also began to be called *Canon* metonymically,⁵ and the Books having regard to this Canon began to be called *Canonical*; not with the expression used more loosely of Books that were extending to the Canon or catalogue of those to be read publicly with profit in the Church, unto which use several Ecclesiastical Books not ΘΕÓΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΙ/*inspired* were formerly admitted: but more strictly, in which sense ATHANASIUS, *Epistola XXXIX, de Festis*, says that he reckoned the Books τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, *of inspired writing, κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία, to be received into the Canon, delivered, and believed, as divine Books*: and in this sense Books κανονιζόμενα, *received into the Canon*, and ἀναγινωσκόμενα/*read*, are opposed to each other; again see ATHANASIUS' *Epistola XXXIX, de Festis*: from both of which, moreover, are distinguished the ἄπόκρυφα, *Apocryphal Books*, see *tome 2, pages 38-40*. In the same manner, RUFFINUS, in his *Expositione in Symbolum*,⁶ *opera Hieronymi, tome 4, page 113*, distinguishes between

¹ Galatians 6:16: "And as many as walk according to this rule (τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ, *according to this canon*), peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

² Philippians 3:16: "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule (τῷ αὐτῷ—κανόνι, *by the same canon*), let us mind the same thing."

³ Jacobus Lydius (1610-1679) was a Reformed theologian and philologist. He served as minister at Dordrecht.

⁴ Cornelius Adami (died 1721) was a Reformed theologian and philologist.

⁵ Metonymy is a rhetorical device in which a word or name is used in the place of another word or name associated with it.

⁶ Ruffinus was a fourth century churchman, a friend of Jerome turned foe, a

Books *Canonical*, *Ecclesiastical*, that is, read in the Church, yet lacking the authority to confirm faith, and *Apocryphal*; accordingly, with all the Books of the Old and New Testaments enumerated from Genesis to Revelation, he subjoins: *These are the ones that the fathers included within the Canon, and upon which they maintained our assertions of faith depend. Yet it is to be understood that there are also other books which are not Canonical, but are called Ecclesiastical by the fathers: that is, Wisdom, which is said to belong to Solomon, etc. All which they did indeed desire to be read in the churches: yet not to be set forth for confirming from these the authority of faith. But they named the other Writings Apocryphal, which they did not desire to be read in the churches: see BUDDEUS' Theologicæ dogmaticæ, tome I, page 195, comparing ENS' de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti, chapter III.*

Separately these are called the Books of the *Old* and *New Testament or Covenant*, with the appellation taken from 2 Corinthians 3:14.¹ A *Testament*, διαθήκη, in Sacred Scripture very often denotes the testamentary Covenant of God, which God makes with the elect sinner, and which He willed to confirm through the death of His Son. But improperly and through a metonymy of subject for adjunct, or of the thing contained in the place of the container, *Testament*, διαθήκη, denotes the *Books of the Covenant*, the Tables of the Testament; which are also by way of division called the *Old* and *New Testament* according to the twofold Economy of the Covenant of Grace before and after the incarnation of Christ, which diverse Economies of the one Covenant are likewise called metonymically *two Testaments* or *Covenants, the Old* and *the New*; and under which double-facing turning point of time, and diverse Economy of the Covenant, these Books were written. By another appellation these Books of the Old and New Testament are able to be called *the Prophets* and *Apostles*, from Ephesians 2:20, in which the doctrine delivered with great unanimity both before and after Christ in the Books of the Old and New Testament the Apostle calls *the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*. For, that by *Prophets* are to be understood, not the recent Prophets living in the time of the Apostles, but those that had

commentator, and a monastery builder. His work in the translation of Greek patristic literature into Latin has proven to be of great importance, preserving works that would have otherwise been lost. He wrote *Commentarium in symbolum apostolorum*.

¹ 2 Corinthians 3:14: "But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament (τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης); which *vail* is done away in Christ."

lived under the Old Testament, and had consigned their writing unto the perpetual use of the Church, I showed in § 12.

Of these Books our AUTHOR relates:

α. the *enumerating Number*,

β. the *Division*;

I. With respect to the Old Testament,

II. With respect to the New Testament.

I. α. The *Number* of the Books of the Old Testament is variously computed. JOSEPHUS, in *book I, contra Apionem, page m. 1036*, counts twenty-two *Books*, whose words that have regard unto this matter EUSEBIUS cites, *Historia Ecclesiastica, book III, chapter X*. This number is followed by a fair number of the Fathers, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ruffinus, Epiphanius; and, that this agrees with the number of the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, JEROME observes in *Prologo galeato*, which is found in his *operibus, tome 3, pages 16, 17*: “Therefore,” says he, “just as there are twenty-two letters by which we write in Hebrew everything that we say, and by means of them the human voice is captured: so also twenty-two volumes are enumerated, by which, as if by letters and introductions, the infancy, yet tender and nursing, of the just man is instructed in the doctrine of God.” Now, these twenty-two Books are reckoned in this manner in JEROME’S *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, pages 16, 17*: 1. Genesis, 2. Exodus, 3. Leviticus, 4. Numbers, 5. Deuteronomy, 6. Joshua, 7. Judges with Ruth, 8. Samuel, whose Books are also, by *Jerome’s* observation, according to the Vulgate and Greek Versions, called *first* and *second Kingdoms*; 9. Kings, which in the Versions cited is contained in the *third* and *fourth volume of Kingdoms*, or rather *Kings*, according to the same *Jerome*; 10. Isaiah, 11. Jeremiah, 12. Ezekiel, 13. The Book of the twelve Prophets, which, adds *Jerome*, in their, namely, the Hebrews’, writings is called *trei asar, the Twelve*;¹ 14. Job, 15. the Psalms of David, comprehended in five divisions and one volume; 16. the Proverbs of Solomon, 17. Solomon’s Ecclesiastes, 18. the Song of Songs, 19. Daniel, 20. *Dibre hayyamim*, that is, the Words of days,² which comprehends the first and second Book of Paralipomenon, *things passed over*;³ 21. Ezra, which itself was also similarly divided into two books among the Greeks and Latins, 22. Esther. “Thus,” says the Holy

¹ Chaldean: תרי עשר.

² Hebrew: דברי הימים, the Hebrew title of Chronicles.

³ Greek: Παραλειπομένων, the Greek title of Chronicles.

Father, “there are likewise twenty-two books of the old law: that is, five of Moses, eight of the Prophets, nine of Hagiographa.” “But,” says our AUTHOR, “they posit twenty-four Books with the Jews commonly, according to the Alphabet in other Tongues, and among the Hebrews augmented by the two ך/ Yods in the ancient writing of the name *Jehovah*,¹ and the number of Apocalyptic Elders,² with the books of *Ruth* and *Lamentations* considered separately.” For, when the Books are reckoned only as twenty-two, the Book of *Ruth* is contained under the Book of Judges, and the Book of *Lamentations* under the Book of the Prophecies of Jeremiah. JEROME, in his *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, pages 16, 17*, makes mention of this augmented number of Holy Books: “Nine of Hagiographa,” says he, “although some write *Ruth* and *Lamentations* among the Hagiograph, and suppose that these books are to be counted in their number, and that through this there are twenty-four books of the ancient Law.” The same he compares, not with the letters of some Alphabet, but with the number of twenty-four Apocalyptic Elders, proceeding in this manner: “whom John’s Apocalypse introduces under the number of twenty-four Elders, worshipping the lamb,” etc. This number of twenty-four Books occurs in *Gemara Bava bathra, folios 14b and 15a*. The same is retained by *Ibn Ezra*,³ *Salomon Jarchi*,⁴ *David Kimchi*, *Elias Levita* in the *præfatione 3* upon his book *Masoreth*, and most more recent Jews, with GALATINUS observing, *de Arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis, book I, chapter I*, so that among them the Bible is usually called עשרים וארבעה, *the twenty-four*: see the places cited in the *Observationibus* of DE VOISIN on *Martí’s*⁵ *Pugionem Fidei, folio 94, or 115, 116*.⁶ The Jews in

¹ יהוה/*Jehovah* was sometimes abbreviated ך.

² Revelation 4; 5.

³ Abraham Ibn Ezra (c. 1089-1164) was a renowned Spanish Rabbi. Although a universal scholar, at the heart of his work is his commentary on the Hebrew Bible. He commented on the entirety of the Old Testament, and his exegesis manifests a commitment to the literal sense of the text.

⁴ The details of the life of Rabbi Salomon Jarchi (Solomon Jarchi ben Isaac) have been obscured by the mists of time. It is relatively safe to associate him with the eleventh century. He commented on the whole of the Hebrew Bible, and the principal value of his commentary is its preservation of traditional Jewish interpretation.

⁵ Ramón Martí (died 1284) was a Catalan Dominican friar and theologian. In 1250, he was appointed by the provincial chapter, together with seven others, to study the oriental languages for the purpose of mission work among the Jews and the Moors.

⁶ Joseph de Voisin (died c. 1685) was a French priest, expert in Hebraic and

this number are able to have regard unto the Hebrew Alphabet, with the letter *Yod* thrice repeated in honor of the tetragrammatic Name. For the ancient Rabbis, if credit be given to GALATINUS, *de Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis*, book II, chapter X, were wont to abbreviate the name *Jehovah* by a triple *Yod* (י׳י׳י׳), even indeed to the end that they might denote the mystery of the Trinity: but afterwards (perhaps out of hatred for Christians defending the *Trinity*) they withdrew one *Yod*, and by a double *Yod* with a *shewa* (י׳י׳) and a *qametz* (י׳י׳) subscripted (י׳י׳) they everywhere wrote the name in the Chaldean paraphrases. “Some of the Greek Fathers,” says SIXTUS SENENSIS in *book I of Bibliothecæ Sanctæ, section I, page 2*, “received this distribution, which most aptly agrees with the number of twenty-four Greek letters; and a fair number of the Latins, both ancient and more recent, embraced it with equal zeal, having regard unto that mystical number of the twenty-four Elders, whom John introduced in his Apocalypse, etc.”

Our AUTHOR yet adds, “No more than twenty-seven. With the Twofold Books divided according to the additional computation of the Five Final Letters, they posit with *Jerome*.” For thus again JEROME, in his *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, pages 16, 17*: “Moreover, there are five double letters among the Hebrews, כ/ך, מ/ם, נ/ן, פ/ף, צ/ץ. For they write these one way at the beginning and in the midst of words, another way at the end. Whence also five are esteemed by most as double Books, Samuel, Malachim,¹ Dibre hajomim,² Ezra, Jeremiah with Cinoth, that is, with his Lamentations.” And indeed, if the two Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles are numbered separately as individuals, and are separated Nehemiah from Ezra and Lamentations from the Prophecies of Jeremiah, five are added to the twenty-two Books before enumerated, which together make up the number twenty-seven. Which number will equally return, if with SIXTUS SENENSIS, while indeed holding Jeremiah with Lamentations as the same Book, you separate, on the other hand, the little book of Ruth from the Book of Judges. FRANCIS JUNIUS, *Oratione III de Fœdere et Testamento Dei, column 38, opera, tome 2*, observes: “Now, what the Fathers divided into twenty-two Books according to the number of Hebrew letters, and into twenty-seven Books, is reckoned in this manner. *Four Quintuplets* of Books are

Rabbinical learning. De Voison published Marti's *Pugionem*, expanded with his own *Observationibus*.

¹ That is, Kings.

² That is, Chronicles.

posited, and two Books in addition, in this manner: The First quintuplet: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. The Second quintuplet: Joshua, Judges with Ruth, twofold of Samuel, twofold of Kings, twofold of Chronicles. The Third: Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song. The Fourth: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, τὸ δωδεκαπρόφητον, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*. To these two others are added, twofold Ezra, and Esther. From these twenty-two, if you divide those which are twofold (think the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra), twenty-seven Books are constituted, which is the number of all the figures by which the letters of the Hebrews are depicted.”

Now, there is no discernable fault of the Jews in this, that they make the computation of the θεοπνεύστων/*inspired* Books to conform to the Number of Alphabetic letters, as indeed some of the Papists maintain. For they were not, therefore, prohibited from admitting additional Books into the Canon, lest they should exceed the number of the letters of the Alphabet: but, while the Canon of θεοπνεύστων/*inspired* Books had already been constituted among them by the gift of the prophetic Spirit, only for the help of education and memory did they begin to reckon them according to the Alphabet.

Now, in the threefold manner of Computation already mentioned, the twelve *Minor Prophets* are always considered all together to make up only *one Book*, named according to the Chaldean dialect from the number of authors, תרי עשר, or תריסר, *the Twelve*, but δωδεκαπρόφητον, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, among the Greeks, as it is in EPIPHANIUS' *de Mensuris et Ponderibus*, chapter IV, *opera*, tome 2, page 162. JEROME, in his *Prologo galeato*, *opera*, tome 3, pages 16, 17, calls it *the Book of the Twelve Prophets*. That conjunction is ancient, whether brought about by Prophetic Men under divine impulse a little after the release from captivity, or even by human management, because the prophecies of these individual Prophets were less with respect to mass and treat a related argument. Whether to this it indeed has regard, that the words of Amos are cited in Acts 7:42 out of βίβλω τῶν προφητῶν, *the Book of the Prophets*, as if one of many or of the twelve, I would not dare to affirm; since the *Book of the Prophets*, taken in greater latitude, is thus able to be set over against Moses, or Moses and the Psalms.¹ But if these twelve *Minor Prophets* are also numbered as individuals separately,

¹ See, for example, Luke 24:44.

there are thirty-nine Books total in the Old Testament.

β. Our AUTHOR subjoins a similarly diverse *Division* of the Books of the Old Testament, both among the Jews, and among the Christians. *For they are divided:*

a. *Either by Dichotomy into Moses and the Prophets*, that is, the writings of both by metonymy of the efficient, or *the Law and the Prophets*, with the Books of Moses thus denominated from the more highly regarded part of the argument of the same, namely, the Legal. And this division is scriptural, resting upon the authority of the Lord Himself and the Apostles; see Matthew 5:17; Luke 16:29; 24:27; Acts 26:22; 28:23. Moses is reckoned separately, because he is the fount of all sacred doctrine, which the others illustrated, and of the Canon by which the writings and books of others were to be proved. To this prince of the Prophets are joined the rest of the *Prophets*, as his successors and interpreters.

b. *Or by Trichotomy*, which was the customary division of the Jews, which, whether it has a foundation in the Sacred Codex, is disputed. JOSEPHUS, in the *place cited* above, *book I, contra Apionem, page m. 1036*, presents a peculiar *τριχοτομίαν/trichotomy* of the Sacred Books, accommodated to his scope/goal. Namely, he is defending against Apion the Antiquity of his Race. This Antiquity he builds upon the integrity of the Jewish histories, which, says he, were preserved with the highest care and diligence; and, since these are chiefly exhibited in the sacred Books, he exhibits a catalogue of them by classes, enumerating five Books of Moses, thirteen Books of Prophets, and finally four Books, which are said to contain Hymns unto God and Precepts of human life. Now, he says that Moses wrote histories from the creation of the world unto the end of his own life; he relates that the Prophets consigned to writing the matters conducted of the following ages unto Artaxerxes:¹ and, when Books remained, which were not easily able to be referred to the class of Histories, he assigns to them a third class apart from the rest. If now we should attend to this scope of Josephus, together with the recension of the Canon of the Jews made by the Christians that most nearly reach the age of Josephus, with regard to the same the Canonical Books are to be divided in this way: That the five Books of Moses make up the First Class is a matter beyond controversy. The thirteen Books of Prophets are to be enumerated in this manner, according to the order

¹ Artaxerxes I, thought by Josephus to be the *Ahasuerus* of the Book of Esther, reigned over Persia from 465 to 424 BC.

in which they follow one another in our Bibles:

1. Joshua,
2. Judges with Ruth,
3. Two of Samuel,
4. Two of Kings,
5. Two of Chronicles,
6. Ezra with Nehemiah,
7. Esther,
8. Job [consult FINDLAY'S¹ *Defensionem Sacrae Scripturae et Josephi adversus de Voltaire, part I, section VI, pages 48-56*],
9. Isaiah,
10. Jeremiah with Lamentations,
11. Ezekiel,
12. Daniel,
13. Δωδεκαπρόφητον, *the Book of the Twelve Prophets*.

The four remaining Poetic and Moral Books are the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song.

From these things it is clear that *Daniel* is numbered among the *Prophets* by Josephus; but it is not thus evident whether Josephus did this according to his own, private opinion, or according to the custom publicly received at that time: if the latter be correct, with this superior argument the exclusion of Daniel from the number of the Prophets among today's Jews would be able to be opposed.

For another Division of the sacred Books everywhere obtains among the Jews, which Division, noted by JEROME, is found in his *Prologo galeato*, already cited numerous times. According to this Division:

1. The תורה/*Torah/Law*, does indeed occupy the first place, that is, the five Books of Moses, called in Greek the πεντάτευχος/*Pentateuch*, that is, *the fivefold βιβλος/book*, that is, a Book divided into five scrolls; called among the Hebrews חמשה חומשי תורה, *Chamishah Chumashim*, that is, five quinternions, five fifth parts; and each Book of the Pentateuch is called by them an חומש/*Chumash, a fifth-part*, because it constitutes a fifth-part of the Pentateuch.

¹ Robert Findlay (1721-1814) was a minister of the Church of Scotland, serving as Professor of Divinity at Glasgow from 1782 to 1814. He labored in the defense of the inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture against the rising tide of Rationalism.

2. The נביאים/*Prophets* compose the second part, whom they divided into ראשונים/*former*, so called because, *a.* these Prophets and the matters commemorated therein, as far as the greater part is concerned, precede *in time* the latter Prophets; *b.* because they relate matters conducted even earlier: now, these are the historical Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. These are followed by the אחרונים/*latter Prophets*, who, *a.* are latter with respect to time than the others just now mentioned, *b.* neither do they so much relate matters conducted in the past, as indeed predict the favors and judgments of God in the future: these are enumerated as three גדולים/*greater/major*, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: and as twelve קטנים/*lesser/minor*, not that they are lesser with respect to weight of argument or authority, but, as mentioned, on account of the small mass of the scrolls; and, lest they be scattered on account of this, they all were joined together in one scroll.

3. Finally, among the Jews follow the כתובים, *the Writings* κατ' ἐξοχήν, *par excellence; Hagiographa*, or, *the Holy Writings*, in JEROME'S oft cited *Prologo*, *The third order contains the Hagiographa, etc.*; γραφεῖα, *the Writings*, in, among other places, EPIPHANIUS' *libro de mensuris et ponderibus, opera, tome 2, page 162*, where he mentions τὰ καλοῦμενα γραφεῖα, παρά τισι δὲ Ἀγιόγραφα λεγόμενα, *those called the Writings, but by some the Hagiographa*; likewise EPIPHANIUS, in his *Hæresi XXIX, tome I, page 122*, where concerning the Ναζωραίοις, or *Nazoræans*,¹ he writes, Οὐ γὰρ ἀπηγόρευται παρ' αὐτοῖς νομοθεσία καὶ Προφηταὶ καὶ γραφεῖα, τὰ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις καλοῦμενα βιβλία, *for among them are not rejected the legislation, and the Prophets, and the writings, which among the Jews are called the sacred books.* Now, they relate that the Books included in this category are thus called, because they were not delivered by mouth, but by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit were immediately captured with the pen and rendered in letters: or because they were dictated by the Prophetic Spirit, not by visions, ecstasies, etc., but by the immediate influx of the Spirit, with the senses and mental operations of the authors unimpaired, שָׁחַם כְּתוּבֵיִם בְּרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ, *He stamped the Writings by the Holy Spirit.* Now, they are the Psalms, the Proverbs of Solomon,

¹ Although orthodox Christians have been called *Nazarenes* by the Jews, Eppiphanius is addressing a form of Judaizing Christianity. Unlike the Ebionites, the *Nazarenes* held orthodox views concerning the person of Christ, but they tenaciously held to the ceremonial law of Moses. Remnants of this sect seem to have survived into the twelfth century.

the Book of Job, the Song of Songs, the Book of Ruth, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, Solomon's Ecclesiastes, the Book of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and two Books of Chronicles. Among these, the *שֵׁנֵי מִגִּלּוֹת*, *the five Megilloth, five Little Books*, are Feast-Day Books, which were wont annually to be read publicly in the Synagogues after the Parashah;¹ the *Song* on the feast of Passover; *Ruth* on the feast of Weeks; *Lamentations* on the ninth day of the month Ab, or July, on which it is delivered by tradition that both Temples were burned; *Ecclesiastes* in the month of September on the feast of tabernacles; and *Esther* on the feast of Purim, on the fourteenth and fifteenth day of February: see *Tractate Sopherim, chapter XIV*, § 18, 19. Hence that Scroll of the five Little Books, plucked from the midst of the Hagiographa, quite often is immediately subjoined to the Pentateuch for the use of the Synagogue, set before all the Prophets.

The foundation of this *τριχοτομίας/trichotomy* the Jews place in the diverse degrees and modes of the revelation whereby they were written. For they acknowledge differing degrees of *θεοπνευστίας/inspiration*, of which the highest falls to *Moses*, the degree called *פה לפה*, *mouth to mouth*:² the next belongs to the *Prophets*, the degree called *נְבוּאָה/prophesy*:³ the lowest that is taught by *רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ, the Holy Spirit*, belongs to *θεοπνεύστων/inspired* men that, although they did not see dreams and visions, nevertheless felt a divine ability resting upon them, and, with this exciting and suggesting words of praise and confession, or other divine things, spoke or wrote: and they say that the Writers of the *כתובים/Hagiographa* rejoiced in this influx of revelation. Concerning the distinction between *נְבוּאָה/prophesy* and *רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ, the Holy Spirit*, see what things are mentioned out of *Kimchi*⁴ by WITSIUS, *Miscellaneous sacrorum, tome 1, book I, preface*, § 14.

Concerning the antiquity of this Judaic Partitioning we would be able more easily to judge, if it were established with certainty that the Lord had regard to it in Luke 24:44, as learned Men maintain: of whom some at the same time think that out of Matthew 23:35 it is sufficiently proven that the Lord, according to the usual division of the Codex at that

¹ The Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament is divided into *Parashot/sections*, around which the public readings are organized.

² Numbers 12:6-8; see also Exodus 33:11; Deuteronomy 34:10.

³ 2 Chronicles 9:29; 15:8.

⁴ From the preface of Kimchi's commentary on the Psalms.

time, considers the Book of *Genesis* as the first,¹ and *2 Chronicles* as the last,² of Sacred Scripture. With respect to Luke 24:44, it is not improperly observed that, if the *τριχοτομία*/*trichotomy* of Books were at that time in common use, the Lord would have made mention of it elsewhere also: but actually He constantly adheres in His speech to a *διχοτομία*/*dichotomy*, making mention of *Moses* and the *Prophets*; which *Luke* himself had also done just a little before in *verse 27*: therefore, there appears to be a specific reason lying beneath, as to why the Lord made mention here of the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Psalms*; which probably is found in this, that the *Book of Psalms* exhibits so many and such illustrious prophecies concerning the sufferings and glorification of the Messiah: wherefore, to this so eminent book, otherwise comprehended among the *Prophetic Books*, above the rest, the Lord wills attention to be paid principally and most diligently; *All things*, says He, *which concerning me were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and especially in the Psalms*:³ as the Angel was instructing the women; *tell His disciples and Peter*, who nevertheless was not to be separated from the disciples of the Lord, *Mark 16:7*.⁴

IKEN, *Dissertation XXIII in Dissertationibus philologico-theologicis*, does indeed think that in Luke 24:44 traces of a tripartite Division of the Codex of the Old Testament are found, unto the third part of which the *Book of Psalms* is to be referred; yet he does not think that thence it is able to be gathered that this Division is clearly the same with the modern Division of the Jews, and that *Daniel* also was already at that time dislodged from the order of *Prophets* in the Hebrew Bible: neither does he believe that it can be admitted that the *Psalms* are here put in the place of the entire order of *Hagiographa*; but from the third portion of the Sacred Books it is affirmed that the *Book of Psalms* alone is cited, since it was especially fit for proving the double State of Messiah, of Emptying and of Exaltation; and then he illustrates this method of citation especially out of *Maimonides*:⁵ see that *Dissertation*.

¹ Genesis 4:8.

² 2 Chronicles 24:19-22.

³ Greek: πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως καὶ προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ.

⁴ Greek: εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ.

⁵ Moses Maimonides, or Rambam (1135-1204), is reckoned by many to be the greatest Jewish scholar of his age. In the Hebrew Scriptures, Rabbinic

And, although the observation concerning the *Books of Chronicles* as the last in the Bible be not disagreeable for illustrating of Matthew 23:35, yet it is not necessarily concluded that today's *τριχοτομίαν/trichotomy* had already obtained at that time. 1. The Lord is able to contemplate the *second Book of Chronicles* as the *last of the Historical Books*, in which mention is made of a perpetrated murder of this sort. 2. Or it is also possible to compare the *murder of Zachariah* with that of *Abel* on account of the agreement of that notable circumstance, that, just as the blood of Abel is said to cry to God from the ground, Genesis 4:10, so also dying Zachariah is reported to have said, *The Lord will look upon and require it*, 2 Chronicles 24:22: consult CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XVII, § 1, pages 440-442.

That this Division is certainly of divine origin, and that he acknowledges Ezra, together with the Men of the Great Synagogue, as the author, which ELIAS LEVITA in the *preface of the book Masoreth hammasoreth* relates without any proof, no reason urges. Then the Greek Version would probably have followed this division also. Neither does *Jesus ben Sirach* make mention expressly of this division in the *preface of his Book*, which is called *Ecclesiasticus*, when he made mention of the Law, and of the Prophets, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοῦς ἠκολουθηκότων, *and of others that have followed their steps*; likewise of the Law, and of the Prophets, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατριῶν βιβλίων, *and of other books of our fathers*: since by these Books of a third order he understands rather human writings of pious Men, who lived after the times of the Prophets. In the time of EPIPHANIUS and JEROME, it is clearly evident from their writings that this partitioning of the Codex was by then common; indeed, unto what age this division might climb, we do not determine. According to VRIEMOET, *Thesis controversa ex Antiquitatibus Israeliticis* XIV, "The Partition of the Sacred Codex into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, appears to have been received into use already in the time of Christ."

We rather affirm that this Judaic Partitioning of the Codex suffers from various disadvantages, on account of which it comes to be disapproved; and that hence moreover its human origin is evident. There are those that think that this Judaic division is able to be defended,

tradition, natural science, and Aristotelian philosophy, Maimonides demonstrates great command and almost equal facility.

yet in such a way that they believe that its foundation and origin is situated, not in diverse degrees of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ /*inspiration*, but in the diverse manners of life and offices of the Writers. That is to say, the תורה /*Torah/Law* is named and reckoned separately, because it was written by the one and only *Law-giver*. The נביאים /*Prophets*, which were written by Men, publicly engaged in the prophetic office, in such a way that they gave themselves to the direction, teaching, and reformation of the Church. The כתובים /*Hagiographa*, the Writers of which, although not of the order of Prophets, but rather devoted to another manner of life, were yet equipped for this service of writing by a peculiar afflatus of the Holy Spirit, like David and Solomon as Kings, Daniel, Nehemiah, and Mordecai as courtiers, Job as a prince, and Ezra as an expert in Law. Thus DRUSIUS,¹ AMAMA, and others. But this, 1. is asserted contrary to the wishes of the Jews, among whom ABARBANEL² expressly denies that these Books were so named with respect to their authors, but rather with respect had to the gift of writing, and the degree of influx. 2. This division is not able to be justified even in this way, while they hold the authors of *Ruth* and *Lamentations* as those that discharged the function of prophesying, and yet were separated from the Prophetic writings; to which writings, on the other hand, are assigned the Books of *Judges* and *Jeremiah*, written by the same authors.

If the Judaic Division of the Codex of the Old Testament were to be approved, of all opinions concerning this matter that of FRANCISCUS JUNIUS would be especially satisfying to me, which he sets forth in *Oratione III de Fœdere et Testamento Dei, columns 37, 38, opera, tome 2*, in the following words: “The Third division of the Old Testament the orthodox Church formerly received from the Jews, who, according to the rationale of the time in which the books were gathered into one corpus, and deposited in the treasure-chamber of the Church, divided that into four classes. The first class is that which the Jews call *Torah*, that is, the Law—for these books were written in the desert, in

¹ Joannes Drusius (1550-1616) was a Protestant scholar; he excelled in Oriental studies, Biblical exegesis, and critical interpretation. He served as Professor of Oriental Languages at Oxford (1572), at Louvain (1577), and at Franeker (1585).

² Isaac Abarbanel (1437-1508) was one of the great rabbis of his age and a stalwart opponent of Christianity, in spite of the danger. He holds fast to a literal interpretation of the Scripture, over against Maimonides' philosophical allegorizing.

the presence of God, who was commanding, dictating, approving, and confirming them in the sight of the entire Church, in a certain extraordinary and singular manner. In this class are contained the books of Genesis, etc. Belonging to the second class are—the former Prophets: which before the Babylonian deportation were written, collected, and stored in the treasure-chamber of the Church, and they also narrated with historical reliability the former matters, that is, matters conducted previously. In this class are the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Belonging to the third class are—the latter Prophets: which were written, partly indeed before the Babylonian deportation, partly after it, but then they were united into one body, and deposited in the treasure-chamber of the Church (unless the conjecture deceive me), by Ezra and his congregation. Unto this class pertain Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets. There is a fourth class, which the Jews call כתובים/*Kethubim*—the medley of these books was drawn together from diverse times; but some, already formerly begun, were completed in the last time, others were written after the time of the captivity here and there in a foreign land and presented to the returning Church, and finally others were composed in Judea in the last times, and were laid up in the treasure-chamber of the Church (if we are able to conjecture anything) in the times of that Judas Maccabeus,¹ when the Church was renovated and catching its breath. Belonging to this class are Job, whose history was written abroad; Psalms and Proverbs, which books were written in a variety of circumstances and were gathered from various parts, and were finally finished at that time; Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which books belong to the last times; and last of all, Chamesh Megilloth, that is, the five scrolls, which, although belonging to different ages, were also joined together for the sake of convenience during that period. Now, they are the Song of Songs, Ruth, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, and Esther.”

But we rather reject this Division: 1. On account of its slippery foundation, inasmuch as diverse degrees of *θεοπνευστίας*/*inspiration* are supposed. We acknowledge various sorts of prophetic visions and perceptions: but here the sacred Amanuenses are considered, not in the mode of prophetic revelation, but in the act of writing; in which all were

¹ Judas Maccabeus was a Jewish priest. Provoked by the religious oppressions of the Seleucid Empire, he led a revolt, the successful prosecution of which brought a measure of independence, the cleansing of the Temple, and reformation. The principal years of his service were 167 to 160 BC.

strong in the same degree of *θεοπνευστίας*/*inspiration*, and equally enjoyed the immediate and infallible counsel and guidance of the Holy Spirit. 2. On account of the injury thus inflicted upon the divine dignity of the Books of the second and especially of the third orders, which, according to EPHODEUS in the *preface* to his *Grammar*,¹ are of so much less dignity than the Law that the *Law* deserves to be compared to the Holy of Holies, the *Prophets* to the Holy Place, and the *Hagiographa* only to the Courtyard. 3. On account of the unreasonable separation of the Historical Books. For no reason is able to be given as to why the Historical Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, are recorded among the Prophetic Books, and are separated from Books of the same subject matter, Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, etc. 4. Especially on account of the rejection of *Daniel* from the order of Prophetic Books, while nevertheless, a. it is clearly assigned to the Prophets by the Lord Himself, Matthew 24:15: b. while the Jews everywhere deny that Daniel was a *Prophet*, to whom revelation came *בנבואה*, by the Prophetic gift and influx, on the other hand JOSEPHUS himself, *Antiquities of the Jews*, book X, chapter XII, quite frequently calls him a *προφήτην*/*prophet*, pages 352, 354, sets him forth as *ἓνα τινὰ τῶν μεγίστων προφητῶν*, a certain one of the greatest prophets, page 353, and thence also magnifies his excellence in the Prophetic office, page 354; for he not only foretold future events like the other Prophets, but he also precisely defined the time upon which the fulfillment of those prophecies were destined to fall. Neither, c. are the Marks of a truly great Prophet able to be denied to Daniel: these are, for example, a. to receive Revelations immediately from God through visions and dreams, Numbers 12:6; but this is related expressly enough to have happened to Daniel, Daniel 7:1, 2, etc.; 8:1, 2, etc.; 10:1, 5-9, etc.: b. to communicate the Revelations received from God by mouth or writing to the Church, Jeremiah 23:28; but *Daniel* fulfilled this, Daniel 7:1, etc. c. It also especially belongs to the Prophets to prophesy concerning the Messiah and His days, Acts 3:24; but Daniel fulfilled this in an exceptional way, even indicating more clearly than all the rest the time of the coming Messiah, Daniel 9, to which are added most excellent prophecies concerning the destinies and successions of the kingdoms, Daniel 7; 8; 11. Therefore, Daniel was

¹ Profiat Duran (c. 1350-c. 1415) was a Spanish Jew and universal scholar. His interests included medicine, history, philosophy, polemical theology, and grammar. He wrote a Hebrew grammar entitled *Ma'aseh Efod*, whence he is sometimes called *Ephodeus*.

a *Prophet*, and rejoiced in the gift of prophecy, which the Jews attempt to subvert only by inane dreams, of which nothing is pertinent to make mention: WITSIUS dispels the same, *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XIX, § 21-25. Against the unbelieving that either maintain that the Book of *Daniel* was written only after the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus contains history, not Prophecy; or has at least been interpolated to an uncommon extent; goes PIERRE-DANIEL HUET, *Demonstratione Evangelica*, proposition IV, concerning the Prophecy of Daniel, § 11-14, pages 412-418; likewise WITSIUS, *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XIX, § 30-42; LILIENTHAL, *Oordeelk Bybelverklar*, chapter V, § 53-67, part 1, pages 444-466; STAPFER, *Theologica polemica*, tome 2, chapter X, § 293-312, pages 1079-1086; but also HENDRIK LUSSING, *de Necessitate Religionis in genere, et Certitudinis Christianæ in specie*, part II, dissertation VII, chapter III, § 910-934, pages 398-425, in which he also contends for the θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* of the Book of Daniel from the Prophecies occurring in the same. CARPZOV, *Introductione ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter VI, § 1-3, 6, pages 227-230, 235, 237, 242-244, 251-255, urges one and another thing just now asserted on behalf of the Prophet Daniel, and his Prophetic Book, and the Biblical Order of the same, at greater length. 5. Finally, it militates against that Judaic Division of the Old Testament that it is believed that *Malachi* sealed the Codex of the Old Testament with the final words of his Prophecy, Malachi 4:4-6; whence it appears that his books ought to occupy the final position in the Old Testament, no less than Revelation is placed in the last place in the New Testament, which likewise is observed to be sealed by John in Revelation 22:18-20.

c. If we consider the Christian, Ecclesiastical Divisions of the Codex of the Old Testament, GREGORY NAZIANZEN in his *Carminibus* also divided the entire Old Testament by a τριχοτομίαν/*trichotomy* into Books *Historical*, *Poetic*, and *Prophetic*. For him the Historical Books are those of Moses and the rest, which follow unto Job. The Poetic Books: Job with the Psalms and the Books of Solomon. The five Prophetic Books: first the twelve minor Prophets; then Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel. But, although in large part the Pentateuch be historical, yet generally it was wont to be called the *Law* in Sacred Scripture, and to be considered as a syntagma of especially legal Books.

EPIPHANIUS distributed the Old Testament into four *Pentateuchs* and one *binary*, in his *libro de mensuris et ponderibus*, chapter IV, *opera*, tome 2, page 162. For him the first Pentateuch is of βίβλων νομικῶν, *Law*

Books. A Pentateuch *στιχίρης* follows, of Books written in verse, which are Job, Psalms, and three Books of Solomon. Then he enumerates the third Pentateuch of Books, which are called *γραφεῖα*, *the Writings*, and by some *ἀγιόγραφα/Hagiographa*: for him these are the Book of Joshua, of Judges with Ruth, of Chronicles first and second, of Kings first and second, and finally of Kings third and fourth, with the binaries of Books compacted into one volume. To him the fourth Pentateuch is Prophetic, into which he places the *δωδεκαπρόφητον*, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, with the four major Prophets. Then he observes a binary of Books to remain, which are the Books of Ezra and Esther. Which same division is held by JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *Concerning the Orthodox Faith*, chapter XVIII, page m. 348, who, when he mentions Ezra and Esther in the last place, also observes concerning Ezra: *τοῦ Ἑσδρά αἱ δύο, εἰς μίαν συναπτομέναι βιβλόν*, *the two of Ezra are joined together in one book.*

d. “Finally,” says our AUTHOR, “the *Scholastics*, with many of our Theologians, not incorrectly distribute these Books into *Legal, Historical, Dogmatic*, which are also *Poetic*, and *Prophetic.*” Thus he enumerates five Legal Books of Moses; twelve Historical Books from Joshua to Job; five Dogmatic and Poetic Books, which are Job, Psalms, and three Books of Solomon, and finally seventeen Prophetic Books. Which quadripartite division best answers to the thematic ordering of the Books, which are found arranged according to this order in the Greek Version of the Septuagint, the Latin Versions of the Vulgate and Junius and Tremellius,¹ and other Versions, and our Dutch Bible. Neither did ABARBANEL have sufficient reasons on account of which he might ridicule this division of the Christians in his *preface* to his *Commentary on Joshua*: see Reverend BEELS’ *Bybeloeffeningen*, page 14.

And these indeed are the Books that among the Jews for ages constituted the Canon of *βιβλίων θεοπνεύστων*, *inspired books*; while without reason by some Christians there has been doubt concerning the Divinity of the book of ESTHER: in favor of its Divine Origin and Canonical Authority, having been written by Ezra, or by Mordecai, or even by another, uncertain author, see GULIELMUS SALDENUS’ *Otia*

¹ John Immanuel Tremellius (1510-1580) converted from Judaism to Christianity and quickly embraced the principles of the Reformation. He taught Hebrew at Strasburg (1541) and at Cambridge (succeeding Paul Fagius in 1549), and served as Professor of Old Testament at Heidelberg (1561). Together with Franciscus Junius, he produced a major Latin translation of the Scriptures.

Theologica, book III, exercitatio V; HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book II, chapter I, section III, page 494; LEYDEKKER'S *de Republica Hebræorum*, tome 2, book VI, chapter V; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 8, pages 762, 763, § 12, pages 818-822, tome II; CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XX, § 6, 7, pages 365-372; WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam*, part II, book I, section II, subsection V, pages 90, 91; NONNEN'S¹ *Disputationem inauguralem pro canonica Cantici auctoritate*, chapter I, § 14, n. 1, chapter II, § 4, n. 2; while most recently both the historical verity and the canonical authority of the book of *Esther* was defended in an exceptional manner against Oeder,² Semler,³ and Michaelis by JACQUES ALEXANDRE VOS in his *Oratione pro libro Estheræ*, delivered at Utrecht in 1775. On the other hand, it could be objected:

1. That in the entire Book of *Esther*, the name of God or *Jehovah* does not occur. But SPANHEIM *Responds, Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, epoch VIII, chapter VI, § I, number 3, column 422: *It should not offend anyone that the name of God is nowhere expressed in this Book; which overtly recounts the remarkable Providence of God in the preservation of the Church, Prayers poured out to Him, the giving of Thanks, a Feast unto His honor, etc.* That is, α. In the examination of the θεοπνευστίας/*inspiration* of a book, it appears that regard is to be had, not so much to the *divine Names*, the use of which of itself in any book does not constitute a criterion of Divinity, as to the *divine matters*, which most certainly occur in this Book. β. What about the fact that in the entire *Song* of Solomon also no express *Name of God* occurs, except יהוה/*Jah* in a composite word, *Song of Songs* 8:6?⁴ γ. And, although in *Ecclesiastes* the

¹ Nicolaus Nonnen (1701-1772) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology (1729-1749), and then Professor of Practical Philosophy (1749-1772), at Bremen.

² Georg Ludwig Oeder (1694-1760) was a German Lutheran pastor and theologian.

³ Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791) was a German Lutheran theologian, and served as Professor of Theology at Halle. He was an early proponent of a purely historical handling of the Scripture, separating matters of history from dogma. He challenged the doctrine of the providential preservation of the Scripture in purity and integrity, and the divine authority of the canon.

⁴ *Song of Songs* 8:6: "Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm: for love is strong as death; jealousy is cruel as the grave: the coals thereof are coals of fire, which hath a most vehement flame (הַשֵּׁלֶתֶתֶת, a *Jah-flame*, a flame of the most powerful kind)."

name אֱלֹהִים/*Elohim* is found, yet the name יהוה/*Jehovah* does not occur there either. δ. If the divine Names were not found in the entire Codex of Scripture, it would be another matter: and so it is to be observed here, that concerning the Criteria for the Divinity of Sacred Scripture in general it is wont to be noted, that they are to be sought, not in the individual periscopes or parts of the Canon, but in the entire complex of the Canon. ε. It does not appear that the reason is to be investigated with over much care, as to why God would wish His Name to be left unmentioned in this Book: perhaps HOTTINGER, *Thesauro Philologico*, book II, chapter I, section III, page 494, supposes not incorrectly that this was done because this history of Esther was translated from the Chronicles of the Kings of Persia for the use of the greater part of the people, for the fidelity of the narration. ζ. It suffices that no Hebrew rejected the Book of Esther for this reason; but that they not only enumerated it among the Hagiographa, but received it with equal reverence with the Pentateuch.

2. Moreover, it could be *objected*, that some of the Ancients, when they enumerate the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, either omit the *Book of Esther*; or even segregate it from the Canonical Books, and refer it to the Books that were wont only to be read to catechumens: on behalf of which appeal is made to Melito,¹ Gregory Nazianzen,² Junilius,³ Athanasius,⁴ and the Author of the Synopsis of Sacred Scripture found in the works of Athanasius: see SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica*, book III, *exercitation* V, § 3; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, page 820, tome II. But I Respond, α. Perhaps in the list of Melito, by a mistake of the copyist, on account of the similarity of the names *Esdras* and *Esther*, the latter was omitted; which defect others in turn were able to perpetuate, who in the

¹ Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chapter XXVI. Melito (died c. 180) was Bishop of Sardis, near Smyrna in Asia Minor. Melito provides what may be the earliest surviving list of the Christian canon of the Old Testament which closely parallels that received by Protestants, excepting its omission of Esther.

² *Carmina Dogmatica*, book I, section I, *carmen* XII.

³ Junillus Africanus (flourished in the mid-sixth century) served as an officer in Justinian I's court. He is remembered for his *Institutis regulariis divinae legis*, a work of Biblical exegesis, mediating the thought of the school of Antioch to Western Christendom. He discusses matters pertaining to the Historical Books in book I, section 3.

⁴ *Easter Letter* of 367.

enumeration of the Biblical Books had the list of Melito before their eyes. This is made all the more probable, given the fact that in Melito's list of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, as EUSEBIUS exhibits the same, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chapter XXVI, it seems that the number of Books appears to be twenty-one, rather than twenty-two, of which, nevertheless, in accordance with the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, the Ancients are found to be fond in this matter. It is not the case, what SALDENUS, *Otiis Theologicis*, book III, *exercitation V*, § 3, accepts, that this is not able to be inferred from the writing of *Melito*, seeing that he, by the testimony of EUSEBIUS, *does not even make any mention of Ezra*: since, at least in Valois' edition of EUSEBIUS' *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chapter XXVI, Ἐσδρας/*Esdras* expressly appears in the *Canon of Melito* immediately after *Ezekiel* as the last of all.

β. Those that leave the *Book of Esther* unmentioned in the index of Canonical Books were also able tacitly to comprehend the same under another book, presumably under *Ezra*, whom many hold to be the author of the same; lest they should exceed the number of the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, to which number they desired to render that number of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament equal; as it is in the *Synopsis of Sacred Scripture*, *opera Athanasii*, tome 2, page 58, Ὅμοῦ τὰ κανονιζόμενα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία εἴκοσι δύο, ἰσάριθμα τοῖς γράμμασι τῶν Ἑβραίων· τοσαῦτα γάρ εἰσι παρ' αὐτοῖς τὰ στοιχεῖα, *The canonized books of the Old Testament are twenty-two in all, equal to the letters of the Hebrews: for just so many are their elements/sounds/letters*. Again, page 59, Τινὲς μέντοι τῶν παλαιῶν εἰρήκασιν κανονίζεσθαι παρ' Ἑβραίοις, καὶ τὴν Ἑσθήρ· καὶ τὴν μὲν Ρουθ, μετὰ τῶν κριτῶν ἐνουμένην εἰς ἓν βιβλίον ἀριθμεῖσθαι, τὴν δὲ Ἑσθήρ, εἰς ἕτερον ἓν· καὶ οὕτω πάλιν, εἰς εἴκοσι δύο συμπληροῦσθαι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν κανονιζομένων παρ' αὐτοῖς βιβλίων, *They say that, indeed, such of the ancient Books are canonized among the Hebrews, even Esther: and that Ruth, united with Judges, is reckoned as one book, but Esther as another one: and that thus again the number of their canonized Books is brought up to twenty-two*.

γ. On the other hand, when they proscribed the *Book of Esther* from the order of Canonical Books, they were able to understand either the entire *Book of Esther* together with the Apocryphal appendix of six chapters, which chapters are not found in the Hebrew Codex, but only in the Septuagint Version, and thence translated into the Vulgate; or this appendix considered

separately: one may gather this from the same *Synopsis of Sacred Scripture* just now mentioned, page 58, where, while it was related that Ἐκτὸς δὲ τούτων εἰσὶ πάλιν ἕτερα βιβλία τῆς αὐτῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα δὲ μόνον τοῖς κατηγουμένοις ταῦτα, besides these there were again other Books of the Old Testament that were not canonized, but were only read to those were being catechized, among the Books of the latter sort is also mentioned Ἐσθήρ, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ· ἔτους δευτέρου βασιλεύοντος Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μεγάλου, τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ Νεισαῖν, ἐνύπνιον εἶδε Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ τοῦ Ἰαείρου τοῦ Σεμεεὶ τοῦ Κισαίου, ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίμ, *Esther, of which this was the beginning: in the second year of the reign of Artaxerxes the Greek, on the first of Nisan, Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, beheld a dream.* Now, this is not the *beginning* of the Canonical Book of Esther; indeed, those words are not found anywhere in this entire Book: but in the Apocryphal Appendix of the Book of Esther, Esther 11:2 according to the Vulgate Version, which the Dutch Version follows: while in the Septuagint in the London Polyglot Bible these words do indeed constitute the ἀρχὴν/*beginning* of the Apocryphal appendix of the Book of Esther. δ. Whatever the case may be, those Fathers that did not reckon *Esther* among the Canonical Books were men liable to error, against whom one may oppose the authority of others, namely, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephiphanius, Hilary, Jerome, etc.; see GERHARD VAN MASTRICHT'S¹ *Canonem Sacrae Scripturae, secundem seriem Seculorum Novi Testamenti* in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis, classis VII, fascicule I, chapter I, pages 2 and following*; and WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam, part II, book I, in the Appendix of Section I, pages 54-60.* ε. But, indeed, in this cause the authority of the Hebrew Canon of the Jews ought to prevail over all, having been approved by the Lord and His Apostles, in the midst of which the *Book of Esther* was beyond all doubt always recognized.

II. α. Next, in the *Canon of the New Testament* our AUTHOR enumerates twenty-seven Books; the Most Illustrious JOHANNES ENS, in his *Diatribē de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti*, diffusely taught that these same Books so consistently made up the Canon of the New Testament that, when certain pious men have from time to time stirred up doubt concerning one or the other of these Books, they did not so much doubt whether that Book was wont to be included in the Canon by

¹ Gerhard von Mastricht (1639-1721) was a German lawyer.

the Church *de facto*, but only whether that was done *de jure*, and whether its divine authority was sufficiently evident.

β. The Fathers divide these Books of the New Testament into two major parts, calling these *the Evangelical and Apostolic Canon, the Evangelical and Apostolic books, εὐαγγελίων πίστιν καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν, the deposit of the Gospels and the tradition of the Apostles*. Our AUTHOR commends to us a *τριχοτομίαν/trichotomy* of these Books, according to which they are found in the New Testament, thus called from their greater part, 1. five *Historical Books*, names, the Gospels with Acts, 2. twenty-one *Dogmatical Books*, namely, fourteen Epistles of Paul, seven Epistles of the other Apostles, which are wont to be called *Catholic*, concerning the sense of which differentiating designation I treated at length in my Dutch Commentary on 2 Peter 1, pages 4-6, 3. one *Prophetic Book*, namely, the Apocalypse: which division the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN, in his *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, Dissertation III*, thinks is to be preferred even to the other.

Nevertheless, our AUTHOR does not ignore the fact that among these Books of the New Testament also there were formerly in the Church and even in the age of the Reformation certain *ἀντιλεγομένουσ/ disputed Books*. That is, from Origen in the third century to Athanasius in the fourth century. Doctors, a fair number, and of eminent authority in the Church, doubted, not only of some individual pericopes, that is, of Mark 16:9-20; Luke 22:43, 44; John 8:1-12 (concerning which, LEUSDEN in his *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, dissertation III, § 5, page 15, dissertation V, § 10, page 35*; RUMPÆUS in his *Commentatione critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros, § XLI, pages 227 and following*; HARENBERG¹ in *Bibliotheca Bremense, classis II, fascicule II, chapter I, § 16-21, pages 248-275*; and MARCKIUS, with respect to Luke 22:43, 44, in *Exercitationibus textualibus, Part VI, Exercitation XXXIV, § 15, and with respect to John 8:1-12, Exercitationibus textualibus, Part V, Exercitation XXXVIII, § 1*); but they, being doubtful concerning entire Books, were at a loss whether they were rightfully entered into the Canon of the New Testament: thus indeed EUSEBIUS relates the matter, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica, book III, chapter XXV*, in which, after a fair number of the Books of the New Testament are reviewed, he adds:

¹ Johann Christoph Harenberg (1696-1774) was an evangelical German Lutheran theologian and historian. He served as Professor of History and Antiquities at Brunswick (1745-1774).

καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις· τῶν δὲ ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δὲ οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἢ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται, καὶ ἡ Ἰουδα, ἥτε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολὴ, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγγάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἐτέρου ὁμονύμου ἐκείνω· —Ἔτι τε ὡς ἔφην ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις εἰ φανεῖη, ἦν τινες ὡς ἔφην ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις, *And these are among the accepted writings: Among the disputed writings, which are nevertheless well-known to many, are extant the so-called epistle of James, and that of Jude, also the second epistle of Peter, and those that are called the second and third of John, whether they happen to belong to the Evangelist or to another person of the same name: —and besides, as I said, the Apocalypse of John, if it seem proper, which some, as I said, reject, but which others reckon among the accepted books, concerning which AMPHILOCHIUS, in his Jambis ad Seleucum, surveying the θεοπνεύστους/inspired Books in verses 308, 309:*

Τινὲς δὲ φασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους νόθον,
Οὐκ εὖ λέγοντες, γνησία γὰρ ἡ χάρις.

*But that which is to the Hebrews is said to be spurious
By some, but incorrectly, for the grace is genuine.*

But, that these things are in no way prejudicial to the Canonical authority of these Books, shall be easily demonstrated; if I in a few words point out just how slight are the reasons that have led pious Men into doubt, and have troubled them. In general, the heresy of the *Marcionites* in the second century, diffused far and wide, was able to give the first occasion to these doubts; inasmuch as those heretics were rejecting all the Books just now enumerated, with TERTULLIAN testifying in his *libris adversus Marcionem*, and EPIPHANIUS in *Hæresi XLII*. In particular:

1. With respect to the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, many of the Latins doubted of it, *a.* because they were uncertain concerning Paul's authorship. But I have shown that this came to pass in a questionable manner, in § 12; neither does this then make for the subversion of the divine and Canonical authority of any Book; consult § 12. *b.* Because they were rashly supposing that in Hebrews 6 and 10 the error of the Novatians concerning the non-admittance of the Lapsed to repentance was established, etc.; see SPANHEIM, *Miscellaneis Sacrorum Antiquorum*, book II, part I, chapter VIII, columns 207-213, *opera*, tome 2,

relating this matter, and showing the rash doubt concerning the *ἀθεντία*/ *authenticity* of this Epistle.

2. The EPISTLE OF JAMES was suspected, *a.* because οὐ πολλοὶ τῶν πάλαι αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, *not many of the Ancients make mention of it*, according to EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book II, chapter XXIII, *toward the end*; it is evident of itself just how inane this is, especially since this Epistle was being read in many Churches with the rest, as the same EUSEBIUS testifies *in the same place*. *b.* In the age of the Reformation, LUTHER did not at first acknowledge the Canonical authority of this Epistle, who was followed by *Illyricus*,¹ *Osiander*,² the *Centuriators of Magdeburg*,³ and other *Lutherans*; because the Epistle of James appeared to them to stray not a little from the analogy of Apostolic doctrine, while he ascribes justification, not to faith alone, but to works: see LAURENTIUS⁴ on the *Epistolam Jacobi*, *on the title*, pages 1, 2; ECKHARDUS⁵ in his *Fasciculo Controversiarum cum Calvino*, chapter I, question 4, pages 19-21; we shall see how rashly these things are presumed in Chapter XXIV, § 15. It is regarded as correct, what the Most Illustrious WOLF writes in his *Curis philologicis et criticis*, when in the *Prolegomenis ad hanc Epistolam* he treats of its divine and Canonical authority: "The Blessed Luther's sinister judgment concerning that is not able to be brought as a reproach against our Church, since ὁ μακαρίτης,

¹ Matthæus Flaccius Illyricus (1520-1575) was a Lutheran divine. He served as Professor of Hebrew at Wittenburg (1544), then as Professor of New Testament at Jena (1557). He made great contributions in the fields of church history and hermeneutics. He wrote *Clavem Scripturæ Sacræ seu de Sermone Sacrarum Literarum* and *Glossam Compendiariam in Novum Testamentum*.

² Lucas Osiander (1534-1604) was a Lutheran theologian. He produced an edition of the Vulgate with supplemental annotations and corrections, inserting Luther's translation in the places in which the Vulgate departs from the Hebrew. He was also an accomplished composer of music.

³ The *Magdeburg Centuries* is an ecclesiastical history covering the first one thousand and three hundred years of the Church, which was compiled by certain Lutheran scholars in Magdeburg, known as the *Centuriators of Magdeburg*, led by Matthias Flacius Illyricus. It is a pioneering work in ecclesiastical history, which aims to show the substantial uniformity of the faith of God's people throughout the centuries, while tracing the parallel development of Antichristian Romanism.

⁴ Jacob Laurentius (1585-1644) was a Dutch Reformed minister. He wrote *Epistolam Jacobi, Perpetuo Commentario Explicatam*.

⁵ Heinrich Eckhard (1580-1624) was a German Lutheran Pastor and Theologian.

the blessed one, himself modified it, neither is there anyone among us today that calls its trustworthiness into doubt:" see also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, pages 1485b, 1486.

3. Concerning the Canonical authority of the SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER some have doubted, because, a. They were uncertain whether it was to be ascribed to Peter: which, a. would not then take away its divine authority, b. rests upon a slight foundation, taken from differences of style; c. by reasons of greater moment, sought from the argument of the Epistle, it is demonstrated that it certainly belongs to Peter. b. They rashly thought that in 2 Peter 3:13 a third new earth was promised after the dissolution of all things: see *Commentarium meum in 2 Peter 1*, pages 20-22.

4. There was doubt concerning the SECOND and THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN, because the Author calls himself the Πρεσβύτερος/*Elder*; but just how vain that is was already observed on § 12.

5. There was dispute concerning the EPISTLE OF JUDE, a. because a great many of the Ancients are as silent concerning it as concerning the Epistle of James according to EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book II, chapter XXIII, which proves nothing. b. Because from the *Book of Enoch*, which is Apocryphal, and perhaps from another Apocryphal Book, testimony is thought to be received in it, in the case of the Prophecy of Enoch recited and the dispute of Michael the Archangel with the Devil concerning the Body of Moses commemorated: which proves nothing, neither is it able to be proven: consult § 3 of *this Chapter*. c. Because the author of this Epistle speaks of the *Apostles* as one of their disciples, and as one following their times: d. Because it contains almost nothing that was not borrowed from the latter Epistle of Peter; see ECKHARDUS' *Fasciculum Controversiarum cum Calvino*, chapter I, question 4, pages 19-21: the *former* of which LUTHER rashly takes to himself out of verse 17, on which see *the marginal notes of the Dutch Bible* and SPANHEIM'S *Miscellanea Sacrorum Antiquorum*, book II, part III, chapter V, column 262; neither is the *later* easily able to be proven: while others in CALOVIUS' *Bibliis Illustratis* on *this Epistle*, page 1689, maintain that the Apostle Peter brought over many things from the Epistle of Jude; which nevertheless is repugnant to the common opinion, which relates that the Epistle of Jude was written after 2 Peter, even by a comparison of the future tense in 2 Peter 2:1 with the past tense in Jude 4. But it

would suffice to have responded with GOMARUS, *opera, part II, page 485*, “Finally, they object that no writings of the Apostles were transcribed from another source, for they were immediately from the Holy Spirit. But this Epistle was transcribed from another source, namely, from 2 Peter 2. Therefore, it is not the writing of an Apostle. But the minor premise is denied, while we say nothing of the major. For, although this Epistle agrees in many things with 2 Peter 2, nevertheless it has some things diverse. The same Spirit is the author of the Epistles of Peter and of Jude, and He dictated the same doctrine to both: and His latter words, set forth by Jude, He illustrated by the testimony of His words, formerly written by the ministry of Peter. In which matter, nothing is absurd: just as Paul wrote nearly the same things in Ephesians 4 and in Colossians 3 by the government of the same Spirit. Similarly a good part of the Prophecy of Obadiah is found in the other Prophets by the inspiration of the same Spirit.” for more things in favor of the divine and canonical authority of this Epistle see GOMARUS, *opera, part II*, before his Exposition of the Epistle of Jude, *pages 485, 486*; CALOVIUS, *Bibliis Illustratis* on Jude 1, *pages 1689, 1690*; JOHANN CHRISTOPH WOLF, *Prolegomenis in Epistola Judæ*.

6. Finally, there were doubts concerning the APOCALYPSE OF JOHN, *a.* because they supposed that John was not its author, which we saw was done without good reason in § 12. *b.* Because this Book seems obscure, supported by no grounds, having nothing of the Apostolic gravity. But in part these things are the chatterings arising from men unlearned and rash, who were not yet thoroughly instructed concerning the certainty of the Apocalyptic prophecies: in part the obscurity is to be imputed to the prophetic argument. *c.* Some believed that the heretic Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse, because they thought that Revelation 20:1-10 favors his doctrine concerning the earthly reign of Christ. But, *a.* they were led away into error by a *παρερμηνεία/misinterpretation of the passage cited*: *b.* if the Apocalypse was by Cerinthus, other errors of Cerinthus would also be found in the Apocalypse: but as it is, *c.* valid arguments against the heresy of Cerinthus are able to be drawn from this book. For the Canonical authority of the Apocalypse, consult GOMARUS on *capita priora Apocalypseos, opera, part II, pages 489-491*; SPANHEIM'S *Xenia Romano-catholicorum, Dilemma XII, opera, tome 3, columns 1138, 1139*; WOLF'S *Prolegomena in Apocalypsi in Curis Philologicis et criticis, pages 371-373*; TWELLS' *Vindicias Apocalypsos apud Wolfium, pages 387-429*; but also

JOHANN CHRISTOPH HARENBERG'S *Stricturas in probra, quæ adversus Johannis Apocalypsin leguntur in libro*, Dictionaire philosophique portative par Monsieur de Voltaire, *Bibliotheca Bremensis nova, classis VI, fascicule II, chapter III, pages 42-98.*

Concerning the rest of the ἀντιλεγόμενοι/*disputed* Books of the New Testament, consult JOHANNES ENS in his *Diatribæ de Librorum Novi Testamenti Canone, chapter XII, page 371 and following, especially Distinction III, pages 384-413.*

Our AUTHOR proceeds: *There has been no place here for the confutation of, α. the SAMARITANS in their rejection of the Prophets after Moses.* This is related concerning the Samaritans by the Jews and Ancient Christians with unanimous consent. Thus they are called in *Benjamin's Itinerario*,¹ *שומרי תורת משה לבדה*, *observers of the Mosaic Law alone.* Thus also EPIPHANIUS has concerning the Samaritans in *book I adversus Hæreses, opera, tome I, page 24, § 2, Διαφέρονται δὲ οὗτοι Ἰουδαίους κατὰ τοῦτο πρῶτον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς προφητῶν τῶν μετὰ Μωϋσέα γραφή, ἢ μόνον ἡ δοθεῖσα πεντάτευχος διὰ Μωϋσέως τῷ σπέρματι Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ τῆς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου πορείας· φημὶ δὲ Γένεσις, καὶ Ἐξοδος, καὶ Λευιτικὸν, καὶ Ἀριθμοὶ, καὶ Δευτερονόμιον, These differ from the Jews concerning this first, that they were given no text of the prophets after Moses, but only the Pentateuch, which was given to the seed of Israel by Moses, in the Exodus of their march from Egypt, namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy; which things are repeated and confirmed in book I adversus Hæreses, opera, tome I, page 28, § 5, περὶ δὲ Προφητῶν, ἐπειδὴ ἔφθη αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι ἢ πεντάτευχος, οὐκετι ταῖς ἄλλαις γραφαῖς ἐστοίχησαν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῃ τῇ Πεντατεύχῳ, καὶ οὐ τῇ λοιπῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ· κἄν τε δὲ αὐτοῖς εἶπη τις νυνὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, φημὶ δὲ περὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἡσαίου, καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς, οὐ παραδέχονται, κατεχόμενοι παραδόσει τῇ προαχθείσῃ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων πατέρων, But concerning the Prophets, since the Pentateuch alone came at the first to be given to them, they submitted to no other scriptures, but to the Pentateuch alone, and not to the others following. Hence today, if one should speak to them of the others, I say, of David, Isaiah, and those after them, they do not receive them, being prevented by the tradition that has been brought to them from their ancestors.* The Samaritans themselves acknowledge this in *Epistola ad Ludolfum a Cellario edita, page*

¹ Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela (died 1173) was a Spanish Jew, who chronicled his travels through Europe and Asia, unto the very borders of China.

2, and likewise in *Epistola 2 ad Scaligerum*, page 131; and the relations of *Pietro della Valle*,¹ *Maundrell*,² and other travelers. Which all they prohibit, lest we should easily give credence to BASNAGE'S³ contrary conjectures, which he sets forth in his *Histoire de Juifs*, book II, chapter III, who maintains that the Samaritans indeed admit the Mosaic Books alone as the rule of faith, yet they also receive the remaining Historical Books with a lesser degree of dignity; either because the Jews did not honor the same with equal veneration, or because they were not of so much necessity and use as the Mosaic Books. These ill-considered conjectures of *Basnage* against universal tradition will less compel assent, the more fully the occasion of this Samaritan error is uncovered. 1. For, before the Assyrian deportation, the remaining Books of the Old Testament besides the Pentateuch hardly appear to have been received by the kingdom of the Ten tribes. Indeed, at the time of the schism, the Prophetic Books were not yet written; but, the reception of the Historical and Hagiographical Books, which were extant at that time, together with the Prophetic Books, which were added thereafter, by Jeroboam and his successors, was hindered by domestic considerations, both political and ecclesiastical: namely, in those Books holy and solemn worship was bound to Jerusalem alone: on the other hand, the defection and idolatry of the Ten tribes was continually condemned by the Prophets, who lived in succession among the people of God. 2. That Priest, returning from Assyria unto Israel, had the care only of the divine Law, consigned by Moses, that he might instill it in the new colonists;⁴ while this alone was embraced as the sum of religion and worship, the remaining things that are delivered in the Historical Books had little bearing upon those foreigners. 3. And while, after the return from the Babylonian Captivity, Ezra and his colleagues arranged the sacred Books into one corpus and sytagma, as it were, the hatred that even then had been provoked in the hearts of the Samaritans against the Jews, and that was being stirred up daily, hindered their reception of the Canon gathered by Ezra and his colleagues as divine, or their acknowledgement

¹ Pietro della Valle (1586-1652) was an Italian nobleman and scholar. He traveled extensively in the Near East, including the Holy Land.

² Henry Maundrell (1665-1701) was an English scholar and clergyman. In the midst of his chaplaincy to the Levant Company in Syria, he wrote *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter Anno Domini 1697*.

³ Jacques Basnage (1653-1723) was a French Protestant pastor, theologian, and historian.

⁴ 2 Kings 17:25-41.

of the authority of the latest Prophets in the Jewish Church. But how greatly the Samaritans strayed from the right path in this, is indeed shown by the approbation of the Jewish Codex by Christ and the Apostles, and by the continual conjunction in their sermons of the *Prophets* with the *Law*: consult our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Miscellaneas, Disputation IV*, which is concerning *Samaritanism*; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter IV*, § 1-3, pages 585-599.

Our AUTHOR thinks that the same rejection of the Prophets and Hagiographa as is found among the Samaritans is attributed to the SADDUCEES without foundation. Nevertheless, we find that ORIGEN had already of old written thus, *contra Celsum, book I, page m. 38*, κἄν οἱ μόνου δὲ Μωσέως παραδεχόμενοι τὰς βίβλους Σαμαρεῖς ἢ Σαδδουκαῖοι φάσκωσιν ἐν ἐκείνοις πεπροφητεῦσθαι τὸν Χριστόν, *although the Samaritan and Sadducees, who receive the books of Moses alone, would say that in them the Christ has been prophesied*. TERTULLIAN also affirms the same concerning the Sadducees, *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, chapter XLV*; and JEROME on Matthew 22:31-33; whose words DRUSIUS cites, following hard upon their steps, *de tribus Judæorum sectis, book III, chapter IX*. Of the same opinion are GROTIUS on Matthew 22:23; and PRIDEAUX in his *History of the Jews, part II, book V, columns 1110, 1111, § 2, etc.* Yet, so that we might not concede unto the same also, do these things make, which JOSEPH SCALIGER places opposite in *Elencho Trihæresii, chapter XVI*, among which are, 1. that neither the Lord, nor the Apostles or Writers of the New Testament, nor Josephus, treating of the Sadducees or disputing with them, ever indicated to us this as their error: contrariwise, that they rejected only unwritten traditions, JOSEPHUS appears to indicate with sufficient clarity, *book XIII of Antiquities of the Jews, chapter XIII, page 454*, when he says that Σαδδουκαίων γένος λέγον ἐκείνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δὲ ἐκ παραδόσεως πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν, *the sect of the Sadducees said that those observances which have been written are necessary to hold, but not to keep those from the tradition of the fathers*. 2. Also, the High Priests were appointed from the sect of the Sadducees: but it hardly, or not even hardly, appears credible that a High Priest sat at Jerusalem that acknowledged the Pentateuch alone and repudiated the other sacred Books. 3. Is it not so that the Sadducees were not only present for the Reading, but they themselves were reading, when the functions fell to them, in the Synagogues, not only the

legal Parashah, but also the Prophetic Haphtarah?¹ On this point, therefore, the *Sadducees* appear to have been confused with the *Samaritans*. That the Sadducees rejected all the Holy Books except Moses no less than the Samaritans, learned men persuade themselves from this, that Christ, when disputing with the Sadducees in favor of the Resurrection of the Dead, with many clear testimonies of other Writers upon this matter disregarded, appeals to Moses alone, from whom he proves this point only by consequence, Matthew 22:31, 32. But, *a.* with the Sadducees objecting from Moses, the Lord rightly wished also to respond from Moses, by comparison with *verses* 23, 24.² *b.* Perhaps the Lord judged them unworthy, whom He might have convinced with more and clearer proofs concerning this matter, by comparison with Matthew 13:10-15: consult CARPZOV'S *Apparatum Antiquitatum Sacrorum ad Goodwini Moses and Aaron*, pages 208, 209.

β. Our AUTHOR does not wish to confute "the many *Ancient Heretics* in their malignant repudiation of individual Books of the Old or New Testament." Namely, those who, as these or those Books of Sacred Scripture were more directly opposing their errors, were audaciously repudiating the Canonical authority of the same. Thus, after the *Simonians in the first century*,³ many and nearly all Heretics of the *second Century* rejected the *Law of Moses* and the *Prophets* as proceeding from an evil God. In particular, unto this end *Marcion* earnestly endeavored to show through affected antitheses that the Law is contrary to the Gospel. So also his disciple *Apelles*,⁴ *Tatian*,⁵ and the *Manichæans*, against whom AUGUSTINE stenuously defends the divine and canonical authority of

¹ The Haphtarah is a series of selections taken from the Prophetic Books read in public worship. The Haphtarah is thematically related to the preceding legal Parashah.

² See Deuteronomy 25:5-10.

³ The Simonians were a Gnostic sect; they claimed to be followers of Simon Magus (see Acts 8:9-24). The Church Fathers sometimes refer to him as the father of all heresies.

⁴ Apelles (flourished mid-second century) was a disciple of Marcion, probably at Rome. However, he may have had views differing somewhat from those of his teacher.

⁵ Tatian the Assyrian (c. 120-c. 180) was a Christian theologian and apologist. He is most remembered for his *Diatessaron*, his harmony of the four gospels, which was used in the Syriac church until the fifth century. In his *Oratio ad Græcos*, he extols the virtues and antiquity of Christianity, and critiques paganism. Some shadow has been cast over his name by accusations of heresy from Irenæus and Eusebius.

the Old Testament; see CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter II, § 6, pages 28-30. And, with respect to the New Testament, it should suffice to relate the words of SPANHEIM *the Younger* from *Disputation X de Fundamentalibus Fidei Capitibus*, § 7, *opera*, tome 3, column 1334: "For example," says he, "from the *Gospels* Faustus Manichæus¹ admitted nothing as written in the Apostolic Spirit; the Ebionites and Nazarenes, only *Matthew*; Cerinthus and his followers, only *Mark*; the Marcionites, only *Luke*; Valentinus² and his, only *John*, in the writings of Irenæus, Eusebius, etc. The same Writers relate that thus the *Acts of the Apostles* was rejected without any shame by Cerdo,³ Tatian, and Manichæus; all the writings of *Paul*, by Ebion and the family of the Heclsesaites;⁴ but the majority, by Marcion. Not to mention the authority of the Epistles of *James*, *Peter*, *Jude*, and *John*, more frequently called into question, or denied, but of the *Apocalypse* especially." Add WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, *exercitation VI*, § 6, pages 149, 150.

γ. Neither does our AUTHOR wish to confute "certain Socinians, attacking especially the authority of the SONG OF SONGS and the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:" SPANHEIM, *de Auctoritate Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, book II of *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquorum*, part I, chapter I, § 1, column 173, "Various of the ancients, indeed, of the more recent especially from the school of *Socinus*, are reported to have moved...the monuments of Solomon." And § 2, column 174, "Yet it has hardly been disputed to such an extent as concerning the authority of that most famous Epistle that is inscribed *to the Hebrews*. That is, its authority has been most consistently discredited, to whose doctrine it was always adverse. *Marcion* repudiated it, chiefly out of a hatred for the Old Testament, deeming with indignation the most painstaking comparison

¹ Faustus of Mileve (fourth century) was a celebrated Manichæan teacher. While a Manichæan, Augustine, wrestling with questions, sought an audience with him. Finding Faustus unable to answer his questions, Augustine rejected Manichæism as a collection of unsubstantiated fables.

² Valentinus (c. 100-c. 160) was perhaps the most influential Gnostic of his day, with many followers. Although his work survives only in fragments, his system continued, albeit in modified forms, in his disciples.

³ Cerdo was an early second century Syrian docetic gnostic. He taught that there were two Gods: the vengeful and demanding creator God of the Old Testament, and the loving and merciful God of the New Testament revealed in Jesus Christ.

⁴ The Heclsesaites were a second- and third-century party of Ebionites. Little is known of them.

of types with antitypes, ...the Old Testament with the New, in this Epistle. *Ebion* was in the same iniquity, with his altogether misguided zeal for the Law and its ceremonies. *Arius*,¹ and the other Antitrinitarians, are of the same opinion, on account of the Divinity of the Son of God asserted so clearly and vindicated in it, etc. Some ancient Latins agreed, the *Africans*, and especially the *Romans*, almost to the times of Jerome, especially because the Epistle seems to support *Novatian* and the *Novatians* concerning not receiving the lapsed unto favor; etc. Even now, there are certain men of the *Socinians*, in many ways injurious to this Epistle and insolent, although more cautiously, according to their usual practice, and with more secretiveness; namely, with the same thrust as the Marcionites and Arians, even that it was enough of an indictment against the Author of the Epistle to have demonstrated both the divinity of Christ and the excellent use of the Old Testament under the New, and the essential agreement of both.” But the *Song of Song*'s divine authority and spiritual sense against the religious crisis of various couples are upheld by our Most Illustrious AUTHOR in his *Prologo et Commentario ad Inscriptionem Cantici*; WITSIUS in *tome I* of his *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, *book I, chapter XVIII*, § 38-40; CARPZOV and NICOLAUS NONNEN *against Whiston*, the former indeed in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, *part III, chapter IV*, § 8, *pages 898-917*, but the latter in his *Disputatione inaugurali pro Canonica Auctoritate Cantici Canticorum*, held at Utrecht on April 6, 1725; and also CARPZOV in his *Introductione ad Libros Poeticos Veteris Testamenti*, *chapter VI*, § 3, 7, *pages 247-252, 261-266*; while I now find in PHILASTRIUS' *Hæresi de Cantici Canticorum Libro*, concerning which he says: “There is a heresy, which disputes concerning the Song of Songs, and does not esteem the things commended by the same to men as worthy of the divine Spirit, but for the sake of human affairs and pleasures:” see what things follow *in that place* additionally. Also in favor of Solomonic authorship of the Song of Songs, and the Canonical authority of this book, read FINDLAY'S *Verdediging der Heilige Schriften tegen de Voltaire*, *part 2, section 6*, *pages 87-108, 131-133*; and LILIENTHAL'S *Oordeelk Bybelverklar*, *chapter VI*, § 88-91, *part 2, pages 155-161*. Indeed, how the authority of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is vindicated by TWELLS, see in WOLF'S *Prolegomenis in Epistola*

¹ Arius (c. 250-336) was a presbyter of the church in Alexandria, Egypt. He denied the Son to be of one substance, and co-equal Deity, with the Father. His views precipitated the Arian controversy, and led to the calling of the First Ecumenical Council at Nicea (325).

ad Hebræos, pages 587-589, while upon the same matter SPANHEIM concisely comprehends many things in these briefer strictures, *de Auctoritate Epistolæ ad Hebræos*, book II of *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquorum*, part I, chapter I, § 3, 4, column 175: “It is certainly a great argument for its divine and unshakeable origin, that the enemy of mankind has made greater and stronger assaults in order to subvert it. And, just as hardly any part of the Canon has experienced so many unjust judgments of men, so hardly is any part more illustrious with Canonical marks, and breathing out its heavenly origin to a greater extent. Whether we attend to the lofty class of doctrine, concerning Christ’s Divinity, Incarnation, Priesthood, figures, which had preceded in Aaron, or Melchizedek, or types legal and ceremonial, and which express what is more sublime than human wisdom; or we consider the most holy principles of life, and precepts or manners; or the agreement, greater than all exception, with the Scriptures of both Covenants; attacked in some *histories* in vain; or the lofty and sublime manner of speaking, greater than human eloquence, swelling already at the very entrance; or the efficacy and ἐνέργειαν/*energy* in the souls of the pious, exerting itself here as elsewhere, and the altogether certain argument of the speaking God; or, dismissing other things, the *antiquity* of the Epistle, already written in the first age of the Apostles, received from the first in the Church, even by an Apostolical man as author, even, which we undertake as worthy of demonstration, *Paul*. Therefore, with the former κριτηρίοις/*criteria* weighed elsewhere, we subject the latter to inquiry; and, if there be agreement concerning its *Author*, remaining scruples concerning its *Authority* will scarcely be possible.”

§ 14: The Canon and the Church

So that this *Material* of the Composition of Sacred Scripture, or the θεόπνευστοι/*inspired* Books designed to direct faith and manners, might take the present *Form* of Canon, God saw to it that they were gathered gradually over time by the Church, were distinguished from ἀκανονίστοις/*non-canonical* Books, and were arranged in order. It is not doubtful that the Lord, providently providing for those things that have regard unto the salvation of the Church, granted to the same the necessary helps unto this end: in such a way that the θεόπνευστοι/*inspired* Books, designed for the Canonical use of the Church, were able to be separated from others, both, 1. by the Help of *faithful Witnesses*, to whom the same were delivered by θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired* Men and commended unto the use of the Church: and, 2. by Means of the *writing or subscription in the Very Hand* of the Holy Men, the Prophets or Apostles, whereby Codices of this sort were able sufficiently to be distinguished from others associated with the name of those, Galatians 6:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:17. Whatever might have actually been the case concerning the σημεῖον/*token/sign* mentioned by Paul *in this passage*,¹ concerning which the Most Illustrious WOLF, in his *Curis criticis et philologicis, on this passage*, discoursing at length, deserves to be consulted, it is not able to be denied that that διακριτικὸν/*distinguishing Sign*, following the intention of Paul, was suited to distinguish the genuine Epistles of of the Apostle from the spurious, which may have been bearing his name, lest the minds of the faithful be readily disquieted by the same, by comparison with 2 Thessalonians 2:2, 3. 3. Doubtlessly the *illuminating Grace* of the Holy Spirit was added, *so that they might recognize the innate κριτήρια/criteria/marks of Divinity*, shining with their own light, in the sacred Books. But, 4. neither is the *Extraordinary gift of Prophecy* able to be denied to the Church at the time of the gathering of the Canon, which may have been granted to the Collectors of the Canon, as far as it was necessary in a matter of such importance to distinguish infallibly genuine and θεόπνευστα/*inspired* writings from the spurious and human.

¹ 2 Thessalonians 3:17: “The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token (σημεῖον) in every epistle: so I write.”

Certainly it is the same God, who did not deem it unsuitable to reveal from heaven His mysteries to men, who saw to it that His oracles were written down for the perpetual use of His beloved Church and as a norm of belief and practice *ἀνυπεύθυνον*, *beyond human control*, and who so marvelously preserved these divine writings; certainly the same, I say, would direct the collection and arrangement of the Sacred Canon by His providence, lest He lose His end, which He had proposed to Himself in the writing of the sacred volumes.

Indeed, concerning the *Collection and Sealing of the Old Testament*, it is able to appear that it is to be labored so much less by us, since we find that Canon to be so often approved by the Lord and the Apostles in the New Testament that there is not able to be any hesitation concerning its authority. For it is solemn thing for the Lord to appeal to *Moses* and the *Prophets*,¹ and to send the Jews to *τὰς γραφὰς*, *the Scriptures*, which they had: we know that *πᾶσαν*/*all* that *γραφήν*/*Scripture* is said to be *θεόπνευστος*/*God-breathed* by Paul, 2 Timothy 3:16, compared with *verse 15*,² and 2 Peter 1:21, upon which place see *Commentarium meum*; and that the Jews were commended by him as faithful witnesses in the delivery of the sacred Codices, Romans 3:1, 2. But, as the divine authority of the Canon of the Old Testament is evident, likewise it would generally pertain to us, to the service of which particularly we would have an obligation to the Collection of the same.

There is not time now, nor is it desirable, to relate at length all that the Talmudists and other Rabbis of the Jews, idly dreaming, pass on to us concerning the *Great Synagogue* of one hundred and twenty members, whose President was Ezra, and his, together with those Assessors, pains concerning the Sacred Codex: in which undoubtedly many things are fabulous, which, nevertheless, owe their first origin to the care of sedulous Ezra with the contemporary Prophets concerning the Sacred Codex; but the history of which matter the Rabbis, according to their custom, pollute to a remarkable extent with fables. Out of many others, I wish the BUXTORFS [the *Elder's Tiberiadem*, chapter X; the *Younger's Librum Cosri*, part III, chapter LXV, and the notes on that],

¹ See, for example, Luke 24:27, 44.

² 1 Timothy 3:15, 16: “And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures (τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα), which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God (πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος), and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness...”

SPANHEIM [*Historiam Ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, epoch VIII, chapter V, columns 420, 421*], LEYDEKKER [*De Republica Hebræorum, tome 2, book VI, chapter VIII, IX, pages 481, 517*], WITSIUS [*Miscellaneous sacrorum, tome 1, book II, dissertation III, § 28, 29*], BUDDEUS [*Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section VI, § 12, pages 796-803*], CARPZOV [*Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter V, section V, § 3, pages 215-218*], and WOLF [*Bibliothecam Hebraicam, part II, book I, section I, § 1-5, pages 2-9*], to be consulted.

I shall now briefly relate, what might most plausibly be held concerning the *Canon of the Old Testament*, augmented little by little, and finally sealed. When Moses at the commandment of God had made an end of writing the Pentateuch עַד תִּמְּלֵם, unto the perfection of those (words), Deuteronomy 31:24,¹ he commanded the Levites in verses 25, 26, to store that book of the Law מִצֵּד אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה, at the side of the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah, so that in that place it might be kept in a case or chest designed for it. This Pentateuch is the foundation of the whole Canon; that people was not able to have a doubtful confidence concerning it, being an ear-witness of many of the commandments given from heaven that were written therein, being an eye-witness of many of the histories that are narrated there, and of the miracles by which the Mosaic ministry was confirmed. To this Pentateuch were gradually added other Canonical Books, written by Joshua [probably the Author of the Book, which bears his name, as far as the principal subject matter; although some brief insertions and the addition at the end were able to be added by another Prophetical Man afterwards, but, as it appears, before the death of David: see CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti, chapter IX, § 4, 5, 7*; the Dutch Annotations on Joshua 15:63, number 44; Joshua 19:47, number 27], Samuel, David [concerning the Collection of the *Psalms*, see BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section III, § 26, tome 2, pages 227b-231*, where in particular the paradoxical opinion of PIERRE-DANIEL HUET concerning this matter is recalled to the anvil: add CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros poeticos Veteris Testamenti, chapter III, § 5, pages 106-108*], Solomon, and the several Prophets, who were commending themselves both by the divine vocation and Prophetic gift of those Men recognized among the people, and by their subject matter, divine and in conformity with the doctrine of Moses; with the

¹ Deuteronomy 31:24: "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished (עַד תִּמְּלֵם)..."

intervening labor of the Priests and Levites, to whom the care was committed, as of teaching the people, so certainly of the sacred Books, comparing Deuteronomy 33:10; Malachi 2:4-7: who appear to have commended to the people the θεοπνεύστους/*inspired* Books of this sort, to have presented them organized into a Canon of faith and manners, and to have kept their αὐτόγραφον/*autograph* in the same place with that Pentateuch. Which place, with the number of Canonical Books increasing, within the Temple, 1. perhaps was not so much the side of the Ark in the Holy of Holies, whither an approach was open only to the High Priest once a year: but another place in one of the chambers of the Temple, where the other most precious κειμήλια/*treasures* were also kept, where, בְּבַיִת יְהוָה, *in the house of Jehovah*, not necessarily *in the Holy of Holies*, in the time of Josiah the Mosaic autograph was found, 2 Kings 22:8: see LUNDIUS' *Sanctuarium Judæorum*, book II, chapter VIII, tome I, page 430; consult also § 12 above. Certainly already in the time of *Isaiah* the *Testimony* was found with the *Law*, to which it was lawful for the Prophet to appeal as Canonical, Isaiah 8:20; consult § 4 above: as also סֵפֶר יְהוָה, *the book of Jehovah*, which was to be searched, is mentioned by the same Prophet, Isaiah 34:16. Thus the *Hymns of David* and of *Asaph* were used in public worship in the time of Hezekiah, 2 Chronicles 29:30. With whom reigning, the *Men of Hezekiah*, that is, wise men σύγχρονοι/*contemporaneous* with Hezekiah, assistants to the King in the reformation of the Church, especially the Prophets then living, appear to have recognized the Canon; to have joined the leaves introduced here and there into the testamentary receptacle, on which many Hymns of David and Proverbs of Solomon were read, into one certain scroll; and in this manner to the Proverbs that were brought together with Solomon living and perhaps by the King himself to have added many things, which were found to have been added after the former collection, by comparison with Proverbs 25:1. Finally, after the return of the people from captivity, Ezra, intent upon the restoration both of divine worship and of the Jewish republic, labored very zealously, doubtlessly together with the contemporaneous Prophets, on the Sacred Canon of Scripture. Ezra is praised, not only as סֵפֶר מְהִיר בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה, *a ready/skilled scribe in the Law of Moses*, Ezra 7:6, but concerning him it is related in verse 10, that הֵכִין לְבָבוֹ לְדַרוֹשׁ אֶת־תּוֹרַת יְהוָה וְלַעֲשׂוֹת וְלַלְמַד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל תּוֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט: *he had prepared his heart to seek the Law of Jehovah, and to do it; and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments*. If we compare this with the necessity of that

time, the work of Ezra and of the Prophets then living appears to have been, not only in teaching orally the things gathered to the people; but also in examining the Codices of the Canonical Books that survived after the burning of the Autographs with the temple; in correcting the errors of the same, which had crept in by the fault of copyists; and in commending the truly Canonical Books to the people, separately from others not pertaining to the Codex: in augmenting thereafter the Canon with Books marked with the character of *θεοπνευστίας*/*inspiration*, of the Prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, who had just recently lived, besides some Histories; to which also Haggai, Zechariah, and indeed Ezra himself added their own Books. After them Nehemiah and Malachi had the care of the same matter, who also by divine authority added their own volumes; after whose deaths no other was needed to seal and close the sacred Canon, to this point in good repair: since Malachi supplied this, who, with the Canonical doctrine of faith and manners vindicated from the corruptions of the Levites and impiety of Libertines through his own Prophecy superadded to the rest of the Canon, finally closed the whole Canon together with his own Book with that illustrious *seal*, Malachi 4:4-6, in which he both sent the Jews back to the *Mosaic Law* as the foundation of all religion, and promised to the same, not some other Prophet of the Old Testament, but *Elijah*, that is, John the Baptist, the first divine herald of the New Testament: *Remember ye, says he, the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments. Behold, I am sending you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of Jehovah: And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.* Upon which pericope see my *Valedictory Sermon*, delivered before the Church *Ingensi*, in the volume *Gedachtenis*, etc. Hence Malachi is also called by the Jews the *הוֹתֵם הַנְּבִיאִים*, *Seal of the Prophets*: see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book II, chapter I, section II, page 489, and what things I taught above in § 11 of this Chapter. Not as if the Church was so well constituted at that time, that it might be able to appear to require no further work of the Prophets: but because the old Economy presses toward an end, and becomes weaker, and wanes with the glory of the Temple: indeed, because souls were to be stirred up to desire and await with greater fervency the Messiah. Now, it is not improbable that, so that the entirety of Ezra's Autograph of the Canon might be the better preserved, a new Ark in turn was built, to be kept in the second Temple, in which

they would have stored that Autograph. What things I have thus narrated in a few words concerning the Gathering and Sealing of the Canon of the Old Testament, PETRUS DINANT sets forth and confirms in many, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, § 1-21, pages 742-775, and then upholds the same opinion against *Spinoza*, § 22-24, pages 775-782; against *Simon* and his public Scribes, § 25, 26, pages 782-789, comparing chapter III, § 20, pages 399-404; against the *Batavian Theologians*, as they call themselves, or, if you prefer, *Le Clerc*, § 27-42, chapter V, pages 789-828: see also JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER'S *Exercitationes Biblicas*, VII, VIII; and in addition compare BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 3, tome 2, page 1453-1455a.

Meanwhile, to this collection of the old Canon, enlarged by Ezra and the contemporaneous Prophets, and to the sealing of the same by Malachi, it does not appear altogether to be opposed, that also at a later time, by the leading of the prophetic Spirit, who also at the time of the birth of Christ was dwelling in old Simeon,¹ they may have perhaps added one and another Song, having regard to the calamities of the Church of that age, to the Book of Psalms; and that one and another Genealogy may have been enlarged and brought down to a later time. Just after the Captivity, before the sealing of the Canon by Malachi, Songs were able to be added to the rest of the Psalms, for example, Psalm 126; 137, as SPANHEIM points out, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, Epoch V, chapter VII, § 6, column 367, but only because, as that most illustrious Man adds, these were regarded as *Prophetic*. But Psalm 44, and perhaps also Psalm 85, was able at a later time to be composed and added to the Canon. Similarly it appears that at a later time the royal Genealogy of Zerubbabel, 1 Chronicles 3:17-24, was added; and also, indeed according to the opinion of many, the sacerdotal Genealogy of Nehemiah 12, see verses 11 and 22: which, nevertheless, were not necessarily on that account inserted by another's hand in this place after all the events of Nehemiah: although many maintain this with PRIDEAUX in his *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, who without any good reason maintains that several entire Books of the Old Testament were at length received into the Canon in the time of Simeon the Just,² and that by this Simeon the Canon was at length fully

¹ Luke 2:25-35.

² This is a reference to Simeon I, high priest in the early years of the third century BC.

sealed: see PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, book V, part I, columns 358, 359, in comparison with book VIII, columns 677, 678. Yet you might here say that FRANCIS JUNIUS is no less liberal, when in his *Oratione III de Fœdere et Testamento Dei*, columns 37, 38, *opera, tome 2*, he does not hesitate to assert: "The fourth division is what the Jews call *Cethubim*, the *Writings*, ... a mixture of which books from diverse times was set in order: but some books, already formerly begun, were finished in the final period; others were written after the time of the captivity here and there in foreign lands and were brought to the returning Church; finally, others were composed in Judea in the last times, and were entered into the treasury of the Church (if we are able to conjecture anything) in the times of that Judas Maccabeus, when the Church was renewed and breathing again. Belonging to this division are Job, whose history was written abroad; the Psalms and Proverbs, which books were written through a course of manifold vicissitudes and gathered from various parts, and finally brought to completion at that time; Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which were books of the last times; and finally the Chamesh Megilloth, that is, the five scrolls, which for the sake of convenience were conjoined together during that time, whatever the difference in age. Now, these are the Song of Solomon, etc." On the other side, MARESIUS is perhaps too rigid in turn, when he, in his *Systemate Theologico*, locus I, § 37, relating the sealing of the Canon of the Old Testament by Malachi, subjoins in his *scholarly notes*, a. *Whence it is proven how greatly he that imagines that some Psalms were written in the time of the Maccabees errs*; and what additional things follow *in that place*. With whom VRIEMOET completely agrees, who in his *Thesi Scripturarum DLXXIII*, and in his *Adnotationibus ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti*, chapter IX, tome 2, page 141, relates that *some Psalms, treating of the affliction of Antiochus Epiphanes, are vainly thought by some to have been composed finally in that age*; and that to him *this is, therefore, not at all to be approved, because at that time there were no prophets speaking by divine inspiration*. To me HEINRICH ALTING appears not to exceed modest limits, *Theologia Elenctica nova*, locus IX, controversy 2, page 470 at the end, writing: *In the end, although Prophets had already ceased in the Jewish Church, nevertheless the same sort of doctrine concerning the covenant of grace appears to have been preserved among the manifold corruptions of the sects, and is able to be evinced from Psalm 44:17, 18, and likewise from Psalm 85:3, 4, 7, written at that time*. JACOB ALTING follows in the footsteps of his father, *Heptad VII, dissertation I*, which is concerning the *Persistence of*

the vernacular Hebrew Tongue to the Jews in the Babylonian Captivity, § 23, opera, tome 5, pages 196, 197, where, after he had recited Psalm 137, 126, and 83, in his judgment composed, the first by the Jewish exiles in Babylon itself, the second by the returnees soon after the release from captivity, the third in the age of Esther and Mordecai; he subjoins: *In the end, with Antiochus Epiphanes raging against the Jewish religion, and, what had never been done previously, with many therefore ending life in martyrdom, instead of falling away from their profession of faith, Psalm 44 was written down in the place of public prayers, and delivered to the Church; and perhaps also Psalm 89, which nevertheless does not at all depart from the ancient integrity of the Hebrew tongue: the constancy of which to this point, namely, to the times of the Maccabees, they hence prove to have been in good repair.* HERMAN VENEMA¹ casts his vote in favor of this opinion, *Commentario ad Danielis caput XI*, § 166, pages 333-335, where you read: *An abundance of such Doctors was not wanting after the Babylonian exile, from the times of Ezra, ...according to that bright and shining promise of God, Isaiah 30:20, etc. ...To which also directly tends what God promised, that His Spirit was going to remain in the midst of the returnees, Haggai 2:5. Finally, it is not foreign to this matter to observe that, at this very time, and to a greater extent thereafter, there were men, incited by divine inspiration, and driven by divine and heroic motions, who...composed and shared with the public sacred hymns, to instruct and strengthen the people, of whom express mention is made in 1 Maccabees 4:33 in the oration of Judas; cast them down with the swords of them that love thee, that those that know thy name might praise thee with songs. Some of their hymns also survive in the Book of Psalms, as the learned have formerly observed.* CAMPEGIUS VITRINGA treads here with great prudence, who, in his *Sacrarum Observationum*, book VI, chapter XIII, discussing *divine Revelations after the age of Malachi*, § 4, relates: *Among the Learned Commentators of Divine things are those that are altogether persuaded that in the Bundle of Sacred Hymns are contained some Psalms composed about the time of the Affliction under Antiochus Epiphanes, which, as published by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and commended to us, we yet hold with the others; and the authority of which we revere no less than the best attested authority of the others. I know that many hold this opinion: but the weight is not the same.* But, after he had produced the authors and examples of this opinion, he subjoined this *ἔπίκρισιν*/judgment, § 5: *But what am I saying*

¹ Herman Venema (1697-1787) was a student of Campegius Vitringa, specializing in Old Testament exegesis and Church History. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1723-1774).

here? I readily admit that I hesitate, as one that esteems it to be a matter of the very greatest difficulty to determine anything certain concerning some of the Psalms of this argument. With respect to the two Psalms alleged by Alting: they actually seem historically to narrate a matter conducted, more than prophetically a matter to be conducted; and, if you except the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, no one would readily say unto what other Calamity or Era of the Old Economy they might more agreeably be referred. And yet this is hindered by the inscription of Psalm 89, which sets forth Ethan the Ezrahite as the author of that excellent Ode, whom it is well-known was famous in the age of David and Solomon. That one thing especially holds me here in suspense.... But however this matter may stand: it is evident that Learned men are not wanting that not without great appearance of reason judge that certain Sacred Hymns were elegantly composed by inspiration of the Holy Spirit long after the time of Malachi, and were added to the others, as works of the same author and authority; but that this opinion is of the sort that may incur serious criticism; even if I to this point do not undertake to subscribe confidently to that. One may apply to this what WITSIUS has, *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XX, § 33, 34, speaking of Malachi as the last of the Prophets: *After his departure from this world, the spirit of Prophecy also departed, and it was, as it were, a stranger among the Jews, until the dawning of the Gospel began to break. Yet, this is to be understood of the prophetic gift in such a way that it is not denied, therefore, that certain revelations came to certain individual persons, by which they might be informed concerning matters regarding either their own personal salvation or the common salvation.*

With respect to the Genealogy of 1 Chronicles 3 previously mentioned, BUDDEUS, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome II, page 817, says: *Indeed, the genealogy of Zerubbabel, 1 Chronicles 3:21-24, is extended far beyond the times of the Maccabees, whence anyone might be able to conclude that these books were written only after the time of Ezra. But, that these were added by some holy man to continue the Davidic genealogy, is not anything we should doubt.* To which add what things JOHANN HEINRICH MICHAELIS,¹ in his *uberioribus Adnotationibus in libros Hagiographos* on 1 Chronicles 3:21, gathered from various Writers: *Moreover, what the learned VITRINGA taught, Observationum Sacrarum, book VI, page 338, "If the books of Chronicles are by*

¹ Johann Heinrich Michaelis (1668-1738) was a German Lutheran Theologian, Orientalist, and Philologist. He served as Professor of Oriental Languages (1699) and of Theology (1709) at Halle. Michaelis published an annotated edition of the Hebrew Bible and works on Hebrew grammar and accentuation.

Ezra, or at least not later than the time of Ezra, taking all into account it is to be established that, among others, the notable appendage, which enumerates the lineage of Zerubbabel unto more recent times, 1 Chronicles 3:21-24, was added to them. For it embraces the succession of many generations, which runs far beyond the age of Ezra, even if you should say that he flourished under Mnemon.¹ So also think HEIDEGGER in his Enchiridio Biblico, page m. 169; D. LANGIUS in his Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti, page 514. And thus CARPZOV, Introductione ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti, page 287, "What," says he, "learned men have observed, that the genealogy of Zerubbabel in 1 Chronicles 3:21-24 is extended beyond the times of the Maccabees, almost to Christ, readily persuades us to believe that such things as these were added more recently after Ezra by a hand equally θεόπνευστον/ inspired, with this purpose, that the entire series of generations of the Davidic lineage might be exhibited in its place." And, on page 295, "Where the account, to be accommodated to the genealogies, leaves off, is not sufficiently evident; although it is plain that it reaches nearly to the times of Christ." In addition, compare in general the Dutch dissertation of Reverend AMBROSIUS DORHOUT, Pastor at Dokkum,² on the Genealogy of Zerubbabel in 1 Chronicles 3:15 and following, in Boekzaal der Geleerde Waereld, August 1759, chapter III, especially pages 223-230.

Finally, if you have regard to the Sacerdotal Genealogy, which is found in Nehemiah 12, concerning this SPANHEIM says, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti, epoch VIII, chapter VI, § I, column 422, Certainly Nehemiah hardly prolonged his life unto Darius Codomannus,³ and Jaddua the High Priest, which things were thereafter inserted in Nehemiah 12:11, 22. For from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus,⁴ at which time Nehemiah was already advance in age (for he returned with Zerubbabel), unto the beginning of Darius Codomannus, roughly one hundred and nineteen years passed. Therefore, the Sacerdotal Genealogy was continued unto Jaddua, Nehemiah 12:22 (of whom Josephus treats in the events and history of Alexander the Great⁵), by some Prophetic man, or Scribe of the Jews, equipped for this by the authority of the Sanhedrin. Indeed, there are those that think that the difficulty concerning the exceedingly protracted life of Nehemiah, if this*

¹ Artaxerxes II Mnemon, son of Darius II, was king of Persia from 404 BC to 358 BC.

² Ambrosius Dorhout (1699-1776) was a Dutch Reformed pastor.

³ Darius III Codomannus (c. 380-330 BC) was the last king of Persia, ruling from 336 to 330 BC.

⁴ Artaxerxes I Longimanus ruled from 465 to 424 BC.

⁵ *Antiquities of the Jews* 11:8.

entire Genealogy be from his hand, is able to be removed in such a way that they deny, therefore, that Nehemiah ought to be thought to have lived to the times of Alexander: they believe that it is sufficient, if Nehemiah saw Jaddua in the Priesthood in the last times of Darius Nothus,¹ from whose reign unto the defeat of Codomannus by Alexander seventy-three years passed; whence, if, with Nehemiah passing, Jaddua is thought to have been thirty-one years old, he was able to meet Alexander in the one hundred and fourth year of his age, but Nehemiah to have died in the last time of Darius Nothus: In favor of which opinion CARPZOV, in his *Introductione ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XIX, § 6, page 347, commends CALOVIUS, whom see in his *Bibliis Illustratis*, tome I, page 116, and on Nehemiah 12. But others are not wanting that assert that to this chronological difficulty *it is more rightly and certainly answered that that entire genealogical Table of the Priestly Succession, which occurs in Nehemiah 12:1-26, is not from the hand of Nehemiah; but that a fragment has been inserted in this Book by another hand for the completion of the history; inasmuch as in verse 26 there is a most distinct mention of Nehemiah the Satrap, called by his own name in the third person, who otherwise is wont to speak of himself in this Book in the first person: they think that an inspection of the fragment itself persuades, as not cohering with the preceding and following narration.* Thus VITRINGA, *Sacrarum Observationum*, book VI, chapter VII, § 15; and his *Prolegomena in Commentariis in Zachariam*, § 9, pages 28, 29. Ὁμόψηφοι, voting together with, him, Petavius,² *Le Clerc*, and Langius are commended by RAMBACH,³ who also himself is found to be especially inclined to this, if you compare his *Adnotationes in Nehemiah 12:11* with his *Præfatione in Librum Nehemiæ*, § 6, 10, in JOHANN HEINRICH MICHAELIS' *Adnotationibus uberioribus in libros Hagiographos*. We have already spoken of PRIDEAUX above. In the *marginal notes* of the DUTCH VERSION on Nehemiah 12:11, without censure is mentioned this opinion of various men, according to which this genealogical series was here inserted after the death of Nehemiah, by some other man of God, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, so that the succession of the High Priests might be

¹ Darius II Nothus reigned from 423 to 405 BC.

² Denis Petau (1583-1652) was a French Jesuit churchman and scholar. His *Opus de doctrina temporum* carries on the chronological labors of Scaliger.

³ Johann Jakob Rambach (1693-1735) was a German Lutheran Pastor and Theologian. He worked with Michaelis on Michaelis' edition of the Hebrew Bible, writing commentaries for Ruth, Esther, Nehemiah, and others.

preserved in the church.

The difficulty concerning the exceedingly prolonged life of Nehemiah might vanish in another way, by assigning to him the Genealogy found in *chapter 12*, on account of the mention of Jaddua the High Priest there; if Nehemiah's Jaddua, mentioned in Nehemiah 12:11, 22, was not that famous High Priest, indeed, not even from the Priestly family, but only pertained to the class of Levites: which opinion CARPZOV tries to render plausible in the *place* just now *cited*. But I am very concerned that Carpzov has not rightly reckoned the accounts here. For, if you attend properly to the argument of Nehemiah 12, the account of the *Levites*, begun in *verse 8*, is then finished in *verse 9*: but in *verses 10* and *11* occurs the succession of *High Priests*, thence from *Jeshua*, under whom, in the time of *Cyrus*, the people were given leave to return from Babylon according to *verse 1*, unto *Jaddua* and *Darius*, either *Nothus*, or *Codomannus*, the last King of the Persians. Now, from this *Jeshua* the High Priest, the *Jeshua* named among the first of the *Levites* in *verse 8* is able to be completely distinguished. Again, in *verse 22*, *Eliashib*, *Joiada*, *Johanan*, and *Jaddua* are not *heads* of paternal families among the *Levites*: but names of the *High Priests*, in the *times* of which the first among the Levites and Priests were enrolled and recorded in a list, comparing *verses 10* and *11* and *chapter 13, verse 28*: compare PISCATOR,¹ BURMANN, HARTMAN on Nehemiah 12, RELAND in his *Antiquitatibus Hebræorum Sacris, part II, chapter II, § 3, 6*.

With respect to the Canon of the Old Testament and its collection, see also COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatomen, locus III, chapter V, page 46*, and *chapter IV, pages 33-37*, where he undertakes the refutation of these theses of Hobbes: 1. In the Old Testament, besides the Book of the whole Law, which is called Deuteronomy, all the way unto the Captivity the Jews held no other written Word as the Word of God. 2. The Scripture of the Old Testament that we have today was not Canonical to the Jews, not even the Law, until they had renewed the covenant under Ezra. 3. Before the Captivity, from the time in which the Book of the Law was lost (which appears to Hobbes to have

¹ John Piscator (1546-1626) was a learned Protestant divine. He held the position of Professor of Divinity at Herborn (1584). His German version was the first, complete and independent, since that of Martin Luther. Through his career, his views changed from those of the Lutherans to those of the Calvinists, and from those of the Calvinists to those of the Arminians. He remains widely regarded for his abilities as a commentator (*Commentarii in Omnes Libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti*).

happened in the time of Rehoboam) unto the time of Josiah,¹ the Jews had no written Word of God.

Next, with respect to the *Canon of the New Testament*: again we observe, 1. that the Testimony of the Church is able to make no Book θεόπνευστον/*inspired* and Canonical; but the Church is only able to declare that Books of this sort, as θεοπνεύστους/*inspired* and Canonical, were delivered to her by the Evangelists and Apostles, and were received by her as such: which testimony of the Church is not altogether without force to beget human faith: nevertheless, divine faith concerning the divine and normative authority of any Book depends, not on human testimony, but on divine inspiration and its innate marks. 2. We observe that not without a divine mark has it come to pass, that, notwithstanding uncertainties concerning the Canonical Authority of some Books sometimes arising and even prolonged for a certain time, the true Church unto the present day has continually retained in the Codex of the New Testament the Books that we have to this day, and concerning which now almost no doubt has hindered through so many ages: which, if we bring this together with those Books' innate marks of Divinity, is able to be sufficient for us, even if express testimonies are wanting to us concerning the circumstances of time, place, and author of the entire Canon of the New Testament, delivered at first to the Church, and received universally by the Churches. 3. This dispensation of divine Providence is to be adored, which saw to it that the divine volumes, as much of the New as of the Old Testament, gathered into one bundle, are preserved religiously in the Church and always received reverently, yet was unwilling for the history of the Gathering of this Canon to be preserved for us; that we might acknowledge that God does not much need human testimony, and might rather exercise our faith in investigating the innate θεοπνευστίας κριτηρίους, *criteria of inspiration*. But it is not strange that in such scarcity of Ecclesiastical monuments of the primitive age, in which we labor, and in the great silence of the writers that survive concerning a matter of such moment, Theologians depart in different directions concerning the first and certain constitution and collection of the entire Canon of the New Testament by the Church. Neither do we doubt that some logomachies also obstruct here, which, if you restrain, perhaps grievous disagreements shall be able to be composed in a certain measure here. That is, the sealing and

¹ See 2 Kings 22; 2 Chronicles 34.

approbation of the Canon is able to be distinguished from the gathering of all the Books pertaining to the Canon into a bundle, and of the exemplars of this Canon transcribed by the tradition of the Church. The admission of the Canon by the Church was also able to obtain, although not all individual Churches immediately and at one and the same time obtained the store of all the Books of the New Testament. The first admission of the Canonical Books also ought to be distinguished from undoubted, universal recognition of them, in such a way that never afterwards was there controversy concerning them. And, with these things advanced, we may consider what in all likelihood and probability, and also in a manner suitable to that veneration which we owe to the divine books, in this exceedingly perplexed antiquarian question, is able to be established.

That already long before the fourth Century the Canon was sealed, learned Men show, from the list of the same Books of the New Testament that alone we admit to the present day, among the Writers of that, and indeed of the previous, age; and from the added mention of the completed Canon, which is found in their writings. EPIPHANIUS, *Hæresi LXI, opera, tome I, page 506*, says that heretics thus receive Apocryphal Books, *παντάπασιν ἄλλοτρίου τοῦ κανόνος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ ὑπάρχοντας*, *being altogether different from the Ecclesiastical Canon*. In the *Synopsi Sacræ Scripturæ*, ascribed to Athanasius, after it was recounted that *our Scripture, πᾶσα γραφή ἡμῶν Χριστιανῶν θεόπνευστος, ὠρισμένα καὶ κεκανονισμένα ἔχει τὰ βιβλία*, *all the Scripture of us Christians, is inspired, and the books are set apart and canonized, opera Athanasii, tome 2, page 55*, the Author also testifies in particular that *the seven Catholic Epistles were εἰς ἓν ἀριθμούμεναι βιβλίον*, *counted as one Book, page 59*, and that *the fourteen Epistles of Paul likewise were counted as one book, or were redacted into one volume, εἰς ἓν ἀριθμούμεναι βιβλίον, page 60*, which supposes that the Canon was sealed, and that the Sacred Books were gathered into one corpus. RUFFINUS, in his *Expositione in Symbolum*, being about to enumerate the Books of the New Testament, just as they are acknowledged by us to the present day, *operibus Hieronymi, tome 4, page 112*, says, *The Holy Spirit under the Old Testament inspired the Law and the Prophets, but under the New, the Gospels and the Apostles*; and then he declares that he means to indicate *the Volumes of the Old and New Testaments, which according to the Tradition of the Ancients are believed to have been inspired by the Holy Spirit and delivered to*

the Churches of Christ, just as he had received them from the monuments of the Fathers. In *Dialogo contra Marcionitas*, commonly ascribed to ORIGEN, which writer is held by others to have been of the fourth century, are also mentioned the ἐνδιάθετοι γραφαί, that is, *the Scripture placed within the Canon*, Section V, page 136. The Learned gather that, indeed, even before the third Century the Canon was thus sealed, both from the mention of *the tradition of the Ancients and Fathers* in RUFFINUS' *Expositione in Symbolum, opera Hieronymi, tome 4, page 112*; and from that which EUSEBIUS relates concerning ORIGEN, namely, that he, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, *maintaining the ecclesiastical canon, testifies that there are no more than four Gospels*, *Historia Ecclesiastica, book VI, chapter XXV*. Indeed, in walking farther backwards, that, before a Pseudo-Canon was devised by Marcion, which they reckon to have been done before the year 130, it is evident that the Canon of the New Testament was already constituted, they suppose from this, that to Marcion the Fathers ascribe a Canon at the same time *Apostolic and Evangelical*, which evidently he was putting in the place of the twofold Canon of this sort received in the Church; see EPIPHANIUS in his *Hæresi XLII, chapter IX, opera, tome I, pages 309, 310, chapter XI, page 318*; TERTULLIAN in *books IV and V of contra Marionem*; consult ENS' *de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti, chapter V, § 17, 18, pages 90-92*: and, that the Apostolic Canon does not include only the letters of Paul, they gather from this, that the Fathers of that age promiscuously draw proofs from the Catholic and Pauline Epistles, and that JUSTIN Martyr in the *Epistle to Diognetus*,¹ by elegant paraphrase, names the Books of the Old and New Testaments, φόβον νόμου, προφητῶν χάριν, εὐαγγελίων πίστιν καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν, *the fear of the Law, the grace of the Prophets, the faith of the Gospels, and the tradition of the Apostles*, page 502. Εἶτα φόβος νόμου ἄδεται, καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκεται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίστις ἴδρυται, καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσεται, *Then the fear of the Law is sung, and the grace of the Prophets known, and the faith of the Gospels is established, and the tradition of the Apostles is preserved*: consult ENS' *de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti, chapter V, § 19, 20, pages 92-95*.

But, so that we might in the end review the whole matter from

¹ The Epistle to Diognetus, written in the second century, is an early example of Christian apologetical writing. Although its author is unknown, it has been traditionally attributed to Justin Martyr.

the beginning, we believe that by us it is to be traced back to the *Apostle John*; 1. that he established the Canon of the Gospels, EUSEBIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter XXIV, expressly testifies, relating that John approved the remaining three Gospels, after they had come under his notice, and that, although hitherto he had taught only with his voice, he confirmed the truth of the remaining three with his own written Gospel. 2. That John sealed the entire Canon of the New Testament, Revelation 22:18, 19, I see nothing to hinder us from believing. *a.* Indeed, this threat most nearly has regard to John's Apocalypse itself; but the Apostle, contemplating the Apocalypse as the last writing of the New Testament, while he prohibits addition and subtraction to this Book, at the same time prohibits all addition to the whole Canon of the Old and New Testaments. *b.* There is the additional fact that John concluded his *Apocalypse* with a promise of the imminent return of the Lord Jesus, just as Malachi sealed his own prophecy and the entire Canon of the Old Testament with a promise concerning the forerunner of the Messiah and the first advent of the same; so that in this way John admonishes us that before the final advent of Christ nothing ought to be added to the Scripture, Revelation 22:16-20. But, 3. it is altogether probable that John, sealing the entire Canon with such an emphatic conclusion, at the same time more frequently testified concerning the remaining Books to the Churches, and sedulously indicated to the chief Men in them what Books ought to be held as Canonical, and diligently separated the same from the spurious; so that thus around the first beginnings of the second Century, unto which the death of John is commonly assigned, the Canon of the New Testament was complete, sealed, and delivered to the Churches through the agency of John and his disciples.

α . That the Ancients believed that the Canon was already confirmed in the age of the Apostles, is established with certainty out of AUGUSTINE'S *contra Faustum Manichæum*, book XI, chapter V, *opera*, tome 8, *columns* 158, 159, "The excellence of the Canonical authority of the Old and New Testaments is distinct from the books of those coming latter, which authority was confirmed in the times of the Apostles by the successions of Bishops and transmissions of the Churches, established, as it were, on high on some foundation, to which all faithful and pious intellect ought to conform."

β . John, on account of his longevity, was able to have an acquaintance with all the Canonical writings of the New Testament, and

so also the care of them: he, as the last of all, wrote, and sealed the Canon: but one may now plausibly suppose that he therefore through so great a space of time was obliged to survive the rest of the Apostles, so that, by delivering the genuine Canon to the Church, he might ward off spurious Books, and, by sealing the Sacred Canon, might turn the thoughts of the Church from all further expectation of the addition of a sacred Book.

γ. An argument from the necessity of the Church is added, that by the divine authority of the Apostle it might learn to distinguish the genuine writings from the spurious; since, even while Paul was yet living, nefarious men had already fraudulently introduced Epistles, so that he regarded it as necessary to mark his own γνήσια/*genuine* writings with a distinctive σημείω/*token*, 2 Thessalonians 2; 3: but thereafter many other writings of Apostles and Apostolical men were circulated: heretics, rejecting the genuine writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, published their own under the name of the Apostles. And so it was certainly for the good of the Church that John, who saw and was aware of these arts of the heretics, might fortify it against the danger of seduction.

δ. That John also actually discharged his office in separating the spurious writings that were put forth under the name of the Apostles from the genuine and Canonical, testifies JEROME, *de Viris illustribus*, chapter VII, *opera*, tome I, page 268, out of TERTULLIAN'S *libro de Baptismo*, chapter XVII, relating that a certain presbyter in Asia, on account of a fable disseminated under the title Περίοδου Παύλου καὶ Θέκλας, *History of Paul and Thecla*, was convicted by John concerning the spurious Book, and was for this reason removed from the ministry.

ε. The testimonies of two eminent disciples of John are added, IGNATIUS and POLYCARP,¹ the former of which not so long after the death of John won the crown of martyrdom. For both in their Epistles left clear traces of the Epistolary and Evangelical Canon already extant at that time. Indeed, IGNATIUS, in *Epistle V to the Philadelphians*, § 5, writes: Προσφυγῶν/*fleeing* (or προσφύγωμεν, *let us have recourse*, according to the opinion of Pearson and Smith in their *Annotations on this passage*, pages 48, 83) τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας, *to the Gospel as the flesh of*

¹ Polycarp (died c. 167) was a disciple of the Apostle John and Bishop of Smyrna.

Christ, and to the Apostles as to the Presbytery of the Church; where, that by εὐαγγέλιον/*Gospel* is to be understood the *Evangelical Codex*, and by ἀποστόλους/*Apostles* the *Apostolic Codex*, is hardly able to be called into controversy. In this manner he understands by εὐαγγέλιον/*Gospel* even more strictly the *Codex of the Gospels* (while elsewhere it denotes more broadly the entire New Testament), *Epistle to the Philadelphians*, § 9, Ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, *but the Gospel has something choice, the coming of the Savior, our Lord Jesus Christ, and His suffering and resurrection.* While he has regard to the *Epistolary Canon*, in *Epistle to the Romans*, § 4, Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν, *I do not, as Peter and Paul, issue commands to you.* Quite often also, being about to confirm his sayings in his Epistles, he appeals to the Sacred Books, not only to the *Gospels*, but also to the *Acts of the Apostles*; and in like manner to the *Epistles*, not only to the *Epistles of Paul*, but also of *other Apostles*, of those also concerning which there was thereafter doubt, as is that of *James*; see RUMPÆUS in his *Commentatione critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § XL, page 216. But if, while John was living, the *Epistolary Canon* had not been constituted and delivered to the Church, and also the *Canon of the Gospel*; how was Ignatius able, writing immediately after the death of John, to appeal so often for the sake of confirmation to the subject matter of this Canon? And it is quite probable that Ignatius gained acquaintance with this Canon also from John himself. The very thing which IRENÆUS manifestly teaches concerning POLYCARP in EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book IV, chapter XIV, where you may see that Polycarp taught the *one and only truth, which he had learned from the Apostles*, and which the *Church delivers*, in opposition to the heresies of *Valentinus, Marcion*, and others. But what is the *Truth delivered* by the Church, except the *Canon of faith* received by the Church? Now, Polycarp himself is said to have received this *truth* from the *Apostles*; but, since he dwelt with John among the *Apostles* for such a long time and familiarly, who does not see that it is probable that Polycarp was instructed concerning the truth of the *Canon of the New Testament* by John, and then in turn delivered to the Churches what he had previously received from the *Apostles*? For which reason in his *Epistle to the Philippians* appear also repeated citations of the *Books of the New Testament*, both of the *Epistles* and of the *Gospels*: indeed, EUSEBIUS himself observes in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book IV, chapter XIV, near the end, that Polycarp in

his *Epistle* makes use of some testimonies taken from the first *Epistle of Peter*: whence also it appears that the Epistolary Canon already existed at that time, and was able to be concluded.

ζ. Finally, that the Canonical Epistles, according to the mutual fellowship and love of the Churches, had come quickly to the notice of the majority of Church and of the faithful in the East, can be gathered from 2 Peter 3, which Epistle he wrote to the converted Jews dispersed on all sides throughout Asia Minor; now, he reminds that an Epistle was also sent to them by Paul, on which occasion he also alleges other Epistles of Paul, and sets them among the rest of the γραφὰς/*Scripture*, as of the same dignity, verses 15, 16. By this Peter signifies that the Pauline Epistles were already at that time everywhere known among the Churches, even among those to which they were not directly sent; indeed, that the same were acknowledged by them as divine. For who does not now discern it to be probable, that these works of Peter and of Paul had also come to the hands of John living in Asia, and that the Overseers of the many Churches had asked the sentence of the Apostle John concerning the authority of these writings: and that these under the auspices of John began painstakingly to seek out exemplars of all the Books of the New Testament, and to transcribe them for their own use and the use of their Churches? see what things upon this matter, out of Tertullian, Jerome, Cyril, Augustine, and Theophylact, are cited by FRANCIS JUNIUS, *operum*, tome 1, column 464, lines 70-82. Add, with respect especially to the Canon of the Gospels, SPANHEIM'S *Exercitationes de Historicis Euangeliorum Scriptoribus*, in the *Appendix to book II of Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Antiquorum*, § 1-9, *opera*, tome 2, column 265-274.

Nevertheless, these things, which I have said concerning the care of the Apostle John with the Canon, I do not wish thus to be accepted, as if by a solemn decree of the Rulers of the Church, over whose assembly John presided after the manner of the Council, confirmation of the Canon was made: since it would have sufficed that the Canonical authority of the rest of the Codices of the New Testament was acknowledged and indicated by John, a Man θεοπνεύστῳ/*inspired*.

Neither does it appear that all the Books of the New Testament already in the time of John, except perhaps quite rarely, were joined in a regular bundle: but likely, according to the variety of opportunity, from the beginning some Church possessed some writings of the Apostles, but other Churches other writings, which they were able conveniently to

obtain, and knew to be approved by the faithful relation of John: to which they added by degrees the rest, as they came to hand. Whence also an opportunity was able to arise, that concerning certain writings not so generally received from the beginning some doubted; until testimonies more illustrious were added, which were affirming those to be acknowledged as true also. Of course, now the situation was different, than under the Mosaic economy, when the Church was contained within the narrow bounds of Palestine, and all the autographa of the Canonical Books were preserved in the Tabernacle and Temple, unto which there was easy recourse in all doubtful situations. But now, throughout all the parts and most diverse regions of the world, the Church was erected, all the Originals of the Apostolic writings were not kept in one place, but in various places according to the diversity of Churches and people, unto whom they were first sent. And so it was, with respect to the Autograph of the Epistles sent to the Jews, dispersed through many regions: but not with respect to the Autograph of the Epistles written to individual persons; after the death of these it was more difficult to be certain, in what place precisely it was found. Whence certain acquaintance concerning the Canon of the New Testament was able to come to all the Churches throughout the world more tardily: and with so much greater confidence and success concerning some Books, or particular pericopes of them, heretics were able to move doubts, because they knew that a comparison with the Autograph was not able to be arranged so easily. Compare PETRUS DINANT'S discourse concerning the Constitution of the Canon of the New Testament, in his *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, pages 828-859.

The Most Illustrious JOHANNES ENS, in his *Diatribes de Librorum Novi Testamenti Canone*, learnedly indeed, presents it as proven that the Epistolary Canon was also completed before the Year twenty-seven of the second Century; nevertheless, he exerts himself mightily in this, that he might evince that we are not obliged to the care of the Apostle John himself for it: but that the Teachers of the Eastern Church performed this service, who survived for some time after John, Ignatius, Polycarp, Quadratus,¹ and perhaps some others. But to each attentively and candidly comparing the reasonings of ENS with those that were hitherto

¹ Quadratus (died 129) is reckoned among the Seventy Apostles of the Eastern Church, and is esteemed as the first Christian Apologist. Eusebius records that Quadratus addressed an apology to the Emperor Hadrian *circa* 124.

discussed, the infirmity of the same, I suppose, will be able to be apparent. What I have not thought necessary to demonstrate at length, most learned Men have done, the Most Illustrious LAMPE in his *Prolegomenis ad Commentarium in Euangelium Joannis*, book I, chapter V, § 14, and the Celebrated JUSTUS WESSELUS RUMPÆUS in his *Commentatione critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros cum præfatione Carpzovii*, § XL, pages 201-227, in which you will see the arguments of ENS solidly confuted, sometimes in the words of his own argument. Nevertheless, it is well that the Most Illustrious ENS shows that at that time, when according to his opinion the Canon was gathered, the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit granted for the edification of the Church, to which the Canon of Scripture was so serviceable, yet obtained, which I suppose are not to be denied to those collectors of this Canon: see his *Diatriben*, chapter XI, § 6-14, pages 361-371.

But with far greater justice COCQUIUS refutes here the impious theses of *Hobbes*, in his *Anatome Hobbesianismi*, locus III, chapter IV, pages 38 and following; namely, 1. the Time, when the Books of the New Testament were first acknowledged and received by the Church as the writings of the Apostles, was considerably later than the time of the Apostles. He asserts that the public reception of the Sacred Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, of the sort we have now, is to be attributed to the Council of Laodicea, which was held in the Year of Christ 364.¹ 2. Before Constantine the Great to no one was the New Testament able to be a Law that could not be transgressed without injustice; but by the same right by which one had received it, he was also able to reject it. 3. Nevertheless, it was Counsel, of which sort, whether good, or bad, he to whom counsel is given is able to observe it or neglect it without injustice. And if indeed the counsel, whether it be good, or bad, is contrary to Laws, one is not able to observe it without injustice.

When now we proceed unto the *Arrangement* of the Canonical Books, our AUTHOR observes that this *Order* or Arrangement of the Books is *human*, and that *it was not bound necessarily to flow from the same Infallible Spirit*. It was sufficient that through the illumination and infallible direction of the Holy Spirit the Canonical Books, all and only,

¹ The Council of Laodicea was a regional synod, composed of about thirty ministers of Asia Minor. It was principally concerned with the regulation of the manners of church members, but it also provided a list of the Books of the New Testament (omitting Revelation), forbidding the public reading of others.

were gathered and acknowledged by the Church as the permanent rule of faith and manners: whether one or another was found in an earlier or later place, in this very little was placed; and so here God willed to leave something to human industry.

Hence the Arrangement of the Books is not the same among all. We saw in § 13 the great difference between the Arrangement of the Books of the Old Testament among today's Jews and Christians. We observed at the same time what difference obtains in the placement of the five Megilloth,¹ and the reason for it. Moreover, in *Bava Bathra*,² chapter I, folio 14, *Jeremiah* holds the first place among the Prophets, which some Manuscript Codices imitate, and of which matter this reason is given, that the Book of Kings is concluded in the destruction, of which Jeremiah and Ezekiel also treat: consult WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam*, tome 2, book I, section I, § 15, pages 47, 48. Hence this is the order of the Prophets: The Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, the Twelve Prophets.

In the recension of the Books of the New Testament, AUGUSTINE, *de Doctrina Christiana*, book II, chapter VIII, *opera*, tome 3, part I, column 18, subjoins the *Acts of the Apostles* to all the Epistles, and sets it immediately before the *Apocalypse*: perhaps he thought that this twofold Books was to be more closely conjoined because, just as Acts contains the matters conducted in the first Church, so the *Apocalypse* of John reveals matters to be conducted thereafter in the Church unto the end of the world. But Acts has too close a tie with the Books of the Gospels, especially of Luke himself, than that it is able to be so far removed from them.

Afterward, Athanasius, the Laodicean Canon, and Philastrius place the Catholic Epistles before the Pauline Epistles, and join them immediately with Acts, contrary to which it was wont to be done in the preceding second and third centuries, contrary to which the other most excellent Writers of the fourth century also do. Perhaps the reason for this transposition is: 1. That many, when all the Books were to be copied with the pen, did not have the complete Canon, but only the Catholic Epistles subjoined to the Gospels and Acts; as briefer and more easily to be copied, without so great expense: just as to the present day Manuscript Codices are found that contain only the Catholic Epistles with Acts. 2. Or, that, because of the hesitation of some concerning

¹ Namely, the Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther.

² *Bava Bathra* is a Talmudic tractate dealing with property rights.

some of the Catholic Epistles, others set them before the Epistles of Paul as altogether worthy of reception. The Catholic Epistles themselves, arranged in a fivefold order among themselves, appear in the works of the Ancients, which variety was able to arise easily from the hesitations of many concerning five of the seven, whether they were rightly inserted in the Canon or not. Their present order is found among the most illustrious collectors of the Canon, Athanasius, the Laodicean Council, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Leo,¹ and Isidore: see *ENS' de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti*, chapter VIII, division II, § 34-41, pages 229 and following.

And the Arrangement of the Books of Sacred Scripture was established, only not according to the Time of Writing, which in the case of many one may conjecture, but not likewise prove. Thus Jonah is everywhere supposed to be first with respect to age among the latter Prophets, yet his book does not occupy the first place. Concerning the time of the prophecies of Joel nothing certain is able to be determined. Among the Pauline Epistles, by general consensus those to the Thessalonians were first in time, yet not in order. Concerning the other Epistles, all things are uncertain: thus concerning the first to Timothy, when it was written, the Learned greatly differ; and, with all things duly considered, the greatest Men conclude that nothing is clear; see the *Note* subjoined to *my Sermon on 1 Timothy 3:16 in the volume entitled Gedachtenis, etc.*, page 307.

But it was established according to the Order of Things, or the Magnitude of the Books, or the Fame of the Churches. You may see observed the Order, partly of Time, partly of Things, in our Arrangement of the Old Testament into its Divisions. Where, after the Mosaic Pentateuch, most certainly the first and most ancient of all the sacred volumes, the Historical Books follow, which set forth the matters conducted in the immediately following times, in successive and continuous order unto the end of the Sacred History of the Old Testament. Next are added the Dogmatic and Poetic Books, almost all written after the Mosaic times by holy Men, of whom mention was made in the preceding Historical Books: and in the series of these Books, Job, David, and Solomon, you see the Order of Time again observed. Finally, the Books of the Prophets are bound together in one volume, who principally treat of matters that were going to be afterwards.

¹ Leo I (c. 400-461) was bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. He is remembered for persuading Attila to turn back from his invasion of Italy, and for his influence over the Christology of the Council of Chalcedon.

Likewise, in the principal Division of the Books of the New Testament you see the Order of Things and of Time observed together. The Gospel, according to the Order of the Time in which they were written, follow one another. That of Matthew is everywhere believed to have been written before the first of the Pauline Epistles that we have. Again, the first Epistle of Paul is thought to have been written before the Epistle of James. Revelation seals all the Books: see ENS' *de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti*, chapter IX, division II, subdivision I, § 15-33, pages 254-277. The Gospels narrate the history of Christ dwelling on earth; Acts narrates the first founding of the Church of the New Testament after the exaltation of Christ; the Epistles make for the confirmation of the Churches already established in the faith; the Apocalypse foretells matters to be expected especially in the Churches of the future, unto the consummation of the ages. Thus several Epistles, sent by the same Apostle to the same Churches or persons, are read according to the Order of Time in which they were written, of which sort are Paul's First and Second Corinthians, First and Second Thessalonians, and First and Second Timothy; and Peter's First and Second: see ENS' *de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti*, chapter IX, division II, subdivision III, § 68-76, pages 317-325.

The Magnitude of the Books certainly appears to have been considered in ordering the Books of the Prophets, in which the Major Prophets are distinguished from the Minor; just as among the Minor Prophets Hosea exceeds most of the others in mass. Indeed, Zechariah by this reckoning would also deserve to be placed among the first in the series of Minor Prophets: but the three, who did not prophesy until the last period after the Babylonian Captivity, are with good reason placed after the others, who had preceded this Captivity.

In the case of the Pauline Epistles, those are observed to precede, which were sent to the Gentiles, first entire Churches, then individual people; that Epistle to the Hebrews follows: either because the Jews with their ancient prerogative and dignity above the Gentiles had now been cut off under the New Testament, or that the latter might be more closely connected with the other Apostles' Epistles sent to that nation. That the prior thirteen Epistles were also arranged according to the Dignity of the Churches and persons to which they were sent, the Most Illustrious ENS strenuously contends, *de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti*, chapter IX, division II, subdivision II, § 34-57, pages 278-305. Others maintain that the weight of the Argument was considered, as thus

page 2; VAN ALPHEN'S¹ *Prolegomena in Epistolam Priorem ad Corinthios*, article IV, pages 19-21. Thus the *Epistle to the Hebrews* in the Subscription is said to have been sent by *Timothy*; while it appears from Hebrews 13:23 that Timothy, at the time of the sending of this Epistle, was absent from Paul. The *First to Timothy* in the ὑπογραφῆ/*subscription* is said to have been written at *Laodicea*, the chiefest city of *Phrygia Pacatiana*: but in Colossians 2:1 the *Laodiceans* are reckoned among those that had never seen Paul's face; and the cognomen of *Pacatiana*, by which the other part of *Phrygia* was distinguished from *Phrygia Salutaris*,² which is of far more recent origin: see BEZA'S *Annotations*; SPANHEIM'S *Geographiam Sacram et Ecclesiasticam, opera, tome I, column 94*; and HOLLENHAGEN'S³ *de Septem Ecclesiis Asiaticis*, § 37, in *Thesauro Novo Dissertationum in Vetus et Novum Testamentum, tome 2, page 1041*. The *Epistle to Titus* is subscribed as sent from *Nicopolis of Macedonia*: but Titus 3:12 teaches that Paul had not yet come to *Nicopolis*, but was proceeding thither before winter; for he does not say ἐνταῦθα/*here*, but ἐκεῖ/*there*, κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι, *I have determined to winter*. But if this Epistles was now sent from *Nicopolis*, of which mention is made in Titus 3:12, doubt would remain whether *Nicopolis of Macedonia* or *Thrace*, or rather *Nicopolis of Epirus*,⁴ was to be understood: see BACHIENE'S⁵ *Geographiam Sacram, part III, section III, chapter XI, pages 877-884*.

And the Division into Chapters and Verses is not divine, but Human. Our AUTHOR in his *Compendio Theologiæ* with good reason distinguishes between the contemporary Division into Chapters and Verses, which we use, and the other Divisions of the Authentic Text, which among the *Hebrews* and *Greeks* were in use for ages.

To be sure, for ages the Jews had their פְּרָשׁוֹת/*Parashot*, into which the *Pentateuch* is divided, thus called from פָּרַשׁ, to be distinct or separated; to divide; in such a way that the *Parashah* indicates the separate section and ordinary reading assigned to each Sabbath. Fifty-four, or fifty-three, such *Parashot* are reckoned in the *Pentateuch*, in which readings the entire Mosaic Law is completed yearly in the Synagogue. The individual *Parashot* are denominated from the first word of the section, or from the

¹ Hieronymus Simons Van Alphen (1665-1742) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1714-1742).

² The western and eastern portions of Phrygia respectively.

³ Jacob Friedrich Hollenhagen (1677-1710) was a German clergyman.

⁴ On the Western coast of Greece.

⁵ Willem Albert Bachiene (1712-1783) was a Dutch Reformed pastor.

first, especially important, word: thus the first section, Genesis 1:1-6:9, is called Parashah בראשית, *In the Beginning*. The next section, reaching to Genesis 12, is named נֹחַ/Noah; and so on, as, from an inspection of the table of all the Parashot after BUXTORF'S tractate *de Abbreviaturis Hebraicis*, pages 281-288, it shall be evident to the eye of anyone. That this division of sections of the Law was made for the use of sabbath reading, which James retraces ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων, *from of old*, Acts 15:21, is easily proven; hence we acknowledge that the same is also sufficiently ancient, although we are unwilling exactly to determine the first author and just importance of this division. In addition to these *major* Parashot, *minor* are also given, which are shorter segments of these pericopes, adapted for distinguishing matters or arguments of the sacred text, and aptly moderating the public reading in suitable intervals. Thus, for example, in Genesis 1, individual allotments of the hexameron¹ are distinguished in minor Parashot; so also, in Genesis 11, the individual moments of the matters there recounted, for example, *a.* the building of the tower of Babel, *b.* the τεκνογονία/*begetting* of Shem, *c.* the generation of Arphaxad, etc. Both Parashot are further distinguished into פְּרָשׁוֹת פְּתוּחוֹת, *open sections*, which in the Manuscript Codices begin from an open line; and into פְּרָשׁוֹת סְתוּמוֹת, *sections closed*, or סְמוּכוֹת/*conjoined*, which are begun in the midst of a line. The greater *open* Parashot are signified by three larger פפפ; the lesser with a single smaller פ: but the greater *closed* Parashot are signified with three ססס; the lesser with a single smaller ס. Now, this entire system of Divisions, as not of great use beyond the public reading of the synagogue, is often omitted in printed editions. Finally, each greater Parashah is divided into seven חֻלְקִים/*Halakim/ portions*, which seven Readers divide among themselves, indicated in the Masoretic Bible by the marginal words כהן/לוי/שלישי/ *Priest, Levite, the third, etc.*

Likewise, the Jews had their חֲפְטָרוֹת/*Haphtarot, sendings or dismissals*, as it is interpreted by Bartolucci; or even *cessations, pauses*, according to Elias Levita: for it is derived from חֲפְטִיר/פֹּטֵר, which sometimes denotes *to cease, to stop*, and at other times *to send away free, to make free/exempt*. Both significations are able to be admitted with propriety: that they might thus be called *Haphtarot*, because by the same *an end is put* to the public reading of the Bible in the Synagogue, and thus,

¹ That is, the six days of creation.

with prayers subjoined, the sacred assembly *is dismissed*: unless Haphtarot are called *Cessations*, on account of their use introduced only after the use of the reading of the Law had ceased. For the *Haphtarot* are prophetic pericopes, corresponding in sense and content with the Parashot, and wont to be read publicly in the Synagogue after the reading of the Law. However, ELIAS LEVITA in *Tishbi* maintains that the reading of these was put in the place of the Sections of the Pentateuch by the elders of the people, after Antiochus Epiphanes, with the rites of the Jews abolished, prohibited the reading of the Law under penalty of death. But, as *Elias* rehearses these things without witnesses, whence VRIEMOET maintains that in this matter *credit is given too rashly to Elias*, as *this author is nearly alone*, *Thesibus Antiquitatum Israelitarum*, CCCCLXXXV; so it appears to hinder that Antiochus raged, not only against the Pentateuch, but against the entire Sacred Codex: neither does it appear probable that the tyrant permitted the reading of the Prophets any more than of the Law; since he prohibited this, so that he might call the people away from the knowledge and worship of the true God. Wherefore the Most Illustrious VITRINGA, *De Synagoga Vetere*, book III, part II, chapter XI, page 1008, fetches the origin of the Prophetic readings from this, that the Jews, after the republic was restored by the Maccabees, handled their sacred rites in every part with more fervid zeal; thereupon they sought out and reviewed all the sacred writings, with efforts renewed after Ezra; and, since they acknowledged the writings of Moses and of the Prophets to be of the same subject matter, and to tend toward the same goal, they made a decision to conjoin in the readings of the sabbath and feast days the writings of both sorts, while hitherto the public reading of the Mosaic Pentateuch alone had obtained. Again, concerning the point of time and author of this arrangement, we determine nothing: but, that this custom of conjoining the reading of the Law and the Prophets obtained in the Synagogues in the time of the Apostles, the *Acts* of the same most clearly teaches, when, in Acts 13:15, mention is made of the sabbath reading in the Synagogue, and this is called ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, *the reading of the Law and of the Prophets*: just as in verse 27 αἱ φωναὶ τῶν προφητῶν αἱ κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγιγνωσκόμεναι, *the voices of the Prophets which are read every sabbath day*, are mentioned. So that you might become acquainted more distinctly with these Haphtarot, the table of the Prophetic sections, לוח הפטרות, subjoined to many Editions of the Bible, is to be inspected; which will show that these sections were taken

equally from the former and the latter Prophets, and will additionally indicate a difference that was observed between the Spanish and the German Jews in the diverse prophetic periscopes sometimes substituted for some section of the Pentateuch: the custom of the former is noted in the margin by *כמנהג הספרדים*, *according to the tradition of the Sephardic Jews*, and of the latter by *כמנהג האשכנזים*, *according to the tradition of the Ashkenazic Jews*.

Furthermore, our AUTHOR mentions the Jews' *סְדָרִים*/*Sedarim/Orders*: by which word, *סְדָר*, or *סדרא* in Chaldean, the greater Parashah is frequently signified in the final Masorah, which also obtains in the writings of other Rabbis. Yet, sometimes from the distribution of the Masorettes a *Seder* constitutes a subdivision of the Parashot, whence it happens that *Genesis* has twelve Parashot, but forty-three Sedarim, and so on. And into Sedarim of this sort other books also, which do not admit Parashot, are found to have been divided by the Masorettes; so that *Joshua* has fourteen Sedarim, *Jeremiah* has thirty-one, etc. Now, this later division of the text is of no use today, and is altogether obsolete.

Finally, among the Jewish Divisions of the Text in our AUTHOR appear also the *פסוקים*/*Passukim, Biblical Verses*, from the Chaldean *פסק*, *to cease, to have an end*. Now, thus the sentences of the Hebrew text are called, set off by the readers with a full breath, and inscribed and punctuated with the silluq (◌◌), the greatest disjunctive accent, together with two points called the *soph passuk* (:), that is, the *end of the Verse*. There are a diversity of beliefs among Critics concerning the antiquity and origin of this Division. 1. There are those that refer the first Division of the Hebrew Text into Verses to the Tiberian Masorettes, and think it to be later than both Talmuds;¹ so it is thought by *Morinus*, *Simon*, and *Le Clerc* following *Elias Levita*: see *CARPZOV'S Criticam Sacram Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter IV, § 5, number 3, pages 158, 159*. 2. HUMPHREY PRIDEAUX, *The Old and New Testament Connected, part I, book V, column 393-397, in the Dutch folio edition*, believes that this Division was contrived, if not quite by Ezra, yet not so long after his death, principally for the sake of the Chaldean Translators, who were translating into Chaldean the Hebrew text, read in public Rites, but hardly understood any longer by the common people. So that the Hebrew Reader and Chaldean Interpreter might know accordingly how

¹ The Jerusalem Talmud was completed *circa* 350 AD; the Babylonian roughly two hundred years later.

far they were obliged to extend, and again where to stop, it was necessary that there be a division of the text into Verses; which was first done in the Law alone, then in the time of the Maccabees in the Prophets also. But he does not maintain that this Division was first made through the use of points, but that lines were devoted to the individual Verses on the parchments, etc.: compare the judgment of CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter IV, § 5, number 3, pages 156-158*. 3. The Most Illustrious BUXTORF, *Tiberiade, chapter VIII*, thinks that the division of the Text into Verses was the work of Ezra and the Great Synagogue, yet derogating nothing from the divine authority of this division: see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter IV, § 5, number 3, pages 155, 156*. 4. Finally, CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter IV, § 5, number 3, pages 153-155*, judges that this Division is to be referred to Moses and the Prophets, God's sacred Amanuenses themselves. While the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN, *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, Dissertation III, § 2, pages 16-19*, hesitates between the opinions of Buxtorf and Carpzov. Indeed, learned Men give a certain demonstration at great length that this distinction of the Hebrew Text into פסוקים/Passukim already obtained, not only before the Tiberian Masorettes, who lived after the five hundredth year after Christ; but even before the Mishnah was completed, which was collected about the middle of the Second Century after the birth of Christ by Rabbi Judah HaQadosh; not only from the unanimous testimony of the Jews, with Elias Levita alone excepted, but also from the frequent mention of the same in both Talmuds; I would not now mention the authority of JEROME, *Præfatione in Jesaiam, opera, tome 5, page 4*, and elsewhere (see LEUSDEN, *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, Dissertation III, § 2, page 17*). In addition, *Carpzov* seeks an argument from the certitude and evidence of the divine sense, which (in his judgment) in many places would be unsteady and would depend upon an unsound ankle, if it were not divinely established where the end of a sentence was to be placed, or, if it were left to the will of each reader to assign the beginnings and endings of sentences at pleasure. He also shows the arguments advanced for the contrary opinion are easily answered.

It is certainly not to be denied that, although apodictic demonstration is hardly to be expected here, yet the arguments for the opinion of *Carpzov* outweigh the rest; and that his opinion is especially useful for keeping in good repair the ordinary reading and division of the Sacred Codex, and at the same time for bridling human license. From a

comparison with those things that were argued concerning the Antiquity of the Vowel Points in § 8, not incongruently shall we also say here, that the Holy Spirit, while He dictated the Scriptures to the Holy Amanuenses, together with the necessary tokens of the Vowels, to such an extent also took care that the sense be stopped and distinguished, as far as this appeared necessary to Him to avert the στρέβλωσιν/*twisting* of the sense of Sacred Scripture, and to remove doubts otherwise arising from a perverse conjunction or disjunction of expressions: which inter-punctuation, indicated by the Spirit Himself, He would also have taken the utmost care to preserve in the Biblical Text; whence there is never to be a mad rush to disturb the common Division of the Hebrew Text: although we would desire to represent to no man that this Division of the individual verses by the same signs of *silluq* (◌) and *soph passuk* (:), as it is today, was already made from the beginning: compare BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, page 799*.

It is not for no reason that our AUTHOR in his *Compendio*, when he had affirmed that the Divisions of Chapters and Verses *according to those Chapters*, in such a way that wherever the *first Verse, second, etc.*, begins to be numbered from the beginning of the Chapter, are entirely human; distinctly then from the *Pauses* of the Jews, and among these, discusses the פְּסוּקִים/*Passukim*, and does not testify expressly of these that they are entirely human.

*Similarly the Greeks had their own τίτλους/inscriptions and κεφάλαια/headings.*¹ They already began to introduce these Divisions into the Greek Text toward the end of the Second Century. In the Third Century, in a Codex of the Gospels, Ammonius Saccas, an Alexandrian Philosopher,² applied his own effort at this point: in the Pauline Epistles, a similar thing was attempted by an Anonymous writer, whom Mill thinks to have been Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia.³ Euthalius the

¹ Conceptually, these divisions differ little from the modern chapters; however, materially, there is a great difference, as they rarely divide the text in the same place.

² Ammonius Saccas (flourished in the third century) is remembered as one of the founders of Neoplatonism, and as Plotinus' teacher. It does appear that there was a Christian Ammonius of third century Alexandria, and that he composed a harmony of the Gospels, but it is a matter of some doubt that this Ammonius was indeed Ammonius Saccas, the Neoplatonist.

³ Theodore (c. 350-428) served as Bishop of Mopsuestia in Asia Minor. Although much of his work has been lost, what remains is a monument of

Deacon¹ especially at this point, in the Fourth Century, won praise in the division of Acts, and the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. The practice of weaving together a harmony of the Gospels furnished the first occasion for this work. The τίτλοι and κεφάλαια sometimes in the same sense come to signify major sections of the Greek Text, each distinguished by its own subject matter; as thus it is in the headings of Matthew, α. Περὶ τῶν μάγων, *Concerning the Magi*; β. Περὶ τῶν ἀναιρεθέντων παιδιῶν, *Concerning the Children Killed*; γ. Πρῶτος Ἰωάννης ἐκήρυξε βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, *John first Preached the Kingdom of Heaven*; etc. But sometimes τίτλοι denotes those greater sections, but κεφάλαια sections far shorter, which were noted with numeral signs in the margin of the text: thus in Matthew they were enumerating sixty-eight τίτλους, but three hundred and fifty-five κεφάλαια. To these were added στίχοι/*Verses*, with two thousand and five hundred numbered in Matthew, which number of στίχων, however, varied considerably: and concerning which it is helpful to hear the Most Illustrious SALMASIUS explaining his opinion in his *Epistola ad Sarraviam, inter Sarravianas CLXXXIII, page 186*, where he writes: “The Ancient Codices were wont to write all words in one, continuous line without any spaces; except that, where a sentence had been completed, they did not begin another on the same line; but they established the beginning of another line or verse. Thence the distinction arose through the verses, which were greater or lesser, as a thought was summed up in more or fewer words; just as individual verses were occupying sometimes two, sometimes three or more lines: the Greeks call them στίχους. Now, those works were numbered by verses, the sum of which was noted at the end of the book. Thence they used πολὺστιχον βιβλίον, *The Many-line Bible*, of the great volume. This method endured for a long time. In an ancient Codex of the Epistles of Paul, which is in the hands of the Dupuy family,² you will find

early Antiochene exegesis, characterized by careful consideration of, and adherence to, grammar and history.

¹ Precious little is known about Euthalius; even the time (fourth to seventh century) and the place (Sulca, perhaps in Egypt) of his labors are obscured by the mists of time. Euthalius provided lectionary and verse divisions for Acts and the Epistles.

² Claude Dupuy (1545-1594) was a French humanist. He collected a great library of manuscripts, which was inherited by his sons, Pierre and Jacques, considerable scholars in their own right. Codex Claromontanus appears to be the manuscript under consideration. It is an Uncial of the fifth or sixth

at the end a *στιχομετρίαν*, a *stichometric catalogue*, of the books of the entirety of the Sacred Scripture.” See more things concerning these divisions of the Greeks in the Text of the New Testament in RUMPÆUS’ *Criticis ad Novi Testamenti Libros, cum præfatione Carpzovii*, § XXXIII, XXXIV, pages 130-146; and also in PRITIUS’ *Introductione in Lectionem Novi Testamenti, chapters XXIV, XXV, pages 219-257*, where you will find τὰ κεφάλαια, or lemmata, the arguments of the major sections of the entire New Testament enumerated in Greek.

But as far as our modern *Division* of the Books into fixed portions, which we call *Chapters*, is concerned, our AUTHOR observes that it is well-known that this is not much above five hundred years old, with the praise of this work in the Latin Text commonly attributed to HUGO CARDINALIS OF ST. CHER.¹ JOHANNES CROJUS, in his *Observationibus Sacris, chapter VII, pages 55 and following*, contends that today’s division of the Books into Chapters is not new, but was already devised by the Fathers of the first centuries. But the foundations upon which his opinion rests are very weak: for, as far as the Manuscript Codex of the Latin Books is concerned, written eight hundred years before, in which today’s division of Chapters appears; to that purpose also in Theophylact, a writer of the Eleventh Century, to whom he also appeals; the Chapters of the Sacred Books are able to have been added by a later hand for the convenience of the readers. If such a division had existed of old, it had not been needful for the Fathers to cite the Biblical text by alleging particular histories: thus, for example, AUGUSTINE relates (with LEUSDEN observing in his *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, Dissertation III, § 4, page 20*) that he is discussing *from the beginning of Genesis unto the expulsion of our first parents from paradise*; in the place of which it would have been far easier to have said, *upon the first three chapters of Genesis*. Similarly GREGORY THE GREAT, who lived about the end of the Sixth Century, says that *he expounded the history from the beginning of the Book of Samuel unto the anointing of King David*; in the place of which we now say *the first Fifteen Chapters of the First Book of Samuel*. Thus JEROME also had written in *Præfatione in Jesaïam, opera, tome 5*,

century, giving a Western text-type of the Pauline epistles, with a Latin rendering.

¹ Hugh of St. Cher, also known as Hugo Cardinalis because he was the first Dominican to achieve the office of cardinal (c. 1200-1263), was a French Dominican Biblical scholar. His exegetical works, covering the entire canon, have been gathered into eight substantial volumes.

page 4, “Didymus...from the place where it is written, *Comfort, comfort, oh ye priests, my people; speak to the heart of Jerusalem:* unto the end of the volume, published eighteen tomes.”¹ So then, in the *Psalms*, with the individual Psalms subsisting of themselves, the same division always obtained, whence Paul cites the *second Psalm*, Acts 13:33; but with respect to the rest of the Biblical context the Division into Chapters is attributed by some to Arlotto the Etruscan, who flourished under the Emperor Adolphus in the year 1290.² JOHN BALE, Bishop of England, in his *Catalogo Scriptorum Magnæ Britannicæ*,³ Century III, ascribes the praise of this labor to his countryman, *Stephen Langton*, Cardinal and Archbishop of Canterbury under Kings John and Henry III.⁴ But most, following GENEBRARD in *Chronologia*, SIXTUS SENENSIS in *Bibliotheca Sancta*, NICHOLAUS SERARIUS in *Prolegomenis Bibliorum*, BUXTORF in *præfatione in Concordantiam*, HOTTINGER in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, say that the author of this work is HUGH OF SAINT-CHER, a Dominican Monk, who was the first from that order raised to the dignity of Cardinal, commonly called *Hugo Cardinalis*; now, he flourished about the year 1240 and died in the year 1262. He, since he wrote Commentaries on the whole Bible, undertook also to provide a *Concordance of the Vulgate Version*, which he completed by the conjoined efforts of five hundred Monks from diverse monasteries. But, so that the words occurring in the Concordance might be found more easily, he divided the entire Sacred Codex into *Chapters*, which might be recorded in the Concordance after the individual words; the Chapters are again divided into smaller segments, not by today’s Verses, but by seven letters, A, B,

¹ Didymus the Blind (c. 313-398) was the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, and one of Jerome’s teachers. It is said that his commentaries covered almost the entirety of Scripture, but his work survives only in fragments.

² Arlotto of Prato was an Italian Franciscan, and eventually became the Minister General of his order. He compiled an early concordance of the Latin Vulgate.

³ John Bale (1495-1563) was Bishop of Ossory, a historian and a controversialist. He published an extensive list of British authors down to his own time, preserving much rare and precious material during the dissolution of the monasteries in England.

⁴ Stephen Langton (c. 1150-1228) was a Cardinal in the Roman Church and Archbishop of Canterbury. Controversy between Pope Innocent III and King John over the election of Stephen to the Archbishopric was one of the factors leading to the signing of the Magna Carta. Langton’s chapter divisions are in use to the present day.

C, D, E, F, G, placed in the margin at equal distance from each other; whence in more lengthy Chapters the Sections were more lengthy than in others. Which invention of Hugh soon earned applause, and almost all undertook to apply that Division to their Bible, without which there was no use to him of Hugh's Concordance. But in the Fifteenth Century, about the year 1430, among the Jews *Rabbi Mordechai Nathan* or *Isaac Nathan*¹ oftentimes discoursing with Christians, observing the manifest usefulness of Hugh's Latin Concordance, undertook to construct a similar Concordance upon the Hebrew Text; which work, begun in the year 1438, was carried through to its end in the year 1445: but which by the labor of the *Buxtorfs* was rendered far more complete and correct still. In this Concordance, Rabbi Nathan assumed Hugh's Division of Chapters, which thereafter also began to be applied by everyone to the margin of Hebrew Text for the use of this Concordance. In subdividing the Chapters he entered upon a still more suitable method than Hugh, by numbering the פסוקים/*Passukim* of the Hebrew Text, and by applying a Hebrew numeral letter to every fifth Verse: which the Jews thereafter followed in the Editions of their Bible, until *Athias*, in the preceding century, in the Bibles published in 1661 and 1667,² while indeed retaining the letters א, ה, י, applied to every fifth Verse, began to distinguish the remaining Verses in between with common numerical marks. This Division of Chapters by the custom of designating Verses, rather than that by the letters A, B, etc., of Hugh, Christians again began to imitate in Editions of the Latin Bible around the middle of the sixteenth Century. But, since only the Old Testament had to this point been divided into the smallest parts of this sort, ROBERT STEPHANUS, a Parisian Printer, rendering the highest service to literature together with his son Henricus, in the same manner, in the place of the Old στίχων, wont to be numbered through entire books with the order uninterrupted, divided the individual *Chapters* of the *New Testament* also into *Verses*, and that especially for the use of the *Concordantiarum Græcarum Novi Testamenti*, which he was preparing; just as previously Hugh and Rabbi Nathan upon occasion of the Latin and Hebrew Concordances also took it upon themselves to divide the Sacred Text. In the first place, with this division of the Chapters into Verses added, Robert Stephanus

¹ Isaac Nathan ben Kalonymus was a Jewish apologist of France. His *Meir Netib* was the first concordance of the Hebrew Bible.

² Joseph Athias (c. 1635-1700) was a Rabbi of Spanish extraction. Settling in Amsterdam, he published two important editions of the Hebrew Bible.

published the Greek Testament together with a twofold Latin translation, that is, of Erasmus and of the Old Translator,¹ in a smaller form, at Paris in the year 1551, which, having been prepared for the sake of convenience, soon found acceptance among all also. I will add concerning the plan of this collected work the words of HENRICUS STEPHANUS in *præfatione Concordantiarum Græcarum Novi Testamenti*, whence it shall be proven that it is not strange, if sometimes that Division of Greek Verses should appear to us less fitting. Therefore, after he had prefaced in a general way, that his father, Robert Stephanus, prepared this Division of the New Testament, while hitherto the individual Books had been divided only into Chapters, he continues: "Concerning the matter itself, I shall say more. I will take my beginning from two things; thou wilt wonder at which of the two thou oughtest more to be amazed. One is that, he, directing his course from Paris to Lyon, completed this division of each Chapter, of which he treats, even indeed a great part of it while riding. The other is that him, reflecting upon this somewhat earlier, nearly all were affirming to be thoughtless, just as if he were willing to invest time and labor in a matter, that was going to be entirely useless, and therefore was not only going to obtain no praise, but was even going to come into derision. But behold, contrary to their condemning opinion of my father's plan, at the same time that his invention came into the light, it also come into the favor of all: and also into such authority, that the other editions of the New Testament, whether Greek or Latin, Gallic or German, or in another vernacular tongue, that did not follow that invention, might be dismissed from service, as it were." And these things indeed shall be said concerning the modern Division of the Bible into Chapters and Verses. Since that division into Chapters is a human work, it is not strange, if it suffer from blemishes, and not always aptly correspond to the cohesion and division of subject matter. Hence in printed Hebrew Bibles the same division is not always found; neither did the translators, whether Luther in the German Version, or Junius and Tremellius in the Latin Version, or the Dutch in their Version, consider it taboo to recede sometimes from the common and accustomed division of Chapters: compare LEUSDEN'S *Philologum Hebræum*, *Dissertation III*, and his *Philologum Hebræo-Græcum*, *Dissertation III*; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, *part I, book V, columns 397-401*; RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § XXXV-

¹ That is, the Vulgate.

XXXVII, pages 146-160. A History of Biblical Concordances, for the sake of which it appears that the Division of Books into Chapters, and of the New Testament also into Verses, was done, BUDDEUS summarily relates in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 12, tome 2, pages 1776b-1783.

As far as the age, authors, and authority of the *minor Distinctions in the Greek Text of the New Testament*, namely, of the accents, breathings, commas, κώλων/*clauses*, points, and parentheses, consult RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § XXXVIII, pages 160-176; PRITIUS' *Introductionem in Lectionem Novi Testamenti*, chapters XVII, XVIII, pages 263-270; LEUSDEN'S *Philologum Hebræo-Græcum*, *Dissertation IV*, § 7, 8, pages 29, 30.

§ 15: Canonical Books Imperishable, Part 1

Among the *Accidental Properties* of these Canonical Books our AUTHOR enumerates that they always Endure and Survive, and also that all always remain Canonical.

Therefore, *the Canonical Books* then extant *did not perish all together and at the same time in the Babylonian destruction of the City and Temple* of Jerusalem. That is, this fable is narrated concerning the Sacred Books being altogether destroyed in the conflagration of the Temple, *so that by the heavenly revelation and care of Ezra, after a certain draught received from God, in the space of forty days, dictating them to five men, they had to be restored, in an Apocryphal book, 4 Esdras 14:21-44.*¹

¹ 4 Esdras 14:21-44: “For thy law is burnt, therefore no man knoweth the things that are done of thee, or the work that shall begin. But if I have found grace before thee, send the Holy Ghost into me, and I shall write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning, which were written in thy law, that men may find thy path, and that they which will live in the latter days may live. And he answered me, saying, Go thy way, gather the people together, and say unto them, that they seek thee not for forty days. But look thou prepare thee many box trees, and take with thee Sarea, Dabria, Selemia, Ecanus, and Asiel, these five which are ready to write swiftly; and come hither, and I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out, till the things be performed which thou shalt begin to write. And when thou hast done, some things shalt thou publish, and some things shalt thou shew secretly to the wise: to morrow this hour shalt thou begin to write. Then went I forth, as he commanded, and gathered all the people together, and said, Hear these words, O Israel. Our fathers at the beginning were strangers in Egypt, from whence they were delivered: And received the law of life, which they kept not, which ye also have transgressed after them. Then was the land, even the land of Sion, parted among you by lot: but your fathers, and ye yourselves, have done unrighteousness, and have not kept the ways which the Highest commanded you. And forasmuch as he is a righteous judge, he took from you in time the thing that he had given you. And now are ye here, and your brethren among you. Therefore if so be that ye will subdue your own understanding, and reform your hearts, ye shall be kept alive and after death ye shall obtain mercy. For after death shall the judgment come, when we shall live again: and then shall the names of the righteous be manifest, and the works of the ungodly shall be declared. Let no man therefore come unto me now, nor seek after me these forty days. So I took the

Several *Fathers* are cited as supporting this tradition, namely, IRENÆUS in his *against Heresies*, book III, chapter XXI, page 216; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Stromata*, book I, page 342; BASIL THE GREAT, *Epistola ad Chilonem, opera*, tome 3, page 7 C; TERTULLIAN, *de Cultu Feminarum*, book I, chapter III; etc. But, as it is evident that the Fathers of the ancient Church were oftentimes deceived in matters of this sort, whose authority then in this matter does not greatly overawe us; so neither is it possible to elicit from their words that all that are cited in favor of this opinion thus actually believed. Let the Greek text of IRENÆUS be examined, which EUSEBIUS has preserved for us in book V of *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, chapter VIII, near the end. It is not asserted in that place that the Scriptures were completely destroyed; but only διαφθαρεισῶν τῶν γραφῶν, that is, *with the Scriptures corrupted*, that is, perverted by errors, which had crept in with the passing of time and the Captivity continuing. When it is then added, ἐνέπνευσεν Ἐσδρα τῷ ἱερεῖ, τοὺς τῶν προγεγονότων προφητῶν πάντα ἀνατάξασθαι λόγους, καὶ ἀποκαταστήσαι τῷ λαῷ τὴν διὰ Μωσέως νομοθεσίαν, *He inspired Ezra the priest to set in order all the words of the former prophets, and to restore to the people the legislation of Moses:* by the word ἀνατάξασθαι, which HENRI VALOIS renders *to compose again*, but MASSUET *to arrange*; nothing else is signified, when you compare that with ἀποκαταστήσαι, but that he emended the Sacred Codices, arranged them into an order, in this manner restored them to the use of all, and exhibited them, completely free from errors, as they were in the beginning, to the people. Since this was not accomplished without a certain inspiration of the Divine and pious affection of soul, Irenæus not incorrectly judges that this was *breathed into* Ezra. What things CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Stromata*, book I, page 342, has were

five men, as he commanded me, and we went into the field, and remained there. And the next day, behold, a voice called me, saying, Esdras, open thy mouth, and drink that I give thee to drink. Then opened I my mouth, and, behold, he reached me a full cup, which was full as it were with water, but the colour of it was like fire. And I took it, and drank: and when I had drunk of it, my heart uttered understanding, and wisdom grew in my breast, for my spirit strengthened my memory: And my mouth was opened, and shut no more. The Highest gave understanding unto the five men, and they wrote the wonderful visions of the night that were told, which they knew not: and they sat forty days, and they wrote in the day, and at night they ate bread. As for me, I spake in the day, and I held not my tongue by night. In forty days they wrote two hundred and four books.”

drawn straight out of Irenæus, as *Potter* also observes,¹ and so are also to be understood in the same way, with the Translator incorrectly rendering there διαφθαρεισῶν as *since they had perished*. In the same manner is able to be taken what CLEMENT has in his *Stromata*, book I, page 329, at the end, δι' Ἐσδραν γίνεσθαι ὁ τῶν θεοπνεύστων ἀναγνωρισμὸς καὶ ἀνακαινισμὸς λογίων, that is, *through Ezra was made a recension and renovation of the divinely inspired oracles*. Thus *Bellarmino* also explains the meaning of these and other Fathers, book II, de *Verbo Dei*, chapter I, *Controversiis*, tome I, columns 83-85.

For our part, we marvel that of the crowd of *Papists* after *Nicolaus de Lyra* on Ezra 7:6 and 2 Maccabees 2:13² that might embrace these trifles, there were none; if indeed they, thus providing that the Church in the entire time of the Babylonian Captivity was preserved without Scripture by the influence of Tradition alone, thought themselves to be able to make use of this device *for the commendation of Traditions and disparagement of Scripture* and its necessary use: see GERHARD'S *Confessione catholicam*, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, page 71.

But it is good that the *more sober* *Papists* themselves interpose; as ABRAHAM CALOVIUS in his *Critico Sacro*, page 384, of the *Papists* cites *Pererius*, *Bellarmino*, *Genebrard*, *Baronius*, *Torniellus*,³ and *Marius*, who refute this fable: to whom BUDDEUS, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, page 829, adds *Huet*, *Demonstratione Evangelica*, proposition IV, page 264; *Louis Ellies du Pin*, *Dissertatione præliminaria super Biblia*, book I, chapter IV, § 3, pages 144 and following; *Natalis Alexander*, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, age of the world VI, dissertation IV, pages 338 and following. The words of the *Papists* that reject that device are cited at length by GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, pages 72-77.

¹ John Potter (c. 1674-1747) was an English scholar and classicist. Among his contributions to literature is his edition of Clement of Alexandria. Potter was a High Churchman, and served as Archbishop of Canterbury from 1737 to 1747.

² 2 Maccabees 2:13: "The same things also were reported in the writings and commentaries of Neemias; and how he founding a library gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts."

³ Augustine Torniellus (1543-1622) was a member of the Society of Barnabites, a Counter-Reformation order. His work, *Annales Sacri et Profani*, cleared up many geographical and chronological difficulties and obscurities, especially in the Old Testament.

It is certainly evident that that *Book of 4 Esdras* is not to be enumerated with those Apocryphal Books that are held by Papists as Canonical and Sacred: on the contrary, its author is described by HUET, *Demonstratione Evangelica*, proposition IV, page 264, as *a man poorly and ineptly fraudulent*. BELLARMINE, in book II, *de Verbo Dei*, chapter I, column 84, deserves to be heard: "This book," says he, "is not only Apocryphal, and was never received by the catholic Church, but also in many places smells of Jewish fables, etc. Wherefore rather the testimony of this book diminishes confidence in this opinion that it alleges." Nevertheless, *Hobbes* also gives assent to this fable; see COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatomen*, locus III, chapter V, pages 47, 48.

Sufficient for the confutation of this fiction, as our AUTHOR rightly observes, is, α. *the dispersal of the Exemplars among the Jews, both the Jerusalemite, who remained in their native land in the time of the Captivity, and those previously rooted in Assyria and Babylon, of which dispersal there can be no doubt; so that, although the autographs be consumed in the conflagration of the Temple, nevertheless the copies remained.* β. *Daniel's reading of the Sacred Volumes in the Captivity itself, Daniel 9:2, 11; and Ezra's soon after the return from the Captivity, Nehemiah 8:2-4, where the Jews seek from Ezra תּוֹרַת אֶת-סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה, to bring, to bring forth the book of the Law,¹ not to compose.* Indeed, concerning returning Ezra in Ezra 7:14, it is affirmed that he had the Law of God at hand, בְּדַת אֱלֹהֶיךָ הִי בְיָדֶיךָ, according to the Law of thy God which is in thine hand. But even before the coming of Ezra, the returning Jews had the written Law, from which, with the Temple restored, they also renewed public worship, Ezra 6:18, בְּכִתָּב סֵפֶר מֹשֶׁה, as it is written in the book of Moses. If anyone wishes all this to be interpreted concerning the Book of Moses already restored by Ezra, he ought to bring clear reasons for his assertion. γ. *Not only the Silence concerning this entire matter in Canonical Scripture, but also its apparent Overthrow, when the precious Vessels of the Temple are said to be carried off by Babylon, 2 Chronicles 36:18 compared with 2 Kings 25:9, 13-17. But if Scripture so carefully records the burning of Jerusalem, the conflagration of the Temple, and the carrying off of the Holy Vessels, certainly it would not have passed over in silence the loss of such a treasure, the total destruction of the Sacred Scripture.* δ. *The faithful care of the Church, in which at that time were holy Men, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah; among whom*

¹ See verse 1.

we saw that *Daniel* made use of the sacred Books in Captivity: *Ezekiel*, and *Jeremiah*, who had received the liberty of remaining in Judea, both from priestly families, upon whom on this double account it was incumbent to teach the people the law;¹ likewise *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, restorers of the worship of God among the returning people; who would believe that they were without the Law and the other Sacred Books? The provident *care of God* Himself is added, who did not permit the Sacred Scriptures to be destroyed by the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the Sacred Books were diligently sought for burning, 1 Maccabees 1:56-58:² shall we now imagine that He permitted the total destruction of Sacred Scripture, when no attempt of the Babylonians to destroy the Sacred Books is mentioned to us? ε. That it is not so necessary for the refutation of this fable to have recourse to the *uncertain narrations* both of JOSEPHUS, who in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, book XI, chapter I, page 357, writes that *King Cyrus read the propheties of Isaiah* that had regard to himself, and that by this very thing he was caught by a desire for the accomplishment of those things that were predicted concerning himself; to which, nevertheless, BUDDEUS denies that credence is safely given, *Historia Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section V, § 8, tome 2, page 662b, with JACQUES ALEXANDRE VOS thinking otherwise, *Voozbereids tot de Uytlegging van Daniel*, chapter I, § 6, pages 4-6: and of THEODORET, who in his *de Curatione Græcarum Affectionum*, book I, opera, tome 4, page 472, relates: Καὶ Κῦρος δέγε ὁ Καμβύσου, τὸν Δανιὴλ ὁμοδίαιτον ἐσχηκῶς, τῶν τῆς θεοσεβείας μετέλαχε μαθημάτων· Λυδοῦς δὲ καταστρεψάμενος, καὶ τούτους ὑποχειρίους λαβὼν, μετέδωκε δήπου τοῖς ὑπηκόοις ὧν παρ' ἐκείνου μεμάθηκεν· κτλ, *And Cyrus, father of Cambyzes, having kept Daniel near, obtained a share in the lessons in God-fearing: and, having subdued the Lydians, and having taken those as subjects, he gave a share to his subjects of what he had learned from him, etc.* ζ. We do not want to appeal to another *Fable*, but what is commemorated in a *Book Canonical to the Papists*, 2 Maccabees 2:4, 5,³ in which you read

¹ See Leviticus 10:11; Deuteronomy 33:10; Malachi 2:6, 7.

² 1 Maccabees 1:56-58: "And when they had rent in pieces the books of the law which they found, they burnt them with fire. And whosoever was found with any the book of the testament, or if any committed to the law, the king's commandment was, that they should put him to death. Thus did they by their authority unto the Israelites every month, to as many as were found in the cities."

³ 2 Maccabees 2:4, 5: "It was also contained in the same writing, that the

that the *Tabernacle*, *Ark*, and *altar of incense* were preserved from the conflagration by *Jeremiah* in a cave of Mount Nebo: it would have been strange, if the chest with the *αὐτογράφοις/autographs* of the *θεοπνεύστων/inspired Book* were not joined with these.

But this *Fable* delays us so much the less, since it is easy to track down its *origin* in the solicitous care of *Ezra* to emend, to gather into one, to supplement, and to arrange the Sacred Codex, concerning which we treated above, and which trifling men think to be a gift to themselves immeasurably to augment with fables of this sort added, namely, so that they might so much the more commend *Ezra*.

prophet, being warned of God, commanded the tabernacle and the ark to go with him, as he went forth into the mountain, where Moses climbed up, and saw the heritage of God. And when Jeremy came thither, he found an hollow cave, wherein he laid the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar of incense, and so stopped the door.”

§ 16: Canonical Books Imperishable, Part 2

As we saw in the § above, the Canonical Books did not at any time perish all at once, so our AUTHOR now contends that *not any Canonical Book* totally *perished*. Of course, concerning this there is controversy between us, 1. and the *Socinians*, who contend that *many Sacred Books perished, that many Books of the Old Scripture perished, that many writings of the old instrument are not in our possession*; as these things are read in *Socinus in Lectionibus sacris, opera, tome I, page 297a, b, Tertium, quod omnino animadvertendum, etc.*, likewise *page 299b, 306a*; and in *Volkelius, de vera Religione, book V, chapter V, page 381* (in *MARESIUS' Hydra Socinianismi expugnata, tome 3, page 26*): they then cite several Books as if lost, many of which our AUTHOR examines under *Objections*. Now, *HOORNBEECK* observes, in *Socinianismo confutato, book I, chapter III, controversy III, tome I, page 48*, that the *Socinians* by those *Sacred Books* that they maintain have been lost understand no others than what were *Canonical*, which their very arguments make evident.

2. The issue stands between us and the *Papists*, who commonly assert the same: among whom is *Bellarmino*, who in *book IV, de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, Controversiis, tome I, column 211*, says: “Many truly sacred and canonical books perished; therefore, we do not have, nor did we have for fifteen hundred years, sufficient doctrine, if the whole be laid up in the Scriptures. For *Chrysostom* teaches that many books of the Old testament have perished, etc.”

The *Scope/Goal* of our Adversaries is *to demonstrate the Imperfection of Scripture*, and especially of the *Papists* also *to show the necessity of Traditions*, according to the title prefixed to *Bellarmino's* chapter just now cited.

At the same time, our AUTHOR not without reason asserts in his *Compendio, Thus the Papists generally*; even though *JOHANN GERHARD, Confessione catholica, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter IV, pages 256-259*, has gathered the opinions of many even of the more learned *Papists*, teaching that no *Canonical books* truly so called have perished; for example, *Salmeron, Stapleton, Marius, Ruizius,¹ Pererius,*

¹ *Diego Ruiz de Montoya* (1562-1632) was a Spanish Jesuit theologian. He

etc.; and in particular then from their writings he responds to the examples of the lost books, which are wont to be alleged, whether out of the Old or New Testament, by their cronies.

We acknowledge, says our AUTHOR, that *Most Celebrated Theologians among us have subscribed, yet for good reason denying the Pontifical hypothesis* (concerning the Imperfection of Scripture and the demonstration of the necessity of Traditions from it); *since Canonical Doctrine, by the goodness of God included in many Books in abundance, most certainly survives in Today's Books.* TURRETIN names those professing this opinion in his *Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question VII, § 3*; while he adds MUSCULUS¹ and WHITAKER, following CHRYSOSTOM, measuring the Integrity of the Canon, not by the number of the sacred Books, or their *quantitative Perfection*; but by the fullness of doctrine, or the *essential Perfection* of all things necessary for salvation, which in the Books that survive is found in abundance: see the words of CHRYSOSTOM in *Homily IX on Matthew*, of THEOPHYLACT and MUSCULUS, upon this matter, together with the prudent observation of GOMAR, concerning the Integrity of the Canon for this cause not perishing, cited by our AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus textualibus XXVI, Part IV, § 2, page 3.* SPANHEIM enumerates many others as attached to this opinion, *Miscellaneis Sacrorum Antiquorum, book II, part I, chapter II, § 10, column 181, opera, tome 2*, to whom one may also add JOHANNES ENS, who, in his *Diatriba de Canone Librorum Novi Testamenti, chapter IV, pages 17-75*, busies himself to prove with many words, that it is to be conceded entirely to the Papists, that many *θεόπνευστοι/inspired* Books have perished, and that the only real controversy here is concerning the Consequence, namely, whether from the destruction of many divine Books flows the Imperfection of today's Canon: while, in § 2, he thinks it to be a mere word-game, if one should concede that *Books Sacred* and *θεοπνεύστους/inspired* perished, but deny that they were *Canonical*, or *destined for the perpetual Canon*: yet which response to the denial of the Assumption, together with the Consequence also, of the Papists concerning lost books does not appear so ludicrous to me, but I, following great Men, shall also next set forth this distinction as solid and

was a refined theologian, most remembered for his *Doctrinæ Christianæ* and his commentaries on selected parts of Aquinas' work.

¹ Wolfgang Musculus (1497-1563) was a Reformed theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Bern (1549-1563). He has had enduring impacting through his Biblical Commentaries and his *Locos communes sacrae theologiae*.

of good use in this matter, and shall urge it as worthy of observation.

But, with this inconsequence of argument noted, our AUTHOR thinks that this Assumption concerning Lost Books is by no means to be conceded, with certain of the most learned Papists, already enumerated above out of GERHARD. Thus HOORNBECK, in Socinianismo confutato, book I, chapter III, controversy III, tome I, page 49, also observes that two things here are wont by our men to be answered to opponents, namely, a denial of the Consequence in the first place, then of the Assumption.

It would not have been useless, in advance to have observed here in addition one or two distinctions. Namely, it is one thing for some Book to be *among the Sacred Books*; it is another thing to be a *Sacred Book*: the former is able to be said concerning all the Books cited in Sacred Scripture, but not the latter.

It is one thing for a Book to be composed by a Canonical and θεοπνεύστῳ/*inspired* Writer; it is another thing for a Book to be Canonical and θεόπνευστον/*inspired*. For θεόπνευστοι/*inspired* Men were not enjoying θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* in all things that they were saying and writing: they were also speaking many things according to their human will; why not also writing? consider the words of the Prophet Nathan in 2 Samuel 7:2-5: but see also the letters written by David to Joab concerning the slaying of Uriah with the sword of the Ammonites, in 2 Samuel 11:14, 15, while in the case of other Sacred writings no one would deny David's θεοπνευστίαν/*inspiration*, comparing 2 Samuel 23:2, 3. AUGUSTINE, *de Civitate Dei*, book XVIII, chapter XXXVIII, *opera*, tome 7, column 394, well says: "I also think that those, by whom the Holy Spirit was certainly revealing those things that ought to be in relation to the authority of religion, were able to write some things as men by historical diligence, and other things as Prophets by divine inspiration: and that these things are distinguished in such a way that the former things are judged to be worthy of attribution to them, but the latter as to God speaking by them; and thus the former things pertain to the abundance of inquiry, but the latter to the authority of religion, in which authority the Canon is kept."

Finally, a particular Book is able not incorrectly to be called *Canonical* in a twofold sense; either insofar as it contains Canonical doctrine, according to which a man ought to compose himself in faith and manners; or insofar as by the determination of God it is also to be

referred to the Canon or syntagma¹ of θεοπνεύστων/*inspired* Books, which are granted for the perpetual use of the Church as a standard. Every Canonical Book in this latter sense ought also to be θεόπνευστος/*inspired*: but not necessarily every θεόπνευστος/*inspired* Book also pertains unto the Canon of the Old and New Testaments. I shall illustrate what I have said with the words of the Great FRANCISCUS JUNIUS, out of *Analyticis Explicationibus Numerorum*, chapter XXI, *opera*, tome I, column 464: “It is to be observed,” says he, “it is one thing if you call a Book Sacred; another thing, if you call a Book Canonical. For every Book published by God through the Prophets and Apostles is Sacred: but not every Sacred Book is therefore necessarily Canonical, pertaining to the universal body of the Church. For example, it is likely that the Prophet Isaiah, as a Prophet, wrote many other things that were divine: but yet those things only were Canonical, that is, pertaining to the public Canon and repository of the Church, that God sanctified that they might be brought into the repository of the Church. Thus the Apostles Paul, etc., penned writings from heaven that are not extant: but of all those they only are Canonical by divine authority that are brought into the universal and Christian Church: that this matter was both commended by the Apostles themselves, and confirmed in the last times of the Apostles, but especially by John at the request of all the Church of Asia and of other regions, the ancient histories have confirmed.” The Most Illustrious WITSIUS, a Theologian of a somewhat more recent age, altogether agrees with Junius; he, in his *Meletematis Leudensiis, de vita Pauli*, Section VII, § 11, expresses this as his opinion: “For my part, I have no doubt at all that all the Apostles according to their singular diligence bestowed a great number of letters upon the Churches committed to their care; to which it was permitted always to be present, and in which, nevertheless, they continually had many things to be inculcated. —The consideration would appear to me injurious unto the trust and diligence of such painstaking men, if one should think that those of the Apostles never wrote any epistles, of whom none now survive, or those, of whom we now have one, or a second, or a third, or even twelve, wrote none except those that we have. The reason for writing was the same for Peter and Paul, as it was for James and John, and for the rest. And what things either necessity pressed, or usefulness urged, that they might write these things to some, the same necessity

¹ That is, systematic collection.

and usefulness demanded that they write the same or similar things to others. It is not that we complain that such precious *κειμήλια*/*treasures* perished by injury of time: it is rather that we give thanks to God, by whose provident benevolence toward us it has come to pass, that we have retained so many and so much, which is abundantly sufficient for us to be instructed unto salvation.”

With which observed to avoid a *λογομαχίαν*, *verbal dispute*, this shall be sufficient to hold here: although many things, written by *θεοπνεύστοις*/*inspired Men*, but not *θεοπνεύστως*, *by inspiration*, may have perished; or even *θεοπνεύστα*, *inspired writing*, but not writings destined by God that they might be referred into the public Canon and repository of the Church: no Canonical writings, pertaining according to the intention of God to the Canon and corpus of the Scripture of the Old or New Testament, and at length also brought and received into that same Canon, have perished. This we prove:

α. *By the Immutability of the Counsel of God, with the End of the Scriptures brought to bear.* For what Books God caused to be written, that they might be the perpetual Canon of faith and manners for the universal Church, these He ought to preserve in good repair from dissolution. The rationale of the Major is that the Counsel of God would have otherwise been disappointed, and failed of its End: but this is absurd. But concerning Books of this sort, destined for the perpetual Canon, we treat here in accordance with the stated hypothesis/supposition: concerning which things, Paul treats in Romans 15:4, ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν, *for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.* Of the writings of this sort, therefore, nothing should perish, unless that goal in the writing of the same at the same time perish: hence nothing is to be added to, and nothing is to be removed from, the Canon, Revelation 22:18, 19.

β. *By the Providence of God continually keeping watch for the salvation of the Church, which is cannot be thought to be able to permit that the Church might suffer the loss or mutilation of so great a treasure as the Canon of Scripture; and which is actually shown in all the times of the Old and New Testaments in the careful preservation of Sacred Scripture, even in the greatest defections and vexations of the Church.*

γ. *By repeated Promises and declarations, Matthew 5:18; Isaiah 40:8; 1 Peter 1:23, 25.* But, if God so carefully averts the mutilation and destruction of individual texts and their words, that not one little letter or the smallest point is able to perish; how much more would he prevent the destruction of entire Books? especially since He wills to preserve His Word in the Church in Written Books.

δ. The *vigilance and care of the Church* is added, both of the *Christian Church*, which vigilance shows itself in such a number of writings of the holy Fathers, in which they commend the Sacred Scriptures, and discuss and enumerate the Books comprehended in the Canon, and carefully inquire concerning any ἀντιλεγόμενα/*disputed Books*; and also especially of the *Jewish Church*, to which the custody of the Canon of the Old Testament was committed,¹ and in this matter is nowhere accused of negligence or treachery by the Lord or His Apostles: on the contrary, its care in preserving the integrity of the Canon *in the latter times was almost excessive and superstitious*, inasmuch as the Masorettes set about numbering, not only the sacred Books, but the sections, verses, words, and even the very letters, so that in this manner they might post שמירת התורה שלא יהיה דרך לשנותה, *a guard for the Law, lest in any manner it might be able to be altered*, as it is in the *Book of Cosri, part III, chapter XXXII, page 109*; see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part I, chapter VI, § 3, pages 295-301*; compare BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section VI, § 12, tome 2, pages 797b, 831-833a*. Also read the concise arguments for the uninjured Integrity of the Canon by PETRUS DINANT, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter V, § 89-106, 112-119, pages 908-947, 961-974*, in which it is argued out of Matthew 5:18, *pages 910-913, 947*; he teaches that the Codex of the *Old Testament* was preserved safe and sound unto the time of Christ, § 96-100; and that the unbelief of the Jews did no harm to it thereafter, he shows from their superstitious care for the uninjured Integrity of the Sacred Codex, while he discourses concerning the means, by which, under the benign guidance of divine Providence, the Christian Church in turn watched over the Preservation of the Canon of the *New Testament*, § 112-119.

On the examples of the lost Books which are alleged, against the Papists GERHARD, among others, deserves to be consulted, in *tome 2 of Confessionis catholicæ, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter IV, pages 259-*

¹ See Romans 3:1, 2.

266. Concerning the Books cited in the Hebrew Codex, but not extant, WOLF discourses at length in *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, tome 2, book I, section IV, pages 211-246. We, with our AUTHOR, shall make do here with a few things:

Moreover, what writings, says he, mentioned in the Sacred Books, are Objected; for example, in the works of Socinus in Lectionibus sacris, opera, tome I, page 297a, b, Tertium, quod omnino animadvertendum, etc., likewise page 299b, 306a; and Volkelius, de vera Religione, book V, chapter V, page 381; in Bellarmine, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, Controversiis, tome I, column 211: those, α. perhaps were never even written: like the PROPHECY OF ENOCH, at long last consigned to writing by the ministry of Jude, Jude 14, 15. That Prophecy was able to have been inscribed in letters by private authority and human will. For, if it was written, it was not immediately written by Enoch himself, nor by divine authority and command, that it might be inserted in the Canon of the Old Testament. Neither does Jude relate that Enoch had written these words, but only that he had prophesied, προεφήτευσε; which by Ecclesiastical tradition was able to become known to Jude, but concerning the truth of which it was made more certain θεοπνεύστως, by inspiration: compare what things were said in § 3.

Our AUTHOR judges in like manner concerning the EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS, which, says he, is clearly forged, Paul making mention of τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας, a writing from Laodicea, Colossians 4:16. Doubt is able to arise from the Vulgate Version, which has, facite ut—ea quae Laodicensium est vobis legatur, cause that...that which is of the Laodiceans be read to you. And indeed that Genitive, Laodicensium, of the Laodiceans, is able to be taken, either objectively concerning those unto whom the Epistle was written, or effectively concerning those by whom it was written. With CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, ŒCUMENIUS, and the more sensible in the Pontifical order, we are able best to understand it as an Epistle sent from the Laodiceans to Paul, unto which Paul was referring a few times in the Epistle to the Colossians, so that these Epistles might be able to lend light to each other, for which reason the Apostle wills that a comparison of the one with the other be made; compare 1 Corinthians 7:1: compare BACHIENE'S *Geographiam Sacram*, part III, tome III, chapter X, pages 755-758, 764-766. That Epistle, written by the Laodiceans to Paul, not improbably concerns the ψευδοδιδασκαλίας, false teachings, which the Judaizers had planted in the Churches of Galatia, and similar things; concerning which, so that

they might discover the mind of the Apostle, the Colossians themselves were also able to send Epaphras to Rome: with whom detained at Rome because of his own chains,¹ the Apostle at one and the same time satisfied both of those Churches with the Epistle written to the Colossians, and sent to them by the agency of Tychicus,² and to be shared with the Laodiceans: see TILLIUS' *Isagoge in Epistolam Pauli ad Colossenses*, article X, pages 326, 327. THEOPHYLACT thinks that the Epistle *from Laodicea* mentioned here is the *First Epistle to Timothy*, which according to the ὑπογραφήν/*subscription* was written ἐκ Λαοδικείας, *from Laodicea*; which opinion COCCEIUS supports, *Commentario in Epistolam ad Colossenses*, chapter IV, § 59, 60: but, that the reliability of this subscription is very unstable, was already observed above in § 14, even from this, that in Colossians 2:1 the Laodiceans are reckoned among those that had not known Paul's face.

While the Greek text openly evinces that mention is not made of a *Laodicean* Epistle sent to *Laodicea*; at least it does not concern a lost Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, that we should be anxious: so we willingly allow to the heretic Marcion that opinion against the Sacred text, that the *Epistle to the Ephesians* is to be reckoned in the place of that which was sent to the *Laodiceans*; which TERTULLIAN relates concerning Marcion, *adversus Marcionem*, book V, chapters XI, XVII. Provided that this was Marcion's opinion, and that Tertullian is not rather to be illustrated out of various passages of EPIPHANIUS, from which it is provided to gather, that Marcion also acknowledged an Epistle sent by Paul to the Ephesians, but that he read another also, which he was calling to the *Laodiceans*, in which he inserted pericopes brought over from that which is to the Ephesians: see VAN ALPHEN'S *Prolegomena in Epistolam ad Ephesios*, *Isagogic Dissertation I*, chapter II, § 64-74, pages 54-60, which entire Dissertation is most worthy of reading, inasmuch as in it, in chapter I, he proves at length that the Epistle to the Ephesians was known as such by all antiquity: and, in chapter II, he refutes both, 1. *Grotius*, who on Colossians 4:16 maintains that Λαοδικείας, *of Laodicea*, is to be read in the place of ἐκ Λαοδικείας, *from Laodicea*, that it might signify an Epistle which is *of the Laodiceans*, that is, which was in the power and control of the Laodiceans, because it was sent to them: and he maintains that the Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans was written in the same tenor

¹ Philemon 23.

² Colossians 4:7, 8.

as that to the Ephesians, and hence Marcion was able to quote as from an Epistle to the Laodiceans, what things are found in the Epistle to the Ephesians: see VAN ALPHEN'S *Prolegomena in Epistolam ad Ephesios, Isagogic Dissertation I, chapter II, § 4, pages 12-16*. Then, 2. he refutes the Dissertation of the Most Illustrious VITRINGA *the Younger*, in which he takes it upon himself, α. to prove that the Epistle of Paul to the *Ephesian Church*, entitled according to the common reading, was not sent to that Church, but to some other assembly of believers; β. then to assert the true and proper right of the *Laodiceans* to this letter. Although it was not permitted to the Most Illustrious Vitringa to weave this warp unto completion, the Most Illustrious VENEMA, continuing this argument, contends that this Epistle was sent to the *Laodiceans*. By examining this Dissertation of the Most Illustrious Vitringa, and in passing that of JOHN MILL¹ also, VAN ALPHEN is content to show that no sufficiently weighty reasons are given that are able to induce us to recede from the received and customary reading of Ephesians 1:1, in which this Epistle is expressly assigned to the Ephesians. Which he does by responding to the individual arguments of the Most Illustrious Vitringa: he especially shows the Most Illustrious Vitringa is quite deceived, affirming that BASIL the GREAT and JEROME both *candidly acknowledge* that in the most ancient Manuscripts the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, in *Ephesus*, were not found by them: which nevertheless neither did: see VAN ALPHEN'S *Prolegomena in Epistolam ad Ephesios, Isagogic Dissertation I, chapter II, § 4, pages 17-66*; compare WHITBY'S² *Examen Variantium Lectionum Millii, book II, chapter I, section I, number 25*; GUDE'S *de Ecclesiae Ephesinae Statu, section II, chapter VIII, § 8, 9, pages 158-166*, who likewise concludes that the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians was indeed sent to them, and not, as the opinion of some is, to the Laodiceans.

Now, that which today is circulated under the title of the *Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans*, and which is exhibited in Greek and Latin by

¹ John Mill (c. 1645-1707) was an English churchman and theologian. He produced a critical edition of the Greek New Testament, which included all previous collections of various readings, with additional readings added from new manuscripts and Oriental versions.

² Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) was an English churchman, theologian, and Bible scholar. An Arminian, Whitby's *Discourse on the Five Points* draws responses from John Gill (*The Cause of God and Truth*) and Jonathan Edwards (*The Freedom of the Will*). There is some evidence that toward the end of his life his views veered toward Socinianism and Unitarianism. With respect to the text of the New Testament, he was critical of the work of Mill.

LEUSDEN, *Philologo Hebræo-Græco, Dissertation IV, § 3, pages 26-28*, and by PRITIUS, *Introductione in Lectionem Novi Testamenti, chapter XI, pages 62-68, etc.*, and which is wont to be printed in the Bibles of the Anabaptists next to the Books of the New Testament; to BARONIUS himself, *Annalibus ad Annum Christi LX, number 13, is spurious and unknown to the ancients*: and it shall be easily proven to anyone looking into the matter with greater attentiveness, that some wit upon occasion of Colossians 4:16 stitched this together from the Pauline Epistles, which has nothing peculiar that the Apostle might write to the Laodiceans; and that it is altogether unworthy to be held as Pauline or Canonical: see HOORNBECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum, book I, chapter III, controversy III, tome I, page 56*. JEROME, *Catalogo Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, chapter V, opera, tome I, page 267*, "Some find also one to the Laodiceans, but this is rejected by all." Concerning the Epistle to the Laodiceans ascribed to Paul, thoroughly consult FABRICIUS' *Codicem apocryphum Novi Testamenti, tome 2, pages 853 and following*; likewise SPANHEIM'S *Miscellanea Sacrorum Antiquorum, book II, part I, chapter II, § 10, opera, tome 2, columns 181, 182*; WITSIUS' *Meletemata Leudensia, de vita Pauli, Section XIV, § 7-12*; GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam, tome II, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter IV, pages 263-265*; RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros, § XVII, pages 35-37*.

The reason to doubt concerning ANOTHER *Epistle TO THE PHILIPPIANS* is able to be even greater, although Paul says in Philippians 3:1, τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, etc., *to write the same things to you, etc.* Nevertheless, our AUTHOR maintains that the Apostle thus has regard, 1. *to his spoken words*, so that now he writes the same things to the Philippians, that he had previously taught them in words, for the greater confirmation of their faith; which is also the observation of our DUTCH INTERPRETERS, comparing 2 Thessalonians 2:15. 2. *To the things written in the same Epistle*; in which the warnings against false teachers, and the contrary instruction of Paul in *chapter 3*, are able to be compared with those especially that had already preceded in *chapter 1*. Therefore, Paul says that he wrote, either τὰ αὐτὰ, *the same things*, concerning which he had treated previously in the same Epistle, or τὰ αὐτὰ, *the same things*, which he had previously preached in word to the Philippians. ENS, in his *Diatriba de Canone Novi Testamenti*, is verbose on this point, that he might prove that several Epistles were sent from Paul to the Philippians, to which purpose he brings in the testimony of POLYCARP in his *Epistle to the Philippians 3*, in which he appeals to

Paul's authority, who, says he, being present, taught them concerning the same matters, and adds: ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, *who also, being absent, wrote letters to you, which if ye carefully study, ye shall be able to be built up unto that faith which has been given you:*¹ hence he maintains that τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν, *to write the same things*, has regard to another Epistle previously sent by Paul to the Philippians: see ENS' *Diatribam de Canone Novi Testamenti, chapter IV, § 33-48*. Perhaps it could be said that Polycarp opposes *to teach in Word to to write Epistles* in a general way as diverse modes of teaching, and so his saying is able to be explained of that one Epistle even now extant: consult Cotelier's *notas ad verba Polycarpi citato*. But, even if Paul sent several Epistles to the Philippians, not all of which yet survive, this does not touch our thesis, as long as it has not been proven that all those were destined for augmentation of the Canon: which sort certainly were not, since otherwise they would have been preserved by God.

There is an similar occasion for doubting concerning a THIRD EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, now no longer extant, and sent before those two that we read to the present day; since Paul relates in 1 Corinthians 5:9, Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, etc., *I wrote unto you in an Epistle, etc.* Our AUTHOR, following CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, CECUMENIUS, and THEOPHYLACT, again thinks that *the Apostle understands the same Epistle, in which indeed, not the very words, but their sense is found earlier*; where, moreover, appeal is wont to be made to verses 1, 2, 6, and 7 of the same chapter, and it is wont to be observed that ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *in the Epistle*, is put in the place of ἐν ταύτῃ, *in this*, just as also in Colossians 4:16, ἡ ἐπιστολή, *the Epistle*,² is read in the place of αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστολή, *this very Epistle*: see SPANHEIM'S *Miscellanea Sacrorum Antiquorum, book II, part I, chapter II, § 10, opera, tome 2, column 182*. As it is believed that ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *in the Epistle*, is set down in the place of ἐν ταύτῃ, *in this one*, GERDES, *Disputatione*

¹ Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians 3:2: "For neither am I, nor is any other like me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and honored Paul, who, being among you, in the presence of the men of that time taught accurately and stedfastly the word of truth, who also, being absent, wrote letters to you, which if ye carefully study, ye shall be able to be built up unto that faith which has been given you..."

² Colossians 4:16a: "And when this epistle (ἡ ἐπιστολή) is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans..."

isagogica 1, in 1 Corinthians 15, § 9, advises that *either* those things which are found written in the same *chapter*, *verses* 1-6, ought compared, or that regard is to be paid to the entire First Epistle to the Corinthians and its primary argument, which he directs to this, that he might dissuade them from the practice of impure sexual activity and from unlawful lusts of the flesh: to which matter he wishes to be compared the Celebrated Ferdinand STOSCH, Theologian and Philologist in Lingen,¹ eruditely defending and illustrating this opinion, in his little book *de Epistolis Apostolorum non deperditis*, § XXII, XXIII, *pages* 75-86. Nevertheless, others observe contrariwise, 1. that, if Paul in 1 Corinthians 5:9 had regard to the arguments of the same Epistle, and indeed to those very things which had just now preceded, he would rather say, *I have written to you just now*, or ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *in this Epistle*, while that phrase, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *in the Epistle*, recurring in 2 Corinthians 7:8,² also has regard there to another, prior Epistle. 2. That, while it follows in *verse* 11, νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, etc., *but now I have written unto you, etc.*, by that very thing the present writing is set over against a previous Epistle mentioned in *verse* 9. 3. They add that the argument in *verse* 9 is not found in the preceding part of this Epistle, neither with respect to sound, nor with respect to sense. Therefore, they prefer that the Apostle previously sent another Epistle to the Corinthians, which may have perished because it was exceedingly brief, and its entire argument was inserted in this our Epistle, and at the same time amplified, so that it was certainly not necessary that it be preserved or shared with the rest of the Churches. And in this opinion with *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Pareus*,³ *Diodati*,⁴ and

¹ Ferdinand Stosch (1717-1780) was a German Reformed theologian and philologist.

² 2 Corinthians 7:8: “For though I made you sorry with a letter (ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ), I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle (ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη) hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season.”

³ David Pareus (1548-1622) was a German Calvinist, serving the Reformed Church as a minister, churchman, and professor. He wrote a commentary on the whole Bible, and it was held in high estimation among the Reformed. His *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos* was burned publicly at Oxford and Cambridge in 1622 by order of the Privy Council of James I because of his comments on Romans 13, in which he upholds the right of resistance to tyranny.

⁴ Giovanni Diodati (1576-1649) was a Swiss Protestant and delegate to the Synod of Dordt. He published his *Annotationes in Biblia* in Italian in 1607, which were translated into English in 1648.

Grotius, are WITSIUS, *Meletematis Leudensiis, de vita Pauli, Section VIII, § 21, 22*; and VAN ALPHEN, *Voozbereidselen vooz den 2 Brief aan de Corinth, chapter III, pages, 42-46, and Prolegomeno in Epistolam Priorem ad Corinthios, article I, pages 4-6*. But once more this detracts nothing from the integrity of the Canon; since in the event it is evident that this Epistle was not destined to constitute the Canon together with the other Epistles to the Corinthians, the contrary of which cannot be proven from the proposition.

Or, our AUTHOR adds, proceeding to the second Class of Books cited, β. *they were not Sacred, θεόπνευστα/inspired and Canonical, although proceeding from Men sometimes θεοπνεύστοις/inspired*; which, as I warned above, are to be carefully distinguished. Our AUTHOR thus rightly judges concerning *the many compositions of Solomon*, which are mentioned in 1 Kings 4:32, 33, which were proving Solomon's Wisdom pertaining to things of nature, and had regard more unto the abundance of inquiry than unto the authority of religion, if I might make use of the Augustinian distinction above, *de Civitate Dei, book XVIII, chapter XXXVIII, opera, tome 7, column 394*, except that those things that Solomon is mentioned *to have spoken* concerning trees and animals, he is not at the same time said *to have written*: compare CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Poeticos Veteris Testamenti, chapter IV, § 3, pages 170-172*.

To these of Solomon our AUTHOR for good reason joins the *Chronicle Books* so frequently cited in the Sacred History, among which, for example, are mentioned: סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel*, 1 Kings 14:19, and in verse 29, סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי הַיְּהוּדָה, *the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah*; and thus often. For they are able to be understood as political Annals, public acts, the archives of the Kingdoms of Judah and Israel; which sort of annals, certified by public authority, are made use of in all kingdoms; thus greater confidence is wont to be attributed to them than to private writings. For neither are they able to be understood as the Sacred and Canonical הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי הַיְּהוּדָה, or *Books of Chronicles*. For what things are cited in the Books of Kings as set forth at greater length in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah or Israel, you often seek in vain in the *Books of Chronicles*: which also are believed to have been written after the Books of Kings, for which reason in the Books of Kings no appeal is possible to the Books of Chronicles found at this day in the Sacred Codex: also, from the citation the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and

the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel appear to have been distinct, while in the Canonical Books of Chronicles matters conducted in the kingdom of Judah and of Israel are mentioned conjointly and indiscriminately. But these Chronologico-political Books sometimes cited, as written principally by human counsel, were never received into the Canon of the Old Testament, although they were able to furnish some part of the material to be consigned to the Sacred Writer; thus were they in turn able to be lost without great detriment to the Church: see WILHELMUS WILHELMIIUS,¹ Διασπορα δεκαφυλος, Section VI, § 44, pages 266-268. That in these Annals of the Kings of Judah and Israel the History of David and of Solomon constituted a large part, there is no one that would doubt. But, whether, when in 1 Chronicles 27:24 are mentioned the : דְּבַר־יְהוֹשֻׁפָּט לְמַלְכוּת דָּוִד, *chronicles of King David*, and in 1 Kings 11:41 the סֵפֶר דְּבַר־יְשׁוּעָה, *book of the acts of Solomon*, there is regard to the same public Acts of the Kingdom, and a specific volume among those, which was treating of the affairs of David and Solomon; or to a particular history, but well-known, eminent and trustworthy, which was formerly written concerning the Kingdom of David and of Solomon, but would have perished some time ago; those Books are always to be referred to the same Class with the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel in this, that they were to be held as human, not divine, not θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired*, at least not as Canonical. Perhaps then the Chronicles of David and Solomon are mentioned separately, because these reigned before the Schism: while the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and of Israel each have regard to a particular Kingdom: compare CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XIV, § 2, pages 240-244, chapter XVI, § 1, pages 280-283, § 3, 4, pages 285-289.

Or, finally, our AUTHOR brings to notice, γ. that *they are yet extant to this day under another name*; as they believe concerning the three thousand *Proverbs of Solomon*, 1 Kings 4:32. Our AUTHOR maintains this, that although many, yet not necessarily all, of the documents of Solomon's wisdom, which are mentioned in 1 Kings 4:32, 33, have perished: seeing that, although in that passage in the history of the life of Solomon none of his sentences or Proverbs are recounted, a considerable portion of the same Proverbs, to the extent that those were θεόπνευστα/*inspired* or Canonical, were preserved in the Book of

¹ Wilhelmus Wilhelmius (1631-1677) was a Dutch philosopher.

משלי/*Proverbs*, indeed, collected and arranged into one corpus, partly (as it appears) with Solomon yet living and by his own hand, or under his auspices, partly in the time of Hezekiah by *the Men of King Hezekiah*, by comparison with Proverbs 25:1.

So also *they generally believe*, says our AUTHOR, concerning the *Words of Nathan and of Gad*, mentioned in 1 Chronicles 29:29, where the *Acts of David* are said to be written in the *Acts of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad*. Indeed, concerning *Samuel* the matter is in the shallows, seeing that he is acknowledged as the author of the first Book that comes under his name, up until the history of his death, 1 Samuel 25:1. But what things then follow in the *first book of Samuel*, together with the entire *second book*, many, both Jews and Christians, maintain that they are to be attributed to *Nathan and Gad* as authors; and thus their words survive under the name of *Samuel*. In which opinion the pious mind certainly appears to be able to rest. While others rather maintain that individual Records were written by *Nathan and Gad*, which indeed perished, but without detriment to the Canon, after those things that the Most High God had destined for the perpetual memory and direction of the Church had been recorded were excised from them and recorded in the Canon, under the title of the *Books of Samuel*, especially the *second*: whether that prior writing of the Records of *Nathan and Gad* were no more θεόπνευστος/*inspired* than the words of *Nathan* in 2 Samuel 7:3, or at least their entire works were not destined for augmentation of the Canon of the Church. There shall be a like judgment concerning the *Words of Nathan, the Prophecy of Ahijah, the Visions of Iddo, relating the affairs of Solomon*, 2 Chronicles 9:29; and also concerning the *Words of Shemaiah the Prophet and of Iddo the Seer, recounting the Affairs of Rehoboam*, 2 Chronicles 12:15; etc. That is, those individual Prophets appear to have recorded the acts of one or more Kings into Historical Registers; from which a summary of matters is exhibited to us θεοπνεύστως, *by inspiration*, in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, to the extent that the Most High God judged it necessary to know the continuation of the history of the ancient Church and people of God: while those larger Historical Registers of diverse Prophets, as not in their entirety destined for Canonical use, thereafter perished in the course of time: compare CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XIV, § 2, pages 240-244, chapter XVI, § 1, pages 280-283, § 3, 4, pages 285-289.

Finally, *many believe the same*, as our AUTHOR relates, concerning the *Book of the Wars of the Lord* and the *Book of the Just*. *The Book of the Wars*

of *Jehovah* is mentioned in Numbers 21:14. 1. Our AUTHOR affirms that it is verily believed by many that this Book is yet extant under another name. For thus *Jonathan*¹ and *Targum Jerusalem*² understand the *Book of the Law* in its entirety, translating it, סֵפֶר אֹרִיתָא, *The Book of the Torah*. Others have regard unto the *Book of Judges*, where, in Judges 11:13 and *following*, in the borders of the Ammonites and Moabites are designated. Others even look to this very Book of *Numbers*, in which the Wars of *Jehovah*, conducted by the Israelites, are also remembered, which HOTTINGER, *Thesaurο Philologico*, book II, chapter II, section II, page 531, thinks to be asserted without absurdity. 2. Yet I would rather believe with others that this *Book of the Wars of Jehovah* was not necessarily an θεόπνευστον/*inspired* Book, much less Canonical; but in Israel, at the time when Moses wrote these things, it was known, but now it has been lost without loss to the Canon, unto which it never pertained; in which were contained certain collected Victory-Songs, or joyous Songs narrating the Wars of the Israelites with their enemies in the desert and the victories won by them by the will of the Lord. But, upon occasion of the victory granted to Israel in the war with the Amorites, the previous state of the Amorites, their battles with the neighboring Moabites, and the borders of the dominion of each, were able in a Song then composed to be narrated in poetry also: for which purpose they may regard the words from that Book to be abruptly cited by Moses here, which were said in that *Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, but also may be said in the future, יִצְחָק;³ as often as this Poetic narration may be recited by the Israelites in their rejoicing. But these words are not repeated anywhere, whether in the *Book of Judges*, or another passage of Sacred Scripture. FRANCISCUS JUNIUS, in his *Analyticis Explicationibus Numerorum*, chapter XXI, opera, tome I, column 464: “So that we might speak plainly, those that understand a *book* of the Wars of the Lord are deceived by a homonym: for the word סֵפֶר/*Sepher* signifies either of two things to the

¹ Jonathan ben Uzziel (first century) was one of the great pupils of Hillel. It is a matter of some doubt whether Jonathan ben Uzziel is actually responsible for the translation of this portion of the Chaldean Version. For the most part, Targum Jonathan tends to be more paraphrastic and expansive than Targum Onkelos.

² Targum Jerusalem is also known as Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. It is a medieval Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew Torah. It is more than a translation, including additional narrative and interpretative material.

³ That is, in the Hebrew Imperfect Tense.

Hebrews, a recounting ἄγραφοι/*unwritten* simply, or written and comprehended in a book. But it is ineptly concluded; if there is a recounting, therefore it is written. Moses says a recounting; he does not say a writing: wherefore, from this passage no just argument is able to be made concerning any written book that may have perished: therefore, whether it is some song, or a Victory Song, which the Hebrews call מִשְׁכָּל/*Maschal*,¹ it is strange to misuse these passages, in order to confirmed that sacred books that were written were cut off from the canon. But let this stand as certain: a book may be written; but not for this reason shall this indeed obtain, that this book was sacred, which may have perished from the canon: for, just as we deny that it was a book, and ask that it be proven; so in turn two postulates concur here: one, that it be proven that the book was sacred; the other, that the sacred book was entered into the Canon. For, whoever from these passages asserts that a sacred book, entered into the Canon, has perished, it is necessary that he prove these three postulates: that it is a book, that it is sacred, and that it is Canonical: So that we might truly understand these things, it is to be observed that it is one thing to say a book is Sacred, another things to say it is Canonical.” See also what things follow, cited above. For more concerning this *Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, and the text of Numbers 21:14, 15, see the discussion of CARPZOV, *Introductione ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter VII, § 2, pages 121-124.

Finally, סֵפֶר הַיְשָׁר, *The Book of the Just*, is mentioned twice, in Joshua 10:13, where in the history of the miraculous standing of the sun and moon appeal is made to this Book. Again, in 2 Samuel 1:18, on occasion of a mournful Song, in which David lamented the death of Saul and Jonathan; and of the plan whereby the King willed that the sons of Judah be taught the bow. Indeed, but, 1. a great many Jews think that this Book also is extant under another name, who name either the book of *Genesis* with *Rashi*, or the book of the *Law* with *Kimchi*, or the book of the *Just*, that is, of Moses, and specifically the book of *Deuteronomy* with *Abarbanel*: while of the Fathers *Jerome* also seeks the *book of Genesis* here: which opinions with their supports are related and refuted by JOHANN GEORG ABICHT² in his *Dissertatione de Libro Recti*, § 12, 14, but this

¹ מִשְׁכָּל, a proverb, parable, or ode, is derived from the verbal root מִשַׁל, to represent.

² Johann Georg Abicht (1672-1740) was a German Lutheran pastor, theologian, and orientalist. He served as Professor of Hebrew at Leipzig

dissertation is found inserted in *Thesauro Novo Dissertationum Hasæi et Ikenii in Veterem Instrumentum*, pages 525-534. 2. But almost all of the more recent agree in this, that this Book was lost some time ago; but at the same time they deny that it was θεόπνευστον/*inspired* and Canonical. Concerning the character of the Book, their opinion is principally twofold, although neither of these is able to be demonstrated with solid arguments. a. The first maintains that יהִשָׁרִי/יִשְׁרָאֵל, *The Book of the Just*, was Poetic, which was presenting a collection of songs of various sorts, whether those were ἐπινίκια/*victory-songs*, or θρηνητικὰ/*dirges*, or ἐπαινετικὰ/*laudatory-songs*, having respect to the history of Israel and to men celebrated in the republic of Israel; in the title of which *Israel* may be called יהִשָׁרִי/*Jasher, the Just*, as יהִשָׁרִי/יִשְׁרָאֵל/*Jeshurun, the Upright*, elsewhere,¹ as if it were excelling the other nations in equity. b. But the other maintains that 'ישראל' is set down as an abbreviation for יִשְׁרָאֵל/*Israel*, and explains the *Book of Israel* as the public Acts and Annals of the republic of Israel, which, being ever continued, under the Kings began to be called the *Chronicles of the Kings*, and indeed were twofold on account of the Schism, the *Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*² and of *Israel*:³ which sort of public Monuments are of proven fidelity and of the weightiest authority among all; hence the Historian is able to appeal most advantageously to these in matters of greater moment. And indeed this latter opinion is embraced and commended by the Most Illustrious JACOBUS TRIGLAND the Younger in his *Dissertatione de Libro Justorum*, in *Sylloge Dissertationum*, pages 38 and following.

But the Learned ABICHT, in his *Dissertatione de Libro Recti*, with other more far-fetched opinions concerning the *Book of the Just* also refuted, § 9-11, 15, in particular does not admit the opinion of the Ancients and of the More Recent, concerning the estimation of the *Book of the Just* as the public Annals of the republic of Israel, which were called the *Book of יהִשָׁרִי*, for the *Book of Israel* or *Jeshurun*, § 13, 16, because, a. the word יִשְׁרָאֵל differs much from *Israel* and *Jeshurun*, and is used nowhere else in the place of the same. b. Because the *Book of the Just* is only cited twice, once to prove the miracle of the sun standing still at the entreaty

(1702-1711), and as Professor of Theology, first at Leipzig (1711-1717), and then at Wittenberg (1730-1739).

¹ See Deuteronomy 32:15; 33:5; 33:26; Isaiah 44:2.

² See, for example, 1 Kings 14:29.

³ See, for example, 1 Kings 14:19.

of Joshua, and a second time so that it might be indicated that the funeral ode of David upon the death of Saul and Jonathan was written in such a book: but in no way is it shown that all the remaining affairs conducted by Joshua and related in the book of Joshua and in the books of Samuel were likewise found in that *Book of the Just* as the annals of the people of Israel. c. Because the fragments of the *Book of the Just* summoned to witness in those two places in which it is cited are metrical; while it is evident from the *Books of Chronicles* that the annals of the people of Israel were wont to be written in a style not so formalized, but free and prosaic. Now, ABICHT himself, *Dissertatione de Libro Recti*, § 1-7, agrees with the opinion, which he also strives with all his might to confirm, concerning the estimation of the *Book of the Just* as a narration concerning some righteous and just Man, which in *Joshua* and in the *second book of Samuel* would not necessarily be found in the same volume; but according to him the *Book of the Just* in *Joshua* is able to be the title of an Funeral Ode composed after the death of Joshua for his praise; but in the book of *Samuel* a volume shall be signified, into which mournful songs were collected upon the death of Saul and Jonathan: a. for סִפָּר does not necessarily denote a great volume; but even an epistle of one leaf,¹ a little bill of divorcement,² a little bill of purchase,³ are called סִפָּר. Now, he observes that by the name of יִשָּׁר, *the Just*, the dead were honored, in a manner similar to the way that we are wont to commend the same as *blessed*, by a comparison with Numbers 23:10: so that the *Book of that Just Man*, הַיִּשָּׁר, is a narration concerning a Man κατ' ἐξοχῆν, *par excellence*, righteous, just, whole, and worthy of praise; and הַיִּשָּׁר, *of the Just*, is a genitive of object or argument, of which that סִפָּר/*Book* discourses, just as mention is made of the *Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, of the *book of*

¹ For example, 2 Samuel 11:14: “And it came to pass in the morning, that David wrote a letter (סִפָּר) to Joab, and sent it by the hand of Uriah.”

² Deuteronomy 24:1: “When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement (סִפָּר כְּרִיתוֹת), and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.”

³ Jeremiah 32:11, 12: “So I took the evidence of the purchase (אֶת־סִפָּר הַמְּקִנָּה), both that which was sealed according to the law and custom, and that which was open: And I gave the evidence of the purchase (אֶת־הַסִּפָּר הַמְּקִנָּה) unto Baruch the son of Neriah, the son of Maaseiah, in the sight of Hanameel mine uncle’s son, and in the presence of the witnesses that subscribed the book of the purchase (בְּסִפָּר הַמְּקִנָּה), before all the Jews that sat in the court of the prison.”

purchase, etc. *b.* He observes that the circumstances of the double location, in which that *Book of the Just* is cited, favor this; where appeal is made unto mournful songs of this sort and Lamentations wont to be recited more often and on repeated occasions, unto the honor of distinguished Men of this sort, as unto documents coeval with the events, known among the people, from which it was possible to be certain concerning the truth of the matters narrated in these passages; whether the entire Book of Joshua was now written by another Prophet after Joshua's death, or this pericope was thereafter inserted in the registers written by Joshua himself, just as also those things that occur concerning the death of Joshua and its consequences at the end of the Book. *c.* This was a common office of piety, both among the Israelites, and among other nations, that they mourned the death of their greatest men, Heroes, Kings, and Princes, and celebrated them with songs. *d.* The very words cited out of the *Book of the Just* in those two places, ABICHT judges to indicate sufficiently, that the argument of this sort of Book was metrical. Whatever the case may be, those volumes, to which appeal is thus made under the title of the *Book of that Just Man*, perished without any loss to the Sacred Codex, unto which it is able to be evinced with absolutely no appearance of probability that the same ever pertained. With this opinion thus defended by Abicht agree what things VRIEMOET has in *Thesibus Scripturarum*, CCXLVIII, CCXLIX: “ סֵפֶר הַיְשׁוּעָה, *The Book of the Just*, in Joshua 10:13, that we might not believe it to have had its name, with the most illustrious Trigland, derived from יִשְׂרָאֵל/*Israel*, or יִשְׂרָאֵלִי/*Israelite*, written in the contracted form, הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי, is brought to pass by its consistent pointing, both in this passage and in 2 Samuel 1:18, in the Hebrew codices, and by its interpretation in the ancient Versions. But whence it was thus called, conjecture is too doubtful. But, that it was Poetic, celebrating in song the memorable deaths of the people of God, is plausible; but that it was canonical, or even θεόπνευστον/*inspired*, there is no evidence.” See also BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section II, § 4, 16, tome I, pages 662b, 754.*

Our AUTHOR, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus*, Part IV, Exercise XI, § 10, pages 659-672, reviewed, with a critical summation added, those things that occur among learned Men concerning the *Book of the Just*, specifically those things in TRIGLAND'S *Dissertatione de Libro Justorum* also, approving some, signifying his dissent from that Illustrious Man in other things. 1. MARCKIUS does not allow that the name of

הַיָּשָׁר, *the Just*, is an abbreviation of יִשְׂרָאֵל/*Israel*, since this method of writing by abbreviation is not found elsewhere in the Sacred Codex, the vowel points are against it, and the designative הַ does not fit so well before a proper name, as before an appellative: nevertheless, by הַיָּשָׁר, *the Just*, as an agreeable elogy, he believes *Israel* to be denoted, with an allusion to this proper name: thus our AUTHOR writes, *Exercitationibus textualibus*, Part IV, *Exercise XI*, § 10, *at the end of page 663*: “But, rather than a simple Apocope,¹ which in no way agrees with the present punctuation, and which makes the prefixed הַ/*He* not so well agreeable here, I would have הַיָּשָׁר, *the Just*, here, as it is in truth, to be an adjectival Noun, alluding to the prior name (*Israel*), and expressing the condition of that nation through the notion of *righteousness*, as also the situation is in the case of יִשְׁרֻן/*Jeshurun*, which is not at all formed by abbreviation from יִשְׂרָאֵל/*Israel*.” And he adds *at the beginning of page 664*: “It is no more foreign to the genius of the Hebrew tongue than of other tongues, thus in the case of names through letters the same or similar to make sport; and that all the more finds a place here, the more worthy and agreeable to the Jews that name of *the Just* is.” 2. He thinks it likely that the *Book of the Just* is the *Annals* of the people of *Israel*, proceeding on *page 664*: “Moreover, that is by far the most fitting, that this *Book of the Just*, or of the just people of *Israel*, is named rather from its subject matter, than, etc.; in which manner it shall be allowed to bring this *Book* together with that *of the Wars of the Lord*,² *of Matters Conducted*,³ *of the Kings*,⁴ *of the Covenant*,⁵ *of the Law*,⁶ *of the Generations*,⁷ etc. No further doubt ought to be considered, that, where appeal is made to this *Book of the Just* as containing a matter conducted and narrated, we far more rightly think of some *Book* narrating historically the same with many others, than of a *Prophecy* predicting that matter, or recalling that matter into the mind of *Israel* long afterwards. Whence it falls of itself, etc.” Moreover, on *page 665*: “Finally, thus *Grotius* speaks of a *poem of ἐπιδικίω/victory*; indeed, *Sanctius*⁸ suggested that *perhaps*

¹ That is, the loss of a sound at the end of a word.

² Numbers 21:14.

³ See, for example, 1 Kings 11:41.

⁴ See, for example, 2 Chronicles 16:11.

⁵ Exodus 24:7; 2 Kings 23:2; 2 Chronicles 34:30.

⁶ See, for example, Deuteronomy 29:21; Joshua 1:8.

⁷ Genesis 5:1.

⁸ Gaspar Sanchez (1554-1628) was a Jesuit scholar. He served as Professor of

there was a Book among the Hebrews in which pious songs were transcribed, etc. In which it appears that some also concluded, that they thought that they found here poetic verses cited out of that book, just as in 2 Samuel 1:18, etc. But against this the *Most Illustrious* TRIGLAND, among other things, opposed both the more common name *Book*, and the better confirmation of the preserved truth out of a prosaic, rather than a poetic, writing, on account of the customary Rhetorical flights and fictions of the Poets. To be sure, I subscribe to those that with CORNELIUS À LAPIDE assert, *What and of what sort the Book may have been is not known, for it has completely perished.*” And on page 666: “But, if anything is to be conceded to probable conjectures, I think that it is to be done with those that have long found here the public Annals of Israel, as most worthy of the name of the *Book of the Just*, of the people of Israel, and most aptly cited in the public acts both of this and of the following age for the confirmation of the trustworthiness of them among the Israelites and then among other men.” Again, on pages 669, 670: “And to me they appear to take a better position, who maintain that the very words of that Book were not copied here, when in the text such is found that this was *written upon or in* that Book, even as this is found elsewhere concerning the matters, but not concerning the words, in 1 Kings 22:39, 45; 2 Kings 1:18; 8:23; etc.; and the Sacred Writer here makes use of an unbroken historical style without any indication of another’s words before or after this citation of the Book of the Just; moreover, by this citation it appears to be indicated that the matter, more briefly described here, is contained at length in the other Book.... Even if these words were metrical, in accordance with those of David, 2 Samuel 1:19, etc., and indeed were also transferred from the Book of the Just, it still would not follow from this that that entire Book was poetic, any more than that the Historical Books of Joshua and Samuel, now expressing those same words, are such.” 3. Our *Most Illustrious* AUTHOR also observes that the *Θεοπνευστία*/*inspiration* of that Book is in no way evident, and that its loss is alleged in an altogether gratuitous manner by the Papists to prove the Imperfection of the Scripture, page 666: “It does not follow from this citation of it in a sacred book, that the same proceeded from the infallible inspiration of the Spirit, since human writings of proven trustworthiness are wont to be cited also elsewhere in the sacred writings for the greater conviction of men; still less that the same was

Theology at Madrid, and is respected by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike as a Biblical commentator.

designed by God for the perpetual Canon of the Church alongside the other Sacred Scriptures, just as not all prophecies had this end. Whence this example also is wont ineptly to be urged to the contrary purpose by the Papists for the destruction of Canonical writings, and for the great Defect or imperfection of the Sacred Scripture remaining to this present day.” 4. Finally, to the question, to what purpose was this appeal to the *Book of the Just* added by the author, Joshua or some other, to the history, Joshua 10:12-14, our AUTHOR responds on pages 670-672: “To be sure, at first glance that doubt is not slight, in what manner Joshua, writing this his book, at almost the very time this matter was conducted, and himself a most trustworthy witness of all, could appeal to another Writing containing this matter.... This objection has brought it to pass that many have long made someone other than Joshua (Ezra, for example) the Author of this Book.... While others speak of Eleazar, or Samuel, or Isaiah, etc.... But from the citation of the *Book of the Just* there is no necessity that we deny this entire Book to *Joshua*; since that parenthetical citation was able to be added by a later Prophetic hand, just like some other similar, briefer pericopes, concerning which also mention was made on Joshua 4:9, etc. Neither is there anything to oppose the idea that Joshua himself, writing of the miraculous event here, both more briefly, and also perhaps also at far greater length at the end of his life, might appeal to another writing, whether his own or another’s, but altogether worthy of confidence, in which the same matter, described both more extensively and more briefly, was able to be read:” upon which matter MASIUS and HUET are cited. Then, at the end, it is yet added: “Neither does it appear unworthy of this Divine Spirit in Joshua, that he, recording so remarkable an event, might appeal thus to another human Writing, when that was altogether received with general confidence, and additionally was treating the same matter more extensively; just as then in the *Books of Kings* and elsewhere we understand many similiary citations; moreover, *Luke* appealed to τούς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, *those which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word*, Luke 1:2: so that I might now pass over in silence the *Poets* cited by *Paul*.¹ For the Spirit studies all means of the conviction of men, even if His sayings are worthy of all confidence of themselves, etc.”

But I commit to each Reader that not-so-easy decision between

¹ See Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12.

those two opinions concerning the *Book of the Just*, whether it be Poetic or Historical, after what things have hitherto been related have been diligently weighed.

§ 17: The Abiding Canonicity of the Old Testament, Part 1

As we have just given a proof that no Canonical Books have perished, so it is now to be proven that those surviving Books are also always to remain *Canonical, even those of the Old Testament under the New Testament*. Which is to be held against several Heretics of the first ages after the birth of Christ, rejecting the Law of Moses and the Prophets, among whom especially are the *Marcionites* and *Manichæans*; see DANÆUS' *ad Augustinum de Hæresibus*, chapter XXII, page 970b, chapter XXIII, page 943, chapter XXV, page 945b, chapter XLVI, page 970b: and among the Heretics of more recent times, 1. against the *Socinians*, who do indeed maintain *the usefulness, but not the necessity, of the reading of the Old Testament under the New*, and that *not anything of that is to be received that does not agree with the New*: and, *if one should now and then make use of the Old Testament in matters regarding doctrine*, they say that *that part of doctrine then is to be reckoned as nothing but history*: *Those things that were delivered in the Old Testament, they do not even esteem as necessary to believe under the New*; and that *it is possible now for one to know and to believe to the extent that is sufficient for salvation, and yet to be ignorant and to disbelieve many things of the Old Testament*: and what things more, which manifestly enough abolish the Canonical and Normative use of the Old Testament under the New, see HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, tome I, book I, chapter IV, controversy IV, pages 57-59. 2. Against the *Anabaptists*, who *maintain that all Christians in matters of faith ought to admit the Gospel alone as normative*; they deny that *articles of the Christian faith can or ought to be proven out of the Old Testament*; they admit only arguments sought out of the *New Testament as valid*, etc.: as DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIVUS, *contra Anabaptistas*,¹ chapter VIII, § I, pages 113-116, show these things with multiple, clear examples sought from their own writings: add

¹ Petrus Jakobus Austro-Sylvius (died 1647) was a Reformed Pastor in North Holland. He was commissioned by the synod of North Holland to prepare a refutation of the errors of the Mennonites. Progress on the work was slow until Abraham à Doreslaer (died 1655), a learned Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian, was appointed to help (1627). The result is a massive eight hundred and fifty-six pages of careful comparison between the doctrines of the Reformed and of the Mennonites.

CLOPPENBURG'S *Gangrænam Theologiæ Anabaptisticæ, Disputation XXXII, opera, tome 2, pages 199-202*. ZWINGLI, in his *Elencho contra Catabaptistas, opera, part 2, folio 10b*: *At length thou wert in this, that thou mightest deny the entire Old Testament. —Among us of Groningen¹ they deny the entire Old Testament, which I myself have seen with these eyes, for they wrote to our Senate: The Old Testament is antiquated, and the testimonies that are brought forth from it are vain, and so they avail nothing. Again, folio 11b: At Groningen ye deny the Old Testament. —Therefore, since ye see that Infant Baptism is able to be defended from the Old Testament, now ye cast away the Old Testament. —When ye reject the Old Testament principally for this reason, because what things are alleged out of it concerning the Baptism of Infants ye are not able to endure, ye evidently show that ye regard God, who is the God of both the Old and the New Testament, as nothing. I hope that I am not regarded by thee as lacking in moderation, O excellent Reader; thou shalt see that all things are worse among them than our pen is able to describe in detail, etc.* Moreover, *folio 18b*: *With utmost frequency Circumcision was given to those that were able neither to confess nor to ask for it, but ye reject the entire Old Testament. — Thus ye say: It is not needful that I seek out Baptism in the Old Testament. By which saying, ye despise the Old Testament: while, nevertheless, Christ submitted both Himself and His doctrine to its judgment, and the Apostles made use of no other Scripture, indeed, they were not even able to make use of any other, since after the beginnings of their preaching there was as yet no Scripture than what might be sought from it. Therefore, this is your error, whereby ye fail to consider the analogy of the Sacraments, which nevertheless the Apostle Paul does in 1 Corinthians 10 and Colossians 2, so that there is no good reason for us to neglect its example. The Northern Anabaptists nevertheless proclaim that they do not completely abrogate the Old Testament; but that they only argue that in the New Testament a clearer revelation was made, and an emendation of certain precepts of the Mosaic Law: the first of which is true; the other is to be taken up in Chapters XI and XII. The Waterlandi,² in their Old Confession, Article XXIX, have: “Doctrine (as far as it is necessary for us for salvation) is comprehended in the Books of the New Testament, to which we join all that which is found in the Canonical Books of the Old Testament consonant with the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles, and agreeable to the administration of His spiritual*

¹ Groningen is a province in the north-eastern reaches of the Netherlands. The Anabaptist movement took root here very early.

² Waterland is in North Holland, just north of Amsterdam.

kingdom:” see HERMAN SCHIJN’S *Historiam Mennonitarum*,¹ chapter VII, article XXIX, page 206, in comparison with the *Præfatione* ***2, versa, 3, *Confessionem Waterlandorum*, article XXIX, pages 22, 23; ENGEL ARENDSOON VAN DOOREGEEST’S² *Brief aan Fridericus Spenhemius*, pages 33-45. This matter was treated at length at the *Frankenthal Colloquium*,³ article I, acts I-V, in which the *Anabaptists* repeatedly concede that they admit the Old Testament and proofs drawn from it in matters of faith, in the *Protocol* and page 43, etc.; but in the teaching of manners and the practice of things to be done they say that *they admit whatever is able to be proven out of the Old Testament, that is not contrary to the doctrine of Christ*, page 12; *they maintain that the Old Testament is not everywhere equal to the New, but only where it is like unto the Gospel of Christ and Apostolic doctrine*, page 37; they assert that *they do not believe that the Scripture of the Old Testament is of the same authority as the New, for proving and confirming all articles of the faith and heads of doctrine*, page 40; likewise that *the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith in things to be believed and to be done is able and ought to be proven out of the Old Testament, but only as far as the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles allows this; neither is the Old Testament opposed to the Scripture of the New Testament, since they do not accommodate Christ to Moses, but rather Moses to Christ*, pages 41, 49, 55. Time and again in the *Protocol* of this Colloquium Objections also occur, which are to be resolved in order by our AUTHOR, pages 9-11, 14, 16, 17, in which latter place they signify that in Matthew 5 they recognize an Opposition between the doctrine of Moses and of Christ; that such is indicated only between the glosses of the Pharisees and the divine Law rightly understood, between the ἀρχαίους/*ancients* and the Law of God expounded by Christ, not between Moses and the Prophets on the one hand and Christ on the other, is taught, pages 29-31. They object similar things, pages 33, 34, 36, 64, 71, 72, 84. DOUWE FEDDRIKS VAN

¹ Herman Schiyn (1662-1727) was a leader among the Zonist (conservative) Mennonites. He spent most of his adult life as an elder in the Zonist congregation in Amsterdam, but his enduring legacy is to be found in his historical works, setting forth the historical origins and doctrinal commitments of the Mennonites. When the Zonist congregation of Rotterdam merged with the Walterland congregation, resolving to admit all professing Christians, not just Mennonites, to communion, Schiyn set himself in opposition, writing *Aenmerkingen op het formulier van benodiging*.

² Engel Arendszoon van Dooregeest (1645-1706) was a Mennonite minister and apologist.

³ Held with the Anabaptists in 1571.

MOLQUEREN,¹ in his tract called *Mennonitisch Onderzoek, etc.*, blames Galenus Abrahamsz,² that in his book called *korte Grondstellingen, etc.*, articles 33-37, he relates, that a new and more perfect doctrine was prescribed by the Lord Jesus in the New Covenant, summarily set forth in Matthew 5-7 and Luke 6; that new and more perfect commandments were given by Christ as Lawgiver, than were formerly obtaining under the Law: against which *Douwe Feddriks* rightly disputes, and with us upholds the Perfection of the Moral Law of Moses, and approaches far more closely than others to us, blaming Galenus that he converts the new Covenant into a new Law of Works, *præfatione* *4 *versa*, 5, and in his *Mennonitisch Onderzoek, etc.*, pages 1, 2, 12, 16, 116-156; excepting only in the Lord's sermon of Matthew 5, as of another sort, and not so much regarding the Moral Law as Forensic Law, those things which the Lord relates concerning the Old doctrine of the Oath and of Vengeance; but concerning which see below in their places. Therefore, as the *Mennonites* feel differently on this matter, they more or less truly complain, as if it were wrongly imputed to them, that according to their opinion the doctrine of the Old Testament is opposed to the doctrine of the New, and that the Books of the Old Testament do not pertain to us, for confirming thence the heads of the Christian faith and the precepts of life and manners: see DE STOPPELAAR'S *Van Stapfers wederleggende Godtgeleerdheid, introduction to chapter XVIII*, § 41, pages 56, 57, and in *notis ad Stapferi, chapter XVIII*, § 31, pages 88-90; KULENKAMP'S *Aanmerkingen op zekeren Brief, etc.*, in *Boekzaal*, October 1740,³ pages 435-465.

The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, *fundamental error*, of the Socinians and Anabaptists is that a *Substantial Distinction* is allowed between the Covenants, between doctrine and religion *under the Old Testament* and *under the New*: that, at that time the observance of the Law with the promise of good things, chiefly earthly, was proclaimed; but now the righteousness of Faith with the promise of eternal salvation.

¹ Douwe Feddriks van Molqueren (*flourished* 1700) was a Dutch Mennonite minister.

² Galenus Abrahamsz de Haan (1622-1706) practiced medicine and preached in Amsterdam.

³ Gerardus Kulenkamp (1700-1775) was a Dutch Reformed minister, serving in Amsterdam. He wrote polemical treatises against the Moravians and the Mennonites. In this paper, published in the periodical *De Boekzaal*, he accuses Joannes Deknatel, a Mennonite minister in Amsterdam, of declension from Mennonite doctrine unto Socinianism.

Against these we prove that the Books of the Old Testament, even under the New, abide as the Canon of faith and manners:

1. *From the perpetual Duration of the Old Law, which Christ did not destroy or abrogate; but He fulfilled, explained, and, with respect to the Law of the Ten Commandments, impressed upon His disciples that it is to be observed; not at all opposing His Precepts as Better than the Mosaic Precepts, but to the παρερμηνείαις, false glosses, of the Pharisees, Matthew 5:17-19 and following through the whole Chapter.*

2. *From the continual Commendation of all the Scripture, and especially of the Old, of the Law and the Prophets, in and under the New Testament; thus, in Luke 16:29, a universal precept is read as given to those that desire to forestall the final judgment; now, that precept is to hear Moses and the Prophets. In John 5:39, Christ sends the Jews to search the Scriptures, since from these they supposed that life was able to be had, which opinion He approves. In Romans 15:4, we read that the old Scriptures were written from our use also, for the establishment and confirmation of hope. If the Canon of the Old Testament has a sufficiency both for faith and for manners: if the old writings are able σοφίσαι, to make a man wise, unto salvation through faith in Christ, and at the same time are able to render a man furnished for every good work: what is the reason given why we might not any longer hold the same as Canon? but this is asserted in 2 Timothy 3:15-17. This normative use of the Old Testament is commended by Peter, who wishes the truth of Apostolic doctrine to be settled by a comparison of the same with the Old Testament, 2 Peter 1:19, in which by the day dawning is not understood the time of the New Testament in general, which had already dawned; but if that be signified, it would have been necessary to say that ἕως οὗ, until, and ἄχρις οὗ, until, are not so positive of the past that they are exclusive of the future, by comparison with Matthew 28:20¹ and 1 Corinthians 15:25:² but either the day of glory is to be understood, by comparison with 2 Peter 3:18, or also the day of grace through the rising of the Day Star, shining in the heart of the faithful. This light had already begun to appear to the faithful, unto whom the Apostle writes; and notwithstanding Peter is able to speak to them concerning the day*

¹ Matthew 28:20: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto (ἕως) the end of the world. Amen."

² 1 Corinthians 15:25: "For he must reign, till (ἄχρις οὗ) he hath put all enemies under his feet."

beginning to dawn in the future, by comparison with Ephesians 1:17, 18. Indeed, the light of Grace in this life is always after the likeness of the *dawn* and time of the morning, while the meridian time of full light is expected in Glory. Now, that ἕως οὗ does not exactly mean *until*, but *while* and *to what time*, by comparison with Matthew 14:22;¹ 13:33.² Peter does not so much determine the *time*, during which attention was to be given to the prophetic Speech, as he indicates the *end* and *scope*, that they ought to establish for themselves in the reading of the prophetic Word, and which by the grace of God they might also obtain through painstaking attention to the prophetic speech; that is, a greater degree unto the day of illumination, which degree gradually tends toward perfection, by comparison with Proverbs 4:18; since perfection is at length to be expected in the next life, here attention is always to be given to the prophetic Speech: see *Commentarium meum ad 2 Peter 1*. What Peter commends, the practice of the same Luke praises in the Bereans, Acts 17:11. And, that the word of the Apostles was able best to be examined according to the writings of the Old Testament, is evident from the perfect agreement of the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, which Paul professes, Acts 26:22, who, when he had announced the whole counsel of God concerning salvation, testifies that *he had spoken nothing beyond those things that had been said by Moses and the Prophets*. I will not add anything concerning the great number of citations of Old Testament passages in the New for the confirmation of doctrine. Therefore, when the New Testament confirms, so often and so expressly, the authority and normative use of the Old Testament, it does not belong to us to abrogate the same.

3. What furnishes the *Foundation* for building up the Church of the New Testament, its normative use under the New Testament is not to be repudiated. But the writings of the Prophets walk in even step with Apostolic doctrine in constituting the foundation of the Church of the New Testament, Ephesians 2:20: see what things I have observed in § 12, so that I might demonstrate that by *Prophets* here, conjoined with the Apostles, are understood the *Old Prophets, the doctrine of whom*, being

¹ Matthew 14:22: “And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while (ἕως οὗ) he sent the multitudes away.”

² Matthew 13:33b: “The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till (ἕως οὗ) the whole was leavened.”

especially renowned, *was extant, written for the use of the whole church, not the new Prophets, concerning whom that was not at all true.*

4. If diverse Articles of Religion either are known far more clearly out of the Old Testament than out of the New, or are hardly able solidly to be proven without collation of the Old Testament; certainly the use of the Scripture of the Old Testament is especially necessary, and Canonical power is not able to be removed from it. So the situation truly stands, that, if you consider the *Faith to rendered to the Creation, Fall, Restoration, and Christ Himself as the true Messiah*, and the *Obedience likewise to be rendered to the Law*, they especially rest on these Books: compare Luke 24:26, 27, etc.

But in vain do *They Object* against us,

1. Diverse *Passages* of Sacred Scripture; for example,

α. Luke 16:16. Christ does not set the doctrine of the Old Testament against the doctrine of the New as diverse in substance; but there was a diversity of mode, Prophetic and Evangelical, under each economy of revelation, of which the former was promising that Messiah was to be revealed, the latter announces that He is now revealed. And, if you compare Matthew 11:13, you will see that Christ does not abrogate the authority of Moses and prophetic doctrine; but signifies that *prophecy concerning the Christ to come* through the Gospel of promise only *endured until John*; while those prophetic promises now fulfilled ought no longer to be announced as to be fulfilled again in the future.

β. John 1:17. Responses: 1. The opposition is not absolute, but *κατὰ τὴν*, *relative*, as is often the case. 2. If by *the Law* you understand *the Moral Law*, we have already seen that this was not abrogated by Christ: but He perfectly fulfilled the same for His own, and merited *grace*, whereby the transgressions of the elect are pardoned, and they themselves are made able to keep the Law. 3. If you have regard to *the Ceremonial Law*, one may indeed discern the body and *truth* of the shadows in Christ;¹ but in this very thing Christ answers to those things that were predicted by Moses concerning Himself: and although the observation of shadows ceases with the body being present, nevertheless the true doctrine and profitable instruction of the same remain.

γ. Romans 6:14. Response: The opposition here is not so much between the Old economy and the New, as between the natural

¹ See Colossians 2:16, 17.

state of man and the state of grace. By nature subjection to the instruction of the Law is incumbent upon man, and, if any be disobedient, the Law condemns; but the Law does not promise or grant grace for its fulfillment: hence sin reigns over fallen man, indeed, by the Law it is even increased, since perverted man struggles against the prohibition, Romans 7:5, 8-11. But believers crossed over to the dominion of Grace, in which they are certainly not freed from the necessary observance of the Law; but, having been freed from the dominion of sin, they are made slaves freely and willingly to fulfill the righteousness which is according to the norm of the Law, comparing Romans 6:15-18, where the Apostle sets forth the homonymy of the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον, *under the Law*, and shows that believers have indeed been set free only from subjection under Law prescribing, and cursing, condemning; but that, nevertheless, the same have not been set free from the direction of the Law. Although believers are not ὑπὸ νόμον, *under the Law*, yet they are not ἄνομοι Θεῷ ἀλλ' ἔννομοι Χριστῷ, *without law to God, but under law to Christ*, comparing 1 Corinthians 9:20, 21; and this believers of the Old and New Testaments truly have in common with each other.

δ. Romans 10:4. Responses: 1. Christ is the τέλος/*telos/end*, that is, not the terminus/limit, but the scope/goal, unto which the Law directs itself, and the pursuit of which is the true and saving use of the Law for fallen man. 2. Christ is the *end*, not of the abrogation of the Moral Law, not even of the Ceremonial Law with respect to its saving instruction; but rather the *end of τελειώσεως/fulfillment* of both, so that thus righteousness might be able to abound to those believing upon Christ. 3. In which manner, since Christ fulfilled at one and the same time the Moral and Ceremonial Law, at the same time an *end* was to be imposed upon the rigid legal Economy. And so believers were obliged ἀτενίσαι εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου, *to look to the end of that which is abolished*, 2 Corinthians 3:13.

ε. 2 Corinthians 3:3-7, where the Apostle rejects *the writing of the Law on tables of stone*; he calls the Law a *killing letter*, of which *the Ministers of the New Testament are not Ministers*; he calls its ministry a *ministry of death and condemnation*, the *glory* of which was *to be brought to nothing*. Responses: 1. Paul's allegorical speech in *verse 3* is no more a total repudiation of the Law *written on tables of stone*, than of the books of the New Testament, which were written with *ink*, which sort are also mentioned *in that very place*. 2. Paul does not speak of an abrogation of

the doctrine and Canonical Books of the Old Testament; but of the abrogation of the rigid legal Economy, with which continuing the *Letter of the Law* is everywhere inculcated, with a grievous threat added, as obliging to fulfillment; only those that were adhering to it, willing to be justified by the works of the Law rendered in their own strength, *were being killed*: to which rigid Legal ministry of death the more gracious ministry of the Gospel would now succeed, formerly administered more sparingly, by which the elect would be thoroughly taught by the *Spirit*, that is, the spiritual use and scope/end of the preached and administered Law, and, having been convinced of their wretched state by the Law, would learn in addition to flee by faith to Christ, as the *Spirit of the Letter of the Law*, for their justification: which also was granted to believers formerly, but this way of righteousness through faith in Christ was not so clearly set forth at that time; at that time believers were obliged ἀτενίσαι εἰς τὸ τέλος, *to look to the end*, through the letter of the Law and the κάλυμμα/*veil*¹ of shadows.

ζ. Ephesians 2:15. Christ is said τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας, *to bring to naught the law of commandments in ordinances*, with respect to its necessary observance for the future, not with respect to its useful, certain, and normative instruction.

2. It no more straitens that *They Object that the Doctrine of the Old and New Testaments is in Opposition*. Accordingly our AUTHOR offers the best *Response*: 1. Indeed, an *Opposition partially obtains in the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace*, which, nevertheless, *does not remove the use of the Covenant of Works* to those that are under the *Covenant of Grace*: but, 2. an *Opposition of the Doctrine comprehended in the Old and New Testaments is denied, whether in things to be believed or in things to be done*; only a distinction of the mode of communication obtains, inasmuch as the doctrine of *Grace* is contained in the *Old Testament* more obscurely, in the *New Testament* more clearly.

3. Finally, the *Sufficiency of the New Testament*, adduced by our Adversaries, does not much vex us, as if this were such that we would not need the *Old Testament*. For, α. *we do not concede this without the comparison of*, 1. *the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, to which we saw appeal so frequently made in the *New Testament* itself, both in other articles, and especially in proving that most weighty article concerning

¹ 2 Corinthians 3:13.

Jesus the true Messiah, for the greater ἀσφάλειαν/*certainty* of faith:¹ 2. *the Precepts of the Old Testament*, since there those things that belong to the Law are wont most copiously to be related and explained. β. *It does not remove the grace of God, by which He provides for us beyond necessity; and against which man would act unjustly, if the abundance, which God willed to grant beyond Sufficiency, he should impudently reject: no less than if one should wish to deprive himself of his second eye, because he believed one to be sufficient for vision.*

Concerning the Use of the Scripture of the Old Testament in the Christian Church, see *the Elder SPANHEIM'S Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas, Disputationum theologiarum, part II, Disputations II-V.*

¹ Luke 1:3, 4: “It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty (τὴν ἀσφάλειαν) of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.”

§ 18: The Abiding Canonicity of the Old Testament, Part 2

As all the Canonical Books are always Canonical, so also they are equally Canonical, with no Dignity to be attributed to some above others, since all were Inspired by God with the same trustworthiness resulting. Our AUTHOR advises that this is to be observed:

1. Against the Socinians, sometimes making light of the Teachings of the Prophets, as if they had or have not the force of Precepts. Thus Ostorodus,¹ *Institutionibus*, chapter XXX, page 221, with HOORNBECK referring to it, *Socinianismo confutato*, tome II, book II, chapter II, part II, page 471: “And this is to be considered, that when Solomon or Sirac” (thus he has a Canonical Author and an Apocryphal Author in equal rank) “say anything concerning manners that in the Law of Moses was not expressly prescribed or prohibited, it no more binds or obliges than the wise counsel and teaching of any other man: if one should comply with it, he shall be reckoned to have done well and rightly; but if not, nevertheless he shall not be reckoned thereby to have sinned against the Law of Moses.” Socinus has similar things on Matthew 5, *operibus Socini*, tome I, page 33b, 34a: see HOORNBECK’S *Socinianismum confutatum*, tome 2, book II, chapter II, part I, section III, pages 424-426. To this also is that saying of GROTIUS able to be referred, *de Jure Belli et Pacis*, book II, chapter XV, § 9, note 10: “There are extant, even indeed in the writings of Solomon, not a few sentences concerning avoiding fellowship with the impious. But these are admonitions of prudence, not precepts of Law: and those admonitions, as do most matters of morals, have a great number of exceptions.” This hypothesis of Grotius was marked with a grave censure by CLOPPENBURG, *Disputatione III de Canone Theologicæ*, § 8, *opera*, tome 2, page 20, admonishing, together with our AUTHOR on this passage, “The multiform παιδείας τρόπος, manner of divine instruction, does not cause the authority of Sacred Scripture to vary or make that lack uniformity; πολυτρόπως, in divers manners,² Scripture

¹ Krzysztof Ostorodt (c. 1560-1611) was a Polish Socinian. He was sent as a missionary to the Netherlands (1598); in Leiden he stirred up great controversy by his success in converting the students of the University.

² Hebrews 1:1.

insinuates itself into souls: for example, whether it speak in the Imperative mood, or in the optative mood, whether as Legislator, or as exhorter and adviser, giving counsel in cases of conscience. Wherefore, they do not hold the Sacred Scripture in reverence, who, for instance, appear to receive nothing in the Old Testament for a commandment or precept of the Legislator that is not on record in words contained in the Law of Moses: for example, the Maxims and *sentences* of Solomon concerning *the avoidance of fellowship with the impious* a Man of great reputation says that they are *only Admonitions of Prudence, not precepts of Law, book II de Jure Belli et Pacis, chapter XV, §9.*” For our AUTHOR well observes that *the Authority of the Divine Word is not changed by, α. The Manner of Statement, with God Himself sometimes desiring, imploring, inviting, etc., by a wonderful φιλανθρωπίαν/philanthropy, which ought so much the more to compel man to obedience. Thus, for example, God is found desiring, Deuteronomy 5:29; imploring, Micah 6:2-5; inviting, Isaiah 55:1-3; giving counsel, Revelation 3:18. β. Neither does the Person immediately speaking, when a man, even a completely ignoble man, change the Authority of the Divine Word,* adds our AUTHOR: so it is obviously whether God speaks immediately, or mediately through the mouth of Prophets: whether the Lord Jesus spoke with His own mouth, or the Spirit of Christ speaks in the Apostles.¹ The *ignobility* of the man speaking does not damage anything, because whom that divine inspiration does not find suitable, it makes suitable in this business; they, being moved by divine inspiration, spoke and wrote, 2 Peter 1:21. Which was said against Castalio,² *dialogue II de Electione*, when he writes: “I prefer to believe Jeremiah more than Paul, because God Himself speaks in Jeremiah, while Paul speaks from himself:” on which CLOPPENBURG, *Disputatione III de Canone Theologicæ*, § 3, *opera, tome 2, page 19*, observes that Castalio imitates the Papists, and has the followers of the Remonstrants as guides. But *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος, all Scripture is inspired*, and everything that is *θεόπνευστος/inspired* has equal authority.

2. The *Equal Authority* of the entire Canon is likewise to be

¹ See 1 Peter 1:11.

² Sebastian Castalio (1515-1563) distinguished himself as a scholar by means of his linguistic talents, evident in his *Annotationes in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*. After a period of working closely with Calvin, the two fell into controversy. Castalio was inclined towards Pelagianism, and his views were influential in the development of Socinianism.

maintained *against the many Papists* that divide the Sacred Books into *Proto-canonical* and *Deutero-canonical*, and among the latter they number the *Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament*, and Mark 16:9-20, John 8:1-11, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. The *Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament* will be discussed at length next, § 19, 20. Concerning the Pericopes and Books of the New Testament here enumerated, consult what things were said in § 13, where these were occurring as ἀντιλεγόμενοι, *disputed Books*. Concerning Mark 16, and the *beginning* of John 8, see in addition GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special, part I, article I, chapter II, thesis 3, pages 115-117. On the *Beginning* of John 8, see also our AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus Textualibus*, Part V, Exercise XXXVIII, § 1; and especially GOMARUS, *opera*, part I, pages 415-419.

But in a twofold sense this title of *Proto-canonical* and *Deutero-canonical* Books is able to be explained, namely, concerning Books that were received into the Canon earlier or later; or that in the Church were held to be of a greater or lesser authority. With respect to the *Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, these two reasons why they might be called *Deutero-canonical* concur: for the title of *Deutero-canonical* here shall mark Books of this sort, which are not only of a secondary authority, but which at the time of the first collection of the Canon by Ezra were not yet received into the Canon, or were not yet even written at that time; but which were admitted at a later time, when in a Synod convoked the Canon might again be reviewed. Thus *Genebrard* devises a threefold arrangement of the Canon of the Old Testament, namely, the first in the time of Ezra, who received into the Canon the twenty-two Books read in today's Hebrew Bible. He maintains that a second, more than two hundred years later than that first, was made by a Synod gathered at Jerusalem for the translation of the Scriptures, in the time of Eleazar the High Priest;¹ when *Tobit* and *Ecclesiasticus* appear to have been added to that former Canon. Finally, third, in a Synod assembled to approve the Pharisees in the time of John Hyrcanus,² he maintains that the former Canons were confirmed, in particular *the books of Judith, Tobit, and others*,

¹ Eleazar served as High Priest from about 260 to 245 BC. He is mentioned in the Letter of Aristeas as sending the seventy-two scholars to Ptolemy II Philadelphus for the translation of the Scriptures.

² John Hyrcanus (164-104 BC) served as Jewish High Priest from 134 to 104 BC, succeeding his father, Simon Maccabæus. He took advantage of a weakening Seleucid Empire to expand Jewish territory.

and the *Books of the Maccabees* and 3 and 4 *Ezra* were added in turn. Which, as they are the mere fabrications of Genebrard's mind, so, by *this* his *impudence*, as RIVET says, *Isagoge ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter VII, § 7, *opera*, tome 2, page 879, it happened that not even among his own is credence given to him: compare GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, *special*, part I, article I, chapter I, tome 2, page 25. Nevertheless, something similar pleases Guillaume Baile in his *Catechismo Controversiarum*: see HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum philologicum*, pages 110-112. But, with respect to the *Pericopes* and *Books of the New Testament* cited, these especially are called *Deutero-canonical*, for, even if they might now pertain to the Canon, yet formerly they did not rise by authority to the Canonical Books of the first Order, on account of the doubt of various men concerning these, until, with this hesitation of some ceasing, they were received by the universal Church.

To uphold this authority of diverse ranks and degrees among the Canonical Books, COTELIER, in his *notis ad Clementis Romani Epistolam priorem ad Corinthios*, § 28, makes use of the authority of AUGUSTINE, book II *de Doctrina Christiana*, chapter VIII, § 12, where he maintains that *the skillful searcher of the divine Scriptures gives priority to those things in the Canonical Scriptures that are received by all the Catholic Churches, before those things that some do not receive: but, in the case of those things that are not received by all, he wishes those things to be given priority that more and weightier Churches receive, before those things that Churches fewer and of lesser authority hold*: see his *opera*, tome 3, part 1, column 18, where in the next place, § 13, the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, together with the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, which the Papists receive, are enumerated, as together making up *the entire Canon of the Scriptures*, in which, *says he, the consideration previously mentioned is to be continually kept in view*.

SIXTUS SENENSIS, *Bibliotheca Sancta*, book I, section I, pages 1, 2, according to his own conception, clearly explains this distinction of Books into *Proto-canonical* and *Deutero-canonical*. "*The Canonical Books*," says he, "*both of the Old and the New Testament are distinguished in two related orders, of which one is prior, the other is posterior; prior and posterior, I say, not with respect to authority, or certainty, or dignity (for both receive their excellence and majesty from the same Holy Spirit), but with respect to recognition and time; in which two matters it happens that, as one order precedes, the other follows*.

"*Canonical Books* of the first order, which it is suitable to call

Proto-canonical, are books of undisputed trustworthiness, that is, concerning the authority of which there has never been any doubt in the Catholic Church, or controversy, etc.

“*Canonical Books* of the second order, which were formerly called *Ecclesiastical*, but now are called *Deutero-canonical*, are those concerning which, because they came to the notice of the entire Church, not immediately after the times of the Apostles, but long after, among Catholics there was ever a doubtful opinion: as they are in the Old Testament, the books of Esther, Tobit, Judith, and Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, the prayer of Azariah, the hymn of the three boys, the history of Susanna, the history of Bel, 1 and 2 Maccabees; similarly also in the New Testament, the last chapter of Mark, the history of Luke concerning the bloody sweat of Christ and the appearance of the Angel,¹ John’s history concerning the adulterous woman, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, John’s Apocalypse, and other Books of the same sort, which formerly the ancient Fathers of the Church held as Apocryphal and not Canonical: and at first they permitted those to be read among Catechumens alone, who were not yet ready for Canonical reading, as Athanasius testifies in his *Synopsi*; then, with time advancing, as Ruffinus in his *Symbolo* writes, they allowed them to be read among all the faithful, not for the confirmation of doctrines, but only for the instruction of the people: and, because they were read publicly in the Church, they called them *Ecclesiastical*: but at length they wanted them to be received among the Scriptures of indisputable authority:” compare GERHARD’S *Confessionem catholicam*, tome II, page 19-23.

To state the matter briefly: α. *The Doubt of some* concerning the Books, which others held as *Canonical*, either had a foundation, or it did not. If for just reasons there was doubt, and a certain Books was not actually θεόπνευστος/*inspired*; then it is to be altogether removed from the Canon, and all Canonical Authority is to be denied to it. But if some *have doubted without cause*, this cannot at all *diminish the Canonical Authority* of that Book. And thus that division of the Books of Scripture into *Proto-canonical* and *Deutero-canonical* collapses. For, β. as our AUTHOR observes, *the appellation of Canon, when it is extended by the Fathers to those things that were read in the Church, does not have regard to the present*

¹ Luke 22:43, 44.

signification of Canon. Thence the Fathers appear sometimes to talk over one another, and one appears to extend the Canon more broadly than the other, because the later speaks of the Canon of *θεοπνεύστου*/inspired Scripture, the other of the Canon of Books to be read in the Church; unto which the various *Apocryphal* books also was pertaining, but which were read for the edification of the common people only, but not to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines, as JEROME has it in his *Præfatione in Proverbia Salomonis, opera, tome 3, pages 25*, where he desires *Ecclesiasticus of Sirach, and another pseudepigraph, which is entitled the Wisdom of Solomon*, to be held in the same rank as *Judith, Tobit, and the books of the Maccabees*, which the church does indeed read, but does not receive among the Canonical Scriptures. Thus AUGUSTINE, *book II de Doctrina Christiana, chapter VIII, § 13, page 302*, extends more broadly the appellation of Canonical Scripture than Jerome, not only to the *θεοπνεύστους*/inspired Books, but also to those read in the Church, yet not received by all: compare RIVET, *Isagoge ad Scripturam Sacram, chapter VII, § 31-38, pages 884-886, opera, tome 2*. But in this sense the distinction of *Proto-canonical* and *Deutero-canonical* Books is applied inconsistently; for thus the language of *Canon* and *Canonical* is taken in one sense when it is attributed to the *Proto-canonical* Books, but in another sense when it is used of the *Deutero-canonical* Books; Ecclesiastical reading is not able to confer Divine and Normative authority upon any Book, concerning which alone is our disputation, when we treat of *Canonical Books*.

Concerning the *division into Proto-canonical and Deutero-canonical* Books, see the inquiry of CHAMIER, *Panstratia Catholica, tome I, book VII, chapter VII*.

§ 19: The Apocrypha, Part 1

After our AUTHOR related *positively* what Books constitute the Matter of Composition of the Sacred Scripture; he now *negatively* separates from the same, both the Books fabulously or by uncertain tradition ascribed to the Apostles or Apostolical Men, and those Books wont to be joined with the Old Testament, which commonly go by the name of *Apocrypha*.

In the first centuries of Christianity, it is well-known that *Pseudepigrapha* were endlessly ascribed to the *Apostles* and to *Apostolical Men*. The Learned observe that this was done by the heretics of the first centuries, and by others that under a false name were seeking to obtain Apostolic authority for their own writings. Those that treat *Ecclesiastical and Literary History* are to be consulted concerning these; and certainly FABRICIUS' *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*; and GERHARD'S *Confessio catholica*, tome I, book I, *general, latter part, chapters VI-VIII, pages 394-430*, in which he discusses the *Canons, Constitutions, and Liturgies of the Apostles* against the Papists: likewise RUMPÆUS' *Commentatio critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § IX, XVII, XXII, *pages 17-19, 33-39, 46-48*, and those many that he cites. Concerning the Pseudo-Gospels and the Pseudo-canonical writings of the New Testament, see considerably more things, against *Toland's Amyntora*,¹ by LELAND, *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, chapter 4, *pages 88-95*. Concerning the Pseudo-Liturgies of Christ and the Apostles, consult BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, appendix, chapter V, tome 2, *pages 853-855, 857, 858*. Concerning the *Symbolo Apostolico*, see also Chapter III:12.

From these, nevertheless, one or another was formerly reckoned in the Canon of Books to be Read also; but simultaneously as Apocryphal it was removed from the Canon of *θεοπνεύστων/inspired Books*. For example, EUSEBIUS says that by some the *Shepherd of Hermas* ἀντιλελέχθαι, *was disputed*, and δι' οὓς οὐκ ἂν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, *on their account it cannot be placed among the acknowledged books*. But by others this Book was judged ἀναγκαϊότατο/*necessary, especially to those that are to be imbued with the first elements of religion; whence also in the*

¹ Toland's *Amyntora* was a twenty-page list of works attributed to Christ, Mary, and the Apostles, by early Church Fathers.

Churches it was δεδημοσιευμένος, published, promulgated, explained; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter III. The *Shepherd* is reckoned by JEROME, *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, page 17, among the Apocrypha, which are not in the Canon*: if only that *Shepherd of Hermas*, of which we now treat, be indicated there, concerning which consult RIVET on the passage next cited. It is said that the author is that *Hermas*, whom Paul wishes to be greeted, Romans 16:14. Whether the Book that is today inscribed with this name actually claims that Apostolical Man as author, the Learned dispute. Men, certainly not of the lowest rank, contend that it is spurious. SCULTETUS,¹ *Medulla Patrum, part I, book XI, chapter VII, pages 372, 373*, rejects this book as *Fabulous and Apocryphal*, and also that on it are built the freedom of the will, a single repentance, monastic solitude, and purgatory. It can be read with COTELIER'S *Notis* in his *Patribus Apostolicis, tome I, pages 68 and following*, with the testimonies of the Ancients concerning the *Shepherd of Hermas* prefaced: I shall be amazed if the reading is going to be very pleasing: for more concerning this writing see CAVE'S *Historiam Litterariam*; GERHARD'S *Patrologiam*; RIVET'S *Criticum Sacrum, book I, chapter XII, opera, tome 2, page 1084*.

Thus in *Pseudo-Apostolic Canon*² LXXXV, together with the Canonical Books are commended, besides *two Epistles of Clement of Rome, eight books of Apostolic Constitutions*, which have their reputation from the same *Clement*.³ But, that these, together with the *Apostolic Canons*, are spurious and ψευδεπιγράφοις/*pseudepigraphal*, the Learned have for some time taught. Indeed, the *Constitutions* are moved back to the Fifth

¹ Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624) was a German Reformed scholar, theologian, and historian. He served as court preacher to the Elector of the Palatinate, and also as Professor of Old Testament at the University of Heidelberg. He was chosen as a representative of the Palatinate to the Synod of Dort.

² The origins of the *Apostolic Canons* can be traced to the early fifth century. Although they claim for themselves Apostolic authorship and authority (at least as promulgated by their disciple, Clement of Rome), there is little to corroborate this. It is a list of decrees concerning the government and discipline in the Church, attached to the end of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The Eastern Church received eighty-five canons at the Council of Trullo in 692, but only the first fifty canons circulated in the West.

³ The *Apostolic Constitutions* is a collection of eight treatises on church order. It was probably written around 375 in Syria. Because of the implicit Arianism of some of its statements, it was not as widely received as the *Apostolic Canons*.

Century by DAILLÉ;¹ by BLONDEL² and others they are believed to have been written near the end of the Third Century. To SPANHEIM some rites commemorated here appear to have been already in use in the Third Century, but the whole work was stitched together at length toward the end of the Fifth Century: but he believes that the names of the *Apostles* and *Clement* were prefixed to obtain authority for the work. Similarly all the *Apostolic Canons* are moved back to the Fifth Century by DAILLÉ, with some Greek plagiarizing the Canons of Councils: but others refer the first fifty Canons to the height of the Third Century, which they think for the most part to have been excerpts from the Constitutions; the remaining thirty-five they think to savor of the Sixth Century. Called *Apostolic* and likewise *Constitutions*, so that they might procure for them authority and the appearance of antiquity, and at the same time separate the argument of those from the doctrine of the heretics of the Second and Third Centuries. More concerning these things shall be imparted by DAILLÉ, GERHARD, OLEARIUS, SCULTETUS in *Medulla Patrum*, SPANHEIM in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century I, chapter XV, § 2, column 570, 580, Century III, chapter XI, § 4, 5, columns 784-786, and others. For these things do not belong to this Compendium. A fair number, discoursing concerning the *Apostolic Constitutions* and their *νοθεία*/*spuriousness*, are cited by WALCH in his *Miscellaneis Sacris*, book III, *Exercitation* I, § 3, pages 490, 491: see also our AUTHOR in his *Exercitationibus Juvenilibus*, *Disputation* XXIII, § 4, pages 497, 498. Concerning the successive collecting of the *Apostolic Canons*, and the work of Clement of Alexandria likely employed in this matter, consult the words of ENS also, *Diatriba de Librorum Novi Testamenti Canone*, chapter VI, *distinction* II, § 7-10, pages 144-148. Concerning the *Apostolic Canons* and *Constitutions*, an occasion for speaking shall return again in *Chapter XXXIII:23*.

But with respect to the *Apocryphal Books*, wont to be joined to the *Old Testament among the Greeks and the Latins*: thus they are vulgarly called,

¹ Jean Daillé (1594-1670) was a Huguenot minister and Biblical scholar; theologically he was inclined to the tenets of Amyraldianism. In his *Treatise concerning the right use of the Fathers*, he argues against the use of the Fathers as a final authority in matters of faith and practice, with the texts of the Patristic writings frequently being found corrupt.

² David Blondel (1591-1655) was a Huguenot minister, historian, and classicist. He served as Professor of Church History at Amsterdam (1649-1655). He is remembered for his critical stance with respect to the many forged and spurious documents coming out of antiquity.

say our AUTHOR, *thence from JEROME*, who in his *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, page 17*, after reviewing the Canon of the Old Testament adds, *whatever is beyond these is to be placed among the Apocrypha*; which he then applies to the Books vulgarly called *Apocryphal*: that is, from this time this solemn denomination adhered to these Books, which in other respects is already found among the Fathers of the preceding age, with TRIGLAND observing in his *Sylloge Dissertationum; Dissertatione de Appellatione Apocryphorum Librorum*, § 4, 14, 16, who thinks that among Christians *Hegesippus*,¹ closest to the time of the Apostles, was the first of all to make use of this appellation, while in his *Commentariis*, plundered by *Eusebius*, *περὶ τῶν λεγομένων Ἀποκρύφων διέβαλε*, *he discussed books, which were called Apocryphal*; see EUSEBIUS' *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, book IV, chapter XXII. Indeed, he believes that this *Hegesippus*, a convert from the Jewish to the Christian faith, drew this appellation from the Jews, among whom these Books were already called *ספרי נסתרים*/*hidden/Apocryphal*.

That these Books in the Greek language were called *Apocryphal* or *hidden*, our AUTHOR judges, together with the most excellent Theologians, not *on account of their uncertain Authors*, as the *Glossator* of the *Juris Canonici*, *Distinction XV, chapter III, column 62*, thinks with a few others, *which, 1. is partly false*, since the author of *Ecclesiasticus*, *Sirach*, is known; the author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* is held to be either the same *Sirach*, or *Philo the Jew*: JEROME, in his *Præfatione in Proverbia Salomonis, opera, tome 3, page 25*, “And also included is a model of all virtue, *the book of Jesus, son of Sirach*: and also another *pseudepigraph, which is titled the Wisdom of Solomon*. The former of which I have found in Hebrew, entitled, not *Ecclesiasticus* as among the Latins, but *Parables...* The second is nowhere among the Hebrews; moreover, its style smells of Greek eloquence: *and some of the ancient writers affirm that this belonged to Philo the Jew.*” 2. *This is partly common to the Canonical books*, among which the authors of the various Historical Books of the Old Testament are uncertain; consult TRIGLAND'S *Syllogen Dissertationum; Dissertatione de Appellatione Apocryphorum Librorum*, § 6. But *on account of their rejected Authority: with an allusion made in the word, 1. not so much to the Ark of the Covenant, from which they were excluded*; that is, where some maintain that the Autographs of the Canonical Books were preserved, but which

¹ *Hegesippus* was a second century Chronicler and preserver of the traditions of the early church. His five-volume *Hypomnemata* is lost, save for the fragments preserved in *Eusebius*.

privilege was denied to the *Apocryphal Books*; as EPIPHANIUS, *de Mensuris et Ponderibus, opera, tome 2, page 162*, after the mention of one and another Apocryphal Book, says that these do not pertain to the Canon, διὸ οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ ἀραῶν ἀνετέθησαν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτῷ, *wherefore they were not kept in the chest, that is, in the ark of the covenant*: which explanation for the denomination satisfies HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia problemata nova, locus II, problem XX, page 122*: but which VRIEMOET, *Thesibus Antiquitatum Israeliticarum, CCCVIII*, affirms to depend upon an erroneous supposition, which is: “The Chest containing the sacred Scrolls was called by the same name in the Synagogues as the Ark of the Covenant was in the Temple, אֲרוֹן/aron. Whence it is a tiresome error, not only of some of the Fathers, but also of the more recent men, concerning the Books of the Sacred Codex, wont to be kept in the Ark of the Covenant.” Besides which observation by TRIGLAND, *Sylloge Dissertationum; Dissertatione de Appellatione Apocryphorum Librorum, § 7*, explained at length, he teaches in addition that the ἡ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτὸς, *the ark of the covenant*, which Epiphanius interprets as ἀραῶν/*chest*, was among five lost things under the second Temple, with which standing the ἀπόκρυφοί/*Apocryphal Books* were at length written. 2. But, as it were, חֲסוּמִים/*hidden, from a Hiding under the earth*, done in one or another way, made use of among the Jews concerning Books of the Law defectively copied or other erroneous Books; when they are said חָסוּ, *to hide*, any book, the matter itself is said to be a חֲסוּמִים/*hiding*, and a book of this sort חֲסוּמִים/*hidden*, to which the Greek word ἀπόκρυφος/*Apocryphal* perfectly corresponds: in which opinion our AUTHOR follows HOTTINGER, *Thesouro Philologico, book II, chapter II, section I, pages 521, 522*, who in *book I, chapter II, question IV, page 142*, relates from the Jews that they called defectively copied Books of the Law חֲסוּמִים, and did not admit them for public use; but they either transferred them to scholastic use, or buried them enclosed in an earthen vessel near a student of wisdom: and he adds that Books truly incompatible with the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were also called חֲסוּמִים, which the Jews did not read, nor esteem worthy to be read, indeed, ἀπέκρυψαν, *they hid*, them lest others should peruse them. This opinion of HOTTINGER, which our AUTHOR also supports, is confirmed and commended at greater length by TRIGLAND, *Sylloge Dissertationum; Dissertatione de Appellatione Apocryphorum Librorum, § 8-16*. The reason for the allusion in the term is of little importance, since in

general it is evident that these Books were thus called with good reason on account of their obscure and rejected authority. AUGUSTINE, *book XI contra Faustum Manichæum, chapter II, opera, tome 8, column 156*: “These are the Books that are called *Apocryphal*; not because they are to be held in any mysterious authority, but because they are mysterious in their origin, and in the absence of clear evidence, have only some obscure presumption to rest upon.”

The Arguments, because of which we reject all the Books wont to be called *Apocryphal* as not divine and Canonical, you will see diligently gathered and powerfully constructed in the *Prologo*, altogether worthy of reading, which is found before our recent Version of these Books in the *Dutch Bible*: see in addition JOHN RAINOLDS’ *Censuram Librorum Apocryphorum*; RIVET’S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram, chapter VII, opera, tome 2, pages 879-887*; consult also JOHN GERHARD’S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I*, where it is proven chiefly out of the suffrages of Roman Catholic Writers, both that the Apocryphal Books in general are not to be held as *Θεοπνεύστοις/inspired* and Canonical, *prior Section, pages 2-36*, and that in particular none of the Apocryphal Books, which the Papists hold as Canonical, are to be paid this honor, *posterior Section, pages 36-71*.

It will suffice to have noted briefly with our AUTHOR what things now follow:

1. With respect to *Malachi’s* sealing of the Canon of the Old Testament, *Malachi 4:4-6*, consult § 14 above; whence we infer: α. What Books were written after the sealing of the Canon by *Malachi*, are not able to pertain to that Canon. But the former is true concerning the Apocryphal Books, Therefore also the latter. β. What Books were written after *Malachi*, called the *Seal of the Prophets* by the Jews, see in § 11, 14 above; who sufficiently indicated that more Prophets are not to be expected under the Old Testament, promising the coming of *John the Baptist*; those were not written by Prophets or by the prophetic Spirit, and therefore are not to be admitted into the Canon, all the Books of which are called the *Prophetic Scriptures*, *Romans 16:26, Prophetic Speech, 2 Peter 1:19, 20*. But these Books were written after *Malachi* and the departure of the Prophets. The *Book of Wisdom* from that period indeed is called the *Wisdom of Solomon*, whom the author also pretends himself to be, *Wisdom of Solomon 9:7, 8*; proclaiming himself to be the King that

had commanded the building of the Jerusalem Temple:¹ but contrariwise it is observed that the author alludes to the games of the Greeks, Wisdom of Solomon 4:2,² which did not begin to be instituted until two centuries after Solomon: consult besides those things, what things I have already introduced from JEROME; SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 58, 59; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section IV, § 33, tome 2, pages 519b-521a, section VII, § 17, pages 967-969a*, and his *Introductionem ad Historiam Philosophiæ Hebræorum*, § 18, pages 57-63; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 57-59*. Learned Men think that it is closer to the truth that the Hellenistic Jews, dispersed throughout various regions outside of Judea, wrote these books in pious zeal, and in addition to the Greek version of the Bible made use of them privately.

2. That these Apocryphal Books are not to be numbered with the Canonical, our AUTHOR proves from this, that *they were written in the Greek Tongue* under the Old Testament, at which time *the oracles of God were entrusted to the Jews*, Romans 3:2. Of course, all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were written in the Hebrew tongue, because they were for the sake of the Jewish Church, to which the Hebrew Language was the vernacular. But these Books were written, either from the first, or *delivered to posterity*, as our AUTHOR most advantageously adds for the sake of explanation in his *Compendio, in the Greek Language*. For concerning some of these it is passed down that they were written in Hebrew or Chaldean. *Sirach in his Prologo* relates that he translated those things that his grandfather had gathered ἐκ τῶν πατρίων βιβλίων, *out of the books of the fathers*; and that what things he had spoken ἐβραϊστὶ, *in Hebrew*, μεταχθῆναι εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν, *are translated into another tongue*, by himself. *The Books of Tobit and Judith*, as JEROME testifies in his *Præfatione ad eosdem, opera, tome 3, page 22*, were first written in *Chaldean*, whence this Father translated them into the

¹ Wisdom of Solomon 9:7, 8: "Thou hast chosen me to be a king of thy people, and a judge of thy sons and daughters: Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning."

² Wisdom of Solomon 4:2: "When it is present, men take example at it; and when it is gone, they desire it: it weareth a crown, and triumpheth for ever, having gotten the victory, striving for undefiled rewards."

Latin language. That *he found the First Book of the Maccabees in Hebrew*, JEROME relates in his *Prologo galeato in Libros Regum, opera, tome 3, page 17*: consult BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section VII, § 17, tome 2, pages 489, 490*. But, while the remaining Books are held to have been written in Greek, even these were translated into the Greek tongue some time ago, if not by the Septuagint Translators, at least by Theodotion. Now, the Apocryphal Books have been brought down to us in this Greek Tongue only, while the text, whether Hebrew or Chaldean, if any had been written in this idiom, perished some time ago. Indeed, HOTTINGER relates that he possesses a complete Manuscript Codex of the Apocrypha in the Hebrew Tongue; but at the same time he adds that it was recently translated into that language, *Thesaurο Philologico, book I, chapter III, section III, question VII, page 317*. Indeed, *the Fourth Book of Esdras* is not even extant in Greek, but in Latin only. But all the authentic Books of the Old and New Testaments were preserved by the providence of God in their original Language: therefore, God did not so care for these Apocryphal Books as He did His own.

3. The very *Writers* of these Books *distinguish themselves from the Prophets*; they sufficiently indicate that their labors are not to be numbered in the register of the Canonical Scripture of the Old Testament; since this in its entirety is called in the New Testament *prophetic* and θεόπνευστος/*inspired*: but *concerning the passing of the Prophets*, which had already obtained among the Jews ἐξ ἰκανοῦ χρόνου, *a considerable time ago*, you read in 1 Maccabees 9:27, in which is commemorated *an affliction of such power as had not been since the time no Prophet had been seen in Israel*.¹ In Sirach's Prologue, *verses 1 and 3*, he clearly distinguishes *Himself* and his *grandfather* from the *Prophets*; and he relates that he and his grandfather lived some time after the Law and the Prophets were written and the Prophets had died out.² In 2 Maccabees

¹ 1 Maccabees 9:27: "So was there a great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them."

² Sirach's Prologue: "Whereas many and great things have been delivered unto us by the law and the prophets, and by others that have followed their steps, for the which things Israel ought to be commended for learning and wisdom; and whereof not only the readers must needs become skilful themselves, but also they that desire to learn be able to profit them which are without, both by speaking and writing: my grandfather Jesus, when he had much given himself to the reading of the law, and the prophets, and other books of our fathers, and had gotten therein good judgment, was drawn on also

2:23, the Writer of that book declares that he is only an epitomist of the Maccabean History, comprehended by Jason of Cyrene in five books;¹ in 2 Maccabees 2:26, there is a consideration *of his sweat and vigils* in bringing this work to completion;² which things savor little of the prophetic genius and divine inspiration. In 2 Maccabees 15:38, the writer begs pardon, εἰ—εὐτελῶς καὶ μετρίως, *if...slenderly and moderately* only this work was executed:³ these things are far from engendering confidence in its divine authority: consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 63, 68.*

4. The Canonical Books of the Old Testament are everywhere cited by Christ and His Apostles in the New Testament for the confirmation of their doctrine: but these several Books, Moral and Historical, are nowhere cited in the New Testament for the confirmation of doctrine. How nearly all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament are cited in the New Testament, HEINRICH ALTING shows in his *Theologia Elenctica, Scriptorum Theologicorum Heidelbergensium, tome I, page 284*, perhaps with the exceptions of Nehemiah and Esther from the Historical Books, Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon from the Poetic Books (nevertheless, that the *Song* is able to be held as cited in the New

himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom; to the intent that those which are desirous to learn, and are addicted to these things, might profit much more in living according to the law. Wherefore let me intreat you to read it with favour and attention, and to pardon us, wherein we may seem to come short of some words, which we have laboured to interpret. For the same things uttered in Hebrew, and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them: and not only these things, but the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language. For in the eight and thirtieth year coming into Egypt, when Euergetes was king, and continuing there some time, I found a book of no small learning: therefore I thought it most necessary for me to bestow some diligence and travail to interpret it; using great watchfulness and skill in that space to bring the book to an end, and set it forth for them also, which in a strange country are willing to learn, being prepared before in manners to live after the law.”

¹ 2 Maccabees 2:23: “All these things, I say, being declared by Jason of Cyrene in five books, we will assay to abridge in one volume.”

² 2 Maccabees 2:26: “Therefore to us, that have taken upon us this painful labour of abridging, it was not easy, but a matter of sweat and watching...”

³ 2 Maccabees 15:38: “And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired: but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.”

Testament as Canonical Scripture, PIETER NIEUWLAND¹ credibly teaches in his *Letter- en Oudheid-kundige Verlostinggen*, part II, chapter VII, section IX), and Obadiah and Zephaniah alone of the Minor Prophets: but which are cited in a general way, in *the Book of the Prophets* mentioned in Acts 7:42, and in the citation of *the Law and the Prophets*, or of *the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms*,² under which were comprehended all those just listed. But the Apocryphal Books were formerly reckoned to no part of the Canonical Scripture cited in the New Testament. And *do not take exception* that the Citation of a Book in the New Testament, if it be present, is not able to confer Canonical authority upon it; nor to remove it, if that citation be lacking: otherwise Aratus,³ Epimenides,⁴ and Menander⁵ are also to be added to the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ /inspired men. For, *I respond*, α . that a bare Citation does not confer Divinity; but a Citation of a Book, as what is Canonical for the proving of doctrine, supposes and implies its Canonical authority. Therefore, the Greek Poets are not made Canonical because of the Pauline citation: for Paul does not cite them as Canonical; but he makes use of them, especially for the sake of his hearers or readers, for arguments *ad hominem*. But, β . while the Apocryphal Books are nowhere cited in the New Testament, either in general, or as Canonical, an argument is not wanting to us by which their Canonical authority might otherwise be able to be decided: indeed, because the Apocryphal Books are passed over, when the entire Old Testament, distributed into its parts, is cited, an argument hence arises for us for the exclusion of these Books from the Canon.

5. What Books show a great many marks, not of *Divinity*, but of *Humanity*, in *falsehoods*, *contradictions*, *superstitions*, and *manifest impieties*, those are not to be held as Divine and Canonical, but as of human origin. But such are the Apocryphal Books. HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia Elenctica, Scriptorum Theologorum Heidelbergensium*, tome I, pages 282, 283, will furnish examples abundantly, and yet even more abundantly the *Præfatio Belgicæ* set before the *new Version* of these Books. Out of the

¹ Pieter Nieuwland (1722-1795) was a Dutch Reformed minister.

² Luke 24:44.

³ Aratus (c. 315-240 BC) was a Greek didactic poet. His *Phænomena* is cited by Paul at the Areopagus, Acts 17:28.

⁴ Epimenides (c. seventh century BC) was a Greek prophet, philosopher, and poet. His *Cretica* is quoted by Paul in Acts 17:28 and Titus 1:12,

⁵ Menander (c. 342-c. 290 BC) was a Greek playwright. He is cited by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:33.

many examples, only these few specimens are now observed by our AUTHOR. In Tobit 12:12, 15,¹ he, who in Tobit 5:12 had called himself Azarias, the son of Ananias the great, one of the brethren of Tobit,² then feigns himself to be the Angel Raphael, one of seven that offer prayers to God, which is the work of the Mediator Christ alone: consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 7-17, VIII, § 21-44. In Tobit 6:6, 7, the same teaches the younger Tobias to drive off evil demons with the smoke and scent of the heart and liver of a certain fish:³ which is said to have been confirmed by experience in Tobit 8:2, 3.⁴ This savours of superstition and old wives tales, contrary to the doctrine of Christ, Matthew 17:21: consult SPANHEIM'S *Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VIII, § 3-20. That the Book of *Tobit* is not to be reckoned among the Canonical Books, is set forth as evinced by GERHARD, *Confessione Catholica*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 48-53: compare BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section IV, § 29, tome 2, pages 489, 490. *Judith*, in *Judith* 9:2-4, commemorates with praise the cruel deed of Simeon and Levi against the Shechemites,⁵ narrated in Genesis 34:25, 26, which their

¹ Tobit 12:12, 15: "Now therefore, when thou didst pray, and Sara thy daughter in law, I did bring the remembrance of your prayers before the Holy One: and when thou didst bury the dead, I was with thee likewise.... I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One."

² Tobit 5:12: "Then he said, I am Azarias, the son of Ananias the great, and of thy brethren."

³ Tobit 6:6, 7: "Then the young man said to the angel, Brother Azarias, to what use is the heart and the liver and the gal of the fish? And he said unto him, Touching the heart and the liver, if a devil or an evil spirit trouble any, we must make a smoke thereof before the man or the woman, and the party shall be no more vexed."

⁴ Tobit 8:2, 3: "And as he went, he remembered the words of Raphael, and took the ashes of the perfumes, and put the heart and the liver of the fish thereupon, and made a smoke therewith. The which smell when the evil spirit had smelled, he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt, and the angel bound him."

⁵ *Judith* 9:2-4: "O Lord God of my father Simeon, to whom thou gavest a sword to take vengeance of the strangers, who loosened the girdle of a maid to defile her, and discovered the thigh to her shame, and polluted her virginity to her reproach; for thou saidst, It shall not be so; and yet they did so: Wherefore thou gavest their rulers to be slain, so that they dyed their bed in blood, being deceived, and smotest the servants with their lords, and the lords upon their thrones; and hast given their wives for a prey, and their daughters to be captives, and all their spoils to be divided among thy dear children; which were moved with thy zeal, and abhorred the pollution of their blood, and

father Jacob so detested, Genesis 49:5, 6: consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VII, § 8, 12. Besides which that entire historical register, which goes under the name of *Judith*, concerning an eminent liberation of the people of God from the hand of the Assyrians by the help of Judith, after which Holofernes, General of the Assyrians, was fooled by a clever plan and killed, in the eighteenth year of King Nebuchadnezzar, etc., to great men appears to savour of a fable, or (as GROTIUS would have it) a parabolic narration, in which all the names are enigmatic, so that the name of *Judith* is in the place of the Jewish nation as a widow,¹ *Bethulia* in the place of the temple or house of God,² etc. Against the verity of the history they appeal not only to the silence of the Hebrew Scripture and Josephus, but especially to the circumstances of the time, in which this history should have happened. Accordingly they argue that this is not able to be understood to have regard, *a.* to the times that preceded the Captivity, as the great Men among the Papists, but also not very long ago PRIDEAUX, *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part I, book I, columns 40-47, assign this history to the time of King Manasseh.³ But these considerations hinder: *a.* that the people were recently returned from that Captivity, Judith 5:16-19⁴ compared with Judith 4:2, 3;⁵ *b.* that there is no mention of Manasseh or any other King, but the height of

called upon thee for aid: O God, O my God, hear me also a widow.”

¹ יהודית/*Judith* signifies a woman of Judea.

² *Bethulia* is the name of the city, delivered by Judith's wisdom. It may be related to the name *Beth-el*, *House of God*, or a compound of *betulah*/*virgin* and *Jah*, that is, *Jehovah's Virgin*.

³ Manasseh reigned for the first half of the seventh century BC.

⁴ Judith 5:16-19: “And they cast forth before them the Chanaanite, the Pherezite, the Jebusite, and the Sychemite, and all the Gergesites, and they dwelt in that country many days. And whilst they sinned not before their God, they prospered, because the God that hateth iniquity was with them. But when they departed from the way which he appointed them, they were destroyed in many battles very sore, and were led captives into a land that was not their's, and the temple of their God was cast to the ground, and their cities were taken by the enemies. But now are they returned to their God, and are come up from the places where they were scattered, and have possessed Jerusalem, where their sanctuary is, and are seated in the hill country; for it was desolate.”

⁵ Judith 4:2, 3: “Therefore they were exceedingly afraid of him, and were troubled for Jerusalem, and for the temple of the Lord their God: For they were newly returned from the captivity, and all the people of Judea were lately gathered together: and the vessels, and the altar, and the house, were sanctified after the profanation.”

government conferred upon Joakim or Eliakim the priest; *c.* that the Jewish people were clearly unknown to the General of the Assyrians, Judith 5:3, 4,¹ etc. *β.* Neither *to the times just before the Captivity*, which is expressly against the text, in which the restoration of the people and worship is expressly mentioned as recent after the Captivity; and in the time of the Captivity the daily worship and oblations of sacrifices by the priests of Jerusalem were not continuing, concerning which Judith 4; 5; and such a numerous population of Jews was not inhabiting the holy land in the time of the Babylonian Captivity, as here is found. *γ.* Neither *to the times after the Captivity*, when there was no empire of the Assyrians, which had already been overthrown by the Medes, while Josiah was reigning; and at that time no expedition of any such King Nebuchadnezzar against the Jews easily agrees with profane or sacred history: consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 18-27, pages 126-133, VII, § 8-12, pages 156-161; SPANHEIM *the Younger's Historiam Ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, Epoch VI, chapter VII, column 391, Epoch VII, chapter V, § 2, columns 405, 406; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 53-56; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section IV, § 29, tome 2, pages 490b-496. The Author of the Book that is called *Ecclesiasticus* shows that he believes that Samuel, actually awakened by the Witch, prophesied after his death, *Ecclesiasticus* 46:20,² which is contrary to Canonical Scripture, Luke 16:27-31; Revelation 14:13; etc.: consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, XV, § 9-22, pages 274-280. In *Ecclesiasticus* 48:10, he confirms the error concerning the expected return of *Elijah the Tishbite* to this earth,³ which is expressly contrary to the exposition of the

¹ Judith 5:3, 4: "And he said unto them, Tell me now, ye sons of Chanaan, who this people is, that dwelleth in the hill country, and what are the cities that they inhabit, and what is the multitude of their army, and wherein is their power and strength, and what king is set over them, or captain of their army; And why have they determined not to come and meet me, more than all the inhabitants of the west?"

² *Ecclesiasticus* 46:20: "And after his death he prophesied, and shewed the king his end, and lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy, to blot out the wickedness of the people."

³ *Ecclesiasticus* 48:10: "Who wast ordained for reproofs in their times, to pacify the wrath of the Lord's judgment, before it brake forth into fury, and to turn the heart of the father unto the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob."

prophecy of Malachi¹ given by Christ concerning John the Baptist:² consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 60-64. Against the canonical authority of the book of *Ecclesiasticus*, consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 61, 62. In 2 Maccabees 12:41-45, are commended prayers and the oblation of sacrifices for the dead, so that their sins might be expiated,³ which again is not able to be reconciled with the Sacred Scriptures. In which manner, with our AUTHOR warning, *Exercitationibus Juvenilibus*, Disputation XXV, § 6, "That Author has gravely erred, not only against the divine law, which is the sole norm of all piety, but also against the history of that fact, from which it is evident that the oblation of Judah was made, not for the dead, but for the living, lest any greater sin be imputed to them, but that they might be cleansed from the common guilt:" consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, XII, pages 243-257; SPANHEIM *the Younger's Xenia Romana-catholicorum*, Dilemma XII, columns 1138, 1139, opera, tome 3; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book IV, columns 991, 992; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VII, § 14, tome 2, page 950; and what things I teach below on this passage of *Maccabees* in Part VI, in which what passages of VOSSIUS and HOSPINIAN⁴ are cited also deserve to be inspected, to remove all faith in the Canonical Authority of that Maccabean book. Against the authenticity and θεοπνευστίαν/

¹ Malachi 4:5, 6.

² Matthew 17:10-13.

³ 2 Maccabees 12:41-45: "All men therefore praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance. Besides, that noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forso much as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain. And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection: For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin."

⁴ Rudolf Hospinian (1547-1626) was a Swiss Reformed theologian, pastor, and Anti-Catholic polemicist.

inspiration of the First and Second books of the Maccabees, consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 63-71. It would detain us for too long a time, if we should add all our observations to all the remaining examples, that our AUTHOR mentions, of the errors, contradictions, superstitions, and impieties in Apocryphal books: SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, frequently cited, are able everywhere to be brought to bear upon these; for example, on Tobit 3:8;¹ 14:4,² 11,³ consult SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VII, § 2-7; on Wisdom of Solomon 7:5,⁴ 17;⁵ 8:21;⁶ 9:7, 8;⁷ etc., see SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 58, 59, VII, § 37-40, XV, § 1-8; against the Canonical authority of the Book of Wisdom, see also GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 56-60; on 1 Maccabees 1:5-7;⁸ 8:15, 16;¹ 12:11,² see

¹ Tobit 3:8: "Because that she had been married to seven husbands, whom Asmodeus the evil spirit had killed, before they had lain with her. Dost thou not know, said they, that thou hast strangled thine husbands? thou hast had already seven husbands, neither wast thou named after any of them."

² Tobit 14:4: "Go into Media my son, for I surely believe those things which Jonas the prophet spake of Nineve, that it shall be overthrown; and that for a time peace shall rather be in Media; and that our brethren shall lie scattered in the earth from that good land: and Jerusalem shall be desolate, and the house of God in it shall be burned, and shall be desolate for a time..."

³ Tobit 14:11: "Wherefore now, my son, consider what alms doeth, and how righteousness doth deliver. When he had said these things, he gave up the ghost in the bed, being an hundred and eight and fifty years old; and he buried him honourably."

⁴ Wisdom of Solomon 7:5: "For there is no king that had any other beginning of birth."

⁵ Wisdom of Solomon 7:17: "For he hath given me certain knowledge of the things that are, namely, to know how the world was made, and the operation of the elements..."

⁶ Wisdom of Solomon 8:21: "Nevertheless, when I perceived that I could not otherwise obtain her, except God gave her me; and that was a point of wisdom also to know whose gift she was; I prayed unto the Lord, and besought him, and with my whole heart I said..."

⁷ Wisdom of Solomon 9:7, 8: "Thou hast chosen me to be a king of thy people, and a judge of thy sons and daughters: Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning."

⁸ 1 Maccabees 1:5-7: "And after these things he fell sick, and perceived that he should die. Wherefore he called his servants, such as were honourable, and

SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 47-57, XI, § 2, 3, 10-13; on 2 Maccabees 2:5;³ 14:37;⁴ etc., see SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, VI, § 47, 48, 56, XIII, XIV. On those things that come to be noted here on the *Additions to Esther*, *Jeremiah*, and *Daniel*, consult the same SPANHEIM, *Disputationibus Anti-Anabaptisticis*, VI, § 28-46, VII, § 13-27, IX, § 50-53, X, § 1-23: add GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 36-48.

6. Finally, our AUTHOR denies that these Books are to be reckoned among the Canonical Books, because they were not received by the ancient *Jews* or *Christians*.

a. Concerning the *Jewish Canon*, it is evident, *a.* from the universal testimony of the Jewish nation, which is perhaps also able to be gathered from the very name of ἀποκρύφωv/*Apocrypha*, סְפָרִים/hidden, for TRIGLAND thinks that this was transferred from the Jews to the Christians, *Sylloge Dissertationum; Dissertatione de Appellatione Apocryphorum Librorum*, § 16, compared with § 9-14. *b.* From the computation of JOSEPHUS and the distribution of the Sacred Books made by him, *book I contra Apionem*, page 1036, where he divides the twenty-two Canonical Books precisely into three Classes, unto none of which are these Apocryphal Books able to be referred; indeed, he manifestly excludes those Books from the Canon of θεοπνεύστων/

had been brought up with him from his youth, and parted his kingdom among them, while he was yet alive. So Alexander reigned twelve years, and then died."

¹ 1 Maccabees 8:15, 16: "Moreover how they had made for themselves a senate house, wherein three hundred and twenty men sat in council daily, consulting alway for the people, to the end they might be well ordered: And that they committed their government to one man every year, who ruled over all their country, and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them."

² 1 Maccabees 12:11: "We therefore at all times without ceasing, both in our feasts, and other convenient days, do remember you in the sacrifices which we offer, and in our prayers, as reason is, and as it becometh us to think upon our brethren..."

³ 2 Maccabees 2:5: "And when Jeremy came thither, he found an hollow cave, wherein he laid the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar of incense, and so stopped the door."

⁴ 2 Maccabees 14:37: "Now was there accused unto Nicanor one Razis, one of the elders of Jerusalem, a lover of his countrymen, and a man of very good report, who for his kindness was called a father of the Jews."

inspired Books, when he subjoins: after the death of Artaxerxes,¹ who reigned after Xerxes,² individual Books indeed were also committed to writing, *πίστεως δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἤξιῶται τοῖς πρὸ ἑαυτῶν, διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχὴν*, *but they were not esteemed worthy of like confidence with the former by our forefathers, because there has not been an exact succession of prophets since that time.* c. Also from the Citation of the Old Testament in the New under the title of *the Law and the Prophets*, or *the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms*; seeing that unto none of these Classes, which alone at that time were constituting the entire Canon of the Jews, are the Apocryphal Books able to be referred. And the *Papists* tacitly agree, since they commonly do not admit the fiction of *Genebrard* concerning the successive augmentation of the Canon, which I mentioned in § 18: consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 10-12, 21, 24, 25. This argument is not without its own weight, seeing that the preservation of the Canon of Scripture was at that time entrusted to the Jews, Romans 3:2, from whom the Christians were obliged to receive the Canon of the Old Testament: and it is not the case that we would here accuse the Jews of bad faith or negligence, with neither the Lord nor His Apostles accusing them of the like outrage, and with long experience supplying contrary evidence: whence AUGUSTINE calls the Jews *in books supporters, in hearts our enemies, in codices witnesses*, *de Fide rerum quæ non videntur*, chapter VI, opera, tome 6, column 108; and he wishes for the Jews to be considered *as book-carriers and scribes, who carry the Codices for us students*, on Psalm 40 or 41:14, tome 4, column 262. And on Psalm 66 or 67:9, column 399, *The Jew carries the Codex, whence the Christian believes. They are made our Copyists, just as servants are wont to carry the codices behind their masters, that they might fade in the carrying, and we might advance in the reading.* Likewise in book XII *contra Faustum Manichæum*, chapter XXIII, tome 8, column 170, *For what else is that nation of the Jews to the present day, except a certain book-chest of the Christians, bearing the Law and the Prophets for a testimony in defense of the Church?* If anyone wishes to see the many testimonies gathered out of the writings of the Jews, which confirm that the Canonical authority of the Apocryphal Books was not at all acknowledged or recognized in the midst of that Nation, let him visit HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, book II, chapter II, section I, pages 522-530.

¹ Artaxerxes I reigned from 465 to 424 BC.

² Xerxes I reigned from 486 to 465 BC.

β. Against the Papists, always harping on antiquity, it is no less permissible to us to appeal to the Canon of the *Ancient Christians*, by whom in like manner for a long time and through four entire Centuries after the Birth of Christ these Books had been proscribed: which is able to appear to the eye of one looking into AMANDUS POLANUS'¹ *Symphoniam Catholicam*, chapter I, thesis I, pages 1-21; RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter VII, pages 879-887, opera, tome 2; JOHN GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 4, 16-19; *Canonem Scripturæ collectum ab Amplissimo GERHARD VAN MASTRICHT* in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, classis VII, fascicule I; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 4, tome 2, pages 1489-1494; WOLF'S *Bibliothecam Hebraicam*, tome II, book I, in the *Appendix of Section I*, pages 50 and following, in which is the Canon of MELITO, Second Century Bishop of Sardis, out of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book IV, chapter XXVI near the end: of ORIGEN out of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VI, chapter XXV, in which, after he had surveyed the Canon of the Old Testament, out of the Apocryphal Books he speaks only of the *Books of the Maccabees*, which he mentions to be excluded from the Canon, saying, ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά, but besides these there are the Maccabean Books: of ATHANASIUS, both out of his *Epistola ἑορταστικῆ*/festali, and also out of the *Synopsi Scripturæ Sacræ* commonly attributed to him, opera, tome 2, pages 38-40, 55 and following, in both of which places after the manner of the Jews twenty-two *Canonical Books of the Old Testament* are enumerated, but then in the *Synopsi* it is added that the other non-Canonical Books of the Old Testament, which are only read to Catechumens, are *The Wisdom of Solomon*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Judith*, and *Tobit*: of CYRIL of Jerusalem, out of his *Catechesi* IV, § 22, page m. 66, in which he, enumerating the twenty-two *Books of the Old Testament according to the Jews*, teaches concerning these, τούτων τὰς εἴκοσι δύο βίβλους ἀναγίνωσκε· πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχε κοινὸν, of these study the twenty-two books: but have nothing to do with the Apocryphal Books; thus esteeming all the remaining Books beyond those twenty-two as *Apocryphal*; which *Apocryphal Books* he does not wish even to be read, *Catechesi* IV, § 20, page 64, ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς θείας γραφὰς, τὰς εἴκοσι

¹ Amandus Polanus (1561-1610) was a German Reformed theologian, and an important figure in the early development of Reformed Scholasticism. He served as Professor of Old Testament at Basel (1596-1610).

δύο βίβλους τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης: καὶ μοι μηδὲν τῶν ἀποκρύφων ἀναγίνωσκε, *study the divine writings, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament: and study none of the Apocryphal Books:* of GREGORY NAZIANZEN, whose Canon in *Carminē XXXIII, opera, tome 2, page 98*, is clearly the same; but he subjoins, *πάσας ἔχεις, thou hast all*, namely, βίβλους, *the books*, εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτὸς, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις, *but if there be any beyond those, they are not among the legitimate books:* of EPIPHANIUS, both from his *libro de Mensuris et Ponderibus, opera, tome 2*, and from *book I adversus Hæreses, VIII, tome I, page 19*, where, after reviewing the truly Canonical Books, he adds, εἴσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι δύο βιβλοὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ (*in controverso*), ἡ σοφία τοῦ σιράχ, καὶ ἡ τοῦ σολομώντος, χωρὶς (*præter*) ἄλλων τινῶν βιβλίων ἐναποκρύφων, *but there are two other books beside those in controversy, the Wisdom of Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon, besides certain other Apocryphal Books:* of AMPHILOCHIUS also, who, in his *Jambis suis ad Seleucum, verses 261-288*, in his review of the Canon makes mention of none of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament. With these of the principal Greek Writers of the first four Centuries the Latins agree, of which sort are: RUFFINUS, who distinguishes between the Books, 1. Canonical, 2. *not Canonical, but Ecclesiastical*, 3. Apocryphal: and he reckons to the Books of the second order *Wisdom, which is said to be of Solomon*, and another *Wisdom of the son of Sirach, which Book may also be called Ecclesiasticus*; likewise the *little book of Tobit, Judith*, and the *Books of the Maccabees: all which the Ancients did indeed desire to be read in the Churches, yet not to be brought forth for the confirmation of the authority of these for faith.* He calls the other writings *Apocryphal, which they did not desire to be read in the Churches*; in the *Expositione Symboli ad Laurentium, opera Hieronymi, tome 4, page 113*. PHILASTRIUS, in *libro de Hæresibus*, describing the Canon of the Old and New Testaments, on the Old Testament names only *the Law and the Prophets*. JEROME, *Prologo galeato, opera, tome 3, page 17*, among the *Apocryphal Books, which are not in the Canon*, reckons *Wisdom, which is commonly ascribed to Solomon*, and the *book of Jesus the son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit, and the two books of the Maccabees*. In agreement is Canon LX or LIX of the faithful *Council of Laodicea*, held in the year 360, or even a few years afterwards, which is altogether silent about the Apocryphal Books: but, that *Baronius* contends in vain, that this Council is more ancient than the Nicean, as if the *Book of Judith* were already received into the Canon by the *Niceans*, of which the Council of Laodicea makes no mention, is shown by SPANHEIM the Younger in his *Historia*

Ecclesiastica, Century IV, chapter XI, § 3, column 909, 910, teaching that what is argued by Baronius concerning the Book of Judith is not able to be confirmed by him with sufficiently suitable authorities. And the authority of this Council is not easily dismissed, since it was approved by the *Trullan Fathers*:¹ see GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 16, 17, 34, who moreover vindicates this argument from Exception on pages 25-27.

But neither do the *ψευδεπίγραφοι/pseudepigraphal Apostolic Constitutions and Canons* agree with the opinion of the Papists, while the Constitutions in a review of the Sacred Books omit the Apocryphal Books; consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, page 32: and Apostolic Canon LXXXV with *Judith* numbers not two, but three, Books of the *Maccabees* among the Canonical Books; it does not have Tobit; it omits either the *Book of Wisdom* or *Ecclesiasticus*, and places the other outside of the Canon, when after the survey of the Canon of the Old Testament it adds, ἔξωθεν δὲ, but besides these it is commended to you, that your young people learn τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Σιράχ, the wisdom of the learned Sirach. Indeed, that the *Greek Church* today does not esteem the Apocryphal Books, received by the Papists into the Canon, as Canonical, is observed by JAKOB ELSNER'S *nieuwste Beschzyving van de Grieksche Christenen in Turkyen*, chapter V, § 15, pages 174-176.

On the *Exceptions of the Papists* against this our Argument, 1. That at that time, when the Fathers agreeing with us lived, the Canon had not yet been defined by the public judgment of the Church. 2. That the Fathers that exclude those controverted Books from the Canon speak of the Canon of the Hebrews, not of the Christians: see GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 23, 24.

BINGHAM,² *Originibus ecclesiasticis*, book XIV, chapter III, § 15, 16, volume 6, pages 91-97, observes that the Books today called *Apocryphal* were formerly read in some Churches, but not in all: and in some Churches under the title of *Canonical Scripture*, with this term taken in a

¹ The Council in Trullo was a major ecclesiastical council held at Constantinople in 692 under Justinian II. It confirmed the decisions of the Council of Laodicea.

² Joseph Bingham (1668-1723) was an Anglican churchman and theologian. In his great work, *Originibus Ecclesiasticis*, he endeavored to provide a definitive treatment of the ancient rites and customs of the Church.

somewhat broader sense.

On § 19, consult also STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS' *Theses Theologicas inaugurales de Verbo Dei*, thesis 81, pages 460-462.

§ 20: The Apocrypha, Part 2

The *Roman Church* did not canonize all these Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament: for with us they reject *The Prayer of Manasseh*, books 3 and 4 of *Esdras*, book 3 of *Maccabees*. But it determined in the Council of Trent, Session IV, Decree I, pages 31b, 32, that of the Apocryphal Books Six are to be held as Sacred and Canonical, namely, *Tobit*, *Judith*, the book of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, books 1 and 2 of *Maccabees*, with the Additions on *Esther*, *Jeremiah*, and *Daniel*.

The Scope/Goal of the Papists in this was to demonstrate the Power of the Church over the Sacred Scripture, and to establish more firmly certain errors out of the Apocryphal Books.

In practice, says our AUTHOR, some Anabaptists and others subscribe, seeking out of these Books proving arguments in Theology: and not only this, that the Anabaptists for the sake of proof promiscuously cite these Books with those of the Old and New Testaments, as HEINRICH ALTING'S observes, *Theologia Elenctica nova*, locus II, pages 35; but the passages sought out of the Apocryphal Books, which they say provide patronage for their errors, they dare to oppose to passages of Canonical Scripture asserting truer things: see DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIVS, *contra Anabaptistas*, chapter VIII, § 2, pages 116, 117. Nevertheless, HERMAN SCHIJN maintains that it is not to be imputed to the *Mennonites* that they accept the Canonical Authority of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, *Historia Mennonitarum*, Preface, * * * 2, compared with chapter VII, page 206. Concerning the Authority of the Apocryphal Books against the Anabaptists SPANHEIM the Elder goes on at length, *Disputationibus Anti-Anabaptisticis*, theological Disputations part II, Disputations VI-XV, with the state of the controversy prudently set down before, so that it might be proven to what extent the Anabaptists are able to be accused here, *Disputation VI*, § 3, 4.

Objection 1: The Apocryphal Books are cited in the New Testament. *Responses*: α. The consequence of the Major is to be denied, that is, that divinity and Canonical authority follow upon a simple Citation: since Paul also cites Gentile Poets.¹ But the θεοπνευστία/*inspiration* and divine authority of any books is confirmed when it is cited

¹ See Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12.

as Canonical for the sake of proof in the New Testament. But, β. I have already related above that nowhere in the New Testament is express mention or Citation of the Apocryphal Books made, whether general or specific, in any manner. γ. In the Passages which they allege neither a Citation nor ever a complete likeness exists between the New Testament and the Apocryphal Books, granting that some sort of agreement exists between them, as it will be evident to the one consulting those passages cited by our AUTHOR in his *Compendio*. δ. At the same time, to the one paying attention it will be demonstrated that here and there sentences of this sort are able to be shown to have been taken more from the Old Testament than from the Apocryphal Books: for example, Romans 2:11¹ altogether agrees with Deuteronomy 10:17 and 2 Chronicles 19:7: Romans 11:34² has regard to Isaiah 40:13, 14, especially if you consult the Septuagint.³ 1 Peter 1:24, 25⁴ was manifestly sought out of Isaiah 40:6-8.

Objection 2: This has been the determination of the Church for many ages, and most recently at the Council of Trent.

Responses: α. Neither the Authority of the *Council of Trent*, nor of the *Council of Florence*, held in the year 1431, inasmuch as they are Antichristian; and indeed the Council of Florence, called by Pope Eugene, against the will of the Basilians, so that he might break up the Council of Basel, which was about to act with respect to the general Reformation of the Church;⁵ is able to move us in any way. So much the

¹ Romans 2:11 bears some resemblance to Ecclesiasticus 35:12: “Do not think to corrupt with gifts; for such he will not receive: and trust not to unrighteous sacrifices; for the Lord is judge, and with him is no respect of persons.”

² Romans 11:34 bears some resemblance to Ecclesiasticus 42:21: “He hath garnished the excellent works of his wisdom, and he is from everlasting to everlasting: unto him may nothing be added, neither can he be diminished, and he hath no need of any counsellor.”

³ Romans 11:34: “For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor (τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο)?” Isaiah 40:13: “Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him (:אֵיךְ הָיָה לְהוֹדִיעַ אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה; τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο ὃς συμβιβᾶ αὐτόν, in the Septuagint)?”

⁴ 1 Peter 1:24, 25 bears some resemblance to Ecclesiasticus 14:18: “As of the green leaves on a thick tree, some fall, and some grow; so is the generation of flesh and blood, one cometh to an end, and another is born.”

⁵ The history of the Council of Florence is complicated. In 1431, Pope Martin V, under pressure to reform the Church, called a Council at Basel; but he

less, because that *Canon XXV*, treating of the Canon of Sacred Books, appears to have been subjoined, perhaps by the Dominican *Francisco Carranza*,¹ in *Summa Conciliorum*, where it is found on *page m. 460*; since it is not found in the Collections of the Councils of *Pierre Crabbe*, *Laurentius Surius*, or *the Dominicus Nicolini*;² and those that cite this Canon are later than Carranza, who published in the year 1546, and, with this Canon inserted, perhaps wished to compose a prelude to the Council of Trent, at which that *Summa* of Carranza was promulgated, and at which the AUTHOR himself was present: see RAINOLDS' *Censuram Librorum Apocryphorum*, *part I, prelection XLI*; RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, *chapter VII, § 41, opera, tome 2, page 886*; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, *tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 35, 36*.

β. But, that the Ancient Church already so determined, has been sufficiently demonstrated above to be false as far as the first four Centuries; neither is the contrary evinced, either, *a.* from Citation of the Apocryphal Books; for a bare citation of a book does not imply its divinity, or its normative authority: or from the title of *Holy, Divine, or Canonical* Writings given to them; for thus they were able to be called by the Fathers, because they treat of sacred and divine things, for which reason they are to be used holily, and because they pertain to the Canon of Books to be read in the Church, not to the Canon of *θεοπνεύστων/ inspired* Books. For whatever was formerly read in the Church is not to

himself died before its opening. The Council was inclined to exalt the authority of councils above that of the papacy, and to move toward the reformation of other abuses, and so Pope Eugene IV, Martin's successor, tried to dissolve it. Beginning in 1438, Pope Eugene attempted to move the Council, first to Ferrara, then to Florence, but the Basilians resisted for a time, even electing an Antipope. The Council of Basel dissolved itself in 1439. In the meantime, the Council of Florence was beginning and working toward reunion with the Eastern Churches in the face of the Ottoman threat. The Council of Basel was disavowed, its decisions annulled, and its members excommunicated. The Pope was again declared to hold supreme authority, even over councils.

¹ Bartolomé Carranza (1503-1576) was a Spanish Dominican. He served the Church as a priest, a teacher of theology at Valladolid, and eventually as Archbishop of Toledo.

² Beginning in 1539, Pierre Crabbe (1470-1552), a Franciscan theologian published a collection of the Councils from the beginning of the Church to his own day. He was followed in this work by Laurentius Surius (1522-1578), a Carthusian; and Dominicus Nicolini, a Venetian printer.

be held as Canonical and θεοπνεύστον/*inspired*: the Apocryphal Books were also read *for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of the authority of doctrines*, as RUFFINUS in his *Symbolo*, and JEROME in his *præfatione in Proverbia Salomonis, opera, tome 3, page 25*; consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 27-33*, who on *pages 34 and 35* also particularly responds to the objected authority of AUGUSTINE, who also called the Apocryphal Books *Canonical* and reckoned them among the *Hagiographa*: concerning which title of *Hagiographa* given to the Apocryphal Books see also *pages 52, 53*. *b.* That the *Nicean Council* had canonized the Apocryphal Books is mere conjecture, resting solely upon the deliverance of JEROME, who in his *præfatione in Librum Judith, opera, tome 3, page 22*, writes, that the *Nicean Synod is read to have reckoned this Book in the number of Sacred Scriptures*. But the history and acts of the *Nicean Council* are opposed, which mention nothing of the sort, nor do the *Fathers of that age*, while *Jerome* was scarcely born at the time of that *Council*, whose testimony alone hence is suspect in this matter, neither does he speak concerning any other book but *Judith*. But neither does *Jerome* affirm this on his own name and authority, but only mentions it recitatively, that the *Nicean Synod is read to have done this*. The Title of *Holy Scriptures* is also able to be used in a broader sense: see RAINOLDS' *Censuram Librorum Apocryphorum, part I, prelection XV*; RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram, chapter VII, § 17, 18, opera, tome 2, page 881*; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 23, 54-56*; SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam, Century IV, chapter XI, § 3, columns 909, 910*. *c.* *The Canon of the Third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397,*¹ to which they appeal,

¹ *Canons of the Third Council of Carthage 16-20*: "It was also determined that besides the Canonical Scriptures nothing be read in the Church under the title of divine Scriptures. The Canonical Scriptures are these: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two books of Paraleipomena, Job, the Psalter, five books of Solomon, the books of the twelve prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Esther, two books of Esdras, two Books of the Maccabees. Of the New Testament: four books of the Gospels, one book of the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, one epistle of the same writer to the Hebrews, two Epistles of the Apostle Peter, three of John, one of James, one of Jude, one book of the Apocalypse of John. So let the church over the sea be consulted to confirm this canon. Let it also be allowed that the Passions of Martyrs be read when their festivals are kept. Let this be made known also to our brother and fellow-priest Boniface, or to other bishops of those parts,

as that in which those Apocryphal Books are numbered among the Canonical Books, which the Papists recognize as such to the present day, 1. is of very suspect trustworthiness. Its editions vary greatly. Mention is made of *Boniface* in it, who appears to be the same as the one that undertook the Episcopate of the Roman Church in the year 418 or 419. Whence learned men think that this Canon more truly pertains to the last Council of Carthage, held in the year 419. 2. What if that Canon be genuine? why might not it be understood to speak of the *Ecclesiastical Canon of Books to be Read*? 3. The Papists themselves will not readily grant the authority of this Council, when in *Canon XXVI* it enacts that the Bishop of the first seat, whoever he may be, is not to be called the *Prince of Priests*, or the *Highest Priest*: compare RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter VII, § 28-33, pages 884, 885; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 16, 18, 33, 34; VAN MASTRICHT'S *Bibliothecam Bremensem*, classis VII, fascicule I, pages 32, 33. d. As far as Pope *Innocent I* is concerned,¹ unto whom *Becanus*² and other Papists appeal, as the one that in the beginning of the Fifth Century first fixed the Canon, see RIVET'S *Isagogen ad Scripturam Sacram*, chapter VII, § 13-17, opera, tome 2, pages 880, 881, compared with BINIUS' *Concilia generalia*, tome I, part I, page 613, number 7. e. Concerning the Roman Council under *Gelasius*,³ held in the year 494, in which the *authentic* Books, both Sacred and Ecclesiastical, are distinguished from the *Apocryphal*,⁴ SPANHEIM reports in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century V, chapter VIII, § 4, columns 1018, 1019. f. Thereafter the *θεόπνευστος*/*inspired* and Canonical authority of these Books was never really recognized in the Church; in which they were always read with the *Præfationibus* of JEROME prefixed, who pronounces them Apocryphal, and relegates them outside of the Canon: while the same Books to the present day are read in the Vulgate Bible with the prologues of Jerome, the Papists stand *ατοκατακρίτους*/*self-condemned* and worthy of ridicule, when they contend for the Canonical authority of some Apocryphal Books: consult GERHARD

for the purpose of confirming that Canon. Because we have received from our fathers that those books must be read in the Church.”

¹ Innocent I served as Bishop of Rome from 401 to 417.

² Martinus Becanus (1563-1624) was a Flemish Jesuit priest and controversialist. He taught theology at Würzburg, Mainz, and Vienna.

³ Gelasius I served as Bishop of Rom from 492 to 496.

⁴ The so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* is probably spurious and of later origin.

VAN MASTRICHT'S *Bibliothecam Bremensem, classis VII, fascicule I, pages 5, 30, 31*; GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 14, 17*.

It is worthy of note that in the Antwerp edition of the Plantin Polyglot Bible of Benedict Arius Montanus (1584), for the examination of which three Censors from the Academy of Leuven¹ were provided by Philip, King of Spain;² in the titles prefixed to the Old and New Testaments, these words may be read: "To this edition are also added books written in Greek, which the Orthodox Church, following the Canon of the Hebrews, reckons among the Apocryphal Books." Now, the Council of Trent was at that time already seated publicly for a few years,³ to the pronouncement of which the opinion of the *Orthodox Church* is here directly opposed. Whence it happened, that, after many copies of that Bible were already sold with this inscription, the cited words in the remaining copies were deleted under the hand of the Papists: see GERHARD VAN MASTRICHT'S *Bibliothecam Bremensem, classis VII, fascicule I, page 42*.

[*Gregory the Great*:] who, in *book XIX Moralium in Job, chapter XIII, opera, tome 2, column 502*, has: "Concerning which matter, we do not act inordinately, if from books, even if *not canonical*, nevertheless published for the edification of the Church, we should bring forth testimony:" at which point he then relates some history from the *First Book of Maccabees*: consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem Catholicam, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 16, 20*.

[*The Ordinary Gloss*:] which for many Centuries was and still is of great authority in the Papacy; but GERHARD relates most express words from its *Præfatione* to our subject matter, *Confessione Catholica, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 5, 52, 53*.

[And similarly *the Decree of Gratian*:] Our AUTHOR likely has regard to *the first part of the Decree, Distinction XV, chapter III*, in which these words of *Gelasius* are related: "The Holy Roman Church, after those *Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which we regularly receive*, also does not prohibit these to be received: the Holy Nicean Synod, etc.;" *Corpore Juris Canonici, columns 59, 60*. It then follows in *columns 62 and 63*: "Moreover, what books in the Ecclesiastical offices might be read by

¹ The Old University of Leuven (then part of the Burgundian Netherlands) was a Roman Catholic institution; it opened in 1425 and closed in 1797.

² Philip II reigned as King of Spain from 1556 to 1598.

³ The Council of Trent met from 1545 to 1563.

some through the cycle of the year (inasmuch as the Apostolic Church does not condemn, but rather follows, that rite), we suppose are to be noted for the edification of the faithful.” Where, together with the Canonical Books, are then reckoned *Tobit* and the *Book of Maccabees*, but not as Canonical, but which are read in the Church at a certain time; that is what these books have in common with the Homilies of the Fathers *therein* enumerated: and additionally in the Notes on the word *Moreover* it is advised: “From this point to the end, neither in the collection of Isidore, nor in any ancient Codex of the gathered materials of Gratian, are they found, etc.”

[*And in all the chorus of the Learned:*] whose words are in GERHARD’S *Confessione Catholica*, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter I, pages 5, 52, 53.

Concerning the Apocryphal Books wont to be joined to the Old Testament by the *Papists*, read the disputation of PETRUS DINANT, especially against *Huet* and *Petitdidier*,¹ *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, § 74-86, pages 872-903.

¹ Matthieu Petit-Didier (1659-1728) was a French Benedictine theologian, and a strong proponent of Papal infallibility. He wrote *Dissertationes historicas, criticas, chronologicas in Sacram Scripturam Veteris Testamenti*.

§ 21: The Argument of Scripture

A consideration of the *Object* or *Argument* of the Scriptures now follows, and of the *Mode* in which that is delivered in Scripture.

The Argument of Scripture is *true Religion*, which is the Right Manner of coming to know and of worshipping/serving God unto the salvation of man as sinner and the glory of God, as we shall see in *Chapter III*. Now, that this is delivered in the Scripture both *dogmatically*, and *habitually*, as our AUTHOR says in his *Compendio*, is proven by these passages: 1. Psalm 19:7, in which there is discussion of the Scripture as converting to the Worship of God and instilling true wisdom, which is found in the Knowledge of God. 2. John 5:39, in which the Scriptures are presented as relating the way of arriving at eternal life, which is true Religion, specifically through the testimony which they gave concerning Christ, the knowledge and faith of whom is principally required in true Religion. 3. 2 Timothy 3:15-17, in which it is asserted of the Scriptures that they are able σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν, *to make wise unto salvation*, which is the scope/goal of Religion; now, the means tending to this are faith upon Christ Jesus, the knowledge of God, and the practice of all good works, whither Scripture leads man by means of διδασκαλίαν/*teaching*, ἔλεγχον/*elenctics*, παιδείαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, *training in righteousness*, rendering the man of God ἐξηρτισμένον, *thoroughly furnished*, for every good work.

And to this principal Argument of Scripture are to be referred and subordinated all the other things that are delivered in the Scriptures, α. *Things Natural*, for in these the manifold glory of God, worthy to be known and worshipped, shines forth, as was already seen in § 13 of *Chapter I*, and to this are able to be directed the most pious *Contemplationes Mundi* of the Most Distinguished NIEUWENTYT, and similar works. β. *Things Historical*, which according to the manifold works of God unfold the things allotted to the Church. γ. *Things Chronological*, from which the fullness of the times is able to be learned. δ. *Things Topographical*, which set up the successive seats of the Church for our contemplation, and together with Things Chronological are the lights and eyes of Sacred History, and contribute much to the confirmation of the same. ε. Likewise *Things Genealogical*, which relate

the succession of the holy people in the promise land, and prove from ancestry that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah. And whatever least things thus have their uses, or perhaps formerly also had more: and, if perhaps not all things related in the Scriptures are equally necessary, the goodness of God is to be acknowledged, which desired to consult not only our necessity, but also our abundance and delight.

§ 22: The Truth of Scripture

Concerning this its Object Sacred Scripture is conversant in such a Mode that it delivers that Truly; see this §. Agreeably to itself; see § 23. PERSPICUOUSLY; see § 24-26. And Perfectly; see § 27-31.

The *Truth* of Scripture, flowing from the infallible Inspiration of the Spirit of truth, is to be established in all things as *Equal*, not even with *Natural Things* excepted.

Our AUTHOR observes this against the hypothesis, quite opposite to the due veneration of Sacred Scripture, namely, that *Scripture in Natural matters speaks according to the Erroneous opinion of the Common People*. This was the impious thesis of SPINOZA, *Tractato Theologico-Politico*, chapter II, pages 22, 23, 28, 29, chapter XIII, page 153, and also chapter XV, pages 166 and following, etc.; consult WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 3, page 146. This has been assumed by some that have attempted to assert among other things the Motion of the Earth and the Rest of the Sun, that is, to the extent that they felt that this their hypothesis did not agree with the expression of Scripture, of which below in Chapter VIII, § 26, our AUTHOR treats; just as CHRISTOPH WITTICH¹ undertook to defend that crude assertion concerning *Scripture speaking in Natural matters according to the Erroneous opinion of the Common People* against all objections; who himself also foolishly uttered similar witticisms concerning Sacred Scripture: see WITSIUS' *Twist des Heeren met zynen Wyngaard*, chapter XXI, pages 278-281; VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, posterior Section, chapter V, § 1-3, pages 62-66, chapter VI, § 2, page 76. BEKKER,² in his *Orbe Fascinante*, accommodated the same thesis to his own hypothesis concerning Demons; see among other things book II, chapter I. THOMAS BURNET, in his *Telluris Theoria Sacra* and *Archæologia Philosophica*,³ also applied the

¹ Christoph Wittich (1625-1687) was a Dutch Theologian and Cartesian. He served as Professor of Theology at Duisburg (1653-1654), Nijmegen (1655-1671), and Leiden (1671-1687).

² Balthasar Bekker (1634-1698) was a Dutch minister, although ultimately deposed. He was a proponent of Cartesian Rationalism, arguing that philosophy and theology must be kept in separate spheres, the former for the exploration of natural truths, and the latter for the exploration of supernatural truths of Scripture.

³ Thomas Burnet (c. 1636-1715) was an English scholar, theologian, and

same to his hypotheses concerning the Creation of the World and the Flood. In *Telluris*, that is, *Theoria Sacra*, book I, chapter I, he asserts: “Where the Sacred Scriptures set forth the circumstances and adjuncts of natural things, it is done in a human manner, as things exhibit themselves to our senses, and are wont to be conceived and accepted by the greatest part of men; although not rarely it turns out to be alien to the sciences, to the nature of things, and to Philosophical truth;” things similar to which he also has elsewhere: consult our AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus textualibus*, Part II, Exercise II, § 13, 16; WALCH’S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, *exercitation VI*, § 7, pages 151-153.

The *Scope/Goal* of this thesis is certainly to seek patronage for certain preconceived philosophical propositions, but not conformable to Scripture.

But this thesis is not able to be reconciled, α. with the *θεοπνευστία* and Inspiration of the whole of Sacred Scripture, both in Spiritual Things, and in Natural Things, by the same Infallible Spirit, 2 Timothy 3:16; 2 Peter 1:21; but the *Spirit of Truth* is not able to be the teacher of any error, John 16:13.

β. Thus the *God of Truth*, which is His name, Isaiah 65:16, would have lied, and would have spoken otherwise than He felt, being made a false witness, in which manner He would have denied Himself: but these things are impossible, Titus 1:2; 2 Timothy 2:13.

γ. There is no reason to presume that God omniscient, who is Himself the Creator of the world, and hence knows intimately the things of Nature, and is best able to testify concerning the work of His own hands, has willed to deceive us, when He presents in Sacred Scripture testimony concerning Natural things, and either has willed to lead us into error, or to confirm us in it. Contrariwise, we have far more confidence in a witness of that sort, than in our blind reasoning and the knowledge of our altogether imperfect minds.

δ. Sacred Scripture’s universal and altogether pure Truth, so often asserted, would otherwise fall: see what is affirmed concerning the whole of Scripture in Psalm 12:6; 19:7-9; 119:105, 130; John 17:17; Romans 15:4a, *Whatever was written aforetime, was written to educate*, not to

author. He is remembered for his speculative cosmogony: Burnet believed that the waters of the earth’s oceans were insufficient to explain a worldwide flood; he hypothesized a hallow earth containing water, which was unleashed during the flood. Methodologically he reinterprets, or sets aside, Scripture to suit his pseudo-scientific hypotheses.

deceive, *us*.

ε. The Most Distinguished NIEUWENTYT thinks that he is able to confound audacious Philosophers of this sort, who on account of theses of Scripture contrary to their own hypotheses do not fear to accuse the Scripture of error; when in his *Cosmotheoria*, with a great many examples brought forth, he contends that the Sacred Scripture philosophizes much more sublimely than was done either by men of that age, when the Sacred Codex was written, or is even done at any time by the Philosophers of our age: unto which argumentation of Nieuwentyt, nevertheless, it shall be helpful to add cautions, which Reverend BUURT supplies in his *notis on Buddeus' Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter VII, § 7 ††, pages 483, 484.

ς. If the opposite opinion stands, the Sacred Scripture no longer remains the infallible rule of our faith, and the sole and ultimate principium of the same: but faith is converted into human and Philosophical Knowledge, which will teach us to admit and to interpret Scripture according to the authority and opinion of the Philosophers.

ζ. With the opposite hypothesis posited, it shall be lawful to twist the entirety of Scripture to our pleasure, and no certainty shall remain in it; for the event immediately showed that all spiritual things are easily drawn into the circuit of Natural things, that is, relatively to the Angelic Spirits in *Bekker*; and with respect to God Himself in others, who, testing all things by their own Innate Ideas as a Lydian stone, and appealing to the tribunal of reason, either in the explication of the divine Attributes withdrew from the true path, or concerning the very Trinity began to doubt, or did not admit the natural and true Generation of the Son of God from the Father: just as CHRISTOPH WITTICH, in his *Dissertatione de Abusu Scripturæ*, chapter III, so that he might all the more easily evince that the Scripture in Natural things speaks according to the erroneous opinion of the common people, also contends in more things that *Scripture in many passages concerning matters practical and moral, in divine matters of faith, indeed in the explication of the divine nature, accommodates itself to the erroneous capacity of the common people, and speaks according to the opinion of men declining from the truth*; see VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, prior Section, chapter VIII, § 2, pages 62-66, chapter IX, § 1-4, pages 92, 96-99.

η. AUGUSTINE demonstrated greater sobriety at this point, who was not daring to believe that any of the Canonical Writers erred in writing: but was most firmly believing that none of those erred at all. And if,

says he, *I should stumble across anything in those books that might appear contrary to the truth; I do not doubt that it is nothing other than either a faulty codex, or a translation that does not follow what is said, or my own misunderstanding, Epistla LXXXII ad Hieronymum, chapter I, opera, tome 2, column 144.* The *Belgic Confession* also states it beautifully in *Article V*: “We believe without doubt *all things* that are contained in them, and that, not so much because the Church receives them as Canonical, as because the Holy Spirit testifies to our consciences that they emanated from God.” According to which article, 1. all things revealed in Sacred Scripture are to be believed without discrimination; 2. from the testimony of the Holy Spirit in our hearts; 3. because they emanated from God.

Indeed, unto the *Capacity* of the Common People, and imperfection of our human ability, by *συγκατάβασιν/condescension* the Spirit speaking in Scripture accommodates Himself: but He never speaks according to the *Errors of the Common People*. He is able to narrate historically the errors of the vulgar, but not to approve or teach the same.

Neither is the contrary elicited, 1. From Passages in which the Scriptures denominates things, or narrates histories, according to their *External Appearance*. For,

α. It is one thing to speak according to External Appearance, which even the DUTCH on Genesis 1:16 and Ecclesiastes 12:2 acknowledge to be done in Sacred Scripture; it is another thing to speak erroneously. So then, it is one thing to speak according to the opinion of the vulgar, founded in the external appearance of things, which strikes the senses, which is conceded by AMANDUS POLANUS, *Syntagmate Theologiæ, book V, chapter XXIII, page 301 at the end, page 302 at the beginning*; FRANCIS JUNIUS, *Prælectione in Genesi, chapters 1, 16, opera, tome 1, column 15, 131*; and others: it is another thing to speak according to the Errors of the Vulgar. β. As we concede that Scripture sometimes speaks according to External Appearance, so expressions of this sort because of some greater probability are not to be multiplied at pleasure. γ. These expressions are not restricted to things natural, but they also obtain in dogmatics, for example, Romans 14:15, ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε, *for whom Christ died, that is, apparently died*; so also in morals, Matthew 9:13, where by δικαίους, *the righteous*, are understood *those putatively righteous*; compare the DUTCH on Ezekiel 3:20, number 54. δ. Where expressions of this sort occur, they are always able to be

discerned from the nature of the thing and context or parallels: in this way is sufficiently understood what Moses writes in Genesis 1:16 concerning the two *great Lights*, the Sun and the Moon; *a.* he does not speak of two *great bodies*, but *great Lights*: but thus the *Moon*, by reason of the use that it furnishes for us, is able truly to be called; for, although in itself it is a dark body, with the help of the Light received from the sun it gives more Light to our world than all the stars together, and thus it is truly called a *great Light*. *b.* Nevertheless, the vast difference, which comes between the Sun and the Moon, is indicated at the same time, while in the same verse the Sun and the Moon are designated comparatively with respect to each other, the Sun being *the great Light*, the Moon *the small Light*: consult VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, *posterior Section*, *chapter XXI*, § 6, *page* 390.

Hardly pertaining to this is that which Luke has in Acts 27:27, ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν, *the shipmen conjectured that some country drew near to them*. Seeing that, *a.* here only the opinion of those sailors is narrated historically. *b.* Προσάγειν is here used intransitively for *to draw near to*: but *to draw near to* is to become nearer, which is able to be said truly of the *land* and the *ship*. *c.* It is not certain that the erroneous opinion of sailors is related here; in that there is no one that does not believe that all sailors rightly knew that a ship properly approaches land, and the land does not approach the ship by motion from its place. *d.* A Mechanical definition is given in addition, according to which the *land* is best able to be said *to approach*, namely, this: "The respective swiftness of the two bodies is that whereby they approach to one another, or move away from each other, whatever the proper swiftness of each might be: indeed, whether both bodies move, or one or the other remain at rest:" consult NIEUWENTYT'S *Cosmotheoriam*, *chapter XXVII*, § 10, *page* 758; VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, *prior Section*, *chapter VII*, § 10-14.

Objection 2: The end of the Scripture is not to teach natural matters. This is the objection of *Spinoza*, *Epistola XXV*, in *opera posthuma*, *page* 458, *It is not the intent of Scripture to teach Philosophy*, nor *to make men learned, but rather obedient*: compare the passages of *Spinoza* cited at the beginning of this section. Similar views are held by *Wittich*, *Burnet*, *Bekker*, etc.: see VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, *prior Section*, *chapter VII*, § 6-9.

Responses: α. I concede that the principal End of Scripture is to teach true Religion. β. But the principal end does not exclude the less

principal, subordinated to the former, which sort is able to be conceived, to teach men the magnificent natural works of God, so that hence they might rise to the knowledge of the virtues of the Creator God. γ. Neither is it fitting that the Holy Spirit tend toward his Target/Goal through errors, or ever deliver in any matter, whether making more or less toward the Goal of Scripture, anything that might be contrary to the truth: compare VRIESIUS' *Exercitationem de Officio Philosophi circa Revelata*, in which, with § 24 compared with § 21, he warns that this is not to be admitted without caution, which *Descartes* inculcates in *part II of Epistolarum*, c., page 327: "They abuse the Scripture, if any wish to elicit from it knowledge of matters pertaining only to human sciences, and not regarding our salvation."

Altogether pious is the Decree of the Orders of Holland of September 30, 1656, to restrain that audacity of the Philosophers, of which this section has treated; in which most expressly prohibit the interpretation of the Sacred Scripture even in those matters that are evident and learned in some measure from nature also, according to preconceived philosophical opinions. That Decree is found in WILTENS' *Kerkelyk Placaat-boek*, pages 306-311, in which see especially page 309. What upon occasion of the assertion concerning *Scripture speaking according to the erroneous prejudice of the common people*, proscribed by the Curators of the Academy of Batava on January 16, 1676, for the defense of that, and concerning similar expressions found among the greatest Theologians, HEIDANUS wrote, see in his *Consideratien*, etc., pages 74-78: compare SPANHEIM'S *Epistolam de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, pages 59, 60. Upon this entire §, read entirely the Most Illustrious PETRUS VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, prior Section, chapters V-IX, pages 62-105: see the Reverend PETRUS DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter III, § 50-52, pages 494-501, § 61-64, pages 518-528; LILIENTHAL, *Oordeelk Bybelverklar*, chapter X, part 5, pages 1-306.

§ 23: The Self-Consistency of Scripture

In the next place, the Scripture is *Consistent* with itself in all things that it relates, which Uniformity of Scripture requires a banishment from it of true Contradictions. We prove this thesis with the following arguments: 1. All Writers that enjoyed the same heavenly *Inspiration* of the same *Spirit of Truth*, are not able to disagree among themselves: But it so happened to all the blessed Holy Writers, comparing 2 Timothy 3:16. Therefore. 2. The Word of *God*, who *cannot lie*, contains no true contradiction: but Scripture is the Word of God, who cannot lie, Psalm 19:7, 8; Titus 1:2. 3. The *Word of Truth*, indeed *Truth itself* absolutely so called, is not liable to Contradictions; because of Contradictories one is always true, the other is always false: But the Sacred Scripture is the *word of truth*, James 1:18, indeed, the *Truth* itself absolutely so called, John 17:17. 4. What is not able *to perish* or *to be broken*, but *abides forever*, that is free from Contradiction: But such is the Word of God contained in the Sacred Scripture, comparing Matthew 5:18; John 10:35; Romans 9:6; 1 Peter 1:23. Therefore, it is free from Contradiction.

Now, this Uniformity of Scripture is to be held against the *Atheists*, *Infidels*, of which sort among the *Gentiles* formerly were Porphyry,¹ Lucian,² Julian the Apostate;³ against the *Mohammedans*, in HOORNBEECK'S *Summa Controversiarum*, book III, pages 110, 111, in comparison with WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, exercitation VI, § 3,

¹ Porphyry (c. 232-c. 304) studied in Rome under Plotinus. He endeavored to make the obscure Neoplatonism of Plotinus intelligible to the popular reader. Porphyry was one of the most able opponents of the Christianity of his day, leveling his attack upon the Scriptures themselves.

² Lucian of Samosata (c. 120-c. 180) was a trained rhetorician, particularly skilled in satire. In his *The Passing of Peregrinus*, he presents the early Christians as comically gullible.

³ Julian the Apostate (331-363) was the last pagan Emperor of Rome. He was raised as a Christian, but rejected Christianity in favor of Theurgy, a form of Neoplatonism. As Emperor, he sought to revive paganism and reduce the influence of Christianity. Julian died after a battle with Persian forces, and it is said that his dying words were, *Vicisti, Galilæe, Thou hast conquered, O Galilean.*

10, pages 145, 146, 156; and again against all *Libertines*, who are wont studiously to gather many ἐναντιοφανῆ, *apparent contradictions*, to undermine the authority of Scripture: but also against the *Socinians*, who indeed acknowledge that the Scripture is agreeable in matters that have regard to the doctrine of faith; but in matters historical, of less importance, they think that it was possible that the Sacred Writers sometimes failed in memory, and hence Contradictions arose; see HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, book I, chapter I, controversy I, tome I, pages 5-8.

For a Catalog of Passages of Sacred Scripture that they object against us, and all which our limitations prevent us from treating here individually, see these treated at length in FRANCIS JUNIUS' *Parallelis Sacris*; JOHANNES SCHARPIUS'¹ *Symphonia Prophetarum et Apostolorum*; MICHAEL WALTHER'S² *Harmonia Biblica*; GISBERTUS VOETIUS' *Disputatione de Insolubilibus (ut vocant) Scripturæ, Disputationum Selectarum*, volume I, pages 47-63; FRANCIS TURRETIN'S *Theologia Elenctica*, tome I, locus II, question V, pages 78-95; STAPFER'S *Theologica polemica*, tome 2, chapter X, § 233-277, pages 1034-1067; FRANCISCUS DE RIDDER'S³ *Schriftuurlyk Licht*, who in the *Præfatione*, part I, of this work also sets forth his judgment concerning *Walther's Harmonia Biblica*; JOHANNES POLYANDER'S⁴ *Accord ofte Dereeninge van veele Passagien der Heilig Schriftuure, dewelke schynen tegen malkanderen te stryden, met ene horte verklaringe derzelve*, Leiden, 1621, octavo. To these BUDDEUS adds a good many others, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 12, tome 2, page 1764b-1776. With respect to the ἐναντιοφανῶν, *apparent contradictions*, which in particular occur in the comparison of the

¹ Johannes Scharpius (1572-1648) was a Scottish Presbyterian theologian and pastor. After banishment from his native land for maintaining the liberties of the church against encroachments of the state, he served as Professor of Theology at Die, France (1608-1629). After being ordered to leave France by Cardinal Richelieu, he was permitted to return to Scotland, and he served as Professor of Theology at Edinburgh (1630-1648).

² Michael Walther (1638-1692) was a German mathematician and an orthodox Lutheran theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Wittenberg (1687-1692).

³ Franciscus de Ridder (1620-1683) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian.

⁴ Johannes Polyander (1568-1646) was a Dutch Reformed theologian of French extraction. He served as Professor of Theology at Leiden (1611-1646), in the aftermath of the Arminian controversy. Although orthodox, Polyander was of an irenic and conciliatory spirit.

Books of Kings and Chronicles, especially in arrangement of times, consult SPANHEIM'S *Chronologiam Sacram*, part II, chapter XIX, columns 235-240; CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Historicos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XIV, § 5, pages 247-268, chapter XVI, § 6, 7, pages 292-296. See LILIENTHAL'S *Oordeelk Bybelverklar*, chapter VII, part 3, chapters XV, XVI, part 8, pages 1-340. But now in a few words we observe with our AUTHOR:

1. The ἐναντιοφανῆ, or *apparent Contradictions*, if we have regard unto the diversity of writers and of the manner of writing, are quite few; and generally they do not occur except in smaller and less necessary matters, which not even the Socinians deny.

2. Diversity is by no means to be held as *Contrariety*; since the narration of one is able to be supplemented from the other, which comes into use hundreds of times in weaving together a harmony of the Gospels; and *diverse circumstances often come together in the same event*, for instance, considered at diverse moments of time, whence that saying, *Distinguish the times and you will unite the Scriptures*: thus at one time *Circumcision* is commanded under penalty of *Excision*, Genesis 17:10-14, and is proclaimed as the *Seal of the Righteousness of faith*, Romans 4:11; at another time it is prohibited, and all virtue is denied to it, Galatians 5:2, 3, 6: of course, the former has regard to the time of the Old Testament, the latter to the time of the New Testament. But then finally our AUTHOR notes that true *Contradiction* obtains, when things are said to be opposed *concerning the same thing, according to the same point of view, unto the same, and at the same time*; as these things are known from the precepts of Logic.

When, therefore, alleged oppositions of passages occur,

α. You will eventually observe that these Oppositions are not alleged *concerning the same thing*, which obtains, *a.* when the same word occurs in diverse places, but with a diverse signification; thus *Justification* in Romans 3:28 is ascribed to *faith without the works of the Law*, but in James 2:21, 24, 25, to *works, not to faith alone*: but the language of *Justification* in *Paul* means to be absolved of sins and to obtain a right to eternal life; in *James*, to be declared and acknowledge as righteous, and is taken for the consequent manifestation of that divine sentence of absolution, of which Paul speaks. *b.* When the subjects of expression are diverse: these appear opposed: *thou shalt not kill*, Exodus 20:13, and *thou shalt not suffer to live*, Exodus 22:18; likewise, *be ye merciful*, Luke 6:36, and *thine eye shall not pity*, Deuteronomy 19:13, 21: but the

former things are commanded to private individuals, the latter to magistrates. *c.* Or when the objects are diverse, as when the Gospel is said to be *a savour of life and of death*, 2 Corinthians 2:16.

β. Or those Oppositions are not alleged concerning the same thing *κατ' αὐτὸ*, *according to the same point of view*. Thus Christ declares opposite things concerning Himself, Matthew 26:11; 28:20, but the former is agreeable to Him according to His human nature, the latter according to His divine nature. Paul in Romans 7:15 and *following* declares opposite things concerning himself, but according to parts or principles.

γ. Or those things alleged are not expressed oppositely concerning the same thing *πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ*, *unto the same*, in the same respect or mode, as when one is expressed absolutely, the other comparatively: thus we are commanded absolutely *to honor our parents*, Exodus 20:12, *to love our wives*, Ephesians 5:25; comparatively *hatred* of these is commanded, Luke 14:26, where *to hate* is to love and esteem less than Christ.

δ. Or those Oppositions are not expressed concerning the same thing *τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ*, *at the same time*: thus some things are agreeable to the Old Testament, others to the New; some to the present life, others to the future. Thus what things occur in Matthew 10:5 and Matthew 28:19 appear to be in opposition, but the former was to be observed before, the latter after, the resurrection of Christ.

3. With our AUTHOR we say that *God with good reason willed that there be Diversity in the Scripture*, *α.* both so that all suspicion of hidden collusion in writing might be banished; which in a striking manner is thus removed by the Evangelists, who otherwise would have most easily fallen into the same: consult § 6 of this Chapter: *β.* and so that we might have exercise for our industry and faith.

4. If in the ways already proposed in the case of *ἐναντιοφάνεσι*, *apparent contradictions*, a clear Reconciliation is not soon found, we further observe with our AUTHOR that *it is not necessary in the Reconciliation of texts that we assert Positively that thus the matter stands, or assert Proofs, which on account of the want of history or other requisites often is not able to be done: but it suffices, if we conjecture that the matter is able to stand in this or that way.*

5. Finally, if not even thus does a way of probable or possible Reconciliation appear to be at hand, care is to be taken just the same, lest

we at any time attribute to those θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired Writers* a single, or even a very trifling, error with the Socinians; but the slowness and imbecility of our intellect is to be acknowledged, or *the Copyists, not the Writers, are to be blamed. Which sometimes, although rarely, appears necessary.* And perhaps God willed that one or the other example of this sort of error be on record, so that we might not assign to all the Copyists, equally with the Writers, so special a divine guidance: at the same time, those cases are so few, in which it appears necessary to have recourse to that, that it might not appear so strange that one or the other example of ἀλύτου, *a thing insoluble*, or ἐναντιολογίας/*contradiction* is presented; but it appears much stranger that far more such examples are not presented. Nevertheless, there is no example of a corrupted passage of this sort that cannot be corrected from a parallel passage. JUSTIN *Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*, page 289: Εἰ δὲ χάριν τοῦ νομίζειν δύνασθαι εἰς ἀπορίαν ἐμβάλλειν τὸν λόγον, ἵν' εἶπω ἐναντίας εἶναι τὰς γραφὰς ἀλλήλαις, πεπλάνησαι· οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω τοῦτό ποτε, ἢ ἐνθυμηθῆναι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἀλλ' ἐὰν τοιαύτη τις δοκοῦσα εἶναι γραφή προβληθῆ, καὶ πρόφασιν ἔχη ὡς ἐναντία οὖσα, ἐκ παντὸς πεπεισμένος ὅτι οὐδεμία γραφή τῇ ἑτέρᾳ ἐναντία ἐστίν, αὐτὸς μὴ νοεῖν μᾶλλον ὁμολογήσω τὰ εἰρημένα, *but if you have done so because you thought yourself to be able to cast doubt on the word, so that I might say that the Scriptures are contradicting one another, you have erred: For I shall not ever venture to suppose or to say such a thing; but if a Scripture which appears to be of such a kind be brought forward, and if there be a pretext that it is contradictory, being entirely convinced that no Scripture contradicts another, I shall admit rather that I do not understand what is recorded.* AUGUSTINE, as he relates in *Epistle LXXXII*, already cited in § 22: *if I might encounter anything in the Canonical Scriptures, which might appear to be contrary to the truth; it must be the case that either the codex is faulty, or the translator has not followed what has been said, or I have not understood: compare BUDDEUS' de Atheismo et Superstitione, chapter VII, § 7, pages 475 at the end, 476.* Such a Passage, in which our intellect hardly finds a way of extricating itself, and hence ought to accuse either itself or the Copyists, is, for example:

Luke 3:36, where τοῦ Καϊνάν, *of Cainan*, is inserted between τοῦ Σαλά, *of Sala*, and τοῦ Ἀρφαξάδ, *of Arphaxad*. The passage, 1. a great many think to lie in defect: whether now, α. with BOCHART¹ in

¹ Samuel Bochart (1599-1667) was a French Protestant pastor and scholar with

Phaleg, book II, chapter XIII, column 89-92, and GROTIUS on the passage, out of *verse* 37, where mention is of *Cainan*, son of Enos, they maintain that this name was transferred into the previous *verse* by the carelessness of Scribes; and, after it was admitted into a number of Codices, was inserted by Greek Christians into the Septuagint Versions also. Or, β. they conclude that out of the Septuagint Version it was transferred here by ignorant copyists, from whatever source that *Cainan* may have first crept into the Septuagint Version. In neither way is Luke himself treated as if he were liable to hallucination. Certainly in the Septuagint that generation is expressly found in Genesis 11:13 and 10:24, and also in some Codices of 1 Chronicles 1:18; and in Luke the reading of this *Cainan* is all but universal. But that the mention of this *Cainan* in the Septuagint is to be added to the other grievous faults that they commit in constructing the Chronology of the Patriarchs of that age and of the Ante-diluvian age, not one of us doubts: since, *a.* the Hebrew Codex, omitting this in three different places, Genesis 10:24; 11:12, 13; 1 Chronicles 1:18, is entirely consistent with itself. Which, *b.* the Chaldean Paraphrases uniformly follow. Just as also, *c.* JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities of the Jews*, book I, chapter VII, page 15, and Africanus¹ in EUSEBIUS' *Greek Chronicle*, page 9. And, *d.* reason supports this, since the thirty-fifth year of the age of Arphaxad, in which he begat Salah, completely agrees with the years of the generation of the remaining Patriarchs mentioned in Genesis 11: on the other hand, the years of generation would be too far ahead of their proper time against the manner of that age, if in the space of thirty-five years between Arphaxad and Salah some middle generation be inserted; which also is directly against the Mosaic text. Therefore, the reading in Luke ought to be emended out of Moses, as it is evident.

2. But, that this *Cainan* is indeed to be rejected, but that this passage in Luke is nevertheless uncorrupted, the Most Illustrious GOUSSET determines, in *Veritate salutifera contra librum Rabbi Isaaci dictum Chizzouk Emouna*, part II, chapter I, page 362, since he believes that

a wide variety of interests, including philology, theology, geography, and zoology. Indeed his works on Biblical geography (*Geographia Sacra*) and zoology (*Hierozoicon, sive Bipertitum Opus de Animalibus Scripturæ*) became standard reference works for generations. He was on familiar terms with many of the greatest men of his age.

¹ Sextus Julius Africanus (c. 160-c. 240) was a chronographer and the first Christian to attempt a history from the creation. His *Chronographai* significantly influenced Eusebius.

those words, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, *as it was supposed*, in verse 23, do not only have regard to the Lord Jesus mentioned immediately before, but thinks that those are to be referred to diverse men mentioned in the following genealogy in a sense in some measure diverse. Jesus was the son of Joseph, *as it was supposed*, because Joseph had taken His mother Mary as wife, and most Jews were ignorant of the miraculous generation of the Lord Jesus. Joseph was the son of Heli, *as it was supposed*, because he had taken his daughter as wife; or because he was Joseph's Legal father, to whom, having died without children, Joseph was raised up by the uterine brother of the deceased, even Jacob.¹ Adam was the son of God, not properly, but *as it was supposed*, on account of the agreement which comes between Creation and generation. But *Cainan* was the son of Arphaxad, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, *as it was supposed*, namely, by those that were reading that most widely circulated Greek Version, in which they were finding him after Arphaxad: compare WESSELIUS' *Nestorianismum et Adoptianismum redivivum confutatum*, chapter XXII, § 270, pages 496-499. Certainly these conjectures are not unworthy of the genius of the Most Illustrious Gousset, and in this manner that passage of Luke is preserved unblemished.

On *this passage*, the erudite *Dissertatio* of JAMES USSHER of Armagh,² inserted in *tome 9* of *Bibliorum Criticis Londinensium*, columns 4003 and *following*, in which, 1. the solution of Gousset, just now mentioned, is now found proposed, *column 4011*. Who, 2. relates that he saw a Græco-Latin Codex of Luke, written on most ancient parchments, in majuscule letters, without breathings and accents, in which in the Greek, του Φαλεκ, του Εβερ, του Σαλα, του Αρφαξαδ, του Σημ, was read in an extended manner in the Latin, *who was of Phalec, who was of Eber, who was of Sala, who was of Arphaxad, who was of Shem*: see *column 4012*. But, 3. in addition he thinks that in the primitive Greek Version of the Mosaic Pentateuch that *Cainan* was not found, although it crept into the κοινήν/*common* Edition of the Septuagint already at a most ancient time: both because that pericope of the Septuagint, concerning which the question is here raised, varies so much in numbers, see *column 4006*, and because the most ancient Christian Chronologists, although they establish the reckoning of years according to the

¹ Matthew 1:15, 16.

² James Ussher (1580-1655) was an Irish churchman and scholar of the first calibre, who eventually rose to the office of Archbishop of Ireland. He is most remembered for his *Annals of the World*.

Septuagint, are nevertheless found to pass over the times of *Cainan*. But an account, explaining how *Cainan*, with time passing, was intruded into the Septuagint Version, and thence into the text of *Luke*, he believes to be demanded no less unjustly of us than the same might be done in all the other pericopes omitted or added to the Hebrew verity in the same Version: see *columns* 4008-4010. In addition, read in SPANHEIM'S *Dubiis Euangelicis*, part I, *doubt* XXIII, *pages* 137-192, his discussion, similar to the others, concerning this imported *Cainan*.

Of this sort also is the passage in 2 Chronicles 22:2, in which *Ahaziah* is said to be *a son of forty-two years, when he took possession of the kingdom* of Judah in the place of his Father *Jehoram*, now dead, and that *he reigned one year*. But in 2 Chronicles 21:20, his Father *Jehoram* is said to have been *thirty-two years old* when he advanced to the administration of the kingdom, and that *he reigned eight years*, who hence had only reached the age of forty when he met his death. On the other hand, in 2 Kings 8:26, *Ahaziah* is said to have *seized the reigns of the kingdom in his twenty-second year*, and to have *reigned one year*. The ways of reconciliation that Interpreters have undertaken certainly appear to be too harsh, referring those forty-two years to the end of the *verse* by trajection, or to his mother, *Athaliah*; or to *Omri* and the time from which his family had begun to reign in Israel, which would expire in this forty-second year. Neither are twenty years able to be subtracted from those forty-two years, during which he had reigned together with his Father; which neither agrees with the years of the Kingdom of *Jehoram*, 2 Chronicles 21:20, nor with the parallel place in 2 Kings 8:26, while in both places he is said to have reigned for only *one year*. Therefore, one passage appears to lie in defect, and indeed the reading of the passage in 2 Kings 8 is concluded as more worthy to be kept, because according to 2 Chronicles 22:2 *Ahaziah* the son would be obliged to exceed the age of his own Father by two years, and to have been a son of forty-two years when his Father died at the age of forty. Various Versions also, the Syriac, Arabic, and Greek abandon the present reading of the Hebrew text in this passage of 2 Chronicles 22. But if it be understood that a $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\upsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ / *short-hand* had formerly obtained in the recension of the number, let us hold it as evident how that exceedingly slight mutation from twenty-two to forty-two was able to happen, since \beth is thus set down in the place of twenty-two, but $\beth\aleph$ in the place of forty-two; now, the slightest stroke being added to \beth changes that into $\beth\aleph$: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XVIII, Part V; STAPFER'S *Theologicam*

polemicam, tome 2, chapter X, § 277, pages 1066, 1067; ALPHONSE DES-VIGNOLES'¹ *Chronologie de l'histoire sainte*, tome I, book II, chapter II, § 20, pages 326-331; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section IV, § 15, tome II, pages 379-383, who supplies a method of reconciliation received from his colleague ANDREAS DANZ as more commendable than others, according to which the number of forty-two years is not referred to Ahaziah, but to his father Jehoram: but you might say that even this fails on account of those things that our AUTHOR now observed, *Exercitationibus textualibus XVIII, Part V*, § 5. Let the Reader also weigh carefully a new method of reconciling this ἐναντιοφανές, *apparent contradiction*, which the most Illustrious LILIENTHAL, having received it, relates to Doctor Stein, and which he attempts at length to render probable, and furnishes to be read in *Oordeelk Bybelverklar*, chapter VII, § 212-219, part 3, pages 263-281. According to this conjecture, Ahaziah was not the proper son of Jehoram by the daughter of Ahab; but begotten of a lesser known son of Asa, a brother of Jehoshaphat, by Athalia, daughter of Omri, sister of Ahab; but adopted first by Jehoshaphat, then by his son Jehoram: he was actually forty-two years old when he took the kingdom, while in the other passage he is said at the same time to be twenty-two years of age, with respect unto the time at which he had first been adopted into the family of Jehoshaphat; and thus he had obtained greater hope for the succession in royal dignity, confirmed to him thereafter by Jehoram. But I fear that this conjecture also appears after serious consideration to be covered with very grave difficulties.

Our AUTHOR judges that it is to be thought in almost the same way concerning the passage in 1 Kings 6:1, in which it is related that *the Temple began to be founded in the four hundred and eightieth year from the exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt, and in the fourth of the reign of Solomon*; which computation you will scarcely be able to reconcile with the passage in Acts 13:20, in which it is thought to be affirmed that *God for four hundred and fifty years gave Judges to the Israelites, unto the time of Samuel: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ, and after that, about the space of four hundred and fifty years, He gave Judges, until Samuel*, just as out of the Book of Judges also, with the forty years of the Judge Eli regarded out of 1

¹ Alphonse des Vignoles (1649-1744) was a Reformed Theologian, laboring in Germany, but of French extraction.

Samuel 4:18, those four hundred and fifty years are accomplished, to which in the next place are certainly to be added the forty years of lodging in the wilderness, the forty years of Samuel and Saul, the forty years of David, three years of Solomon, which totals one hundred and twenty-three, besides the uncertain time to be assigned to Joshua and the Elders:¹ but thus the number recorded in 1 Kings 6:1 shall lack more than a hundred years: see our AUTHOR in *Mantissa Observatione* after *Analysem Exegeticam in Jesaie 53 textu*, IV, pages 397-407.

Yet others assert a reconciliation of the number recorded in 1 Kings 6:1 both with the account of the times, and with Acts 13:20, a reconciliation not so difficult that hence we think it necessary to pronounce that passage corrupt. Unto which end they observe, not so much that the years of servitude and oppression are to be comprehended under the years of peace, which are clearly opposed and distinct in the Sacred text, which certainly appears too harsh: but that there were often various Judges raised up at the same time in the various tribes and parts of the land of Israel, so that at the same time some might judge in Ephraim, others liberate Israel from the Ammonites, others fight for them against the Philistines; hence their years are not to be subordinated, but coordinated; as they judge the time of servitude and affliction of one Judge to come together unto the same point of χρόνου/time with the years of this or that Judge; and in this manner they display to the eye with the calculations balanced that from the exodus out of Egypt unto the founding of the temple not more than four hundred and eighty years passed. And they assert that thus the passage in Acts 13:20 does not hinder, since there the Sacred text relates, not *how long* God gave Judges, but *when*, that is, in the four hundred and fifty years after God *had elected the fathers*, which in *verse 17* Paul had named in the first place as the foundation of all the benefits bestowed upon the Israelite nation in after-times, and also to be remembered in turn by the Apostle. Which *Election* of Israel unto a holy nation, peculiar to God, indeed is able to be initiated from the promise, Genesis 12 and 13, but with greatest reason is also able to be drawn down from the birth of Isaac, the son of the promise, and the father of the people of God, according to Genesis 17 and 21. Now, from that nativity of Isaac unto the time when God gave Judges to Israel are reckoned *approximately*, ὥς, four hundred and fifty years, with which accomplished, μετὰ ταῦτα, after the other things

¹ Joshua 24:31; Judges 2:7.

narrated before, God gave Judges. Unless some trajection obtains here in the text, and it is to be read in accordance with a number of Codices: *κατεκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν κριτὰς*, *He divided to them their land by lot, about the space of four hundred and fifty years, and after that He gave judges*: in which manner the time, not of the giving of the Judges, but of the division of the Israelite land by lot, is indicated, which, drawn down in the same way from the nativity of Isaac, is able to be reckoned agreeably; when at the same time with the promise made to Abraham the fulfillment of the same in the giving of the land of Canaan after about four hundred and fifty years shall be mentioned, and these two shall be aptly connected: consult SPANHEIM *the Younger's Chronologiam*, part II, chapter XIX, in *Canone Epochæ IV, Veteris Testamenti*, columns 231, 232, *opera*, tome I; and JOHANNES ENS' *Disputationem de Chronologia Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, Epoch IV, pages 12-16. But without a trajection of this sort the integrity of the text of Acts 13:20 is able to be preserved, and also the explication of it proposed immediately before concerning the time *when* God gave the Judges, only let an ellipsis of a participle be admitted, easily to be supplied from the sense, either *πραχθέντα*, *having been accomplished*, or, what is perhaps even simpler, *γενόμενα*, *having come to pass*; of which LOUIS DE DIEU has the former on *this passage*, *As if it were written*, says he, *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα πραχθέντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς*, *and after those things having been accomplished about the space of four hundred and fifty years, He gave Judges*. He relates the latter from the consent of others, and then FRANCIS JUNIUS himself proves it, *Parallelis Sacris*, book I, *opera*, tome I, column 1082, where it reads, *And, that that outline of times indeed pertains to the what precedes, certain most learned men in our recollection have thought, as if in the Greek context of Luke it should thus be read, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα γενόμενα*, *and after those things having come to pass about the space of four hundred and fifty years*; always under *ἔτεσι/year ἐν/in* is understood. He greatly extols that latter supplement, *γενόμενα*, *having come to pass*, and LEONARD OFFERHAUS¹ commends this sentence, *and after these things* (which Luke had said from *verse 17* concerning the fathers and the division of the land), *about the space of four hundred and fifty years, were accomplished or*

¹ Leonard Offerhaus (1699-1779) served as a professor of history and eloquence at Groningen University.

conducted, *He gave Judges until Samuel the Prophet: Spicilegio historico-chronologico*, book I, chapter II, § 14, pages 31, 32, in which he rightly advises that a diverse construction of *verse 18* is observed by VAN ALPHEN, pages 20, 21, in designating the time *when* and *how long*: yet it was not the case that he asserted that the most illustrious VAN ALPHEN received this from heaven concerning the obvious ellipsis of the word *γενόμενα* in Acts 13:20: in that we saw that that supplement of the participle *γενόμενα* was already indicated and commended by FRANCIS JUNIUS. (See also concerning *this passage* below in *Chapter VIII:20.*) And in this manner there shall not be any necessity to acknowledge a corruption of number *in this passage*.

Neither does it seem necessary that it come to this point, when in Acts 7:14 *πᾶσα συγγένεια*, *all the kindred*, of Joseph is said to consist *ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε*, *in seventy-five souls*; while, on the other hand, you see that they are numbered as sixty-six souls in Genesis 46:26, and as seventy souls in *verse 27*: wherefore some maintain that *πέντε*/*five* in Acts 7 is a corruption of *πάντως*, *in all*; others maintain that *πέντε*/*five* was introduced here from the Septuagint Version of Genesis 46:27;¹ see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* III, Part II, § 3. But a way of reconciliation, with the integrity of the text preserved, is not altogether impossible. Namely, those that occur in the genealogy of Jacob, Genesis 46:8-25, with Jacob himself enumerated with the rest, are seventy-two, from which, if you subtract the two sons of Judah that had already died in the land of Canaan, Er and Onan, according to *verse 12*, those shall remain that went down together with Jacob into Egypt, constituting the house of Jacob, seventy in number according to *verse 27*: where perhaps in the place of *כָּל־הַנְּפָשׁ לְבֵית־יַעֲקֹב הַבָּאָה מִצְרַיִם*, *all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt*, you might better read, *every soul of the house of Jacob coming into Egypt*, that is, *of the house, which came*, than *every soul that came*. From which, if you again subtract both Jacob, the head of the family, and Joseph, who was already in Egypt, together with his two sons born there, sixty-six souls, according to *verse 26*, proceeding from the loins of Jacob, went down, who together with Jacob entered Egypt. When it is now expressly added in *verse 26* that there were sixty-six souls *besides Jacob's sons' wives*, there are those that

¹ Genesis 46:27b: "...all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten (עַשְׁרֵים וָשֵׁשׁ; ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε, *seventy-five*, in the Septuagint)."

think Stephen to be reconciled easily with Moses, with the nine wives of the sons of Jacob added to those sixty-six souls, which figures taken together make the number seventy-five. But the wife of Judah, the daughter of Shuah, was already dead, according to Genesis 38:12. And thus the matter was able to be with several of the wives of the sons. But the place of these the wives of the grandsons of Jacob were able to take. And thus, in one manner or another, the *συγγένεια*/*kindred* of Jacob was easily able to make up the number seventy-five. But perhaps there is no necessity to flee to the wives of the grandsons; if, as is fitting, to the wives of the sons of Jacob we add not the wife of Joseph, who was an Egyptian, and did not have any necessity to come into Egypt; nor the wife of Judah, as having already died; and if we then posit that it is hardly improbable that Benjamin was not yet joined to a wife at the time of the coming of Jacob with his family into Egypt, then nine wives of the sons of Jacob shall remain, together with the family of sixty-six men, making up the number of seventy-five. And indeed the ten sons of Benjamin, enumerated in Genesis 46:21, are able to have been born thereafter in Egypt, with their grandfather Jacob yet living; so that the descent of Jacob with his family into Egypt ought to be extended unto his death: but only in this should the express exception of the two sons of Joseph, as born in Egypt, *verse* 27, be allowed, which sort of exception with respect to the sons of Benjamin is not found: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* III, Part II, § 4; and HARENBERG'S *Spicilegium* II, *de Pericopis Bibliici recte ordinandis*, § 4, in *Bibliotheca Bremensi, classis* III, *fascicule* II, *chapter* III, *pages* 292-296.

Finally, that I might not heap together more, a defect is not necessarily discerned in Acts 7:16, as if Abraham is there said to have bought a sepulchre from the sons of Emmor τοῦ Συχέμ, *of Sychem*: while, on the other hand, from Genesis 23:8-18 it is known that Abraham bought the sepulchre from Ephron the Hittite near the city of Hebron; but, that Jacob bought a field from the children of Hamor in the region of Shechem, is narrated in Genesis 33:19: whence some maintain that Ἀβραάμ/*Abraham* has been incorrectly substituted here in the place of Ἰακώβ/*Jacob*, or think that for the sake of supplementing the text Ἀβραάμ/*Abraham* was inserted in the place of Ἰακώβ/*Jacob* by some ignorant scribe, in which place previously there was no name in the text. Others that uphold the integrity of the text think that actually Ἀβραάμ/*Abraham*, as grandfather and eminent head of the family, is set down here in the place of his grandson, *Jacob*, as *David* in the place of Rehoboam, 1

Kings 12:16, *David* in the place of Christ, Ezekiel 37:24, 25. Yet for this no sufficient reason is here produced; on the other hand, Stephen in context again and again mentions *Jacob* by name, indeed immediately before in *verses* 14 and 15. So also it is too harsh, what others thought was to be read here in the place of Ἀβραάμ/*Abraham*, namely, ὁ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, *he of Abraham*, that is, ἔκγονος, the grandson of Abraham, Jacob. But there is another, twofold, easy reconciliation at hand, which SPANHEIM supplies, and one of which he prefers to the others, *Historia Jobi, chapter XI, § 19, Miscellaneorum Sacrarum Antiquitatum, book I, opera, tome 2, columns 91, 92*. Namely, he thinks that the speech concerning the sepulchre truly belongs to Stephen, which sepulchre Abraham bought from Ephron, in these words: ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ ὠνήσατο Ἀβραάμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίου, *in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of silver*. But then, as far as the following words are concerned, παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ, *from the sons of Emmor of Sychem*, Spanheim recognizes, that from them Abraham did not buy the μνήμα/*sepulchre*; but that from them Jacob bought a field, not for the sake of burial, but of habitation. And so he thinks, 1. that παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ, *from the sons of Emmor*, is able to mean the same thing as παρὰ τὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ, *besides that of the sons of Emmor*, by a common ellipsis. Our Fathers, says Stephen, were laid up in the sepulchre that Abraham had bought with a sum of silver; *besides that of the sons of Emmor*, that is, in which Joseph alone was buried, because the field, in which this sepulchre was, passed to Joseph by a special grant of his father Jacob, Joshua 24:32; Genesis 48:22. Or, 2. παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ, *from/by the sons of Emmor*, is to be referred, not to the verb ὠνήσατο, *he bought*, but to the more remote ἐτέθησαν, *they were laid*. That is, Jacob and his sons, the fathers of the Jews, were not buried in the Shechemite field, but all, with the exception of Joseph, were buried at Hebron in the sepulchral monument of Abraham, which is related concerning Jacob in Genesis 49:29, 30; 50:13; but JOSEPHUS also mentions the same concerning the sons of Jacob, *Antiquities of the Jews, book II, chapter IV, near the end*. So that the Patriarchs might be buried there, *they were first carried over unto Shechem*, where were the sons of Hamor, friends from of old, allies, where was the hereditary possession of the Israelites; and thence παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ, *from/by the sons of Emmor*, with the help and guidance of the *Shechemites*, the transfer was then made unto the place of burial, Hebron and the cave of Abraham, in the midst of the descendants of

Heth, an impious and alien nation. And thus our Fathers with Jacob were carried after their deaths to Shechem, καὶ ἐτέθησαν παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ ὠνήσατο Ἀβραὰμ, etc., and they were laid by the sons of Emmor in the sepulchre that Abraham bought, etc. Which twofold solution, one or the other, MARCKIUS also mention as worthy of admittance, in his *Analysi Exegetica* of Genesis 48:22, § 20, page 61, and on Genesis 49:29, 30, § 19, pages 348, 349. And that we are not in any respect bound to say that the text in Acts 7:16 lies in defect, WESSELIUS also teaches in *Dissertationibus Sacris Leidensibus* VI, § 6, against *Le Clerc*.

With this ἐναντιοφανεῖ, *apparent contradiction*, a second, which results from a comparison of Genesis 33:19 with Genesis 48:22, cleaves: in which in the former place Jacob is said to have bought the portion of a field, in which he had spread his tent, from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem, for one hundred silver pieces or lambs: but in the second, which is not without reason judged to be referred to the former, dying Jacob says to Joseph: *And I have given to thee one shoulder, or one portion,¹ above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow.* It certainly appears to dispute with itself, that the same field is said to have been bought with a price from the sons of Hamor, who was an Hivite, Genesis 34:2, and is related to have captured by sword and bow from the Amorites. In the resolution of this question, lest anyone hesitate, receive also a twofold solution in a few words, the latter being more probable than the former, which MARCKIUS suggest in his *Analysi Exegetica in præcipuas partes Pentateuchi* on Genesis 48:22, § 20, pages 53-61, where you will also be able to see several other solutions less worthy of admittance related with strictures added also. The twofold solution: 1. Perhaps the price of one hundred silver pieces or lambs, with which he had purchased the Shechemite field, Jacob figuratively called *his sword and his bow*: just as the Latins are wont to say *by my prowess, by my own supplies*, similitudes taken from warfare, by which they signify what they are able to effect by their own effort; and this they distinguish from that in which they needed the help or industry of others. For, even if Jacob has nothing that he does not acknowledge to have received from God, nevertheless he was able thus to distinguish between those things that he had immediately from God, whether promised or given, and those things that he bought for himself with his own resources, called *his bow* and

¹ Hebrew: יָדוֹ וְקַוְּוֹ.

sword; as elsewhere money is also wont to be called a *hook*, by which fish are caught. Now, thus the name of *Amorite*, Genesis 48:22, either shall be taken more broadly, because of the foremost power of that nation among the Canaanites, by comparison with Genesis 15:16; Amos 2:9; or it is to be said that the Hivites were similar to or mixed with the Amoties in such a way that the same prince was able to be referred in different respects to both tribes. 2. Or, if that exegesis perhaps appears too artificial, if I might make use of the words of MARCKIUS, “after all things it appears that it is best said that Jacob in these words has regard entirely unto something past, but that it was not mentioned elsewhere in the sacred history, not thereby deserving less confidence coming from the mouth of the dying, just as often on suitable occasions are narrated matters conducted previously and passed over in their own place. When by *his sword* and *his bow*, striking from near and from far, he signified whatever arms of war, of which Abraham had also made use, Genesis 14:14, 15, and Jacob is plainly not to be thought to have been without his necessary defense, etc. And when in the *capture* of that one shoulder from the hand of the Amorite he indicated, not so much the preservation and defense of the occupied, as indeed a war-like occupation, which happened after the purchase and the violence of Jacob’s sons against the Shechemites, rather than before those things. Unto preservation have regard those things which *Pererius* adduced out of *Jarchi* and *Lyra*: *Since because of the slaughter of the Shechemites and the destruction of the city Jacob exceedingly feared an attack of the neighboring nations against himself, he, trusting in the help and protection of God, armed himself and his own, and stood in the gate of Shechem, expecting the arrival and assault of enemies. But those, having been terrified and thoroughly frightened by God, did not dare to rise against him. And in this manner Jacob obtained that land by right of war, which is to have acquired it in bow and sword, with them destroying the life and city of Shechem with good reason because of the violation of Dinah. Moreover, that that region of the Shechemites was in the power of Jacob after the slaughter of them, there is clear proof, for the sons of Jacob thereafter were feeding their flocks in Shechem, as it is read in Genesis 37, as in a land under the right and power of Jacob.* But unto that occupation, which we prefer, pertain the final comments of *Andrew Masius*, after he had previously disputed for an improper understanding of sword and bow: *But if one thinks, but is not able to prove, those things to be cleverer, let him think it, although, that Jacob first purchased with money a small piece of land from the compatriots of Hamor in which he might be able to abide with his own, for a hundred coins that are called*

Cessitæ,¹ but then from the neighboring field gradually drove out the Amorites, which those had seized from the Shechemites, not by right but by arms, since the wasters had passed over Jordan. For Jacob does not say that he obtained that field from Hamor with sword and bow, but from the Amorites; now, Hamor and Shechem were Hivites, which is testified to by the sacred words themselves, Genesis 34:2. The following things from our Rivet are able to make for the greater illustration of this opinion (*Exercitatione CLXXVI in Genesi, opera, tome I, page 668*): Much more probable is the opinion of those that refer it to a past time, and maintain that by the right of war he acquired or received that land for himself, not indeed through the unjust action of his sons, which even then he abhorred, but because the Amorites, after Jacob had withdrawn, and had departed toward Hebron, captured the Shechemite field by force, and at the same time seized upon that part that Jacob had bought, which, when they were unwilling to restore, Jacob expelled them with arms, and claimed for himself that property detained by the unjust usurpers. And Pererius himself, after long and laborious disputation, returns to this at last, teaching: When, and upon what cause or occasion, and how this was done by Jacob is no where related in the sacred books, but what Masius said is likely, that first the field was purchased by Jacob, then afterwards from the neighboring and bordering field, which the Amorites had seized from the Shechemites by force, Jacob expelled them with military force, and in this way enlarged the former field. Or, when after his departure from the city of Shechem the Amorites had invaded and occupied that very field, Jacob by arms, his and those of his own, with those expelled, recovered his field. In any event, it is certain that concerning this Shechemite Shoulder Jacob willed not only to note by this description something peculiar, but also to show that he formerly came into true possession of it by the right of war, war not unjust but legitimate, so that consequently he is able to gift it to another.” To confirm the solution of this doubtful case just now given, IKEN labors even further, *Dissertationibus philologico-theologicis IV, pages 37-50*. Upon the twofold ἐναντιοφανές, apparent contradiction, just now mentioned resulting from the comparison of Acts 7:16 with Genesis 23:8-18, and Genesis 33:19 with Genesis 48:22, VAN RIE is also able to be consulted for the sake of greater illustration, *tydrekenkundige Bybel-openingen, part I, question 15, § 11, 12, pages 310-313*.

There is a conspicuous ἐναντιοφανές, apparent contradiction,

¹ Genesis 33:19: “And he bought a parcel of a field, where he had spread his tent, at the hand of the children of Hamor, Shechem’s father, for an hundred pieces of money (הַשָּׁקֶל/*Cesitah*).”

that occurs in the Evangelical History of the Lord's Passion, if you compare Mark 15:25 with John 19:14: but concerning this I spoke at length in a *Disputatione* on these passages, which I shall exhibit to the Reader at the end of this *volume*.

And thus far concerning the ἐναντιοφανείαις, *apparent contradictions*, of Sacred Scripture. I shall end this argument with the fitting words of AUGUSTINE, which I already commended above out of *Epistle LXXXII ad Hieronymum, opera, tome 2, column 144*; now, these are read in *book XI contra Faustum Manichæum, book XI, chapter V, opera, tome 8, columns 158, 159*, "The excellence of the Canonical authority of the Old and New Testaments is distinct from the books of those coming latter, etc. There, if (the intellect) moves anything as absurd, one ought not to say, The Author of this book did not hold to the truth: but, either the codex is faulty, or the translator erred, or you are not understanding." Consult also on § 23 DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord, chapter V, § 67-72, 74, pages 535-551, 555*.

§ 24: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 1

Furthermore, Sacred Scripture delivers the substance of Religion *Perspicuously*. So that we might demonstrate this *Perspicuity*, it is to be observed:

A. In general,

α. That that does not so much have regard unto the *Things* related, as unto the *Manner* of relating. For Scripture treats the sublimest mysteries of salvation, even those that far transcend human capacity; but the Spirit in marvelous *συνκαταβάσει/condescension* sets forth the same in the Scriptures in so Perspicuous a manner that, although the proposed Matter in all its fullness often flees the sight fo the mind, yet the pious mind pursues the Word clearly setting forth that matter, and thence learns to understand the matter itself, which has been related, as far as understanding is required for salvation. Thus clearly and perspicuously the Scripture reveals τὸ ὄτι, *the fact*, of mysteries, for example, the Trinity, the eternal Generation of the Son, etc., which is necessary for us to know and to believe for salvation: but τὸ πῶς, τὸ διότι, *the how and wherefore*, lie hidden to us, and one is not required to know this for salvation.

β. We observe that nevertheless the Degrees of Perspicuity vary in the Sacred Scripture;

1. In various Passages and parts of Scripture, of which variegated style of the Scriptures AUGUSTINE teaches us that there is manifest use, both in *book II de Doctrina Christiana, chapter VI, opera, tome 3, part I, column 17*, “Therefore, the Holy Spirit magnificently and profitably has modified the holy Scriptures in such a way that by the plainer passage He might meet need, but by the more obscure remove contempt”; and in *Sermon XI or LXXI de Verbis Domini, chapter VII, opera, tome 5, column 272*, “In all the abundance of the holy Scriptures, we are fed by the plain passages, and exercised by the obscure: in the former hunger is banished, in the latter contempt.”

2. In various Matters; thus *prophetical* matters are often of a more profound research, which God has left for our diligent investigation and for the exercise of our faith, and the Church’s

necessary understanding of which He nevertheless does not exclude. *Dogmatic* matters are more perspicuous, especially those that are absolutely necessary for salvation; not in such a way that no industry is needful for the understanding of these things: to such an extent that with the help of legitimate means they are able to be understood from the Scriptures by individual believers unto salvation: so that common people are not to be kept from the reading of Scripture as harmful and dangerous to them, nor is it necessary to depend upon the tradition and pronouncement of the Church.

B. In particular, we assert a *Subjective Perspicuity* of this sort belonging to the Scriptures, that is, which inheres in the subject, concerning which the speech, namely, of the Scripture, is to us, on its part. We deny an *Objective Perspicuity* of the Scriptures, or which extends itself to whatever objects outside of Scripture, that is, to whatever men reading it. Which distinction our AUTHOR teaches to be employed *commonly* and *rightly*, *the vain censure of certain more Recent Men not withstanding*; on which words consult MARESIUS' *Systema Theologicum*, locus I, § 44, note a, page 28; PETRUS VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, posterior Section, chapter II, § 2-5, pages 157-161. We shall prove the former against the *Papists* in the following §. The latter we now refute against the *Socinians* and *Remonstrants*. Against whom we hold that the Scripture, however perspicuous, nevertheless is not able to be understood savingly apart from the special internal and supernatural Illumination of the Holy Spirit.

The *Socinians* deny this, among whom *Ostorodus*, *Institutionibus*, chapter I, pages 3, 4, writes, "they err grievously and dangerously, who think that the Sacred Scripture is in no way able to effect faith and obedience in men without the internal illumination and special revelation of the Holy Spirit; and that man is no otherwise able to have any use regarding salvation from the Scripture read or heard." And in chapter XXXIV *de libero Arbitrio*, page 285, § 3, "Whence it appears in what a dangerous error the Evangelicals abide, especially the Calvinists, etc., who think this, that men have no help from the hearing of the external Word of God, unless the Holy Spirit teaches them internally in a peculiar and hidden manner, and works faith and obedience in them": consult ARNOLDI'S *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, pages 39-41, chapter IV, *de Scriptura Sacra*, § 1-4.

The *Remonstrants* understand things similarly, for example, in

their *Confessione*, chapter I, § 14, “Such is the clarity and perspicuity of the Sacred Books (say they), especially ideas necessary to be understood for eternal salvation, that all Readers, not only the learned, but also the unlearned (*indeed, furnished with common sense and judgment*), are able to follow their meaning *sufficiently*: only let them not allow themselves to be blinded by prejudice, vain confidence, or other depraved affections; but let them search this Scripture piously and painstakingly, etc.” Add the words of *Episcopus*, sounding harshly enough in the ears, *Disputationibus Theologicis*, part I, *Disputation* III, § 1-9, and part III, *Disputation* III, § 1-3, *opera*, tome 2, part 2, compared with TRIGLAND’S *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen*, volume 4, page 636a. Nevertheless, sometimes our Adversaries, either teasing with words, or compelled by the force of truth, also speak of the *gift of the Holy Spirit*, and its use for the understanding of the Scriptures; as it is done in *Catechesi Racoviensis* “de Scriptura Sacra”, chapter III, question 3, pages 16, 17, upon which place consult ARNOLDI’S *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, § 1, page 39, § 2, page 40, § 10, page 43. You also may find that JAMES ARMINIUS, in *Disputationibus Theologicis publicis*, thesis XI, § 8, has a sounder understanding at this point than his followers.

The *πρῶτα ψεῦδη*, *fundamental errors*, of the Socinians and Remonstrants are, the Pelagian principle concerning the sufficient abilities of fallen man; the confusion of Philosophy and Christianity; the confusion of different kinds of clear perception, one that happens by the light of nature in natural matters, and another that happens by the light of grace with respect to mysteries.

Here, the question is not concerning just any sort of understanding of the Scriptures, but, as our Adversaries themselves dictate *in the passages cited, concerning the understanding of Scripture as far as it is sufficient*, by means of *pious and painstaking investigation*; concerning the understanding of the Scriptures, *which is able to work faith and obedience*, and *from which it is given to man to draw saving uses*. Not concerning the Literal knowledge of the Grammatical Sense only, but concerning Practical and Spiritual knowledge. At which point the *Censura Confessionis Remonstrantium*, chapter I, page 24, teaches that the grammatical or literal sense of Scripture is incorrectly mixed with its spiritual sense in this Question by *Episcopus*. “But we,” the *Censurers* subjoin, “distinguishing the Grammatical Sense of Scripture from the Spiritual understanding of spiritual things, do indeed concede that the natural man is able to follow the former in a natural way: but we deny

that the power of the latter agrees with any natural man.” Whence, while *Episcopus* took the opportunity to cavil in the *Apologia Remonstrantium*, chapter I, pages 33-35, and did not fear to write that this distinction of the Grammatical and Spiritual Sense *is a device overly pedantic*; our men have so clearly explained and vindicated this distinction and its usefulness. “There is a Spiritual Sense,” are the words of HOORNBEECK, *Socinianismo confutato*, book I, chapter V, tome I, page 67 (who *in the same place*, pages 65-73, discourses at length concerning rightly establishing the State of the Controversy at this point), “that is not contained in the Grammatical, as such, and that is not poured out by the Holy Spirit to the mind of man following upon the Grammatical, but is given to man with the Grammatical or literal sense, so that man might not only know what the letters in the Sacred Books express, but rightly understand, comprehend, and even experience them: this is the Spiritual Sense, distinguished from the Grammatical; and it is called Spiritual, 1. because it is bestowed upon man by the Holy Spirit..., 2. because it is elicited by man in a spiritual way, that is, by a supernatural and spiritual power and habit, bestowed upon man by the Holy Spirit above natural judgment and sense, Matthew 16:17. 3. Because it is a practical sense and understanding, John 6:63.” And so the *Spiritual Sense* here shall be a spiritual and saving Understanding of the Sense of Scripture, for which we require the Illumination of the Spirit. Most satisfactorily the Most Illustrious TRIGLAND in his *Antapologia*, chapter III, page 58a, “In which sense the device shall be neither unsuitable nor pedantic, to distinguish here between the literal sense and the spiritual. For, what the literal sense may be, *that is indicated by the words themselves*; the spiritual, *that in the words is indicated by the Spirit of God*. Because that literal sense the impious, unbelieving, and heretics understand, but this spiritual sense they do not understand; whence it is that they reject the doctrine delivered in Sacred Scripture. And thus it is best understood how the principal doctrine of Scripture concerning the Christ *might be said to be foolishness by the wise of this world*, 1 Corinthians 1:23. For, from this it happens that they understood what this is, *that He was crucified*, that is, that He was fixed to a cross, and died on it; but they do not understand this according to the spiritual sense, that is, that this was delivered by the Spirit of God, because it was necessary on account of men’s sins, so that in this manner there might be a satisfaction for them, and therefore this might result in the glory of God, and in the salvation of men (which, nevertheless, all Sacred Scripture delivers); from this (I

say) it happens that they repudiate that doctrine as vain and foolish.... And so that doctrine is called foolishness by the impious and unbelieving, because even those senses were foolish and altogether harsh to them; and they themselves were so foolish that they were neither able nor willing to understand those senses in a proper manner.” Likewise on page 55*b*, “Natural man is able in some measure to perceive what the Sacred Scripture indicates, when it speaks of matters necessary for salvation; otherwise such a man would not be able to reject them as foolish: nevertheless, distinctly and under that manner in which they are set forth and indicated, as such: such things (perhaps it is to be read, *as they are such*, or, *as spiritual*), as necessary to salvation, he is not able to perceive them, because they are spiritually discerned; and therefore they are foolishness to him. It is necessary, therefore, that the internal light of the Holy Spirit be added, by which a man might take hold, not only of what is indicated Grammatically in the Scripture’s words and modes of speaking; but also might consider and perceive that truth as spiritual and necessary for salvation.” Add WILLIAM AMES’ *Assertiones theologicas de Lumine Naturæ et Gratix*, after *Rescriptionem ad Grevinchovii responsum*, pages 24-29; WITSIUS’ *Practyke des Christendoms*, pages 16-22, and *Geestelyke Printen*, chapters III, VII, X; likewise the exceptional oration of VALENTIN ARNOLD, Theologian of Herborn,¹ on this matter, *Orationem inauguralem de Unico supremi Doctoris Christi, in Ecclesia Vicario, eoque vero docentium aequae ac discentium Doctore*, delivered in 1758. It is also able to be examined in *E. T. Vertoog over het onderscheid der Kennisse van een Wedergeboren en Onwedgeboren Mensch*, *Boekzaal*, April 1761, chapter V, pages 468-478.

Nevertheless, the Ministry of the divine Word, of an Interpreter not savingly illuminated, is not therefore to be rejected, as if he himself be not able rightly to explain the way of salvation to the people. For, 1. a Minister savingly illuminated is never able to be infallibly distinguished from another not thus illuminated. 2. A Minister, furnished with a faith historical, albeit not saving, is able rightly to explain to others the sense of Sacred Scripture, although he himself does not savingly understand it, neither does he look upon the mysteries of salvation with eyes illuminated by saving faith: just as a blind man is able to learn from one seeing a procured description of colors, and of other matters that are the

¹ Valentin Arnold (1712-1793) was a Reformed philosopher and theologian, serving as Professor of Philosophy (1745-1770) and of Theology (1770-1793) at Herborn.

object of sight; which that blind man, just like one seeing, thereafter shall be able to communicate with others, even if that blind man be able to form far less correctly the idea of the matters which he describes, nor be able to dwell with such delight upon those matters by the operation of his own intellect, as another rejoicing in sight: compare VAN DER WAEYEN¹ *en* WITSIUS *tegen de Labadisten*, page 319; and GERARDUS VAN AALST'S² *geestelyke Mengelstoffen*, part I, treatise 5, pages 84-100.

We prove our Anti-Socinian thesis:

α. From the *Blindness of the natural man*, whence one might form a twofold argument, to demonstrate that the Illumination of the Spirit is necessary for a spiritual and saving understanding of Scripture.

First, from a reckoning of the subject of *Scripture* we thus argue: What contains incomprehensible Mysteries, vastly exceeding the capacity of men and only to be discerned spiritually,³ that is not able to be savingly understood by blind and natural man apart from the inward Illumination of the Holy Spirit: But the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments contains Mysteries of this sort. Therefore. The Minor is expressly related in many passages, Matthew 13:11; Romans 16:25, 26; Ephesians 3:8-10. The rationale of the Major is that the *principia/foundations* of nature and reason are not adequate for such Mysteries, 1 Corinthians 2:6-9.

Then, with respect to the thing predicated, *Illumination necessary* for the understanding of Scripture, it is permitted thus to be argued: Whoever is blind in mind and slow and unyielding in heart to believe and obey, he is not able without the illuminating and regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit to understand the Scripture fruitfully, to embrace it in faith, and to yield obedience to it: But man is such; totally natural before regeneration, but partly spiritually after regeneration. The Major is not able to be denied: it is confirmed in Deuteronomy 29:4. The Minor is evident from Ephesians 5:8; Revelation 3:17; Luke 18:34; 24:25. The whole argument is confirmed in 1 Corinthians 2:14: ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται, *but the natural man does not grasp, or does not accept, does not receive, does not admit, τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστὶ, the things of the Spirit of God; for they are*

¹ Johannes van der Waeyen (1639-1701) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian of the Cartesian-Cocceian school. He served as Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Franeker from 1677 to 1701.

² Gerardus van Aalst (1678-1759) was a Dutch Reformed pastor.

³ See 1 Corinthians 2:14.

foolishness to him: καὶ οὐ δύναται γινῶναι, *neither can he know*, that is, those things, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται, *because they are spiritually discerned*, or *neither can he know that they are spiritually discerned*: consult on this passage SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum, opera, tome 3, column 1001*; STEPHEN DE BRAIS'¹ *Lecturas Theologicas de Auxiliis*, after *Analysin Epistolæ ad Romanos, pages 444-505*; BUDDEUS' *Institutiones Theologicæ dogmaticæ, tome I, book I, chapter I, § 49, pages 84-86*: add 2 Corinthians 3:5; 4:4.

β. We argue from those things that are delivered to us in Sacred Scripture concerning the *Illumination of the Spirit*: in which,

1. *It is sought* by the Saints: now that which the faithful earnestly ask for as necessary for them to understand the Scripture and keep it, that ought not to be thought little of and neglected as not necessary: But such is the Grace and Illumination of the Holy Spirit, Psalm 119:18, 27, 33, 34; Ephesians 1:17, 18. JEROME *ad Paulinum, opera, tome I, page 104*, "Uncover, says David, my eyes, and I shall behold wondrous things from thy Law. If such a Prophet admits the darkness of ignorance, with what night of ignorance do you think us, little children and almost sucklings, to be circumscribed? Now, this veil was not only placed on the face of Moses,² but also on the Evangelists and Apostles.... Unless all those things that were written by Him be opened, who has the key of David, who opens and no one shuts, and shuts and no one opens:³ they will opened with no one else unsealing."⁴

2. This Illumination *is promised* by God: if God now specifically *promises* this, that He is going to grant the gifts of His Spirit to His own unto this end, that by His grace and assistance they might be able to know the mind of the Lord in the Scriptures, and then to believe upon Him and obey; therefore, the Grace and Illumination of that Spirit is necessary for these things. For God is not to be thought to have promised anything vain and that we do not need, nor is it esteemed as such by those that receive it; indeed, the very words of the promises sufficiently indicate that this is promised and conferred as altogether necessary for this matter, Isaiah 59:21; John 16:12, 13; Isaiah 54:13 compared with John 6:44, 45.

¹ Stephen de Brais (c. 1630-c. 1677) was a French Reformed Pastor, and Professor of Theology at Saumur (1675-c. 1677).

² See 2 Corinthians 3:13-15.

³ Revelation 3:7.

⁴ See Revelation 5:1-7, 9; 6:1.

3. Also, that Illumination of the Spirit is read in Sacred Scripture to have been graciously *granted*: so that those to whom it has been given to understand and comprehend rightly the Sacred Scripture are said to have done this by the special assistance and grace of God, and of His Spirit, not by their own strength; Psalm 25:9; Luke 24:45, on which place see our AUTHOR'S *Historiam Exaltationis Jesu Christi*, book I, chapter XI, § 12; Acts 16:14; 1 Corinthians 2:10; 2 Corinthians 4:6; 1 John 2:27.

γ. And so, what Scripture attributes to the grace of God and to His Spirit, let us not assign that to human strength, denying the honor owed to God: But the Scripture does thus attribute expressly, 1 Corinthians 12:3; 2 Timothy 2:25; Matthew 13:11.

Consult CALVIN'S *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, book II, chapter II, § 19-25; ARNOLDI'S *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, pages 41, 42, § 5-7; HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, tome I, book I, chapter V, section II, pages 73-78. Add what things GROTIUS on Luke 24:45 cites upon this matter out of JUSTIN *Martyr*, ORIGEN, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*; see also what things EPIPHANIUS has in *Ancorato*, chapter XXVI, *opera*, tome 2, page 31.

On the other side, *Ostorodus* forcefully advocates a bi-membered *Objection*, which he sets forth by way of a twofold dilemma: If man without the internal Illumination of the Spirit is not able to understand the Scripture in such a way that he might thence draw salutary fruit, the reason and fault for this matter would either be in the Scripture or in men.

1. If the fault inhere in the *Scripture*, either it is too obscure and not written intelligibly; or it must be said that what is contained in Scripture is not the Word of God, and therefore it is not able to work in us faith or obedience. But the contrary is evident concerning the Scripture: in Psalm 119:105; 2 Peter 1:19; etc., it is called a *light*, etc. Also, the whole is *θεόπνευστος*/*inspired*, 2 Timothy 3:16; and so it also has the power of engendering faith, Jeremiah 23:29; James 1:18, 21; etc.

2. If the fault be in *man*, either he was thus created by God, so that by nature he is not able to understand divine things, even if they be externally revealed to him; or his nature was bound afterwards to contract such corruption that now at length he is unfit for the understanding of spiritual things. We are unwilling that this fault should adhere to man by creation: but our opponent does not concede that the

nature of man was thereafter corrupted.

Response 1: α. We concede that the Scripture is Perspicuous *subjectively*: but the internal Light of the Scripture does not give sight to the man reading the Scripture: as the light of the sun does not bestow eyes to the blind. β. The Power of regeneration, illumination, and conversion ascribed to Scripture, by the corruption of man does not belong to it unless joined with the grace of the Spirit, 2 Corinthians 2:15.

Response 2: We acknowledge that the whole man is created: but that man and his faculties are not vitiated through corruption, and that the powers of understanding and judging in him rightly extend themselves to spiritual things even to the present day, as formerly in the state of Integrity, is begging the question and an altogether false **πρῶτον ψεῦδος**, *fundamental error*, the contrary of which is to be taught against the *Pelagians* and *those Pelagianizing* in *Chapter 15*; neither is anything clearer able to be desired than what we heard from Paul, 1 Corinthians 2:14.

Now, it is not to be excepted against the distinction between *Subjective* and *Objective Perspicuity*, that *patibiles/Passible* qualities describe a relation to the object, which *patitur, is experienced*, and is affected through them: Perspicuity is a passible quality; Therefore, it describes a Relation. If, therefore, Perspicuity belongs to the Scripture, that is not only Subjective, but also Objective.

Response 1: That altogether requires the Object, but a fit Object: just as the light of the sun is perspicuous, but only to those rightly using the sense of sight; neither does its light penetrate into a room, except after the opening of the windows: so also the Perspicuity of Scripture requires a man, whose soul is illuminated by the Holy Spirit.

Response 2: Although the Perspicuity of the Scripture describes a relation to the intellect of man, it is none the less, even principally, its absolute state: not otherwise than a lamp and the sun, although they give light to and shine upon men, bear light in themselves, whereby they are able to illuminate the eyes of men.

§ 25: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 2

We shall now prove the Subjective Perspicuity of the Scripture against the *Papists* in the sense in which that was declared in the *preceding* §. For *Bellarmino*, when he takes up this controversy against us, *book III de Verbo Dei, chapters I, II, Controversiis, tome I, column 159 and following*, set forth the state of the Question in a less useful manner, saying that it is asked: *Are the Sacred Scriptures of themselves altogether easy and open, or do they require interpretation?* And he maintains that this is the opinion of the Protestants, that the Scriptures are of themselves altogether easy and open, so that they do not require interpretation.

But we contend that, although Scripture treats of Matters sublime and obscure, it nevertheless treats of Matters necessary to be believed and to be done for salvation in a very Perspicuous manner, if not everywhere, at least in many places; so that even Laymen, with the Illumination of the Holy Spirit mediating, are able to read it with profit and to understand it savingly: but that, because of the blindness of men and the gravity of the matters related in the Scriptures, and also the difficulty of the manner of delivery in many places, the Interpretation of Scripture is practically established, so that what things are clear might be understood more perfectly, and what things are obscure might be understood to some extent, which interpretation, nevertheless, is to be sought again from the Scripture itself, according to 2 Peter 1:20.

We prove this opinion:

1. *From most obvious testimonies*, in which the Scripture itself affirms its own Perspicuity. Now, what the Scripture testifies concerning itself is true, because it is the testimony of God Himself speaking in the Scripture. But Scripture testifies that it is Perspicuous:

α. In the Old Testament, Deuteronomy 30:11-14. And indeed, what *word was not before Israel as marvelous and hidden*, in such a way that it was permitted only to marvel at it, but not to comprehend it, and what was *not far off, but very near, to do it*; this word is to be called Perspicuous: which is established both immediately and naturally from the very words, and from the scope of Moses, who by this his word wants to withdraw from the Israelites all pretext for Ignorance of the divine Word, after the revelation of the covenant Law given to the

Israelites through his own ministry; above other peoples left in their natural ignorance. But without Perspicuity sufficient for a saving understanding, that Word, considering the sound only and not the sense, had been so little advantageous to have that the pretext of ignorance had not at all been removed.

Neither *is it to be Excepted* with Bellarmine, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter II, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 164, that, *a.* Moses speaks concerning the ease of fulfilling the Law; since he is removing the pretext, not for Impotence, but for Ignorance; the ease of fulfilling the Law, to be understood only in a sound sense, supposes the ease of understanding its commandments, which is primarily treated here, and without which commandments are not able to be fulfilled.

They Except that, *b.* the understanding of the *Scriptures* is not treated, but only of the *precepts of the Decalogue* and the like, which are natural, and had been perspicuously declared to the Hebrews by Moses.

Responses: 1. There is no restriction here to the moral or natural Law, which was not hidden or far from the Gentiles either; but Moses speaks of the entire Covenant Precept in the written book of the Law, under which Evangelical promises are also comprehended. 2. Even if from this passage the Perspicuity of the Law alone, as the rule of things to be done, was established, from other passages a similar Perspicuity of the Gospel is no less validly proven.

β. For the Scripture testifies no less in the New Testament that it is Perspicuous, and indeed in relation to the Gospel, 2 Corinthians 4:2-4, in which the *Gospel* and its *truth* are said φανεροῦν, *to manifest, themselves to every conscience of men, and to be hidden only from ἀπολλυμένοις, those that are perishing, through the intervening blindness of the god of this age.* So, unless impediments intervene on the part of men, the *Gospel* is φανερόν/*manifest, ἀποκαλυμμένον/open, and Perspicuous, no less than the Mosaic Word is declared to be, Deuteronomy 30.*

Again, *it is not to be Excepted* with Bellarmine, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter II, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 166, that this is a discussion, *not of the understanding of the Scriptures, but of knowledge and faith upon Christ, which the Apostles were preaching.* For it is treated directly of the Gospel and its preaching, from which knowledge and faith upon Christ are drawn, unto which the Perspicuity of the Gospel contributes much.

2. We appeal to the *Similitudes of Light and Lamp, under which the Scripture comes with simplicity; with a reason added from the instruction and*

illumination of the simple themselves, which supposes an innate light. And so what Scripture is formally and at the same time effectively, shining and bright, that is Perspicuous. But such is the Sacred Scripture. Therefore. The Proving of the Minor is easy: the Scripture is *formally* shining, for it is a *Light, Lamp*, Psalm 119:105; Proverbs 6:23; no less *effectively*, because *it illuminates the eyes and gives wisdom* to those that are *simple*, Psalm 19:7, 8; 119:130: it is a *Lamp shining in a dark place*, 2 Peter 1:19, on which *passage* see *Commentarium meum*.

Bellarmino takes exception, book III de Verbo Dei, chapter II, Controversiis, tome I, column 165, that, a. in these passages sought out of Psalm 19; 119, and Proverbs 6, the entirety of Scripture is not treated, but only the dominical precepts. b. Or all Scriptures are indeed treated, but the Scriptures are said to be shining, indeed, a light and lamp, both here and in 2 Peter 1, not because they are easily understood, but because, when they are understood, they illuminate the mind.

Responses: a. Under the name of Law and Precept in the passages cited, as in a great many places, the entire Word of God without restriction is indicated, which the effects of conversion, rejoicing, etc., sufficiently indicate. b. Nothing is more silly than the other Exception: for it is the same as if I should say that the Scripture does not illuminate unless it illuminates; for whereby it is understood, by the very same it illuminates. But Scripture, as a light truly illuminating, shines by its own light, casts itself upon the eyes, and makes it so that we might see and understand; compare Psalm 119:98, 104, 130.

3. *Many Reasons for the Perspicuity of Scripture are added, α. from the efficient cause or the Divine Author, the Father of Lights,¹ wisest and highest, who is indeed able and willing to speak clearly; neither is this able to be said, that He is not able or not willing, without injury to His wisdom and goodness. β. From the matter, or the sufficiently perspicuous summary of both parts, the Law and the Gospel, John 3:16; Matthew 22:37-39; and elsewhere. But what is perspicuous in the doctrine of the Law and Gospel, that is perspicuous in necessary dogmas. But... Therefore. But we maintain no more than this. γ. From the goal of omnimodal instruction and Canonical use, Romans 15:4; 2 Timothy 3:15-17; but that goal is not able to be obtained without sufficient Perspicuity. δ. From the persons for whom the Scripture was designed, all Christians, even the immature, Psalm 19:7; 119:130; 2 Timothy 3:15; 1 Peter 2:2, etc.;*

¹ James 1:17.

Habakkuk 2:2, כְּתוּב הָזוֹן וּבְאֵר עַל-הַלְקוֹת לְמַעַן יִרְוץ קוֹרֵא בּוֹ: *write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it*, upon which passage see the *Commentarium* of our AUTHOR.

This Perspicuity of Sacred Scripture was already of old asserted by the Fathers; see LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Euangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 4, pages 139, 140.

§ 26: The Perspicuity of Scripture, Part 3

Following the ancient *Gnostics*; see IRENÆUS' book II *Contra Hæreses*, chapters XXVI, XXVII, pages 154, 155, together with MASSUET'S *Dissertatione prævia III in Irenæum*, article 2, pages CXI, CXII; our AUTHOR'S *Orationem II* after *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*, page 425, 426; and the ἀλληγορομανοῦντας/*allegorizing Origenists*; see DANÆUS' *ad Augustinum de Hæresibus*, chapter XLIII, number 8, page 964b: today there are both the *Enthusiasts*, see below § 30, 32, and especially the *Papists*, who claim that *it is to be acknowledged necessarily that the Scriptures are most obscure*, both with respect to Substance and with respect to the manner of delivery; *since they relate the highest mysteries, etc., prophecies concerning future things, etc.*; and if you consider the manner of speaking, *innumerable reasons for difficulty are found, etc.*, whence it happens that even *Scripture itself presents testimony concerning its difficulty and obscurity*; as it is in *Bellarmino's book III de Verbo Dei*, chapter I, column 159, 162.

Our AUTHOR most satisfactorily uncovers the *Scope/Goal* of the *Papists*; that is, of course, *that they might turn the common people from Reading, assert the necessity of Traditions, and subject all to the interpretation of the Church.*

Now, *Bellarmino* argues against us in this way:

1. Concerning the difficulty and obscurity of whatever the Scripture presents testimony, that is difficult and obscure. But the Scripture presents testimony concerning its own difficulty and obscurity. Therefore. But let us see what proofs of the Minor he adduces.

α. He says in *columns* 159, 160, David asks that *his eyes be uncovered*, Psalm 119:18; but David was so great a Prophet: therefore, with what a night of ignorance are others beset?

Response: This is *ignoratio elenchi*.¹ We do not ask concerning the blindness of the man that reads Scripture, but of the Perspicuity or obscurity of the Scripture read. The ignorance and slowness of man in

¹ *Ignoratio elenchi*, sometimes called the fallacy of the irrelevant conclusion or thesis, is the presentation of an argument that does not address the question at hand.

understanding the Scriptures no more removes their Perspicuity, than does the blindness of man the light of the sun; the sun is not to be said to be obscure because the blind man does not see. And so the Subjective Perspicuity of Scripture is easily able to consist with the necessary, internal Illumination of man, that the Scripture might also be made objectively perspicuous to him.

β. *Bellarmino* in column 160 took another proof from 2 Peter 3:16, in which Peter testifies concerning the *Epistles of Paul* that *in them are certain things difficult to understand, which the unstable and unlearned pervert*.

Response: In this way nothing is proven against us: for, 1. Peter speaks concerning matters delivered in Scripture, not concerning the manner of delivery, which we especially intend when we call the Scripture Perspicuous. Now, Peter says, ἐν οἷς, *in which*, which is not able to be referred to the preceding ἐπιστολαῖς/*Epistles*, but ought to be referred to the immediately preceding περὶ τούτων, *of these things*, and has regard to the matters contained in Paul's Epistles.¹ 2. If mention now be made of the Epistles themselves and the manner of delivery, it would be only a particular proof, from which the obscurity of the whole Scripture could not at all be concluded. For far more Biblical Books are given than the Epistles of Paul and Peter. Neither are those Epistles said to be obscure in their entirety, but only certain things in them, *τινα*. Now, it is sufficient for us, if the matters *necessary for salvation* be perspicuously related in Scripture: neither does it hinder that in some places they are set forth more obscurely, if only elsewhere they be found more clearly expressed. 3. And the Apostle does not say that all, even the faithful and illuminated, pervert these *τινα* because of their obscurity: but ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν, *these things the unlearned and unstable wrest*. Now, they are ἀμαθεῖς, not simply *unlearned, those that have not yet learned*; but also *unteachable*, those that are neither willing nor able to learn and be educated, unto which signification *Henricus Stephanus* cites a passage out of *PLATO'S de Legibus, book III*: now, they are ἀστήρικτοι that are turned about with every

¹ 2 Peter 3:16: "As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood (ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς [feminine], λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων [neuter]· ἐν οἷς [neuter] ἔστι δυσνόητά τινα), which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction."

wind of doctrine.¹ It is not strange that men of this sort wrest the Scriptures, although plain and perspicuous. These are said στρεβλοῦν, *to wrest*, not only those things difficult to understand, but these things ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς, *as also the other scriptures*, so that the fault is to be attributed, not to the Scriptures, but to these men. Finally, 4. Some things are δυσνόητα, *hard to grasp*, yet the sense of which one may search out with the application of effort; other things are ἀνόητα, *beyond understanding*, in which the obscurity is completely invincible.

2. Then *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter I, columns 162, 163, sets forth examples of many Passages, in which there is the greatest difficulty, generally arguing in this way: What both in substance and in manner of expression is obscure and difficult, that is such in itself. The Sacred Scripture both in substance and in manner of expression is obscure and difficult. Therefore. He proves the Minor; *concerning substance*, by the example of *sublime mysteries*, or of *prophecies concerning events which were going to happen only long afterwards*. With respect to *the manner of expression*, he appeals to Passages in which he wishes to be observed either the *ambiguity of the words*, for example, in John 8:25, when Jesus says, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, which the Vulgate renders, *The Beginning, who also speak to you*: or the *imperfection of the speech*, for example, in Romans 5:12 and following, where he notes that *in the entire sentence there is not a main verb*: or *conflict*, of which sort of passages there are *many, which at first glance appear contrary*, for example, Exodus 20:5 and Ezekiel 18:20: or *impropriety*, in which *tropes, allegories, hyperbata*,² *ironies, figures of this sort without number*: or *changed order*, as when you compare Genesis 10:31 with Genesis 11:1.

But *I respond* that in this argumentation the fallacy *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*³ is admitted. What is everywhere and in all cases difficult and obscure, that is simply such: but what is only in some places and in certain cases difficult and obscure, that is deservedly judged difficult and obscure in accordance with those. In the former sense, the Minor with respect to Scripture is false. By the latter nothing is concluded against us, who, 1. acknowledge obscurity in matters of substance, and indeed in some matters more than others; but at the same time we assert Perspicuity in the manner of setting those same matters

¹ See Ephesians 4:14.

² That is, inversions of normal word order.

³ *A dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter* is the fallacy of arguing from a qualified statement to an unqualified one, from a particular to a general.

forth: 2. we admit that the degree of Perspicuity is not everywhere the same, but we assert that the more obscure things are made known in other, more perspicacious Passages.

And so the Proofs of the Minor are also faulty in both members, as they proceed from pure particulars.

Some mysteries and prophecies are obscure: Therefore, all things in Scripture are obscure.

Some forms of speech in Scripture are obscure: Therefore, all expression in Scripture is obscure.

But our AUTHOR rightly observes, the Perspicuity of Scripture notwithstanding, "God with good reason willed that there be certain examples of Obscurity in the Scripture, for the manifestation of His own wisdom, the distinction of gifts, esteem for the word, the ruin of unbelievers, our humiliation, the exercise of faith, and diligence in reading and prayer."

3. To the *Objection* sought from various *Reasons*, our AUTHOR *Responds* with sufficient clarity. With respect to *Reason* δ , sought from the *Necessity of Exposition*, which *Bellarmino* here and there urges in the *chapters cited*, we observe that the Interpretation of Scripture is done, not only because of the obscurity of Scripture in some things, but also, even more so, because of the blindness and slowness of the human intellect, and the ready aversion of the human will to good.

STAPFER defends the Sufficient Perspicuity of Sacred Scripture also against the *Naturalists*, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 136, 140-152, pages 976-980, 982-987.

§ 27: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 1

Finally, Scripture delivers the Substance of Religion *Perfectly* and *Sufficiently*. Bellarmine, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IV, busies himself to prove *That the Scriptures do not so contain all things that they themselves might suffice without other Tradition*; see tome I *Controversiarum*, column 211. On the other hand, we hold the *Perfection* of Scripture, through which that, all by itself, is a total and adequate rule of faith and manners.

For this *Perfection* of Scripture it is not required that it contain *all matters conducted, or all the speeches of the Savior and His Apostles*; we readily acknowledge that many things of this sort are not found in Sacred Scripture: for example, such is the speech of the Savior before the men of Emmaus, Luke 24:27, the many signs performed by Christ and the matters conducted by Him, John 20:30; 21:25.

Neither do we require for this *Perfection* that the Scripture include *whatever temporary or external rites*, the ordering of which is left to the prudence of the Overseers of the Church; and concerning which it is able to be sufficient if the common rule of the Apostle be observed, that *all things be done decently and in order*, 1 Corinthians 14:40.

We are only maintaining this *Perfection* of Scripture, *through which it might contain all things necessary for Salvation, both with respect to Belief, and with respect to Practice*: so that it is not needful to have recourse to some ἄγραφον/*unwritten* Word beyond Scripture, which might supply certain dogmatic and ethical Traditions, which, where Scripture is deficient, are to be held as the rule of faith and manners no less than the Scripture.

Neither do we assert that such an *extensive* or *quantitative* *Perfection* occurs in each part of Scripture or in the individual Books; but in the *whole* Scripture, or taken together as an integral whole.

It is not necessary that all things necessary with respect to Belief or with respect to Practice are read in Scripture *explicitly*, αὐτολεξεῖ, *in express words*, κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν, *according to the things specified*, in so many words; it is sufficient if they be found there either *explicitly*, or *implicitly*, κατ' ἰσοδυναμίαν, *by equivalence* (let allowance be made for the word), κατὰ διάνοιαν, *according to the sense*, κατὰ συνακολούθησιν, *according*

to necessary implication, in such a way that they are able to be deduced from Scripture by legitimate Consequence: for it has been seen in Chapter I, § 29, 30, that such things are virtually contained in Scripture, and that truths drawn from the Scriptures by legitimate Consequences are to be admitted as revealed in it.

This Perfection of Scripture, as thus described, we prove, 1. From a clear passage, Psalm 19:7, תִּנְרַת יְהוָה תְּמִימָה, *the Law of Jehovah is perfect*, in which, α. those various names conjoined in the context, *Law, Testimony, Precepts, Commandment*, etc., in verses 7 and 8, denote the entire doctrine of salvation, and hence the whole Scripture, which delivers that doctrine, which here is set over against *the heavens* and *the expanse*. β. Now, this Law is said to be *Perfect*, not only with a Perfection, *intensive* and *qualitative*, of purity, ἄμωμος, *immaculate*, as the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate* have it, or free from every blemish of error and impurity, and also from any just charge of obscurity and other reproaches: but also a Perfection, *extensive* and *quantitative*, of integrity, by which it has with sufficient *integrity* all necessary parts, and to such an extent that it is Sufficient for the *end* of human salvation, as afterward *in this very passage* this is deduced and demonstrated at length. Not only originally from תָּמַם, *to be complete, to be perfect*, does this signification most aptly agree with the word תְּמִיִּם; but in this sense it is often used also, thus שָׁנָה תְּמִימָה, *a year whole, complete*, Leviticus 25:30;¹ כִּי־יֹם תְּמִיִּם, *about a whole day*, Joshua 10:13; הָאֵלֶּיךָ תְּמִימָה, *the whole rump*, Leviticus 3:9. γ. Now, that Perfection and Sufficiency of the *Law* is to be understood with respect to that Economy, so that, with the remaining Books of the Old and New Testaments added to those that were then extant, the present Perfection of the Scripture is constructed with complete certainty by an argument from the lesser to the greater.

2. From the saving *Fruit*, which it is given to draw from the same, when one may argue thus: What renders us perfect unto salvation, that contains the perfect doctrine of salvation. Sacred Scripture renders us perfect unto salvation. Therefore. The Major rests upon a Logical axiom: No effect exceeds the perfection of its cause: likewise, It is Impossible that a cause be inferior to its effect. But, that

¹ Leviticus 25:30: “And if it be not redeemed within the space of a full year (שָׁנָה תְּמִימָה), then the house that is in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it throughout his generations: it shall not go out in the jubilee.”

the Scripture renders us perfect unto salvation, is indicated by the saving uses of the Scripture often mentioned; of which sort are *the conversion of the soul, the giving of wisdom, the gladdening of the heart*, Psalm 19:7, 8, *saving instruction and the consolation of conscience*, Romans 15:4, *faith upon Christ*, and *eternal life itself*, to be obtained *in the name of Christ*, John 20:30, 31. In which passage, α. John speaks of the many things not written; β. he says that the end of those things that were written is *eternal life* to be acquired *through faith upon Christ*. But if the Scripture be not now Perfectly sufficient for this, that it might be able to lead a man to the obtaining of this end; God would fail of this His end in the inspiration and revelation of His Word: which is absurd. Add that 2 Timothy 3:15-17 is not at all to be overlooked, and the uses mentioned there, and you will be obliged to confess that nothing is wanting that a man could need to obtain salvation, whence the Sufficiency of the Scripture is concluded. *This passage* of Paul shall furnish for us many instances: α. the Sacred Books are able us σοφίσαι, *to make wise*, that is, *to instruct Perfectly* (for one that has been taught in only a slight manner is not able to be called σοφός/*wise*), *to make wise unto salvation through faith upon Christ*; Therefore, they contain the whole doctrine of salvation, and are alone sufficient for man without the addition of another word: for what do we seek beyond that we might be made sharers of salvation, and that the true way leading to salvation might be pointed out to us? β. The Scripture is able *to teach* all necessary truth, *to refute* errors, *to correct* vices, *to instruct in righteousness*, and to such an extent that it is *useful* unto all theoretical and practical uses: Therefore, it is sufficient for salvation. γ. The Scripture is sufficient to render *Men of God*, Prophets, Apostles, Pastors, Perfect in every good work; Therefore, their hearers also.

Upon *this passage* Bellarmine, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter X, columns 242, 243, takes exception: α. Paul does not say ὅλη γραφή, *the whole Scripture*, but πᾶσα γραφή, *all Scripture*: if, therefore, you wish to gather the Sufficiency of Scripture from the uses mentioned here, the same should be attributed to the individual parts of Scripture, while the rest would be superfluous; but we do not attribute Sufficiency to each little book. *Responses*: 1. Πᾶς/*all* is used here, not so much *distributively* concerning the individual parts of Scripture taken separately; but *collectively* concerning the integral whole, or the *whole* Scripture taken together, which is often the signification of the litte word πᾶς, Matthew

2:3;¹ 8:32, 34;² 27:45;³ Acts 2:36;⁴ Ephesians 4:16.⁵ 2. Neither would Bellarmine himself be able to find equally all the uses mentioned here in every little part of Scripture.

He takes exception, β. Paul only says that the Scripture is *ὠφέλιμον/profitable* for all the uses then mentioned: but not every *useful* thing is *sufficient* to obtain a particular end; so food is useful to nourish, yet it is not sufficient for nourishment, unless natural heat be present in man, and all the organs be well disposed. *Responses:* 1. It is not here asked concerning the power of the Scripture upon the soul of man, so that one might report all the uses enumerated by Paul out of the Scripture: unto this end we acknowledge that internal Grace and the omnipotence of the Holy Spirit must be added, which might render a man well-disposed to profit from the saving uses of Scripture, and the nourishment of this spiritual food, if we might make use of the similitude of Bellarmine. 2. But we hold the Scripture at one and the same time to be Perfect and Sufficient in its own class, that is, in its normative use, so that it exhibits all things necessary to know, to believe, and to do; it is able *σοφίσαι, to make wise*, a man unto salvation; it is useful unto the *διδασκαλίαν/teaching* of the true, the *ἔλεγχον/reproving* of the false, the *ἐπανόρθωσιν/correcting* of evil, and the *παιδείαν/inculcating* of the good: but nothing more is required in the rule of faith and manners. Therefore, what is useful, not only unto a certain thing, but universally unto all things, with a complete and adequate usefulness, that truly has *Sufficiency*: it is not therefore an imperfect rule, because the hand of the

¹ Matthew 2:3: “When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all (πᾶσα) Jerusalem with him.”

² Matthew 8:32, 34: “And he said unto them, Go. And when they were come out, they went into the herd of swine: and, behold, the whole (πᾶσα) herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters.... And, behold, the whole (πᾶσα) city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought *him* that he would depart out of their coasts.”

³ Matthew 27:45: “Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all (πᾶσαν) the land unto the ninth hour.”

⁴ Acts 2:36: “Therefore let all (πᾶς) the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.”

⁵ Ephesians 4:16: “From whom the whole (πᾶν) body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.”

architect is required to apply it. 3. The defect, which Bellarmine here pretends, is not able ever to be offset by some ἄγραφον/*unwritten* Word and unwritten Traditions.

3. Add the Canonical and Normative use of Scripture. That is the unique *Canon* and Rule, by which all other things are to be tested (see § 32), which hence according to the nature of the matter does not admit of addition or subtraction. For a measure, to which addition or subtraction is possible, by that very fact is not a rule. Thus FAVORINUS¹ well said: Κανὼν ἐστὶ νόμος ἀπαράβατος, *a canon is an inviolable law*, καὶ μέτρον ἀδιάψευστον, *and an infallible measure*, πᾶσαν πρόσθεσιν καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν μηδαμῶς ἐπιδεχόμενον, *without any addition and subtraction admitted*. Similarly CHRYSOSTOM, *Homily XII, in Epistola ad Philippenses, on chapter III, verse 16, opera, tome II, page 293*, ὁ κανὼν οὔτε πρόσθεσιν οὔτε ἀφαίρεσιν δέχεται, ἐπεὶ τὸ κανὼν εἶναι ἀπόλλυσι, *the Canon admits neither addition nor subtraction, since such would cease to be a Canon*. Therefore, either the Normative use of Scripture is to be denied, or its adequate Perfection and Sufficiency is to be held.

4. If Scripture were imperfect and not quite sufficient, God should not have forbidden all *Addition* or subtraction. On the other hand, to what under penalty of anathema nothing is to be added, nothing subtracted, that is to be called Perfect and Sufficient. But to Sacred Scripture nothing is to be added, nothing subtracted, whether in matters to be known and believed, or in matters to be done. So it is in Deuteronomy 4:2; 12:32. But, α. the *Word* and *Precept*, which Moses taught to Israel, at the divine command was recorded by him in the records of the Pentateuch: whence the Israelites are commanded to observe no other precepts than those which are contained in *the Book of the Law written*, Deuteronomy 28:58; and *the whole Law commanded by Moses* is interchangeable with the *Book of the Law*, Joshua 1:7, 8. β. To this Pentateuch many other Books were thereafter added, but they were written at the divine command; while in the *passages cited* God was expressly forbidding only *human Addition*. And in the remaining Books were written dogmas and precepts not so much new, but rather the Mosaic doctrine was declared in more words for the rising generation of the Church; so that Paul, declaring πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the*

¹ Favorinus of Arelate (c. 80-c. 160) was a Roman rhetorician and philosopher, teacher and writer. Fragments of his works survive in other authors.

whole counsel of God, Acts 20:27, speaks nothing beyond Moses and the Prophets, Acts 26:22: consult DINANT'S *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter V, § 53, pages 843, 844, § 64-73, pages 860-872. In Galatians 1:8, an anathema is declared against anyone evangelizing, not only *against*, but simply *beyond* or *beside* that which was preached, *παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν*, the Vulgate rendering it *præter/beside*.¹ THEOPHYLACT reasons, *Οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐναντία καταγγέλλουσιν, ἀλλὰ κἄν μικρόν τι εὐαγγελίζονται, παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν*, *he did not say that they proclaim opposite things, but even if they preach a little something beside what we preached to you*. Neither is it possible to make a distinction between Additions *corrupting* and *perfecting*: seeing that there is given no Tradition perfecting that which is already Perfect; and all human Addition in matters of faith is corrupting, whence it is simply forbidden *to preach παρ' ὃ, in addition to which*. Finally, John willed that all Addition and subtraction be prohibited with the utmost gravity, Revelation 22:18, 19; this prohibition has regard, *α*. most immediately indeed to the book of Revelation, but equally to the remaining divine Books, which human Addition would corrupt. *β*. In this Chapter, John no less expressly seals the whole Canon than Malachi had sealed the Old Testament; so that, with the Apocalypse added to the remaining Books, the Canon of Scripture, which before was substantially Perfect, was now also circumscriptively Perfect. Therefore, when he forbids *to add* anything to this Book, which was added as the last to complete the Canon, he forbids at the same time to add to or subtract from the whole Canon of Scripture.

The Fathers agreeing with us in this thesis concerning the Perfection of Scripture are set forth by LEYDEKKER, *Veritate Euangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 3, page 138. Indeed, SPANHEIM shows that the Papists themselves sometimes agree, *Exercitatione de Præscriptione in rebus Fidei*, Section V, § 10, *opera*, tome 3, column 1105.

The *Papists* that everywhere hold the contrary, so that from the imperfect condition of Scripture they might show the necessity of Traditions, *Object* with *Bellarmino*, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapters IV, V:

¹ Galatians 1:8: “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you (*παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν*; *præterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis*, in addition to what we have preached to you, in the Vulgate), let him be accursed.”

α. John 20:30; 21:25. *Response*: It is an ignoratio elenchi.¹ In the determination of the state of the Question, I observed that it is not requisite for the Perfection of the Scripture according to our position, that the individual words and deeds of the Lord and His Apostles be commemorated in it; but only those that are necessary to be known and believed by us. Whence it is to be observed that those things that are passed over are not necessary to be known by us for salvation, by comparison with John 20:31; or that they were not substantially different from those that are written; so that those things passed by were also written *κατ' εἶδος*, *in kind*, although not *κατὰ μέρος*, *in the particulars*.

β. What is Perfect and Sufficient neither according to its whole, nor according to its parts, that is in no way Perfect and Sufficient. Sacred Scripture is Perfect and Sufficient neither according to its whole, nor according to its parts. Therefore. They attempt to prove the Minor in this way: The Scripture is not Perfect in the first way, because many Books truly Canonical of the Old and New Testaments have perished. Nor in the second way, because no one Book contains all things, by a comparison with 2 John 12 and 3 John 13; or, if the individual parts were Perfect and Sufficient, then the rest would be superfluous: see *Bellarmino, tome I, Controversiis, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, column 211*.

But we are able to convert the disjunctive Minor into a copulative: because Sacred Scripture is Perfect, both according to its whole with an essential Perfection of the whole; and according to its individual parts, with an integral Perfection of the parts, while the individual parts considered separately have a partial Perfection.

Now, in the proposed Argument the proof of the Minor with respect to the *first member* is false: for no Book truly Canonical has perished, as we saw in § 16; and in the Books surviving to the present day the doctrine of salvation is contained with abundance.

The proof of the *second member* is partly false, because various Books do contain individually all necessary doctrines; partly irrelevant, because Scripture was written not only for Sufficiency of salvation, but also for the greater *ἀσφάλεια*/*certainty* of faith, in comparison with

¹ Ignoratio elenchi, sometimes called the fallacy of the irrelevant conclusion or thesis, is the presentation of an argument that does not address the question at hand.

Philippians 3:1:¹ it is partly an *ignoratio elenchi*, and it does not harm us; for we taught above that for the Perfection of Scripture it is not required that the individual parts have the Perfection of the whole: it suffices, if they have partial Perfection, some greater than others, which, joined together in the end, constitute the whole body of Scripture, perfect with an integral Perfection. For example, as the stomach in the human body does not have the Perfection of the whole, nor is it as perfect as the head; nevertheless, its own partial Perfection is not wanting to it, and together with the remaining parts of the body it contributes to the constitution of the Perfection of the integral whole.

γ. John 16:12: see *Bellarmino, tome I, Controversiis, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter V, column 216*. But our AUTHOR sufficiently enervates this Objection in his Response.

δ. What does not refute heresies, that is not Perfect: but Pelagius, Socinus, Arminius, etc., are not expressly refuted in Scripture. *Response*: It is sufficient that in Scripture is positively taught what is to be believed by us, whence heresies, opposed to the truth of Scripture, are easily refuted by legitimate consequence: since what is straight and true reveals both itself and what is crooked.

ε. To whatever something is ever being added, that is not Perfect: but to Moses the Prophets were added, to the Prophets the Apostles. *Responses*: 1. To what something is ever being added, sometimes that is at last made Perfect; so that at least now after so many additions the Scripture ought to be judged Perfect. 2. The additions were more frequently of new Books, not of substantially new doctrine, which endured, and was by degrees explained more clearly and fully. 3. Of course, revelation has increased by degrees, in keeping with the increasing maturity of the Church, until to the adult Church in the time of the Apostles, and especially of the last of the Apostles, the Canonical Books, joined together into a proper volume now also of adult size, were delivered.

¹ Philippians 3:1: “Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe (ἀσφαλές).”

§ 28: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 2

The *Papists* wish to supplement the feigned Imperfection of the Scriptures by *Traditions*, propagated orally in the Church from the Apostles, which may be Another Principium/Source of our Faith; Traditions not Human and Ecclesiastical, as they say, but *Divine* and *Apostolic*. Thus *Bellarmino*, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter III, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 204: “Therefore, the controversy between us and the heretics consists in two things. The first is that we assert that the entirety of necessary doctrine is not expressly contained in the Scriptures, whether concerning faith or concerning manners: and that hence in addition to the written Word of God the unwritten Word of God is also required, that is, *Divine* and *Apostolic Traditions*. But they teach, etc.”: compare book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter II, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 203. They maintain that this is the Other Principium of Faith, whether more or less preferable, or *worthy to be received with the like affection and reverence of piety*, in things to be believed and things to be done, as they commonly assert with the *Council of Trent*, Session IV, Decree I, page 31b: while *Bellarmino*, in book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter VII, column 225, says: “Some traditions are greater with respect to obligation than some Scriptures, but some are lesser, and some equal.” Consult concerning this argument of PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS his *Historiam Concilii Tridentini*, book II, pages 169-171, 182, 184.

The *πρῶτα ψεῦδη*, *fundamental errors*, of the *Papists* here are the successive Innovations in the Roman Church, or the additions in doctrine, worship, and government, for which they vainly seek support in the written Word.

The *Scope/Goal*: to exalt the authority of the Church, to which this treasury of unwritten Traditions has been committed for keeping; and to seek patronage for their errors and successive innovations.

In which commendation of unwritten Traditions, the *Papists* imitate, α. the *Jews*, who, in addition to the written Law and scrolls of the Prophets, have also their own *Mishnah*, δευτέρωσιw/*Tradition*, or Oral Law, which God is said to have delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai; thence from Moses this was, according to the *Jews*, observed and

successively propagated by oral Tradition, delivered from Moses to Joshua, from Joshua to the Elders, and thus successively; until in the Second Century after the Birth of Christ under the Emperor Antoninus¹ Rabbi Judah flourished, called *Judah haQadosh*² from the holiness of his life, *Judah haNasi*³ from his dignity. At this point, seeing that the Oral Law was consigned to oblivion, he gathered all the scraps on which the Jews had written certain things for the sake of memory; and from these he composed the Mishnah. Which as the text of the Body of the Civil and Canonical Law of the Jews, set forth through aphorisms, the most learned Jews then illustrated and augmented with Commentaries under the name of *Gemara* or Supplement, or Complement; relating in this other part of the Talmud various authors' disputations, more copious explanations of the text of the Mishnah, discussions of diverse opinions, and finally the settlement of the true opinion. Now, the *Gemara* is twofold, that of *Jerusalem*, published by the Palestinian Doctors about the year of our Lord 230, consisting of only one folio volume: and of *Babylon*, written by the Babylonian Doctors, and completed about the year of our Lord 500, consisting of fourteen volumes, which as greater and more excellent surpassed and suppressed the Jerusalem Talmud. Now, that Talmud, which includes the Mishnah and Gemara, the Jews highly esteem, indeed more highly than Sacred Scripture, as can be seen in the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN'S *Philologo Hebræo-mixto*, *Dissertation XII*, § 5, *page* 89, who nevertheless rightly observes that the Talmud does not actually contain the Oral Law delivered to Moses by God, nor is it to be compared with the Word of God, much less to be preferred to it, nor in any way is it to be as highly esteemed as the Jews make it: which he proves by these reasons: 1. Because an Oral Law, beyond the written Mosaic Law, is not given, therefore it is not contained in the Talmud. It is not given; for the written Law is perfect, Psalm 19:7; Deuteronomy 4:2. If to Moses another Law, an Oral Law, had been delivered, he would not have passed over this history in silence, as a thing necessary, concerning a foundation and article of faith, upon which all the Theology of the Jews depends. Entire Sects of the Jews, like the Sadducees, Samaritans, and Karaites, are joined with the Christians in this matter. Neither is anything found in the Talmud that savors of the divine Law. 2. Because in the Talmud many impieties are contained,

¹ Antoninus Pius reigned from 138 to 161.

² קדוש/*qadosh* means *holy*.

³ נשי/*nasi* means *prince*.

and blasphemies against God and the Lord Jesus. 3. Because it often makes determinations contrary to Sacred Scripture, and asserts to be true things plainly contradictory: but truth harmonizes with truth, one divine thing with another. 4. Because it is evident in the almost infinite fables and lies, the many sources of which he indicates: see LEUSDEN'S *Philologum Hebræo-mixtum*, *Dissertations XII-XIV*, in which he discusses the *Talmud*. To which add, α . that it could not have been done without a continuous miracle, that this Law, containing so many minute points, was propagated through so many ages without writing. β . If according to the good pleasure of God this Law ought, not to have been written, but to be orally propagated; who conceded the authority to the Rabbis thereafter to commit this Law to writing contrary to the counsel of God, who had already taken care through so many ages that it be propagated orally? Therefore, by fables of this sort concerning the divine origin of their Traditions the Jews thought to have looked after the glory of their Nation and Law, and to have acquired authority for their Talmudic work. Nevertheless, it will be worth the effort to consult HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, *book II, chapter III, section III, pages 560-564*, in which by thirteen theses he shows the agreement of the Jews and Papists in defense of their Traditions. Indeed, while the Papists pronounce us to be like unto the *Sadducees* on account of our rejection of unwritten Traditions, they prove themselves to be the genuine offspring of the *Pharisees*.

β . In this erroneous hypothesis the *Papists* are also able to some extent to be called the *Imitators* of the *Mohammedans*, who also acknowledge to some extent the divine authority and origin of Sacred Scripture, only bewailing the corrupted Codices of today (see above, § 9); but they add or substitute another principium of faith, namely, the *Koran* (consult *Chapter I:6*): but against the ἀξιπιστία/*trustworthiness* of this Book HOORNBEECK, in his *Summa Controversiarum*, *book III, pages 128-134*, observes, apart from the fact that praises of the *Koran* are found in the book itself ad nauseam, which is not according to the dignity of a serious Writer, much less divine, the following things: 1. Its author, Muhammed, was the most vile of bipeds, a fanatic, a demoniac: consult above in HOORNBEECK'S *Summa Controversiarum*, *book III, pages 113-122*. 2. This book shamelessly contradicts itself about its origin. 3. The truths that it appears to adduce out of the history of the Old Testament, it mutilates and perverts, and no longer holds in a sound sense. 4. The *Koran's* ἀμεθοδεία, *lack of orderliness*, stands against its

divinity. 5. The Mohammedans themselves confess that in the Koran many things are retracted, emended, corrected. 6. This book is in great part mutilated. 7. It has many things contrary to itself. 8. The lies, fables, and figments in the Koran are innumerable. 9. It also has a great many foul, filthy, and wicked things. 10. It incites men to barbarity and cruelty. 11. The doctrine of the Koran is never confirmed by any miracle. 12. If a comparison of the Koran with the Gospel is made, it will appear to be beneath the dignity of the latter to be compared with the former. For a confutation of the θεοπνευστίαν/*inspiration* of the Koran read also what things were written by PETRUS DINANT, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter I, § 50-57, pages 83-97; and by HENDRIK LUSSING Matthysz, *de Necessitate Religionis in genere, et Certitudine Christianæ in specie, vindicata*, part I, dissertation V, chapter IV, pages 581-611, pages 454-482.

γ. Moreover, the *Papists* in the commendation of unwritten Traditions under the pretext of the Imperfection of the written Word imitate a good many *ancient Heretics*, surveyed by our AUTHOR, concerning whom in this regard consult SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, century II, chapter VI, column 648; our AUTHOR, *Oration II* after his *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*, pages 425-427. IRENÆUS, in his *contra Hæreses*, book I, chapter XXV, number 5, page 104, relates concerning the *Carpocratians*:¹ Ἐν δὲ τοῖς συγγράμμασιν αὐτῶν οὕτως ἀναγράφεται, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτως ἐξηγοῦνται, τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντες ἐν μυστηρίῳ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀποστόλοις κατ' ἰδίαν λελαληκέναι, καὶ αὐτοῦς ἀξιῶσαι, τοῖς ἀξίοις καὶ τοῖς πειθομένοις ταῦτα παραδιδόναι, *and in their writings thus it is inscribed, and thus they interpret, declaring that Jesus spoke in a mystery to His disciples, and to His apostles privately, and that they requested permission to hand down these things to the worthy and believing; which things THEODORET cites verbatim out of Irenæus, Hæreticarum fabularum, book I, opera, tome 4, page 197: consult DANÆUS' ad Augustinum de Hæresibus, chapter VII, number 2, at the end. Concerning the Valentinians the same IRENÆUS, in his contra Hæreses, book III, chapter XI, page 192, relates: "But these that follow Valentinus, being, on the other hand, beyond all fear, putting forth their own writings, boast that they possess more Gospels than there really are. Indeed, they have proceeded to such a pitch of*

¹ Carpocrates of Alexandria was the founder of a libertine Gnostic sect in the early second century.

audacity, that what was written recently by them they entitle the Gospel of Truth, although agreeing in nothing with the Gospels of the Apostles, so that there is not even a Gospel among them without blasphemy. For, if what is set forth by them is the Gospel of Truth, but is dissimilar to those that have been delivered to us by the Apostles, those that will be able to learn, as is shown from the Scriptures themselves, that what has been delivered by the Apostles is no longer the Gospel of Truth. But, that the Apostolic Gospels alone are true and reliable, and admit neither an increase nor diminution of the aforesaid number, I have proved by so many and such weighty things.” EPIPHANIUS, *adversus Hæreses, book I, tome 2, heresy XXXI, chapter XXIV, opera, tome 1, page 193*, also relates concerning the *Valentinians*: Τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν οὔσης, ἦν οὔτε Προφῆται ἐκήρυξαν, οὔτε ὁ Κύριος ἐδίδασκεν, οὔτε Ἀπόστολοι παρέδωκαν· ἦν περὶ τῶν ὄλων ἀρχοῦσι πλεῖον τῶν ἄλλων ἐγνωκέναι, ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες, *but such is their thesis, which neither the Prophets proclaimed, nor the Lord taught, nor the Apostles delivered: which they boast in knowing better than all others, having them from things unwritten.* TERTULLIAN has a similar thing, *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, chapter XLIX, pages 221, 222*: Now, the heretic Valentinus introduces many fables.... He also has his own Gospel in addition to these, our Gospels. PHILASTRIUS, *de Hæresibus, chapter LXXXVIII: Especially the Manichæans, Gnostics, Nicolaitans,¹ Valentinians, and how many others, who, having apocryphal works of the Prophets and Apostles, that is, different Acts, think little of reading the Canonical Scriptures.* Concerning this matter, JAKOB ELSNER explains and refutes the opinion of the contemporary Greek Church, *nieuwste Beschzyving van de Grieksche Christenen in Turkyen, chapter V, § 6-14, pages 164-174.*

We ourselves allow: 1. that the language of *Tradition* is used many times in Sacred Scripture, in which *to deliver*² is often used in the place of *to teach*, with relation also to written truths, Acts 6:14, in which sense also CYPRIAN said, *Epistle LXXIV ad Pompejum, opera, page 315*, “If it is taught in the Gospel, or is found in the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles, let this be heeded as divine and holy *tradition*.” 2. The Oral propagation of written Doctrine, through the ministry of the Word also:

¹ Although the Nicolaitans are mentioned by the early Church Fathers, little is known with certainty about them beyond what is mentioned in John’s Apocalypse, that they ate things sacrificed to idols, and committed fornication. See Revelation 2:6, 14, 15.

² Latin: *tradere*.

consult JEWEL *adversus Hardingum*,¹ article XV, *opera*, tome I, page 121.

3. We also allow Traditions *Historical*, which contain the history of matters conducted, and *Ritual*, which treat of rites and ceremonies of free observation, provided they be well-founded; nevertheless, we do not allow the same as infallible or as the principium of faith. 4. Moreover, we allow Traditions both *flowing from the Scripture*, as in the Fathers just so many doctrines are found, not read in words in the Scriptures, but thence derived by legitimate consequence, such as the Son of God is to be called ὁμοούσιος/*homousios*, of the same substance: and *declaring the Origin of Scripture*, which it is the office of the Church to deliver² to us by formal and actual Tradition, concerning which ORIGEN is to be understood, “as he relates that he learned by *Tradition* that the four Gospels were undoubted in the entire Church,” in EUSEBIUS’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book VI, chapter XXV, Μόνα τέσσαρα εἰδέναι Εὐαγγέλια μαρτύρεται, ὧδέ πως γράφων ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων Εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνᾳ ἀναντίρρητᾷ ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *he testifies that he knows only four Gospels, writing as follows: I have learned by tradition concerning the four Gospels, which are the only indisputable ones in the Church of God under heaven.* But concerning Tradition, material and passive, dogmatic or ethical, at this point there is debate between us: whether, with that θεοπνεύστῳ/*inspired* Scripture posited, which we have by Tradition of the ancient Church, certain unwritten Traditions be additionally needful to supplement the defects of Scripture in matters necessary for salvation; and whether Divine and Apostolic Traditions of this sort be granted, which we ought to esteem with a veneration equal to that of the written Word? This we deny against the *Papists*:

1. *On account of the Perfection of the Scripture just now demonstrated*, § 27, and,
2. *On account of the Prohibition of all Addition, as we saw there.*
3. *On account of express rejections of Traditions*, Isaiah 29:13, 14; Matthew 5:21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34, 43, 44; 15:2, 3, 6, 9; Colossians 2:22, in which *in the very subject matter* are condemned *indeed Pharisaic and*

¹ John Jewel (1522-1571) was an English churchman, living through the tumultuous times of the English Reformation. He suffered exile under Mary, but returned and was installed as Bishop of Salisbury under Elizabeth. Jewel became a literary defender of the Elizabethan settlement, engaging Roman Catholic opponents (such as Thomas Harding) and Puritans.

² Latin: *tradere*.

Heretical Traditions; but nevertheless not so much as such, or as all contrary to the written Word, as indeed under the general category of human Traditions, whence ἐθέλωθησκειά/will-worship, Colossians 2:23, which always displeases God, and which sort of Traditions always render the commandment of God void, vain, α. which is on record concerning not adding, Deuteronomy 4:2 and elsewhere, as we saw in § 27; β. and which claims the Dominical glory for God alone, Ezekiel 20:18, 19; γ. and all the rest, from the observance of which men are all the more led away by addition: indeed, with Law multiplied transgression is wont to be multiplied. And the similarity of the Traditions of the Roman Church with the Traditions of the Pharisees and Heretics, which in the cited passages are primarily condemned, is easily able to be shown; as it is done by our AUTHOR in Oratione II after Exercitationes Miscellaneas, page 425, 422, 423, etc.

4. *On account of the Traditions themselves.*

α. In general, a. their Uncertain Origin; which the Papists do not remove by their Rules for discrimination, which are equally uncertain. Indeed, Bellarmine, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter IX, Controversiis, tome I, column 234-237, sets forth five rules, by which it is given to arrive at the recognition of true and Apostolic Traditions, as he says; for example, when the universal Church embraces as a doctrine of faith anything that is not found in the divine books, it is necessary to say that it is had from the Tradition of the Apostles; because the universal Church, judging something to be of the faith, is not able to err, but has these things which are of the faith from the Prophets and Apostles: and so on. But all those Rules for discrimination are in the end brought back to the testimony and authority of the Church; but it is this very authority that comes into controversy: consult CLOPPENBURG'S Disputationem octavam de Canone Theologiæ, opera, tome 2, pages 50, 51. b. And the necessary proving of all Traditions by the Scriptures, 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1; for how might the faithful prove all things and the Spirits, except by the prescribed examination of the same by the Scripture, unto which as the sole norm of faith we are everywhere sent, Luke 16:29; John 5:39; Acts 17:11; 2 Peter 1:19, etc.

β. And in particular the Papistical Traditions', a. battle with the Scripture, when, for example, is delivered the local Descent of Christ into Hell, Purgatory, the propiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, etc.: see below in Chapter XXI:14; XXIV:9, 10; XXXI:26, 27: b. uncertainty, according to their own rules not agreeing with them; when they urge the universal consent of the Church in embracing a Tradition, the universal observance of that Tradition by all the Learned in the past; the testimony

of all the Doctors of the Church agreeing that something has come down from Apostolic Tradition; etc.: *c. or declaration made in the Scriptures*, as the matter is concerning the Trinity, see *Chapter V:13*, etc.; Pædobaptism, which *Bellarmino* himself, *libro de Baptismo, chapter VIII, tome 3, Controversiis, columns 315-317*, proves out of Scripture, see *Chapter XXX:17, 18*; the number of the Sacraments, at least enumerated, by comparison with 1 John 5:6, 8, see *Chapter XXIX:28*; the admission of women to the Sacred Assembly, by comparison with Acts 2:42; 1 Corinthians 11:28; the translation of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day, by comparison with Revelation 1:10; 1 Corinthians 16:2; Colossians 2:16, 17, see *Chapter XII:16*: hence in these matters there is no need to have recourse to ἄγραφον/*unwritten* Tradition, as another principium and infallible foundation of the faith.

The Fathers ὁμοψήφους/*agreeing* with us in rejecting unwritten doctrinal Traditions, LEYDEKKER cites in *Veritate Evangelica triumphante, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 6, pages 142, 143*.

§ 29: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 3

The Papists object against us, 1. What at any time has obtained in the Church, the same is also able to obtain now. But Traditions obtained in the Ancient Church before and after Moses, outside of Israel and in Israel, with Passages and example proving this: see *Bellarmino, tome I Controversiis, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, columns 209 and following.*

Responses: α. The consequence is to be denied, since the divine Economy actually varies in the diverse ages of the Church. In § 3, 4, we saw that before Moses only the ἄγραφον/*unwritten* Word obtained; from Moses to the sealing of the Canon, the ἄγραφον/*unwritten* and ἔγγραφον/*written* at the same time, yet in such a way that all doctrinal Traditions were obliged to be examined by Moses and the Canonical Books previously written, Isaiah 8:20; Acts 17:11; after the full sealing of the Canon, now we have only the ἔγγραφον/*written* Word.

β. They attempt to prove the Minor:

a. *From Passages, Exodus 13:8; Psalm 44:1.* But there it is manifest that regard is had to things comprehended in Scripture, which out of those parents were obliged to inculcate in their children, and to explain the Word itself. The case is not improved by Deuteronomy 32:7, in which it is treated, not so much of doctrinal matters and the heads of faith, but of the remembrance of past divine beneficence; both ancient, which certainly was to be repeated from the Scriptures; and more recent, which privy witnesses esteem to be entrusted to themselves for the glory of God and the salvation of their children, so that thus those might understand as fully as possible the continuous paternal acts of God for them, and hence their own altogether insane and indecent foolishness in their evil deeds. But we do not proscribe all Historical Tradition, as was already mentioned above.

b. Moreover, they seek proof from *Heads* not read in the Old Testament *concerning the Divinity of the Scriptures, the Remedy of Original Sin in Girls and Boys dying before the eighth day, and the spiritual Signification of Sacrifices, etc.* *Response:* We do not admit this proof: while, 1. the Scripture of Moses and the Prophets abundantly teaches that it is the Word of God and Canon of faith, and marks its books with

those criteria, so that they might be able to be recognized and received as divine; compare § 6 above and *Commentarium meum in 2 Peter* 1:21. 2. The Remedy of Original Sin both for boys and for girls is only the blood and Spirit of Christ purging from all sin, Isaiah 53:5; Ezekiel 36:25-27, of which Circumcision was merely the seal, Romans 4:11, which indeed was administered only to boys, as alone capable of receiving it; at the same time the advantage of this rite also had regard to women, which were held as circumcised in the men, by comparison with 1 Corinthians 7:14: and hence they were also admitted to eat the Passover before uncircumcised men, consult *Chapter XXIX*:11, 22 below, whence Israelite women, no less than the men, were opposed to the uncircumcised, Genesis 34:14. But, since Circumcision was not effectual to remove Original Sin, but only to signify and seal its removal by the blood and Spirit of Messiah; neither were the males, dying before the eighth day, lacking the Remedy, which supplies the want of Circumcision. 3. The very nature of the Sacrifices was teaching that this worship of itself was not able to please God; an oral explanation of the ceremonial commandments was added, and also the prophetic promise of the antitypical Sacrifice of Messiah. 4. And no one would deny that the Scripture is now more perfect, if not in substance, at least in accidents, in degree of clarity and abundance, than formerly in Israel; while, 5. outside of Israel, after Moses, under the Old Testament, we discern no Church, Psalm 147:19, 20; Acts 14:16.

They object, 2. What Scripture commends as the rule of faith, and unto the observation of which it obliges the faithful, that is to be held in reverence and as the Word of God: But *Scripture commends* and wills *Traditions* to be observed. Therefore. They fetch Proof of the Minor from 1 Corinthians 11:2, 23, 24; 1 Timothy 6:20; 2 Timothy 1:13; 2:2; and especially 2 Thessalonians 2:15: see *Bellarmino, tome I Controversiis, book IV de Verbo Dei, chapter IV, columns 216-220.*

I respond: *α.* in general, *a.* the language of *Tradition* is ὁμώνυμος/*homonymous*; it is used in Scripture concerning doctrine both written, Acts 6:14; 1 Corinthians 15:3, and unwritten, Luke 1:2. Therefore, when mention is made of *Tradition*, it is not immediately to be concluded that it treats of unwritten Tradition, since the consequence does not proceed from the general to the specific. *b.* Although in some passages unwritten Tradition is treated, this does not help the Papistical cause, partly because the Apostles delivered doctrine and necessary rites first with the living voice, afterwards in writing, 1 Corinthians 11:23; 1

Thessalonians 4:2; partly because no more than the ancient heretics are they able to teach that their Traditions are indicated in these passages.

β. In particular, with respect to the *passages cited*, in 1 Corinthians 11:2, 23, 24, is treated both doctrine, *verse 23*, etc., and rites, *verses 2 and following*. The former, described in the words of Christ, is subjoined. The latter are furnished in the words of the Apostle, both specifically insofar as he declares what he wills to be observed concerning Prayer and the Lord's Supper; and generally insofar as He commands that *all things be done decently and in order* in the Church, 1 Corinthians 14:40. For it was not necessary to prescribe all rites individually, inasmuch as they vary according to the circumstance of places, times, and persons. And of this sort were those things that Paul promises that he is going to set in order in person, 1 Corinthians 11:34, as the expression and circumstances show. But not at all are understood doctrines concerning the sacrament of the altar, concerning the matter and form of the other sacraments: for Paul delivered that which he had received from the Lord; but the burden of proof rests upon the one asserting that the Apostle had received these things from the Lord.

In 1 Timothy 6:20;¹ 2 Timothy 1:13;² 2:2, *a.* under the language of παρακαταθήκης/*trust* is treated either the flock, or the gifts of the Spirit: or under this language and expression of ὑποτυπώσεως ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων, *the form of sound words*, at one and the same time is treated sound doctrine, which Paul had taught Timothy out of the Scriptures, by comparison with Acts 26:22, and which he was also setting forth in his written Epistles. *b.* In 2 Timothy 2:2, Paul does indeed will that Timothy παρατιθέναι/*commit* the things heard from the Apostle to faithful men as a deposit of great worth, hence to be kept with the greatest care; but he thus speaks of oral Tradition of doctrine already written, which from the Scriptures of the Old Testament Timothy had known from boyhood, 2 Timothy 3:15, and which he had heard Paul delivering according to the Scriptures, 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4, and which has been declared at greater length by the Evangelists and Apostles in the writings of the New Testament for the use of the Church. Paul does not will these things παρατίθεσθαι πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *to be committed to*

¹ 1 Timothy 6:20: “Ο Timothy, keep the trust (τὴν παρακαταθήκην), avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called...”

² 2 Timothy 1:13: “Hold fast the form of sound words (ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων), which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.”

faithful men, through anonymous insinuation of arcane doctrine, but through public preaching and testimony: which would be all the clearer, if in the place of διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, *among many witnesses*, we read ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν, *the things that thou hast heard of me in many* (as opposed to δι' ὀλίγων, *in few words, briefly*, 1 Peter 5:12), in many words, sermons frequently repeated, μαρτύρων ταῦτα παράθου, etc., *testifying, deposit or commit these things, etc.*, as NORTON KNATCHBULL, in his *Animadversionibus in Novum Testamentum*,¹ ingeniously explains it, and after him the Reverend HOLTJUS² in a *Concione Belgica ad 2 Timothy 2:1, 2*, which you should see; which HOMBERGK³ also judges to be done *without absurdity*: but which WOLF judges to be *with so little proof* that this reading is actually destitute of all authority.

Finally, the passage in 2 Thessalonians 2:15, in which the Apostle advises, κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις, etc., *hold the traditions, etc.*, does not prove that ἀγράφους/*unwritten* doctrinal Traditions are allowed: but, 1. παραδόσεις metonymically denotes in general *traditions delivered*, according to the use of this word, and of similar language of *giving, receiving*, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; Virgil, *Eclogue* 1:19:

But, nevertheless, who this God is, give, Tityrus, to us.

The Spirit ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, shall receive of mine, John 16:14, 15,

¹ Norton Knatchbull (1602-1685) was an English scholar; he served in Parliament for the county of Kent and the port of New Romney. He wrote *Animadversiones in Libros Novi Testamenti*, and in its fourth edition it appeared in English, *Annotations upon Some Difficult Texts in All the Books of the New Testament*.

² Nicolaus Holtius (1693-1773) was a student of Marckius and Wesselius, and later served as pastor at Koudekerk. He is remembered for his involvement in the trial of Antonius van der Os, whose doctrine of justification seemed to imply that faith is a meritorious human accomplishment. When Johan van den Honert and Jan Jacob Schultens recommended leniency in the case, Holtius, together with Alexander Comrie, vigorously resisted what they esteemed to be an unwholesome toleration.

³ Johann Friedrich Hombergk zu Vach (1673-1748) was a Professor of Law at Marburg, and later the chancellor of the university. He wrote, not only on legal topics, but also on selected texts of the New Testament (*Parerga Sacra seu observations quaedam ad Novum Testamentum*).

that is, *shall learn*, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς/*anthropopathically*. 2. The little word εἴτε, *whether...or*,¹ does not distinguish matters delivered by Paul, as if he had taught some matters with living voice, and other matters differing in substance in written Epistle. But, *a.* either εἴτε is to be taken conjunctively, as in 1 Corinthians 3:22;² Colossians 1:20;³ *b.* or, if it be taken disjunctively, it has regard to the diversity, not of the material delivered, but of the manner of delivery, with the identity of the matter delivered remaining; as the Apostle set forth the same doctrine of the Holy Supper first in living speech and then in writing to the Corinthians, 1 Corinthians 11:23 and *following*. *c.* If Paul did not set forth the entire doctrine of the Gospel in this Epistle, it does not follow thence that the written doctrine is one thing, and the doctrine delivered orally in the Church another, because the whole doctrine of salvation is homogeneous, Galatians 1:7-9. This only shall be thence evident, that the doctrine of the Gospel is less fully contained in this brief Epistle, which they had been more fully taught by Paul in person, and which the Thessalonians at that time, and we to the present day, find more copiously written elsewhere. As neither the occasion was bearing, nor necessity postulating, that the entire doctrine of the Gospel, to be read in fullness elsewhere, be delivered in every little Epistle. Which is also to be said on 2 John 12 and 3 John 13, if there the speech is concerning necessary doctrines.

They object, 3. Examples of Heads, which are not found in the Scriptures, even of the New Testament: see *Bellarmino*, *tome I Controversiis*, *book IV de Verbo Dei*, *chapter IV*, *columns 213-215*, *chapters VI, VII*, *columns 220-232*. Thus PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS, *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, *book V*, *page 531*, relates, that in the Colloquy at Poissy⁴ Claudius Espencæus,¹ disputing with Beza, shows that many

¹ 2 Thessalonians 2:15: “Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle (εἴτε διὰ λόγου, εἴτε δι’ ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν).”

² 1 Corinthians 3:22: “Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come (εἴτε Παῦλος, εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς, εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος, εἴτε ζωή, εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε ἐνεστώτα, εἴτε μέλλοντα); all are yours...”

³ Colossians 1:20: “And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven (εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).”

⁴ The Colloquy at Poissy (1561) was convened to reconcile the Roman

doctrines gained strength in Traditions alone, for example, that *the Son is consubstantial with the Father*, that *Infants are to be baptized*, that *Mary remained a Virgin even after giving birth*.

Response: I advised before, at the *beginning* of § 27, that we do not demand for the Perfection of Scripture that all things be delivered there *αὐτολεξεῖ*, *in express words*; but it is sufficient if they be *κατ' ἰσοδυναμίαν*, *in equivalence of meaning*, and *κατ' ἀκολούθησιν*, *by consequence*: neither do we require that there be more things delivered there than are necessary to be known and believed for salvation. The Heads that the Papists now enumerate, either, *α.* are delivered in Scripture sufficiently, if not explicitly, at least implicitly, like the *Trinity*, the *Procession of the Spirit from the Son*, *ὁμοουσία/homousia*, *Pædobaptism*, etc.: see *Chapter V:13* and *following*, 2, 5, 10, 21, 22, *Chapter XXX:17*, 18: or, *β.* are less certain and less necessary to believe, like *the perpetual Virginity of Mary after the birth of the Lord*, *the Mixture of the Cup*,² *the Formula of Baptism*, *the origin of the Symbol*, *the observation of Passover*, etc.: consult *Chapters XVIII:11*; *XXXI:6*; *XXX:11*; *III:12*; *XII:16*: or, *γ.* are erroneous doctrines, of which sort are *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *the Invocation of Saints*, which Scripture refutes, and in this manner shows its own Sufficiency; see *Chapter XXXI:19-23*; *Chapter XXXIV:9, 10*; *Chapter XXVI:3*; and more passages, to which our AUTHOR sends the reader.

Apart from the fact that the Papists also labor to prove all these from the Scripture, whence Tradition in these Heads is made less necessary even according to their hypothesis.

They object, 4. several *Reasons*: see *Bellarmino*, *tome I Controversiis*, *book IV de Verbo Dei*, *chapter VIII*, *columns 233, 234*.

α. What is according to the custom of all Nations, that also is according to the custom of the Church: Some Unwritten Law is according to the custom of all Nations. Therefore.

Response: The Major is denied; because, as the Church of God is a peculiar people, Exodus 19:6; 1 Peter 2:9, so it has peculiar customs, Deuteronomy 4:8; Psalm 147:19, 20. A matter of dissimilitude with

Catholic and Protestant churches of France. The differences, however, were too great, and the Colloquy ended inconclusively.

¹ Claude D'Espence (1511-1571) was one of the theologians of the Sorbonne. He was a participant in the Council of Trent.

² In the Roman sacrament of the Mass, water was mingled with the wine. It had a variety of mystical explanations (the mingling of the people of God [represented by the water] with Jesus Christ [represented by the wine], etc.).

respect to Traditions thence also is evident, that the Laws of the Nations are imperfect, but the Law of the Church is perfect, Psalm 19:7, 8; the former often require addition and subtractions, the latter rejects such, Deuteronomy 4:2.

There is nothing to *Bellarmino's* appeal to Jewish Traditions outside of Scripture, since these are expressly and sufficiently condemned in the writtin Word, Matthew 5; 15; etc.

β. If the peculiar Dignity of the Church consists in the possession of the divine Word, certainly unwritten Traditions are granted: for otherwise no prerogative is granted to the Church above that of the heretics, who also read the Written Word.

Response: This is denied: the ambiguous terminology of the *possession* of Scripture ought to be explained. The privilege of the Church above the heretics does not consist in acquaintance with the words of the Scriptures, which also devolves upon devils, James 2:19; Matthew 4:6; but what prerogative is suitable to the Church concerning Scripture is to be restrained to its primary design, the saving understanding of the truths comprehended, and their keeping, genuine explanation, defense, faith, and practice: consult also § 6 above.

γ. What the excellency of many Mysteries requires, that God had not denied to His Church: but the excellency of many Mysteries requires unwritten Traditions: for many are to be left unmentioned and only to be set forth among the perfect, by the example of Christ, Luke 8:10; 1 Corinthians 2:6.

Response: The Minor is denied: The excellency of Mysteries rather requires the public preaching of the same, commanded by Christ, Matthew 10:26, 27, in accordance with the end of the revelation of the same, Romans 16:25, 26; nevertheless, with rules of sobriety applied concerning subject and object, and of prudence concerning manner, Romans 12:3; Hebrews 6:1-3; Romans 6:19. Indeed, Christ did explain the parables to His disciples separately, but for a far different reason, given in Luke 8:10 *to the end*. But in Paul, 1 Corinthians 2:6, there is no distinction between writing and *speaking*, as elsewhere also ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture*, is said λέγειν, *to speak*, Romans 9:17; 4:3, so Paul, while writing, μυστήριον λέγει, *speaks a mystery*, 1 Corinthians 15:51: now, he was speaking, whether with voice or with writing, *wisdom among the perfect*, setting forth such doctrine as is acknowledge as wisdom by the *spiritual*, 1 Corinthians 2:15, especially by those more perfect in knowledge: but this was the entire Evangelical doctrine concerning

Jesus crucified.

How *Bossuet*¹ fights with such weak weapons on behalf of unwritten Traditions, SPANHEIM shows, *Præfatione Speciminis Stricturarum ad Libellum Episcopi Condomiensis, opera, tome 3, part 2, columns 1030, 1031.*

On § 27-29, consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam, tome I, book I, general part I, chapter I, pages 28-73, part II, chapter V, pages 349-394*; WILLIAM WHITAKER'S *de Sacra Scriptura, question VI, opera, tome I, pages 368-416.*

¹ Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) was a Roman Catholic bishop and theologian. He served as the court preacher to Louis XIV of France, and was renowned for his oratorical abilities. His *Exposition de la foi catholique* was an attempt to reunite French Protestants to the Roman Church, by giving a somewhat modified and moderate presentation of Roman dogma.

§ 30: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 4

Again, in another way the *Enthusiasts* wish to supplement the feigned imperfection of Scripture, namely, through *Private Revelations of the Spirit*. Already in his time, THEODORET called the *Messalians* or *Euchites*¹ *Enthusiasts*, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book IV, chapter XI, in which he also explains the reason for the imposition of this name on them: Ἐχουσι δὲ καὶ ἑτέραν προσηγορίαν ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος γενομένην· ἐνθουσιασταὶ γὰρ καλοῦνται, δαίμονός τις ἐνεργείας εἰσδεχόμενοι, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίαν ταύτην ὑπολαμβάνοντες, *they have also another appellation, which arose from their practice: for they are called enthusiast, because they are moved by the impulse of a certain demon, even esteeming that to be the advent of the Holy Ghost*. Which *Enthusiasts* he then further describes: οἱ δὲ τελείαν τὴν νόσον εἰσδεδεγμένοι, ἀποστρέφονται μὴν τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἐργασίαν ὡς πονηράν· ὕπνω δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐκδιδόντες, τὰς τῶν ὀνείρων φαντασίας προφητείας ἀποκαλοῦσι, *men, infected with this plague to its full extent, shun manual labour as vice; and, giving themselves over to sloth, call the fantasies of their dreams prophesies*. Of course, from its origin the Greek word ἐνθουσιαστῆς, *inspired by the divine*, could be used equally in a good sense and in a bad sense, having been derived from the primary element Θεός/*Theos/God*, whence is compounded ἔνθεος/*entheos*, with the preposition ἐν/*in*, that is, *in whom is God, the divine, inspired by God*; from ἔνθεος, ἔνθεος, is ἐνθουσιάζω, *to be urged by a fanatical or divine fury, to be inspired by the divine*; hence ἐνθουσιαστῆς, *inspired by the divine, a fanatic*, and ἐνθουσιασμὸς, ἐνθουσίασις, *inspiration of a fanatical or divine fury, divine instinct or inspiration*. But everywhere, as in

¹ ἱλῆη, *Metsalin, praying people*; or, εὐχήται, *Euchetai, praying people*. Messalianism was a form of eastern, ascetic mysticism; it began to get traction among the eastern churches in the fourth century. The teaching: Union with God, even possession by the Holy Spirit, is to be sought through intense meditation and prayer, fostered by other ascetic disciplines. The importance of the Sacraments was minimized. In some cases, claims were made that the practitioners could see the invisible spiritual world, even the Holy Trinity. This heresy was condemned by the Council of Ephesus (431).

THEODORET, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book IV, chapter XI, and in the argument that we now treat, they are called *Enthusiasts* in the following sense: they falsely boast of and display divine inspirations and extraordinary Revelations of the divine Spirit. Our AUTHOR in his *Compendio Theologiæ* reviews a good number of men of this sort, both of the more ancient and of the more recent age, besides the *Messalians*, of course:

The *Cerinthians*, of whom THEODORET treats in his *Hæreticarum fabularum*, book II, chapter III, *opera*, tome 4, where he relates of Cerinthus: οὗτος ἀποκαλύψει τινὲς ὡς αὐτὸς τεθεαμένος ἐπλάσατο, καὶ ἀπειλῶν τινῶν διδασκαλίας συνέθηκε, *he forged certain revelations, as if he had beheld them, and he framed doctrines of such boasts.*

The *Basilidians*,¹ of whom the same THEODORET treats in his *Hæreticarum fabularum*, book II, chapter IV, *opera*, tome 4, relating concerning Basilides, εἶχε δὲ καὶ προφήτας ὁ Βασιλίδης, Βαρκάβαν καὶ Βαρκῶφ, καὶ ἑτέρους τινὰς παραπλησίως βαρβάρους, *but Basilides also holds them as prophets, Barkabas and Barkoph, and certain others equally barbarous.*² EPIPHANIUS, *Hæresi XXIV*, chapter I, *opera*, tome I, page 69, attributes to Basilides φαντασιώδεις μυθοποιίας, *imaginative fable-making.*

Of the *Severians*³ THEODORET treats in his *Hæreticarum fabularum*, book I, chapter XXI, *opera*, tome 4, οὗτοι καὶ τοῦ θείου Παύλου τὰς ἐπιστολάς, καὶ τῶν πράξεων τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκβάλλουσι, *those cast away both the Epistles of heaven-sent Paul, and the history of Acts.* AUGUSTINE, *de Hæresibus*, chapter XXIV: *The Severians sprung from Severus.... They reject the resurrection of the flesh with the Old Testament. Moreover, he said that a certain girl, Philumena, was divinely inspired to foretell future things, to whom referring the dreams and heat of his own soul, he was wont secretly to be forewarned by her divinations and prognostications, with the same phantom showing himself in the habit of a boy to Philumena, the former appearing as a boy and sometimes claiming to be Christ, sometimes Paul. Consulting with this phantom, she was wont to answer what*

¹ The Basilidians were a second century Egyptian, dualistic Gnostic sect; they were followers of Basilides of Alexandria.

² Basilides claimed to have received his secret tradition, coming down from Noah, through Ham and a succession of eastern wise men.

³ The Severians were Gnostic ascetics. Severus was a disciple and successor of Tatian.

things it would say to those listening to it. Thus in Danæus' *Opusculis* and other editions of the works of Augustine the text is exhibited: nevertheless, whether these things went forth from the hand of Augustine, and whether they pertain to Severus, or rather to Apelles, the *Benedictines* advise that there is reason for doubt, in *de Hæresibus*, chapter XXIV, *opera Augustini*, tome 8, column 7.

Of the *Elcesaites*¹ THEODORET treats in his *Hæreticarum fabularum*, book II, chapter VII, *opera*, tome 4, Ἐπωδαῖς δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων ἐπικλήσεσι καὶ οὗτοι κέχρηται. —ἀστρολογίαὶν δὲ, καὶ μαγικὴν, καὶ μαθηματικὴν ἠσπάζοντο πλάνην, καὶ προγνωστικούς ἐαυτοὺς προσηγόρευον· τὸν δὲ ἀπόστολον παντελῶς ἠρνήθησαν· καὶ βίβλον δὲ τινα συντεθείκασιν, ἣν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔφασαν πεπτωκέναι· ταύτης τὸν ἀκηκοότα ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαμβάνειν παρ' ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐδώρησατο, *But those have consulted the charms and names of dæmons. —And they have embraced deceptive astrology, both magical and mathematical, and called themselves prognosticators: but they have completely denied the apostle: and they have added a certain book, which they have claimed to have fallen from heaven, and that the one harkening to it receives the release of sins beyond that which Christ has given.* JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *de Hæresibus*, *opera*, page 579: "The Elcesaites were deceived by Elces, a false prophet, whose kinswomen Martha and Marthina survive even to the present day, and are esteemed and adored among the number and in the role of goddesses because of foreknowledge."

Of the *Montanists* THEODORET yet treats in his *Hæreticarum fabularum*, book III, chapter II, *opera*, tome 4, αἱ δὲ τῆς Πρισκίλλης καὶ Μαξιμίλλης προφητεῖαι ὑπὲρ τὸ θεῖον εὐαγγέλιον τετίμηνται παρ' αὐτοῖς, *but the prophecies of Priscilla and Maximilla have been revered among them more than the divine gospel.* For more consult EPIPHANIUS discoursing against them, *Hæresi XLVIII*, *opera*, tome I, pages 402-417, where among other things there is in chapter I, Μοντανὸν δὲ τινα Προφήτην ἀύχοῦσιν ἔχειν, καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Μαξιμίλλαν Προφητίδας· οἷς προσέχοντες τὸν νοῦν ἐξετράπησαν, *they boasted of Montanus, a certain Prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla Prophetesses: to whom turning their minds, they were turned out of the way:* and in chapter II, Ἦ γὰρ δεῖξωσιν εἶναι Προφήτας μετὰ Μαξιμίλλαν, ἵνα μὴ

¹ The Elcesaites were a sect of Judaizing Christians in southern Mesopotamia. They may have been related to the Ebionites.

ἀργήση παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένη χάρις· ἢ οἱ περὶ Μαξιμίλλαν ψευδοπροφητῆται εὐρεθήσονται, μετὰ τὸν ὄρον τῶν προφητικῶν χαρισμάτων, τολμήσαντες οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πλάνης δαιμόνων ἐνθουσιασθῆναι, καὶ φαντάσαι τοὺς ἀκούοντας αὐτῶν, *for either they show that there were Prophets after Maximilla, lest the grace mentioned sit idle by them: or those associated with Maximilla shall be found false prophets, having undertaken to be inspired after the time of the prophetic gifts, not by the Holy Spirit, but by the imposture of dæmons, and to beguile those listening to them.*

Concerning all these see our AUTHOR speaking in *Oratione III* after *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*, pages 450-453, while he makes mention of the *Enthusiasts* of the more recent age, pages 443-448. Such are:

The *Schwenckfelders*, who have their name from *Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig*,¹ a noble Silesian,² who, disapproving of something in all sects of Christians, joined himself to none: but he began to spread Enthusiastical errors about the year 1526. Namely, he taught, 1. an Enthusiastical Sabbath, in which men, with all thoughts in their souls renounced and cast out, rest in studied and persevering leisure, so that they might receive heavenly inspiration: which then to them is *σαββατίζειν*, *to keep Sabbath*, spiritually in the soul, in which the mind, withdrawn inwardly upon itself and emptied, from that sleep might dream and belch forth all, and even divine, truth. 2. That God does not make use of the ministry of the Word as a means unto the conversion of man: for God does not effect our salvation through external means. As if something were detracted from the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit and divine grace: see HOORNBECK'S *de Paradoxis et Heterodoxis Weigelianis*,³ pages 75-80; WEISMANN'S⁴ *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, Century XVI, part I, page 1563; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, page 1364.

Many *Anabaptists*: see SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum*,

¹ Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig lived from 1489 to 1561.

² Silesia was a region in south-western Poland.

³ Valentin Weigel (1533-1588) was a German theologian and mystic. He served as a Lutheran pastor at Zschopau, and wrote voluminously. He kept his more radical ideas to himself, and lived peacefully. Contrary to the dogmatic tendency of the age, Weigel believed that internal illumination is superior to all external means of spiritual knowledge.

⁴ Christian Eberhard Weismann (1677-1747) was Professor of Theology at the University of Tubingen.

opera, tome 3, columns 776, 778. Thomas Muntzer¹ was wont to say: What is the Bible, Bubble, Babel? VOGET'S² *de Theologia Pseudo-mystica*, § 11, page 11. But rightly does our AUTHOR say *many Anabaptists*, since the Northern Anabaptists in SPANHEIM'S *Elencho Controversiarum*, *opera*, tome 3, columns 776, 778, refuse to come into the society of Enthusiastical error; as even HERMAN SCHIJN, in his *Historia Mennonitarum*, chapter XI, page 296 and *following*, contends, that the Mennonites always and more than the men of others sects abstained from Enthusiasm and immoderate allegories.

The *David-Jorists*, followers of *David Joris* of Delft,³ who already by the year 1527 spread (but with greater secrecy) wicked and impious doctrines, even concerning himself as the Anointed and Christ of God; those were to be gathered into his *Librum Mirabilium*: see SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum*, *opera*, tome 3, column 775; DANIEL GERDES' *Historiam Reformationis*, Section II, chapter I, § 40, tome 3, pages 116-125; WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XVII, part 2, page 600; HARTNACK'S⁴ *Continuationem Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Micrælii*, part 2, pages 1359-1383; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1371b, 1372a.

The *Paracelsists*, so called after *Theophrastus Paracelsus*, from the region of Zurich, the great restorer of Chemistry,⁵ who in the Sixteenth Century spread from the mysteries of Nature Enthusiastical dreams, concerning the state of Adam, concerning the Origin of Christ, concerning the Resurrection of the dead, and others, in Switzerland and neighboring Alsace, in which he died: see SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum*

¹ Thomas Muntzer (1589-1525) was a German Reformer. Ultimately he opposed not only the Roman Catholic Church, but also the Magisterial Reformation of Luther. After being involved in leadership of a peasants' uprising, he was captured and executed.

² Albertus Voget (1695-1771) was a Dutch Reformed Pastor and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1727-1735), and at Utrecht (1735-1771).

³ David Joris (c. 1501-1556) was a Dutch Anabaptist mystic and leader. Although he spent the last decade of his life in the Reformed Church (under the assumed name, Johann van Brugge), he continued to circulate his peculiar doctrine in writing.

⁴ Daniel Hartnack (1642-1708) was a German Lutheran theologian and schoolmaster.

⁵ Paracelsus (1493-1541) was a Swiss-German philosopher, naturalist, physician, and astrologer. His method was revolutionary, making use of natural observations, rather than ancient texts, in the treatment of disease.

Controversiarum, opera, tome 3, column 775; BUDDEUS' Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1364b-1366a.

The *Weigelians*, having their name from *Valentin Weigel*, from Zschopau, Lutheran Pastor in Meissen, who in the year 1612 became famous for fanatical books: the literal sense of the Word he called useless, was seeking and commending the allegorical, and believed that it was to be learned by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with the schools and academies repudiated: see HOORNBEECK'S worthy tract *de Paradoxis et Heterodoxis Weigelianis*; HARTNACK'S *Continuationem Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Micrælii, part 2, pages 1384-1414*; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1366-1368.*

The *Quakers*, who on account of *George Fox*, the author of their sect, had begun to be known in Britain from the year 1649, hold: "The Holy Spirit always has manifested, and still manifests, Himself in divine and immediate revelations, which ought not to be weighed by Scripture and reason. The Scriptures are not the primary rule of faith and manners, but the internal command of the Spirit:" LAMPE'S *Historia Ecclesiastica, book II, chapter XIV, § 43.* The history of these Quakers, and the grievous vexations, to which they were liable both in Britain, and in Pennsylvania, through so long a space of time, yet clinging pertinaciously to their views, GERARD CROESE'S¹ relates in three books. In order to understand the history and doctrine of the Quakers, it would not at all be displeasing to add WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam, Century XVII, § XIX, part 2, pages 567-598*; likewise BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1376-1377.* Consult also HARTNACK'S *Continuationem Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Micrælii, part 2, article VII, pages 1498-1561*, in which also he relates as the doctrines of the Quakers, and proves out of their own writings: 1. Not only formerly, but even to the present day are given Revelations of the Holy Spirit, immediate and internal, which not only subjectively illuminate the minds of men, but also objectively set forth Theological truths to the mind. 2. By benefit of these the Gentile Philosophers also in their own mind not only perceived the weakness of the faculty of cognition; but were also helped by this light of Revelations, so that they might in turn set up their lives according to the dictates of right reason and be saved. 3. The reading of Sacred Scripture begets faith only as

¹ Gerard Croese (1642-1710) was a Dutch pastor and theologian. He wrote *Historiam Quakerianam.*

applied to fables or parrots: the internal Word of the Spirit alone renders that firm. 4. Therefore, not Sacred Scripture, which requires the testimony of the Holy Spirit to furnish divine faith in it; but that internal Word of the Holy Spirit is the first and primary principium of faith, and so Sacred Scripture is secondary at least. 5. Not the Sacred Scripture, which only teaches general things: but the internal Word of the Spirit is the norm as to what is to be thought concerning this or that question, and is the rule as to what is to be done in this or that case. 6. The Sacred Scripture does not at all pertain to all the faithful, but it is altogether ambiguous in matters of faith; however, the internal Word of the Holy Spirit is common to all, and it frees us from all difficulties. 7. Therefore, for the Interpretation of that, neither the inspection of the original text, nor the consideration of the connection of the parts, and hence neither the study of Languages and arts, accomplishes anything; but those things rather obscure its true sense and complicate things evident. But the safest method of interpretation is the internal light and dictate of the Holy Spirit, who abundantly furnishes all these. With respect to these more recent *Enthusiasts* WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, *Exercitation VI*, § 12, pages 157-159 is also able to be considered. Concerning *Enthusiasm* and *Fanaticism*, and the difference between them, read BUDDEUS' general discussion, *Theologiæ Moralis*, part I, chapter I, section V, § 17-23, pages 176-186.

All the errors hitherto enumerated have at least this in common among them, that, with the Sacred Scriptures contemplated in the vilest manner, to them either they join, or they substitute, the internal Word and Private Revelations of the Spirit, according to which action is to be taken and belief is to be formed. Their *πρῶτα ψεύδη*, *fundamental errors*, are distorted passages of Scripture, which shall be set forth in § 31. The *Scope/Goal* is to defend their shameful doctrines. Against the *Enthusiasts* consult LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Evangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter IV; and especially SPANHEIM *the Elder's Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas, Disputationes theologicas, part II, Disputations XVI-XX*.

For the refutation of these, besides those things that were said above concerning the Perfection of Scripture, with our AUTHOR we posit;

1. The prohibition of all addition to the Scripture, even under such a pretext, Galatians 1:8, 9, *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ*, etc., *but though we or an angel*

from heaven preach to you any other gospel than, etc., which passage we just now vindicated in § 27 against the Papists; likewise, 2 Thessalonian 2:1, 2, —μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, etc., *neither by spirit, etc.* And so the Apostle esteemed new revelations unnecessary to manifest to us now anew any doctrine not contained in Sacred Scripture. As the Perfection of Scripture does not allow this; neither does the Perspecuity of the same in relating saving truths, so that we do not need new revelation for the explication of the written Word. Whence, concerning the *formula of Faith* dictated by John in a nocturnal vision to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*;¹ concerning certain *Revelations of Christina Poniatovia*, among which in Revelation XIX there is a marvelous adumbration of the Holy Trinity; and also concerning the *Revelations of Christopher Kotterus*, among which is the Angelic Sermon concerning the excellent Triple Title of Christ, namely, that He is called the Man of Wisdom, Lion of the tribe of Judah, and the One standing in the midst of the Seven Churches;² a judgment is able to be made: in all which you will discover nothing that rises above human ability, and that without extraordinary revelation is not esteemed equally, if not better, from others: see WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXIV, § 19-21, 8, 9, 16, 17, 22-25.

Nevertheless, by way of *Exception* our AUTHOR subjoins: *yet we are unwilling to altogether deny all Extraordinary Revelation concerning private events for private uses.* For extraordinary Revelation concerning matters of faith, which is to be received in the place of Sacred Scripture, or for a supplement of the deficient written Word, and serves as a norm for the entire Church, differs greatly from Revelation concerning private events for private uses. Concerning Revelations of the former sort we now principally argue: concerning those others it will be helpful to hear now the judgment of HERMAN WITSIUS, that most prudent and pious Theologian, who, in his *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter

¹ Gregory Thaumaturgus, or the *Wonder-worker* (c. 213-c. 270) was a disciple of Origin, and later Bishop of Cæsarea. His pastoral labors did much to advance the Christian faith in Asia Minor. It is said of him that he wrought miracles, and received revelatory visits from Mary and the Apostle John, who is said to have delivered to him a Creed.

² John Amos Comenius (1592-1670) was a Moravian educator and author. Comenius was a mystic, and in his *Luce in tenebris* he published the prophecies and visions of Krystyna Poniatowska (a Moravian mystic, who began prophesying in 1627) and Christopher Kotterus (of Silesia, who began prophesying in 1616).

XXIV, § 38, thus pronounces: “Nevertheless, I do not therefore wish to deny that it frequently happens that men pious, and devoted to divine service in a singular manner, and admitted unto closer and more intimate relationship with the Divine, by Him are taught of things future and mysterious; the knowledge of which is very useful for the excitement of piety, for the consolation of the soul, for strengthening in faith and hope, and for the exercise of prudence. The history of every age is full of examples of these. I do not see any reason why belief should be withheld from men honest, pious, and altogether worthy of confidence, relating such things concerning themselves from time to time, for the glory of God. In such a way that not all things that are related are to be received blindly. For, it can easily happen in such things, that either men trifle with phantasms, or heavy and strange affections proceed from an affection of the brain and humors, or finally fictions are offered in the place of facts.... If, nevertheless, any revelations befall some, those are more for their private information, than that they might be for a norm of faith or action for others, much less for the Church.” Consult the history of those things, which happened surrounding the inquiry of JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER concerning *extraordinary Revelations*, and his abdication from office of Professor at the Academy of Marburg,¹ in *Bibliotheca Bremensi, Classis I, fascicule II, pages 152-159*; and what things the illustrious HOFSTEDE² has in *Byzonderheden der Heilige Schrift* on 2 Corinthians 12:2, § 21-23, volume 2, pages 291-324; and also *de Nederlandse Bibliotheek, volume 2, n. 7, Mengelst, pages 202-205*. But these things in passing.

2. We posit *the Uncertainty of such extraordinary Revelations, on account of the deceitfulness of the Heart*, Jeremiah 17:9, עֵקֶב הַלֵּב מְכַל, *fraudulent, deceitful is the heart, attacking*, as it were, men very *insidiously from behind*, and *oppressing with the greatest craft and deceit, above all other things*, אִנְיָן שֶׁאֵינָהּ, *and that is mortally diseased*, so that it is *insidiously cunning and crafty unto its very own ruin*: מִי יִדְעֶנָּה: , *who shall know*,

¹ Johann Heinrich Hottinger III (1681-1750) was a Swiss Theologian and Orientalist. He served as Professor of Antiquities (1704-1710) and of Theology (1710-1717) at Marburg, and later as Professor of Theology at Heidelberg (1723-1750). Hottinger was forced to resign his professorship at Marburg because of his belief in the possibility of some ongoing special revelation in matters treated darkly by Scripture.

² Petrus Hofstede (1716-1803) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Pastor, serving in Rotterdam.

prevail to know, it? see VRIEMOET'S *Adnotationes ad Dicta classica Veteris Testamenti*, chapter XIV, tome 3, pages 76-78: no less on account of the cunning of the Devil, 2 Corinthians 11:14, for which reason also all Spirits are to be proven by Scripture, John 4:1, on which text see VOETIUS' *Disputationem sextam de Signis, quæ est de Probationibus Spirituum, Disputationum selectarum theologiarum*, part II, pages 1100-1133.

3. We add the various Prophecies concerning False Prophets arising under the New Testament, under sheep's clothing, Matthew 7:15; 24:11, 24; 1 John 4:1: while similar promises concerning the rousing of true Prophets, properly so called, under the New Testament in its progress are wanting.

4. *The testimony of the Spirit in the cases of those that have urged it is sufficiently convicted of falsehood, from its conflict with the Scriptures, both mutual and also proper, and from impieties and sins.* WITSIUS, in his *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapter XXIV, § 20, asks, "Finally, what is found to have appeared in any sort of writing, by anyone that called himself a Prophet, or was esteemed a Prophet by others, that might deserve to be added to our books, undoubtedly divine, and might contain truths momentous, heavenly, divine, and profitable for faith, piety, and salvation, that are not already there? Whatever was ever or anywhere discovered to me by those that hold in contempt the doctrine of the Scriptures as the rude elements of wisdom, that consists either in blasphemous comments, or in superstitious and fabulous trifles, or in pompous grandiloquence of speech, in which there is not even a particle of good sense." Who then, in § 29-35, also shows at greater length just how greatly the revelations that *Thomas Muntzer* and *Nicolaus Drabicius*¹ boasted had been given to them tend to agitate all things in Church and republic, and were at the same time convicted of falsehood by the event: this makes for confirmation,

5. Of our AUTHOR'S argument, concerning all the upset of Order and manifest confusion in the Church, to be introduced necessarily by this

¹ Nicholas Drabicius (1588-1671), son of a burgomaster in Moravia, was admitted to the ministry, but was forced into exile by the severe edicts of the Emperor against Protestantism. He was more than fifty years old when his visions began. He prophesied that the house of Austria would be crushed, that Prince Ragotski would command one of the victorious armies, and that Drabicius himself and his brethren would be restored to their native land. However, Ragotski died, without accomplishing the defeat of the house of Austria; indeed, the house of Austria waxed in strength, rivaling its former power. Comenius published Drabicius' prophecies in *Luce in Tenebris*.

principle, and always introduced.

To the Spirit of the Enthusiasts MARNIXIUS¹ maintained that our Spirit is to be opposed, most certainly attesting and declaring that all their Enthusiasms are false, vain, and wicked. Since what they say is ridiculous, that our Spirit is not the true Spirit; especially when they take away the genuine evidence and proof of the Spirit, which is Sacred Scripture; we are no more bound by their bare assertion than they are by ours, or either by others': see HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book VI, pages 405-407.

Let us hold with certainty that we are to beware of those that, boasting Enthusiasms, make little of the Scripture, contrary to Isaiah 66:2; Psalm 119:72, 127; and let us not ever separate the Spirit of God from the Word attested in the Scriptures, being mindful of the promise, Isaiah 59:21.

The Edict of the Senate of Zurich against modern Fanatics and Neo-prophets, April 18, 1717, promulgated from the pulpits in city and country, is exhibited in the German tongue in *Bibliotheca Bremensi*, Classis I, fascicule III, chapter VIII, pages 351-358. Read the argument of the book, outlined in *Bibliotheca Bremensi*, Classis I, fascicule VI, chapter V, pages 870-879, which was published in German in Zurich, 1717, under the title, *Hora Tentationis super Ecclesia Euangelica per novos sponte sua currentes Prophetas, etc.*, and the author of which is given as JOHANN JAKOB HOTTINGER, Theologian of Zurich.² Concerning the *Inspired* or Neo-prophets of the Cevennes,³ see also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1377b, 1378a.

¹ Philips of Marnix (1540-1598), Lord of Saint-Aldegonde, was a Dutch statesman and proponent of the Reformation. He is responsible for one of the earliest translations of the Bible into Dutch.

² Johann Jakob Hottinger (1652-1735), son of Johann Heinrich Hottinger, served as Professor of Theology at Zurich (1698-1735). He wrote voluminously, engaging opponents of Reformed orthodoxy, including Roman Catholic theologians and Enthusiasts.

³ The Camisards, French Protestants in southern France (the Cevennes region, and surrounding areas), engaged in an armed resistance against persecution after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. As their teachers and leaders were captured, killed, or exiled, the movement fell under the influence of more mystically oriented leadership and "prophets".

§ 31: The Sufficiency of Scripture, Part 5

The *Objections* of the Enthusiasts:

1. They attack the *Scripture*, which they call a *double-dealing, dead letter*, appealing to Paul in 2 Corinthians 3:6.

I respond with our AUTHOR, α . All the blame of the Obscurity of the Scriptures, through which obscurity they may not be able to understand the Scriptures sufficiently for salvation, is to be sought in the blindness and twistedness of men, while otherwise they are in themselves sufficiently perspicuous, as was seen in § 25, 26. β . Similarly, that the Scripture is dead and ineffectual, is occasioned by the vice of corrupt man; but otherwise it is living and efficacious in itself, 1 Peter 1:23; Jeremiah 23:29. γ . Paul does not speak properly *of the Letter*, that it is *dead*, but that it *kills*, which is not the act of a *dead thing*, but of a *living*, τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, *for the letter killeth*, of which *Letter* he says that he is not a minister. In which manner the Apostle does not reject and despise every Word written in the books of God: for he himself, who denies himself to be a minister of the letter, left so many volumes written for the Church, and greatly commends the Scripture of the Old Testament also, 2 Timothy 3:15-17. But by the *Letter* he understands the Legal ministry of Moses predominating under the Old Testament, to which he opposes the more gracious ministry of the Gospel, called *the ministry of the Spirit*, either on account of the *Spirit* promised there, who in the Gospel revealed by Himself not only teaches the spiritual scope/end and use of the Law, but also confers grace for the fulfillment of the Law in Evangelical perfection: or because by the Evangelical ministry of the New Testament he understands the *Spirit* of the Law, as opposed to the external *Letter* of the same, which is the deeper and more hidden Scope/End of the Law according to the intention of God, namely, that Christ is more clearly delivered and more abundantly inculcated unto righteousness to each believer. Now, that *Letter of the Law kills*, since it only prescribes and threatens death to transgressors; while at the same time fallen man is unable to fulfill the Law. Thus *by the Law* there is no justification, but rather *the knowledge of sin*, Romans 3:20. *The Law worketh wrath*, Romans 4:15; Galatians 3:10:

by the Law *sin* also *abounds*, Romans 5:20; 7:9, 11. The *Letter* of the Ceremonial Law also *kills* those that, cleaving to the *Letter* of those precepts, imagine that this worship is of itself acceptable to God, and seek righteousness by the observation of it, but do not penetrate to the spiritual and Evangelical marrow of it by the help of the Spirit of illumination and faith. δ . And so we do not deny the necessary instruction of the Spirit as teacher for true understanding and the right use of the written Word, but in such a way that He teaches from the Scriptures and through them: but not that He might deliver new Revelations beyond the Scriptures and contrary to them. Consult the things to be said concerning the sense of this passage below, *Chapter V*, § 26, on 2 Corinthians 3:17, 18; and WESSELIUS' *Dissertationem* on this passage, which is *ninth* in his *Fasciculo Dissertationum*.

2. Their *Objections* concern the *Enthusiastical Spirit*, whom they maintain,

α . To have been *Promised* both elsewhere and especially in Joel 2:28, 29.

I Respond: *a.* With phrases alike selected out of the Old Economy according to the manner of the Prophets, that the abundance of light and knowledge is designed, that would obtain under the New Testament through the instruction of the Spirit, but from the Scripture, according to Isaiah 59:21; and that would be such that the faithful flocks of the New Testament, compared with the faithful flocks of the Old Testament, would excel them by so great an interval as formerly had been between the Prophets and other men of the common people. *b.* But, a certain excellent and extraordinary proof of this matter, and earnest, as it were, God willed to be on record in that effusion of the Spirit, with which the Apostles were magnified, and of which He made certain others sharers in those first times, and in which the words of the prophecy were more literally fulfilled: so that from those the faithful might gather what they might be warranted to expect for themselves from the divine resources. *c.* For it is evident that those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit do not pertain to all unto whom the prophecy of *Joel* had regard; inasmuch as Peter extends this promise unto all truly penitent under the New Testament, Acts 2:38, 39, just as *Joel* had made mention of *all flesh*, whom nevertheless the event teaches not at all to have been made partakers of that extraordinary prophetic gift. While the promises of Isaiah 54:13 and Jeremiah 31:34 ought not to be understood absolutely, but rather comparatively, concerning the greater

grace of the Spirit and more extensive effusion of knowledge under the New Testament, or concerning the more abundant, future, subjective effusion of the Holy Spirit under the New Testament than under the Old; and concerning the greater and clearer, shining, objective revelation under the New Testament through the execution and fulfillment of the things signified and predicted under the Old: which things do not at all exclude instruction also mediated out the Scriptures, which are revealed for this purpose, as a perfect rule of faith. On Isaiah 54:13, consult TRIGLAND'S *Antapologiam*, chapter XXXIII, pages 447, 448, in comparison with the *Apologia Remonstrantium*, chapter XVII, page 185b; and WESSELIUS' *Fasciculum Dissertationum*, Sermon on this passage, pages 647-653. The same WESSELIUS, *Fasciculo Dissertationum*, in the *Dissertation* on 2 Corinthians 3:6, § VIII, concerning the text of Jeremiah 31:34, writes: "They shall teach no more every man his friend, and every man his brother, that is, an Israelite, but also the Nations, dwelling through the entire world, unto its bounds, with the dividing wall now removed."

β. To prove that the same Enthusiastical Spirit is Bestowed upon believers, they lean upon 1 John 2:20, 27.

Response: They err, that by *χρίσμα*/unction/anointing, which believers have *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου*, from the Holy One, understand an internal Light of the soul, as another Light opposed to the Light of Scripture, which is more certain and accurate than the Light of the Word, is readier and more universal for use than the written Word, and which makes believers themselves a living Bible, who are thus a norm unto themselves, and do not so need the written Word. Which, following after other Enthusiasts, are also the delusions of the *Hernhutters*.¹ But, *α. τὸ χρίσμα* are the saving gifts of the Spirit, frequently and emphatically likened unto a pleasing ointment, Psalm 45:7, among which is also illumination unto understanding, rightly compared to *eye-salve*, Revelation 3:18: hence indeed the Light of understanding arises in the mind, but that is not to be opposed to the Light of Scripture, but always depends upon the Light of Scripture, the true use of which the Spirit teaches believers, and by which He makes them wise.² The situation is the same as with the blind, for whom the light of day has no use; but, when his eyes are opened by a Physician, he sees all visible things with the help of the light of day: but the faculty of seeing never confers its own light, by which it

¹ That is, the *Moravians*.

² See 2 Timothy 3:15-17; Psalm 119.

might be able to gaze upon visible objects without the help of the light of the sun, or of the moon, or of a lamp, so that it might be able easily to do without all external light. Likewise, man, naturally blind in spiritual matters, from the Holy Spirit receives the clear eyes of understanding and the faculty of sight, in such a way that he is able to consider and discern spiritual things; but with the Light of the Word mediating. *b.* By this τὸ χρίσμα/*unction* believers knew *all things*, not absolutely, for thus they ought to have been Omniscient, which belongs to God alone; but all things necessary for salvation, which are a great many, even all comparatively. Neither does it hence follow that the written Word was not thereafter useful to them; but, as all things were contemplated by means of the Word and in the mirror of the Gospel, so they ought to have persevered in the consideration of that mirror, lest they again forget the forms of spiritual things. And certainly, if the Word written to these, who τὸ χρίσμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ἔχουσι, *have the unction from the Holy One*, was not at all necessary, John would have vainly written this Epistle to them, in which contrariwise he commends the utility of the Word to them, 1 John 2:21, 24. Therefore, when the Apostle in *verse* 27 affirms that those that have an Unction from the Holy One *have no need that anyone teach them*, he does not exclude the teaching of the divine Word; but rather the ψευδοδιδασκαλίας, *false teachings*, of Heretics, Antichrists, of whom he makes mention in *verses* 18, 19, 22, 26. And he declares that they have imbibed saving doctrine, as far as all the essential parts, from the Gospel preached by the Apostles with the Spirit as Teacher, in such a way that those cleaving to the doctrine delivered were able securely to do without, indeed ought to have rejected, all that were wishing to teach another Gospel besides that which they had already learned.¹

On the text of Luke 17:21, see below, *Chapter XX*, § 32; and CROCIUS'² *Anti-Weigelium*, *chapter I*, *question I*, *pages* 46-48. The remaining things that they offer in objection are resolved with sufficient plainness by our AUTHOR.

That the *Hernhutters* foster Enthusiasm, is able to be demonstrated from those things that they boast of their own *Unction*, of whom we have already made mention: see DANIEL GERDES'

¹ See Galatians 1:6-9.

² Johannes Crocius (1590-1659) was a Reformed theologian. He was appointed as Professor of Theology at Marburg (1618), at Kassel (1629), and then again at Marburg (1653).

Waarschouwend Vertoog tegen de Hernhuthers, rakende de Zalvinge der Gelovigen, pages 14 and following; *Herderlijken Brief van Predikanten en Ouderlingen te Amsterdam tegen de Hernhuthers*, pages 13, 14; JAN VAN DEN HONERT'S *Dissertationem* subjoined to his Oration *de Bohemorum et Moravorum Ecclesia*, pages 45-47; ALBERTUS VOGET'S *van de valsche Mystike Godtgeleerheid*, § 23, pages 39-41; GERARDUS KULENKAMP'S *Enthusiastery der Hernhuthers*, part I, chapter I, § I, pages 34-44, where it is specifically shown that according to them internal illumination excels the external preaching of the Word. In *Enthusiastery der Hernhuthers*, part I, chapter I, § 2, pages 61-69, it is taught that the Hernhuthers with the rest of the Enthusiasts judge that the hearing and reading of the external divine Word is not so necessary, provided that one carefully attends to the internal preaching. That the internal Unction is set before the Scripture by the Hernhuthers after the manner of Enthusiasts, see KULENKAMP'S *Enthusiastery der Hernhuthers*, part I, chapter I, § 2, pages 77-84, 102.

That extraordinary Revelations are to be preferred to Sacred Scripture, the *Mystics* also maintain, abusing the name of *Pietists*; see VOGET'S *van de valsche Mystike Godtgeleerheid*, § 12, page 14, § 15, page 20; compare PICTET'S *Syllabum Controversiarum*, book I, chapter XVI, page 113-115. Concerning the sufficiency of the internal, supernatural Light given to every man, without the external Word, and concerning the contempt of it among the *Mystics*, see also CREMER'S¹ *Evangelische Zedenketen* on 2 Peter 1:3, part I, pages 77-82, on verse 6, part II, pages 401, 402, and on verse 8, part III, pages 31-33. This opinion among them is defended by *Poiret*,² *Economicæ*, tome 4, chapter VII, § 11, page 156, with MILL citing it in his *Oratione de Erudita Pietate* (which is found after his *Miscellanea Sacra*), page 79, in which he assails this erroneous opinion of the *Mystics*, pages 73-85. The Theological Faculty at Groningen, in *Judicio suo* given to the petition of the Ecclesiastical Sanhedrin of Groningen, also disapproves as *Enthusiastical* certain theses concerning Instinct, an internal Impulse, divine Responses, new Prophecies, which are found in the little books circulated by the Most Illustrious *Driessen*³ in

¹ Bernard Sebastian Cremer (1683-1750) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Harderwijk (1717-1750).

² Pierre Poiret (1646-1719) was a French mystic, and disciple of Antoinette Bourignon, publishing her works (as well as those of other mystics, ancient and modern).

³ Antonius Driessen (1648-1748) was a Dutch Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1714-1748).

the year 1743, 1744; see *pages* 3-8, 19-30, 35-38.

And thus it is not at all difficult to enlarge the series of Enthusiasts, enumerated by our AUTHOR in the beginning of § XXX, with diverse new names; unto which more are also able to be referred from the ample *catalogue of Prophets*, which VOETIUS constructed in his *Disputationum selectarum theologicarum, part II, pages* 1055-1086.

§ 32: The Proximate End of Scripture: the Rule of Faith and Practice

With our AUTHOR the *Proximate* and *Subordinate End of the Scripture* is to be considered, which, says he, from all these ways in which Scripture contains true Religion, is evident: namely, that it was given so that it might be a fixed *Canon* and *Rule* of faith and manners. Thus it is often called by the Ancients: *The Rule of Truth* by IRENÆUS, *book IV contra Hæreses, chapter LXIX*, or XXXV, “But we follow the one and only true God as teacher, and *hold His words as the Rule of Truth*, etc.,” by CHRYSOSTOM, ἀπάντων ἀκριβῆς ζυγὸς καὶ γνώμων καὶ κανὼν, *the precise balance, rule, and Canon of all things, homily XIII on 2 Corinthians, opera, tome 10, page 537*; by AUGUSTINE, *the Rule of doctrine, de Bono Viduitate, chapter I, opera, tome 6, column 271*, *For the Holy Scripture sets down the Rule of our doctrine*. By the same AUGUSTINE, *Scales, de Baptismo contra Donatistas, book II, chapter VI, opera, tome 9, column 68*, “Let us not employ deceitful scales, when we would weigh what we maintain, and how we maintain it; speaking according to our own judgment, This is weighty, this is light: but let us employ *the divine scales from the Holy Scriptures*, as from the Lord’s treasury, and let us weight on that which is the weightier; nay, let us not weigh, but rather acknowledge the things as weighed by the Lord.” What we have asserted concerning the *End* of written Scripture the *Enthusiasts* overturn, who think little of the written Word of God, and subordinate it to particular Revelations as a more certain Rule. *Sebastian Franck*¹ in the *preface* to his *Paradoxorum CCLXXX* writes: “The letter of Scripture is the sword of Antichrist, and kills Christ: the Scripture, without the light, life, and interpretation of the Spirit, is a darkened lamp and killing letter: heresies and sects are from the letter of Scripture: Scripture is a book shut up with seven seals, and a sealed enigma: the sheeth is not the sword of the Spirit, the Silenus of Alcibiades.” Which words certainly disparage the Canonical use of Scripture. Add what CROCIUS cites out

¹ Although initially a Roman priest, Sebastian Franck (1499-c. 1543) joined the Reformation in 1525. However, he came to see the teachings of Scripture as paradoxical and inadequate for the instruction of the Christian, looking instead to immediate communication from the Holy Spirit.

of *Weigel* concerning the Scripture as *double-dealing*, with a subjoined refutation in *Anti-Weigelio*, chapter I, question III, pages 68-71. Now, what comparison might obtain between the Scripture and *the Silenus of Alcibiades*, you may learn from ERASMUS' *Adagiis*,¹ pages 653-657. The Papists speak with equal irreverence concerning the written Word, calling Scripture *a Delphic sword*,² that is, that to which a various Sense is able to be accommodated, and which is able to be taken up both by the heretics and by the orthodox in defense of their respective causes; just as the Delphic sword was forged in the same manner, that by the same they might at the same time slaughter sacred victims, and afflict the guilty with punishment, see ERASMUS' *Adagia*, pages 54, 55: likewise *a wax nose*, which is able to be twisted and molded into whatever form: *a rule leaden, Lesbian*,³ in a proverb, mention of which is found in ARISTOTLE, book V of his *Ethics*, chapter XIV, page m. 91, *opera*, tome 2, Τοῦ γὰρ ἀόριστου ἀόριστος καὶ ὁ κανὼν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς λεσβίας οἰκοδομῆς ὁ μολύβδινος κανὼν, πρὸς γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ λίθου μετακινεῖται καὶ οὐ μένει ὁ κανὼν, that is, *for the rule of what is indefinite is also indefinite, like the leaden rule used in Lesbian architecture; for the rule changes to fit the shape of the stone and does not remain a rule*. Now, an ἀόριστος/*indefinite* rule of this sort, and which does not remain like unto itself, is not a rule. The adage is used when reason is preposterously accommodated to fact, rather than fact to reason: and when Law is accommodated to behavior, behavior is not emended according to Law, see ERASMUS' *Adagia*, pages 431. Abuses of this sort against Scripture erupt from the Papists: *Martin Kromer*,⁴ in his *libello de falsa Lutheri Religione*, page 48, says, "It is an old proverb, that Sacred Scripture has a wax nose, which everyone is able to bend at his will: in such a way that not only diverse, but even contrary, doctrines by it are wont to be established and defended by contentious men and heretics. It is not what you contend." Likewise, Scripture is called a *wax nose* by

¹ In Plato's *Symposium*, Alcibiades (fifth century BC Athenian general and statesman) compares Socrates to the statue of Silenus (in Greek mythology, a companion of Dionysus), ugly and hollow, but full of golden statuettes of the gods on the inside. The general idea: Something ugly on the outside may contain something beautiful and valuable on the inside.

² That is, double-edged. Aristotle's *Politics*, book I.

³ A Lesbian rule was a flexible mason's rule, used to measure and/or reproduce curves, made of pliable lead from the island of Lesbos.

⁴ Martin Kromer (1512-1589) was a Roman Catholic churchman, and Polish historian, statesman, and diplomat.

Quintinus Heduus,¹ with Pamelius² approving in his annotations on Tertullian's *Præscriptione* 237; and by the Jesuits of Cologne in *Censura Catechismi Monhemii*,³ page 117; by Albert Pighius⁴ in his *Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, in the Index of Arguments, book I, chapter IV. The same Pighius called the Scripture a *leaden rule*, *Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, book I, chapter II, "The Scriptures are, as it were, a certain leaden rule of Lesbian architecture, which suffer themselves easily to be accommodated to whatever sense one may have presumed within himself beforehand." "The Scriptures," says Coster⁵ in his *Enchiridio*, page 44, "which the Apostles left for us on parchments, are dead letters, written with ink on parchment and papyrus, which, if one wishes to mutilate, twist, or pervert by perverse expositions, it feels nothing. They are like a sheath, which admits any sword, not only steel, but also lead, wood, and brass; for they suffer themselves to be drawn along by whatever interpretation." As all these things are not able to be reconciled with the normative Use of Scripture, so Bellarmine, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter XII, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 254, 255, contends, "*The proper and principal end of the Scripture was not that it might be a rule of faith, but that it might be a sort of useful reminder, to preserve and foster the doctrine received by preaching.*" He then adds, "The Scripture, even if it was not principally made so that it might be the rule of faith, is nevertheless a rule of faith, not total, but partial. For the total rule of faith is the Word of God, or the revelation of God delivered to the Church, which is divided into two partial rules, Scripture and Tradition."

The *Scope/Goal* of asserters of this sort is easily demonstrated, namely, to defend extraordinary Revelations of the Spirit and *ἀγράφοις/unwritten* Traditions, and to recall us to the tribunal of the

¹ Jean Quintin (1500-1561) was a member of the Order of Malta, and Professor of Canon Law in Paris.

² Jacobus Pamelius (1536-1587) was a Flemish theologian. He produced edited works of Cyprrian, Tertullian, and Rabanus Maurus.

³ Johann Monheim (1509-1564) was rector of the cathedral school at Dusseldorf. He was a Roman Catholic of Erasmian sentiments. Toward the end of his life, he published a catechism that was clearly influenced by the Reformation, which created a firestorm of controversy that continued after his death.

⁴ Albert Pighius (1490-1542) was a Dutch Roman Catholic theologian. He was heavily involved in the defense of the Roman hierarchy against the Reformers and the Eastern Orthodox.

⁵ Franciscus Coster (1532-1619) was a Brabantian Jesuit theologian. He was heavily involved in the Counter-Reformation.

Church as unto an infallible Interpreter of Scripture and supreme Judge of Controversies.

Our thesis, that Scripture was written unto this end, that it might be *the Canon of faith and manners*, not that it might only be a useful Reminder, we prove from this, α . that, not only is it called a *Canon*, for example, in Galatians 6:16,¹ but it also has all things *requisite* for a Canon, 1. namely, Infallible Truth, according to § 22, whence the עֲדוּת הַיְהוָה, *testimony of the Lord*, is called נְאֻמַּיִן / *sure*, Psalm 19:7, upon which the conscience is able safely to lean, without any danger of seduction or deception; מִשְׁפָּטֵי יְהוָה אֱמֶת, *the judgments of the Lord are true*, Psalm 19:9: 2. Complete Harmony, of which we spoke on § 23: 3. Sufficient Perspicuity, which we saw proved in § 24-26: 4. and necessary Perfection, which we evinced in § 27-31. So the Scripture was not only produced as suited for this, that it might be a Canon, but, β . God also continuously commends the Scripture, and the Scripture alone, for this use. But, what not only has all things requisite for a Canon, but was also divinely inspired for this, that it might direct our faith and life, and to which accordingly we are continually and uniquely sent as a norm of faith and manners, indeed, to which we are bound under threat of anathema; that is to be called, not so much a Reminder, as a Norm and Canon of faith and life. But in this manner the matter is compared with the Sacred Scripture. That the Scriptures were written for Canonical use, you read in John 20:31; Romans 15:4. That unto this Canon we are sent and are bound under threat of anathem, see in Isaiah 8:20; Luke 16:29; 2 Peter 1:19; Galatians 1:8. γ . Moreover, the example of the faithful is commended and set forth to us as worthy of imitation, as much under the Old as under the New Testament, who made use of the Scripture, and that alone, as the rule of faith and life, Psalm 119:105; Acts 17:11. And, δ . either the Sacred Scripture is the Rule of faith and manners, or no such thing is given; whence the uncertainty of all Religion would follow, which is absurd. *Bellarmino*, therefore, although he denies that Scripture was written unto this end, acknowledges that it is a rule, albeit partial, on account of the hypothesis concerning Traditions, which we exploded above with the other concerning extraordinary Revelations. *Becanus*, in his *Analogia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, chapter I, question I, rightly says, “Canon signifies two things, 1. A Norm or Rule that we

¹ Galatians 6:16: “And as many as walk according to this rule (τῷ κανόνι τοῦτο), peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.”

follow. 2. A Catalogue or number of particular things. The books of Scripture are called Canonical in both senses. Indeed, the former, because they contain the norm or rule that we ought to follow in faith and manners. The latter, because they have been recorded in the catalogue of divine books.”

The *Papists* certainly quibble, when *They Object* that, α . Paul calls the Scripture *Useful for doctrine*, etc., 2 Timothy 3:16. Since a Canon certainly furnishes these Uses: and not only are the Uses mentioned by Paul able to be drawn from Sacred Scripture, but at the same time each one is bound to apply the Scripture as a Canon to these doctrinal and practical Uses; so that whatever Scripture teaches he might receive, whatever Scripture refutes he might reject, whatever Scripture commends he might turn into practice, whatever Scripture punishes he might avoid. These advantages are subordinated to the ruling principle of *Canon*, which the Scripture has. The Scripture is able to be compared to Scales, evaluating the magnitude of weights, and by this very thing bestowing great advantage.

β . *Chance Writing without a Command*, which they similarly use as a pretext, and which we have already confuted in § 4.

γ . It is also mere quibbling that the Scripture was not written systematically. The argument is obviously structured in this way:

Those that professedly deliver the norm of religion ought to write Catechism or System:

The Apostles did not write Catechism or System; but they wrote either history or Epistles, in which disputations concerning dogmas are delivered only tangentially: Therefore. See *Bellarmino*, book IV *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IV, column 212.

Responses: 1. The method of writing was founded in the will of God. 2. Not without good reason did He choose such, which is especially able to furnish occasion for the exercise of industry. 3. Apart from the fact that the Holy Men are to be said to have also delivered professedly a System of religion, both with greater abundance, as in the Epistle to the Romans, and more concisely, in surveys of the great heads of religion, Hebrews 6:1, 2; Mark 1:15; etc. Indeed, in the histories and Epistles disputations concerning dogmas are not delivered by the way, but professedly, for example, in the Gospel of John, in the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews. In like manner, the *Naturalists*, caviling at the authority of the Sacred Codex, are refuted by STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 477-481, pages 1173-

1175.

δ. Finally, they do not gain much by this argument:

A rule of faith ought to be adequate for the thing ruled, that is, to contain all and only those things that pertain to faith. But Sacred Scripture does not contain all things necessary to be believed, nor those alone, as it appears from the many histories of both Testaments, and also from the salutations of Paul.

Responses: The Minor, 1. with respect to the former member is altogether denied, from the Perfection of Scripture demonstrated in § 27 and *following*. 2. If with respect to the latter member we concede that some things occur in Sacred Scripture, even without which its Perfection as a Canon of faith and manners could appear to stand firm, in this the divine goodness, providing more abundantly for us, is to be acknowledged. At the same time it is to be said that nothing in Sacred Scripture superabounds as completely superfluous, since *whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning*, Romans 15:4, and *all Scripture is profitable πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, for doctrine, etc.*, 2 Timothy 3:16. Therefore, the histories, salutations, and whatever other things could appear to be of lesser moment, are comprehended in the circle of this Canon and Rule; as each thing to the little measure of human capacity in a variety of ways in Scripture is set forth, absolutely and with limitation, in thesis and hypothesis, in the theory of precepts and praxis of examples.

§ 33: The Translation of Scripture, Part 1

After indicating this End of the writing of Scripture, our AUTHOR relates the *Means* tending toward this End, which are the Translation, Reading, Understanding, and Interpretation of the Scripture.

With respect to the *Versions* of the Bible there is a controversy with the *Papists* concerning the Propriety and Necessity of them. The more sober of them do indeed acknowledge the Necessity and Utility of the Versions, for which reason they also adorn various Versions in various Tongues. BARONIUS, in his *Annalibus Ecclesiasticis, tome 2, on AD 231, § 17 and 18*, asserts, “By a divine and wonderful counsel the first and foremost Version of the Septuagint Translators was painstakingly made:” see GERHARD’S *Confessionem catholicam, tome II, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, thesis VII, pages 174b-180*. Nevertheless, other writers of this sect, not a few, condemn the Translations of the Bible into the Vernacular Languages as harmful and dangerous: thus Arboreus¹ in *Theosophiæ, book VIII, chapter XI*: “There is one origin of heresies, the translation of the Sacred books into the vulgar tongue.” With whom agree Azor,² Harding, Baile, and a great many Jesuits, who “are wont to criticize” the translation of Scripture “as the curious εὑρημα/*invention* of heretics, exiled from orthodox religion, and hence useless to the Churches, and devised to sow heresies:” consult GERHARD’S *Confessionem catholicam, tome II, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, thesis VII, pages 171-173*.

The *Scope/Goal/End* cannot be obscure, namely, that which our AUTHOR observes, *that they might more easily exercise tyranny over consciences*.

We prove the Propriety and Necessity of Versions:

α. *From the Canonical Use of Scripture* just now asserted in § 32,

¹ Alabri, writing under the pseudonym *Johannes Arboreus*, published his multi-volume work, *Theosophy*, from 1540-1553. However, sidestepping the esoteric elements, his definition of *theosophy* is roughly equivalent to *theology*.

² Juan Azor (1535-1603) was a Spanish Jesuit philosopher and theologian. He is remembered for his three volume *Institutionibus Moralibus*.

which is not applicable without the Translation of Scripture. For, if the Scripture is going to be a norm of faith and manners for me, I must have the same for continual reading, meditation, and the turning of its pages day and night: which, after the preaching of the Gospel among nations of all Languages, cannot be done by the faithful as individuals without a Translation of the Bible; while not even to a hundredth part among the members of the Church is the way open to the two Original Languages.

β. *From the First Writing, made in the language, not peculiar to some learned men, but most Common under the Old and New Testaments.* For the Hebrew Tongue during the time of the writing of the Old Testament for the use of the Jews was the Vernacular of that people. Greek at the time that the New Testament was set down was especially common, sufficiently familiar to the Jews themselves, whence both Philo and Josephus, both being Jews, wrote in Greek. But, if it were so dangerous to open the way for any Laics to consult the Sacred Codices, God Himself had provided for the Church in a manner not quite proper. Contrariwise, we follow His example without any risk, when we exhibit the Bible to be read to each Church in its Vernacular Language, so that God might reach the goal of providing a norm, which He proposed to Himself in delivering the Scripture to the Churches.

γ. From the gift of Tongues soon granted with the extension of the Church to the Nations, so that each nation τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, *in its own language*, might be able to hear τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the wonderful works of God*, as in Acts 2:6, 8, 11; so that what was written might be fulfilled, πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ, *every tongue shall confess to God*, according to Romans 14:11.¹ But, if therefore God Himself miraculously granted the gift of Tongues to the Apostles and first Teachers of the New Testament, so that they might proclaim the Gospel in the Vernacular Tongue to each nation; the duty is incumbent upon faithful overseers of the Church, that to the Church they deliver the Gospel, which Men of God, as universal Teachers, wrote in the most common Language of the time, translated together with the Books of the Old Testament into the Vernacular Tongue of each nation, for the purposes of reading.

δ. From this necessity and utility of Versions of the Scripture, acknowledged already from the infancy of the Church, which brought it to pass that the Sacred Books were soon enough read by many nations in

¹ See also Isaiah 45:23.

the Vernacular Tongue, with the benevolent Providence of God smiling upon this pious undertaking of the Church in the translation of the Original text. Hence CHRYSOSTOM, *homily II, or I, on John, opera, tome 8, page 10*, says of the Gospel of John: καὶ Σύροι, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, καὶ Ἰνδοὶ, καὶ Πέρσαι, καὶ Αἰθίοπες, καὶ μυρία ἕτερα ἔθνη, εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν μεταβαλόντες γλῶτταν τὰ παρὰ τούτου δόγματα εἰσαχθέντα, ἕμαθον ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι φιλοσοφεῖν, *Syrians, and Egyptians, and Indians, and Persians, and Ethiopians, and countless other nations, translating into their own tongues the doctrines introduced by him, although barbarians, have learned to philosophize.* THEODORET also, in *Curacione Græcarum affectionum, book V, opera, tome 4, pages 555, 556*, affirms that the Hebrew books or speech of the Hebrews was not only translated into Greek idiom, but also in the Roman Language, and Egyptian, Persian, Indian, Armenian, Scythian, and Sarmatian; and quickly into all Languages, of which the nations were making use unto that day: Ἡμεῖς δὲ, τῶν ἀποστολικῶν καὶ προφητικῶν δογμάτων τὸ κράτος ἐναργῶς ἐπιδείκνυμεν· πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ ὑφήλιος τῶν δε τῶν λόγων ἀνάπλεως· καὶ ἡ Ἑβραίων φωνὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς Ἑλλήνων μετεβλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Ἰνδῶν καὶ Ἀρμενίων καὶ Σκυθῶν καὶ Σαυροματῶν, καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν, εἰς πάσας τὰς γλώττας αἷς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη κεχρημένα διατελεῖ, *but we visibly display the power of the apostolic and prophetic doctrines: for every language under the sun has full need of the words: and the Hebrew language was translated, not only into that of the Greeks, but also into that of the Romans, Egyptians, Persians, Indians, Armenians, Scythians, and Samartians, and, to say it in brief, into all the languages of which at this day all the nations make use.* And speaking of Lucian and Hesychius publishing a corrected Version of the Old Testament, JEROME in his *preface to the Gospels, opera, tome 3, page 30*, writes, *that the Scripture had already previously been translated into the languages of many nations.* It does not belong to this Compendium to speak on behalf of the worth of the various Versions reviewed by our AUTHOR, and the great many others that could be enumerated in addition. This requires a whole and proper Commentary. Concerning these Ecclesiastical History is to be consulted; and BRIAN WALTON'S *Apparatus Biblicus*; HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurus Philologicus*; LEUSDEN'S *Philologi*; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra in Vetus Testamentum*; RUMPÆUS' *Commentatio Critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § L, *pages 344-443*; BINGMAN'S *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, *book XIV, chapter III, § 17, volume 6, pages 97-104*, in which there is a brief

narration of the Versions of Scripture used in the ancient Church.

We shall make do with a few things that are able to make for the illustration of our AUTHOR.

Our AUTHOR says, *From the beginning Latin Versions were multiplied*: thus, of course, AUGUSTINE testifies, in *book II, de Doctrina Christiana, chapter XI, opera, tome 3, part I, column 19*, “If the infinite variety of Latin translators produces any doubt.” And a little afterwards: “For those that translated the Scriptures from the Hebrew language into the Greek are able to be enumerated, but not the Latin Translators. For, as the Greek codex came into the hands of each in the first ages of the faith, and he appeared to himself to have a little ability in both languages, he ventured to translate.”

Among which was celebrated of old that which is called the Itala or Common, some parts of which they desire the Vulgate yet to retain. Thus again AUGUSTINE, *book II de Doctrina Christiana, chapter XV, column 21*, “Now, among those translations let the Itala be preferred to the others: for it holds more tenaciously to the words with perspicuity of meaning.” Moreover, concerning this Version, and what today’s Vulgate is judged to retain from the same, see what things we said on § 10.

There are also the Greek translations of the Septuagint, so called after the Seventy Elders, the most ancient of all, concerning which previously: That is, to the extent deemed sufficient we disputed concerning this Version on § 11, where we at the same time admonished, lest anyone should declaim on behalf of preaching from the *Version of the Seventy Interpreters*, or *from the Seventy Greek Interpreters*, since that entire narration concerning the Seventy-two Interpreters is either uncertain or fabulous.

Our AUTHOR, with the whole chorus of Theologians and Philologists, calls this Version *the most ancient of all*: from whom whether the Most Illustrious HOTTINGER has sufficiently weighty reasons to dissent, when he maintains that before this Greek Version, even from the times of Ezra, there was a Chaldean paraphrase of most of the books of the Old Testament, and also thinks that some Greek Version of the Pentateuch of the Samaritans surpasses the antiquity of the Septuagint—Viralis, is able to be doubted, if one is pleased to call his reasons set forth in *Thesouro Philologico, pages 282-285*, in for examination, and to compare with those what things were taught in § 11, both concerning the Greek Version of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and concerning the antiquity of the Septuagint—Viralis Version.

Then our AUTHOR adds Greek Translations:

Of Aquila *Ponticus*, under *Hadrian*. Initially he was a Greek with respect to religion, then at Jerusalem he embraced the faith of Christ and was baptized: afterwards he was ejected from the communion of the Church, because he was so addicted to Judicial Astrology;¹ at which time he was made a proselyte: and when with great labor he had learned the Hebrew language, he translated the speech of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek, especially (as it is evident) so that he might annoy the Christians, and corrupt the oracles prophesying concerning Christ; and that under the Emperor Hadrian before the middle of the Second Century. For, as the Septuagint Version had already been prepared before the birth of Christ, so the remaining Greek Versions mentioned here were completed only after the Christ: see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter III, § 2, pages 553-560; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book I, columns 762-764.

Of Theodotion of *Ephesus*, under *Commodus*.² Epiphanius calls him *Ponticus* also, but according to Irenæus and the *Synopsis* of Athanasius he is believed to have been an *Ephesian*. Although the Ancients relate various things concerning his religion, perhaps they were able to be reconciled in this way; if you say that he was first a Marcionite, then an Ebionite, and finally a proselyte. Having been made a proselyte and circumcised, he prepared a new Greek Version, generally following the footsteps of the Septuagint Translators. The Church was always wont to read Daniel out of the translation of Theodotion, as JEROME testifies, *preface on Daniel*, opera, tome 3, page 27. This his work is referred to the rule of Commodus after the middle of the Second Century by Epiphanius and others, although there are those that think that it is to be referred to a time shortly before Lucius Aurelius Commodus: see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter III, § 3, pages 560-566; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book I, columns 763-765.

Of Symmachus the *Samaritan and Ebionite*, under *Verus or Severus*.³ Not very long after Theodotion Symmachus also translated the Old Testament into the Greek language; EPIPHANIUS expressly relates that

¹ "Judicial Astrology" is a term encompassing a family of astrological techniques for forecasting the future. The term is used to distinguish these techniques from "Medical" and "Meteorological" Astrology.

² Commodus reigned as Roman Emperor from 180 to 192.

³ Septimius Severus reigned from 193 to 211.

this happened under Severus. EUSEBIUS makes him an *Ebionite*. JEROME calls him at one time a *Jew*, at another time a *Judaizing heretic*, and elsewhere expressly an *Ebionite*. Nevertheless, EPIPHANIUS, the *Author of the Athanasian Synopsis*, and others, describe Symmachus as a *Samaritan*, who, led by ambition (as EPIPHANIUS relates), did not have his wish answered among his people, and, becoming angry with his people, passed over to the Jews, and, putting his name among the proselytes, was circumcised a second time, with his foreskin previously restored by medical arts. That the Scope/Goal of Symmachus in his translation was to subvert the Versions that were received among the Samaritans, EPIPHANIUS relates: *πρὸς διαστροφήν τῶν παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἐρμηνειῶν ἐρμηνεύσας, τὴν τρίτην ἐξέδωκεν ἐρμηνείαν*, *translating in order to pervert the translations current among the Samaritans, he published the third translation*. Nevertheless, that does not appear likely to FABRICIUS in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, unless perhaps it might therefore be said that, because the Pentateuch alone was admitted by the Samaritans, Symmachus translated the remaining Prophetic Books also. He thinks that it is rather to be observed that Christian writers, just as they generally indicate Aquila when they appeal to the Hebrew, so when they cite the *Σαμαρειτικὸν/Samaritan*, have regard unto this Version of the Samaritan Symmachus, by whom this learned Man persuades himself the Pentateuch was translated out of the Samaritan. Yet, with CARPZOV in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter III, page 568*, as judge, this erudite observation of Fabricius does not at all prevent Symmachus from being able to undertake and prepare a Version out of hatred for his fellow tribesmen; although perhaps the Fathers call or hold that as *Samaritan*, not from the here overlaid opinion of the Samaritans, but from the author, first arising from the Samaritans: compare § 11; CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, part II, chapter III, § 4, pages 566-571*; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments, part II, book I, columns 763-765*.

But thus divine Providence took care that, besides the ancient Greek Version prepared by the Jews, three others were additionally supplied by Apostates or Infidels of the Church. But these four Greek Versions formerly made up the Tetrapla of ORIGEN, which in four columns was exhibiting the Version, 1. of Aquila, 2. of Symmachus, 3. of the Septuagint, 4. Of Theodotion. Unto which, in the Hexapla prepared by the same Church Father, were added in a first and second column the Hebrew Text written in the Hebrew box-script, and the

same Text expressed in Greek characters. In addition, in the Octapla of the same Origen were extant two ἄνωνυμοι/*anonymous* Greek Versions of uncertain authorship, one called *Hierichuntine*,¹ because in the Third Century under Emperor Antonius Caracalla² it was discovered at Jericho, stored in earthenware vessels, together with other Hebrew and Greek books. Whence Athanasius conjectures that it was composed by one that was without devotion to Jerusalem. The other is called *Nicopolitan*, which was similarly found in earthenware vessels on the Actian shore of Nicopolis³ not very long after the former, with Alexander Severus reigning.⁴ Now, which Version was first gathered in Origen's Octapla, whether the Hierichuntine according to Epiphanius and others, as it is commonly thought; or whether the Nicopolitan is to be set before the Hierichuntine, which indeed CARPZOV concludes to be preferable, CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter III, page 572, out of Jerome; in this matter there is certainly too little evidence: since those quadru-, sextu-, octuple Codices have lamentably perished, except for some fragments of this work beyond the Septuagint Version remaining to the present day, published by MONTFAUCON in 2 folio tomes, Paris, 1713. But, the greater the labor ORIGEN had devoted to an accurate emendation of the Septuagint Version, the greater the loss the destruction of this work of Origen has brought upon the Church; since he, reviewing the text of the Septuagint, added, 1. *Asterisks* (*) to words that were wanting in the Greek, but supplied by himself out of the Hebrew: 2. *Obelisks* (‡ or †) to words, added beyond the Hebrew text in the Greek Version, as if fixed with a nail: 3. *Lemnisci* (±), where readings may vary, but the superior number of exemplars may prevail: 4. *Hypolemnisci* (-), where there is at least a pair of exemplars agreeing, or, according to Epiphanius, one of the thirty-six pairs of Interpreters or Translators; the distinct exemplars, thirty-six in number, of all which, exhibiting various readings here and there, Epiphanius believes, foolishly enough, to have survived unto the time of Origen. But thus of the Lemnisci and the Hypolemnisci, as we have just now related, judge MASIUS, VALESIUS, HUETIUS, and SPANHEIM, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century III, chapter X, columns 774-776.

Indeed, we hardly doubt that today's editions of the Septuagint

¹ That is, of *Jericho*.

² Caracalla reigned from 198 to 217.

³ On the western coast of Greece.

⁴ Alexander Severus reigned from 222 to 235.

Version also have much from the emendation of Origen: nevertheless, the value of the work would have been to distinguish for the eye his corrections, enclosed with the signs just now mentioned at the beginning and two points at the end.

Concerning the comparison and joint exhibition of the Greek Versions of the Old Testament and Origen's work on the same, see the discussions of, among others, JOHANN ALBERT FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca*, book III, chapter XII, volume 2, pages 315-360; PRIDEAUX, *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book I, columns 765-770; BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, pages 1525-1528a, § 8, pages 1585-1587; JOHANN GOTTLÖB CARPZOV, *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter III, pages 552-585, and the many more whom he commends. Concerning the exemplar of the Septuagint Version, of which Origen made use, and which he inserted in his Hexapla, see in addition CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part III, chapter IX, § 3, pages 955, 970-972.

Our AUTHOR continues in this way, *Famous also are the Targumim or Chaldean Paraphrases, especially of Onkelos and Jonathan.* To the Chaldeans, a תַּרְגּוּמֵי / *Targum* or תַּרְגּוּמֵי אַרְמֵי / *Targumah* is a *translation*, or an *explication*, in which the words of one are rendered and explained either through another, more familiar language, or in the same language through more and clearer words; it is from the quadrilateral root תַּרְגַּם or תַּרְגַּם, *to interpret, to explain*. Nevertheless, usage thus obtained that the word *Targum* be used in a somewhat more restricted sense, and be assigned to indicate synecdochically the Chaldean Paraphrases of the Bible, which the Jews ordinarily understand when they cite a *Targum* in an absolute manner, while they call other Versions in other languages תַּרְגּוּמֵי אֲרָמִי / *translations*, from תַּרְגַּם, *to translate*. Moreover, DRUSIUS advises that *Targum*, as it is also with *Talmud*,¹ is not quite used correctly by Christians in the neuter gender, since a *book* is understood, which nevertheless is not regarded as applicable in all places. The origin of the Targumim is commonly found in a custom, which had come on with the vernacular dialect of the Jews having changed by degrees, namely, that in the Synagogues, after a section of the Hebrew text was read aloud by the reader, the same was then translated by an interpreter in Chaldean or Syriac for the use of the ignorant: which is thought to have furnished an

¹ תַּלְמוּד / *Talmud* signifies *instruction*, from לָמַד, *to teach or study*.

occasion to Onkelos and Jonathan, so that these might consign to writing the translation, the former of the Law, the latter of the Prophets. Our AUTHOR also reviews these two Targums as more celebrated in reputation than the others.

They commonly make *Onkelos* younger than *Jonathan*, and they maintain that he flourished somewhat after Christ; while Jonathan ben Uzziel, who is thought to have been a disciple of Hillel the Elder,¹ and a disciple together with Simeon the Just² and Gamaliel,³ of whom we read in Acts, is thought to be older than Christ by some years. Whence they suppose that Jonathan also published his translation before Onkelos: see BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti, period II, section VII, § 17, tome 2, pages 971b, 972*. On the other hand, that Onkelos both lived and composed his Targum before Jonathan, the Learned PRIDEAUX, *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments, part II, book VIII, columns 1386, 1393, 1394*, concludes from this, 1. that the style of Onkelos is far purer than the diction of Jonathan, and comes much closer to Biblical Chaldean; 2. that, if the Targum of Onkelos upon the Pentateuch had not yet been prepared, no reason is able to be given as to why Jonathan, with the Pentateuch passed by, had undertaken a translation of the Prophets: which diverse opinions CARPZOV thus attempts to reconcile in the best manner possible, asserting that Onkelos was likely a σύγχρονον/*contemporary* of Jonathan, and that both were of the same generation with the Savior Christ; and that Jonathan was perhaps more advanced in age, yet his hand was applied later to his work, after he had understood that Onkelos' Version of the Law was received with such applause. Of course, from Onkelos we have a Translation of the Pentateuch alone, but from Jonathan ben Uzziel a Targum upon both the former and the latter Prophets. And, although this Paraphrase of Jonathan perhaps ought to yield to Onkelos' in order

¹ Hillel the Elder (c. 110 BC-10 AD) was one of the great sages of his era, founding a school of disciples known as the "House of Hillel". His teaching concerning the Law is characterized by leniency, and is presented in constant contrast with the Pharisaic strictness of the "House of Shammai".

² Simeon ben Hillel succeeded his father as president of the Sanhedrin. He was quickly succeeded in turn by Gamaliel I. Some have thought this to be the same Simeon that blessed the infant Jesus, Luke 2:25-35.

³ Gamaliel I, son of Simeon ben Hillel, succeeded his father in the presidency of the Sanhedrin. In the Acts of the Apostles, Gamaliel is remembered as warning the Sanhedrin against punishing the Apostles with death, Acts 5:34, and as the teacher of Paul, Acts 22:3.

of time, that the age of this Jonathan and of his paraphrase are almost the same as that of Christ, contrary to the opinions of Morinus and Isaac Vossius, who postpone the same unto far later ages, the Learned gather from the purity of style, Talmudic suffrage; and from the very style of commenting, which is simpler and more restrained than what is found in following ages; and also from shining testimonies concerning the Messiah, by which he confirms Christian truth even against the Jews. But, if any vestiges of novelty occur in this Paraphrase, they think that these argue the hand of an interpolator. For, with respect to the character of each of these Targumim, the translation of *Onkelos* is judged to take the prize above all the other Targumim: since in polish and purity of language it comes near to the Biblical style of Daniel and Ezra, and does not admit barbarous words in such number as the others do: it cleaves more firmly to the letter, and generally renders the sense in the same number of words in which it is expressed in the Hebrew Codex; and to fables and digressions it is altogether strange, and from the corruptions of copyists and the patched on rags of interpolators it is thus free enough.

In the prophetic Targum of *Jonathan* the style of Chaldean speech and the purity of Chaldean diction are also commended, agreeing quite closely with Onkelos, and little turning from the terse Biblical Chaldean. This Targum is seen as somewhat more liberal, especially in the latter Prophets, and indulging excessively in allegories. It is also found to be variously interpolated. Nevertheless, excellent testimonies concerning Messiah are drawn from it.

The remaining Targumim, as of a far later age, are thus of an inferior character. Such are the *Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan upon the Pentateuch*, *Targum Jerusalem upon the Pentateuch*, the *Targum on the five Megilloth* of uncertain authorship, *another Targum upon the Book of Esther*; the *Targum upon the Hagiographa*, which is commonly attributed to *Rab Jose*, or *Joseph Cæcus* or *Luscus*, Rector of the Academy of Sorana in Babylonia in the fourth Century, to whom also is related the received *Targum upon the Books of the Chronicles*,¹ brought into the light at last near the end of the preceding Century: concerning all which the Philologists and Critics just now cited above are able to be consulted, even CARPZOV, in his *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter I, pages

¹ Jewish tradition has it that Joseph Cæcus was a third or fourth century rabbi, but there appears to be some question as to whether there is any historical personage behind this name.

430-481; PRIDEAUX, in his *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book VIII, columns 1383-1405: to which add BUDDEUS, in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, pages 1509-1516a; JOHANN CHRISTOPH WOLF, in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, part II, book VI, pages 1135-1191.

To which we join, as our AUTHOR continues, the *Syriac Versions*, both of the New Testament, and also of the Old Testament, both exceedingly ancient. The Syrians make use of a twofold *Version of the Old Testament*, one simple and ancient, which is drawn from the Hebrew, and is alone used in the divine offices: and one more recent, translated from the Greek text of the Septuagint long after the advent of Christ. That simple Version is found in the Paris and London Polyglots, published from a variety of Manuscript Codices. The Syrians refer this Version either unto the age of Solomon and Hiram, or to Asa the priest, who was sent from Assyria to Samaria,¹ to whatever extent the Canonical Books had already been committed to writing at that time; or unto the Apostle Thaddæus, or unto Mark the Evangelist. It is likely that that most ancient and first Church of Christians, which was in Syria, was not long without the more intimate use of Scripture, which without translation into the vernacular tongue was not able to be so readily available to all. The repeated mentions of τοῦ Σύρου, *the Syriac*, by the most ancient Fathers argue that this Version is ancient enough, and that it possesses no small authority. Now, however things may stand concerning the primeval reading of this simple version, which was able to be accommodated to the Hebrew Text with sufficient accuracy; nevertheless, that, as it is read in the Polyglots, often approaches more nearly to the Septuagint than to the Hebrew Text, the fault of which situation is perhaps to be attributed to copyists. But in such a way that it is devoid neither of its own usefulness, nor of these and similar blemishes.

The other Syriac Version of the Old Testament, made from the Greek translation of the Septuagint, is more recent; nevertheless, no typeset edition has hitherto furnished a copy of it for us. However, many Versions together, or certainly editions, of this sort, translated from the Greek, appear to be in the hands of the Maronites.² Concerning this twofold Syriac Version of the Old Testament, see

¹ See 2 Kings 17:27, 28.

² The Maronites were Aramaic-speaking and used Aramaic in their liturgy from the seventh to the eighteenth century.

CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter V, § 1, 2, pages 621-640, and the many whom he commends: to which add PRIDEAUX in his *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, part II, book I, § 10, columns 760-762; and BUDDEUS in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, page 1528.

The Syriac Version of the New Testament is not held to be of the same age among all. The Syrians maintain that this Version was undertaken by the Evangelist Mark himself. Others judge that this was composed by an Apostolical men. Again, others believe that this work was undertaken by the nascent Church of Antioch for its own uses. From whom JACQUES BASNAGE dissents in a surprising manner, when he contends that this Version was not composed before the twelfth century. Although the Author of this Version be uncertain, "yet the translation, prepared from a Greek and authentic text, is simple and accurate, in which the words answer as faithfully as possible to the words, and for which reason it is often a light to Interpreters;" if I might symbolize with FREDERIC SPANHEIM *the Younger*, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century II, chapter VII, § I, column 650: whence it is deservedly held in great estimation among all. Moreover, that this Version belongs to venerable antiquity, appears to be indicated both by the necessity of the Church of the Syrians, and also by the lack of the books, over which there was disputation in the Third Century and following, in the exemplar which in the Sixteenth Century Ignatius, Patriarch of Antioch,¹ sent into Europe,² from which JOHANNES ALBERTUS WIDMANSTADIUS, Jurisconsultus, Chancellor of the provinces of eastern Austria,³ a little after the middle of the sixteenth Century, took care that the first edition of this Version be printed at Vienna: which lack of books, nevertheless, was thereafter supplied out of other Manuscript Codices: whence it is no trifling conjecture that a Version of the entire New Testament already existed among the Syrians from the earliest times; but because of which doubts were moved concerning some Books, that among the Syrians the Canonical confidence in these Books even began to labor, whence they were even omitted from the Canon of many Churches in Syria; and that thus these Books were not received into the Canon, of which the Patriarch Ignatius made use, and

¹ Namely, Ignatius Abdallah I, who held the patriarchate from 1520 to 1557.

² This exemplar was missing 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation.

³ Johann Albrecht Widmannstetter (1506-1557) was trained in law, theology, and oriental languages. He served as a papal secretary for a time.

which, that it might be set down in type, he willed to be given. Indeed, in the titles, which were added to the individual chapters of the New Testament, mention is made of the veneration of the cross, prayers for the dead, and other Papal ceremonies, which in the times of the Apostles were not yet received in the Apostolic Church: but FREDERIC SPANHEIM *the Elder*, in *Dubiis Euangelicis*, and JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER, in *Analectis Historico-theologicis*, observe that these titles are not of the same antiquity as the rest of the work; but that from the Vulgate Version various things were inserted into the Syriac Version in following ages whether by fraud, or under the pretext of correction. Nevertheless, the Revisers of the new Dutch Version of the New Testament, among others also, set less value upon this Version: see LODEWIJK GERARDUS VAN RENESSE'S¹ *Commentariolum historicum, etc.* in the *Bylagen* to NICOLAAS HINLOPEN'S *Historie van de Nederlandsche Overzettinge des Bybels*, page 138. Concerning this Version consult LEUSDEN'S *Philologum Hebræo-Græcum*, *Dissertation VII*; SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, *Century II, chapter VII, § I, column 650*; BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, *book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, page 1528*; RUMPÆUS' *Criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, *pages 436-441*, besides many others commended by Rumpæus. Concerning the various Editions of this Version see RUMPÆUS' *Criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, *pages 438 and following*; and the *Præfationem* set before the edition of the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN and SCHAAF.² That the Syriac Version of the New Testament was prepared in the Syrian dialect of Antioch, not the Syrian dialect of Jerusalem, following WALTON OTHO VERBRUGGE observes, *Observationibus philologicis de Nominum Hebræorum plurali Numero*, *Observation II, § 28, 30, pages 130, 133.*

That there is no number of the more recent translations in various Languages, our AUTHOR justifiably subjoins. Which will be most persuasive to each one, if he should consult the *Bibliothecam Sacram* of JACOB LE LONG of Paris, a Priest of the Congregation of the Oratory, edited and enlarged by CHRISTIAN FREDERICK BOERNER, Professor of humane Letters at the Academy of Leipzig, which appeared in two

¹ Lodewijk Gerardus van Renesse (1599-1671) was a Dutch pastor and theologian. He was appointed to work on the revision of the Dutch translation.

² Leusden and Schaaf published a Syriac edition of the New Testament in 1709. Karl Schaaf (1646-1729) was a German orientalist, and professor of oriental languages at Leiden.

octavo volumes at Antwerp and Leipzig in 1709;¹ BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 5, tome 2, page 1531, § 6, pages 1538b-1543, § 7, pages 1543-1580, in which there is extended discussion focused upon *Luther's German Version* of the Bible, pages 1549-1569, and in the *Addendis*, pages 1841, 1842a; especially with respect to the New Testament, JUSTUS WESSELUS RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros cum præfatione Carpzovii*, § L, pages 344-443; and FABRICIUS' *Bibliothecam Græcam*, book IV, chapter V, volume 3, pages 191-203, where the Versions of the New Testament are reviewed in Alphabetical order. Concerning the various *Italian Versions* of the Bible prepared during the time of the Reformation, see GERDES' *Specimen Italicæ Reformatæ*, § 10, pages 14-16, and the *Syllabum Italarum Reformatorum*, pages 190, 191, 242, 329, 330, 340, of the same.

Moreover, our AUTHOR has, *The rash assertion from the statements of the Papists, resting upon the misrepresented Testimony of AUGUSTINE, that for many ages the Scripture was formerly read only in the Three Languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.* They are certainly deceived, if they want to conclude this from AUGUSTINE'S *de Civitate Dei*, book XV, chapter XIII at the end, *opera*, tome 7, column 298, where it reads: "For also in certain Codices, three Greek, one Latin, and even one Syriac, agreeing among themselves, Methuselah died six years before the flood." For nothing else is gathered from these words, than that this threefold Version of the Old Testament was formerly esteemed to be of great value, since perhaps they were also surpassing all with respect to antiquity, whence Augustine appeals to the consent of these.

The other passage of AUGUSTINE, from *book II de Doctrina Christiana*, chapter XI, *opera*, tome 3, part I, column 19, is no more to the point, of which *Bellarmino* expressly makes use, *book II de Verbo Dei*, chapter XV, column 141, to prove the hypothesis mentioned by our AUTHOR; for AUGUSTINE *in that place* speaks only of men of the Latin Tongue, whom he wishes to learn also the Hebrew and Greek Languages, so that in doubts arising from the variety of Latin translations they might be able to have recourse to the founts: "Indeed (says he), men of the Latin tongue, whom we now undertake to instruct, have need of two others for the knowledge of the divine Scriptures, namely,

¹ Christian Frederick Boerner (1683-1753) was a German Lutheran theologian, excelling in the fields of Ecclesiastical History and Biblical Criticism. He published an edition of the works of Martin Luther in twenty-two volumes, and a corrected and enlarged edition of Le Long's *Bibliothecæ Sacræ*.

the Hebrew and the Greek, so that they might have recourse to the preceding exemplars, if the infinite variety of Latin translators should produce any doubt.” But, 1. Augustine in that place, speaking concerning *men of the Latin Tongue*, neither affirms nor denies concerning men of another tongue, whether they might also have the Sacred Scripture translated into their own Vernacular Language, or not; but many Fathers of the same period do affirm it. 2. At least concerning men of the Latin Tongue he teaches that they ought to read Scripture in the Vernacular Language: but if it is as harmful as the Roman Church maintains, neither ought the Scripture to be translated into the Latin Tongue. 3. He wants these men in doubts arising from the Latin Version to have recourse to the Hebrew and Greek founts, which also little agrees with the tenets of the Roman Church, in which they attribute authenticity to the Vulgate Version. 4. Finally, if it is lawful for men of the Latin Tongue to read Scripture in the Vernacular Language: why shall that not be equally lawful for men of another Tongue?

Neither is it *to be Objected* that, if the use of Versions were necessary, the Apostles, furnished with the gift of Tongues, would have prepared more Translations of this sort, in which manner only would we be able to be confident concerning the infallibility of the Versions.

As may be expected, *I Respond* with our *Author*, the Apostles, α . were taken up with more necessary business, β . as Universal Doctors, wrote in the Language most common at that time; whence, γ . they left the task of translating the Scripture into more Languages to the diligence of the Church, which is no more infallible in the Translation of Sacred Scripture, than in its preaching and explication, although it ought to be faithful; and in all doubts recourse to the authentic Text is granted: consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, *special part I*, article I, *chapter II*, pages 181-184.

§ 34: The Translation of Scripture, Part 2

But let the greatest care be taken by pious Magistrates, together with the Governors of the Churches, that for the Church publicly and privately provision be made of a faithful Version by Men skillful in Languages. In this respect both the Magistrates of the Netherlands as Nursing-Fathers to the Church,¹ and the Ministers of the Church themselves, have discharged their duty faithfully. In the first times after the Reformation, the Church in the Netherlands made use of a Version of the Sacred Scripture, the author of which is unknown, prepared, not from the Hebrew and Greek founts, but from the German Version of *Luther*, which was problematic in many portions, however *Eckhardus* may endeavor to defend the same, *Fasciculus Controversiarum cum Calvino*, chapter I, question 5, pages 21-24. With respect to the New Testament, the Dutch Version was thereafter emended and corrected in accordance with the Greek Text by JAN UYTENHOVE,² to whom were added as help JOHANNES À LASCO,³ MARTINUS MICRON,⁴ PETER and WALTER DELHEN, formerly Ministers of the Dutch Church in England: and henceforth from this emendation our Church read the New Testament, after which this Version thus corrected was first published at Embden in 1565: see ISAAC LE LONG'S *Boekzaal der Nederduytsche Bybels*,⁵ pages 708, etc., 718. However, innumerable errors, and some of those quite serious, were remaining, which both from *Luther's* Version had adhered to ours, and additionally had crept in through the indolence of the Dutch Translators and typesetters. For which reason a new Version, prepared from the very founts, was altogether necessary. Unto this most

¹ Isaiah 49:23.

² Jan Uytenhove was a Ruling Elder of the Dutch congregation in London.

³ Johannes à Lasco (1499-1560) was a Polish reformer. He served as superintendent of the Strangers' Church in London (1543-1555), composed mostly of French and Dutch refugees.

⁴ Martinus Micron (c. 1522-1559) was one of the Dutch pastors of the Strangers' Church. He studied under Bullinger at the University of Basel.

⁵ Isaac Le Long (1683-1762) was a historian and bibliographer. Although of French descent, his family fled to the Netherlands for religion reasons. He wrote a history of the Dutch translations of the Bible.

important work at diverse times were nominated Nobleman Philippus Marnixius, Lord of Saint-Aldegonde,¹ Arnoldus Cornelii,² and Wernerus Helmichius,³ who all died with the work hardly begun. And so by the States-General of the Netherlands the National Synod of Dort in the year 1618, after preparation made for this in *Sessions VI-XII*, in *Session XIII* designated certain eminent Theologians to undertake the care of the first preparation of this new Version, or of review of it thereafter, and thus to render this work, so long desired, at last completed. And the Translators of the Old Testament were indeed selected by the Synod, Johannes Bogerman,⁴ Willem Baudært,⁵ and Gerson Bucerus.⁶ To whom with additional votes were most closely joined Antonius Thysius, Jacobus Rolandus,⁷ and Herman Faukelius.⁸ For the Translation of the New Testament and Apocryphal Books were chosen Jacobus Rolandus, Herman Faukelius, and Petrus Cornelii. To these with superior votes were most closely conjoined Festus Hommius,⁹ Antonius Walæus, and Jodocus Hoingius.¹⁰ But, with the death of some that the Synod had designated intervening, Jacobus Rolandus, Antonius Walæus, and Festus

¹ Philips of Marnix (1540-1598) studied theology under Calvin and Beza at Geneva. In 1560, he moved to the Netherlands and took an active part in the Reformation, serving as both a statesman and an author. He undertook one of the earliest Dutch Bible translations.

² Arnold Cornelisz Crusius (1547-1605) was a Dutch Reformed minister.

³ Werner Helmichius (1550-1608) was a Dutch Reformed minister. In 1598, the States of Holland nominated Arnold Cornelisz Crusius and Werner Helmichius to make a new Dutch translation; but both men died, leaving the work incomplete. The work of translation would not be resumed until 1618.

⁴ Johannes Bogerman (1576-1637) was a Frisian Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1633-1637). He was involved in the production of the Dutch Bible, and was president of the Synod of Dort.

⁵ Willem Baudart (1565-1640) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Pastor. He was particularly skillful in Hebrew.

⁶ Gerson Bucerus (1565-1631) was a Dutch Reformed Minister, perhaps of English extraction. He was a noted Hebraist.

⁷ Jacobus Rolandus (1562-1632) was a Dutch Reformed Minister. He was a zealous opponent of the Remonstrants, and a mover in the calling of a national synod to handle the crisis.

⁸ Herman Faukelius (1560-1625) was a Dutch Reformed Minister. He was active in the struggle with the Remonstrants, and a representative of the Zeelandic churches to the Synod of Dort.

⁹ Festus Hommius (1576-1642) was a Dutch Theologian and Pastor. He was actively involved in opposing the Remonstrants, and served as secretary to the Synod of Dort.

¹⁰ Jodocus Hoingius (died 1637) was Rector of the Academy at Harderwijk.

Hommius actually translated the New Testament.

Now, to the Examination of the Version of the Old Testament were appointed, 1. Antonius Thysius; 2. Johannes Polyander; 3. Petrus Plancius,¹ whom, having died, Jacobus Rolandus succeeded, and, with Rolandus also dying, Abdias Widmarius² was appointed by the Synod of Northern Holland; 4. Jodocus Larenus;³ 5. Sibrandus Lubbertus,⁴ in whose place Bernhard Fullenius⁵ was substituted; 6. Jacobus Revius;⁶ 7. Franciscus Gomarus. To whom, 8. Arnoldus Teekmannus⁷ was finally added by a particular Synod of Utrecht.

To the Examination of the Version of the New Testament were appointed, 1. Sebastiaan Damman;⁸ 2. Festius Hommius, into whose place succeeded Henricus Arnoldi Lidanus; 3. Gosuinus Geldorpius,⁹ whom Willem van Nieuwenhuizen followed; 4. Antonius Walæus, into whose place Carolus Dematius¹⁰ succeeded; 5. Bernhard Fullenius, who was also among the Revisers of the Old Testament; 6. Johannes Langius,¹¹ whom Caspar Sibelius¹² followed; 7. Ubbo Emmius,¹³ whom

¹ Petrus Plancius (1552-1622) was a Flemish astronomer, cartographer, and minister.

² Abdias Widmarius (1591-1668) was a German Reformed Pastor and scholar. He served as Professor of Old and New Testament Exegesis at Groningen from 1645 to 1668.

³ Jodocus Larenus was minister at Flushing.

⁴ Sibrandus Lubbertus (c. 1556-1625) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1585-1625), and was a prominent participant in the Synod of Dort.

⁵ Bernhard Fullenius (1565-1636) was a Dutch Reformed theologian, minister, and orientalist.

⁶ Jacobus Revius (1586-1658) was a Dutch Reformed theologian, historian, and poet. He was equally energetic in his opposition to Arminianism and Cartesianism. Revius was appointed secretary of the translation committee.

⁷ Arnoldus Teekmannus served as a pastor of a congregation in Utrecht.

⁸ Sebastiaan Damman (1578-1640) was a Reformed minister in Zutphen. He was appointed to serve as secretary to the Synod of Dort with Festus Hommius.

⁹ Gosuinus Geldorpius (1563-1627) was a Dutch Reformed minister, and opponent of the Remonstrants.

¹⁰ Carolus de Mæts (1597-1651) was a Flemish Reformed theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht from 1640 to 1651.

¹¹ Johannes Langius (died 1624) served as minister of the Gospel at Doesburg.

¹² Caspar Sibelius (1590-1658) was a Dutch Reformed minister in Deventer.

¹³ Ubbo Emmius (1547-1626) was a German Reformed theologian. Emmius played a leading role in the formation of the University of Groningen, and he served as Professor of History, Geography, and Theology (1614-1625).

Heinrich Alting followed. To whom, 8. the men of Utrecht added Lodewijk Gerardus van Renesse.¹

The Venerable Synod determined that a beginning of the work was to be made three months after the dismissal of the Synod, and it believed that that was able to be completed thereafter in the space of four years. However, the Translators of the Old Testament finally met in the tenth year afterwards, 1628, at Leiden, and began the translation. In the following year, 1629, the Translators of the New Testament and Apocryphal Books followed. They completed the Translation of both the Old and the New Testament in the year 1632. With the work of Translation completed in the space of four years, those that were appointed for the Examination of the Version, and had already privately reviewed at home some Books received from the Translators at various times, were summoned to Leiden, so that there they together might call the entire work unto a meticulous examination. The Revisers of the Old Testament, after they had landed at Leiden on July 1, 1633, were applying themselves to the work entrusted to them until September of 1634. Then, the Revisers of the New Testament also brooded over the work unto which they had been appointed until they completed it in the month of October, 1635. At long last, this new Version was first brought forth into the light in the year 1637, with a *Preface* added by the ILLUSTRIOUS and MOST POWERFUL GENERAL ORDERS OF THE NETHERLANDS, to which Churches of the Netherlands they study to commend the same. See concerning this Translation and its Rules, which the Venerable Synod wished to be observed in the same, the Acts already cited of the National Synod of Dort, *Sessions* VI, VIII-XIII, *page m.* in the larger form of Elzevir's edition, 21, 23-31; and also LEUSDEN'S *Philologum Hebræo-mixtum*, *Dissertation* X, XI; the *Vitam Walæi*, before his *Opera*, ***** 4 *versa*, *column b*, ***** 1, 2; add the *Bibliothecam Sacram* of JACQUES LE LONG, *part II*, *chapter IX*, *section X*, *pages* 276-284; and especially that most accurate history of this Version written by the most noble HINLOPEN, Judge at Hoorn, which he published at Leiden in the year 1777 under the title, *Historie van de Nederlandsche Overzettinge des Bybels door NICOLAAS HINLOPEN*: from which among other things it shall appear that the Translators, both of the Old and the New Testament, came somewhat more swiftly to Leiden and began the work of Translation, and that they they brooded over it a little longer than I

¹ Lodewijk Gerardus van Renesse (1599-1671) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and minister. He was a learned man, and trained in nine languages.

have given above from the relation of others; see *pages 95-97, 100, 103-108, 112-114, 121, 122, 127, 128, 134-136, in the Appedices, page 77.*

Concerning this Version, introduced into our Church by public authority, necessary is the admonition or our Most Illustrious AUTHOR, *let no one rashly by private judgment despise and censure the same before the people; which to him is evidence of intolerable impudence and ambition.* And indeed, by universal consent our New Version excels nearly all the Versions in painstaking attention to detail, ἀκριβεία/*precision*, and faithfulness: and we altogether forwardly and with abandon anticipate that those eminent Theologians, who were intent upon this work in such number, for so long a time, so painstakingly, and with their shared insights, are going to surpass everywhere by long intervals, either us ourselves, or one or the other Theologian, either in skill in the Original Languages, or in happily following the mind of the Holy Spirit. And so, unless some weighty cause move us, there is to be adherence to the received Version, which shall contribute to the edification of the Church, and to the averting of the doubt of the simple and of much common scandal: for more on this see LEYDEKKER in his *Face Veritatis, locus II, controversy V, pages 45-47.*

Nevertheless, our AUTHOR does not wish this to be extended to such an extent, as if we believe our Version to be also Authentic with respect to the words and infallible, so that there might not be any appeal from it: for this is a privilege of the Original Text alone. We do not imitate the *Papists*, who do not hesitate to canonize their Vulgate Version; nor the *Anabaptists*, who in disputation concerning controversies of faith ever cleave to the Vernacular Version, although corrupted, to such an extent that they do not admit an appeal from it to the Original text; see DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIVS, *contra Anabaptistas, chapter VIII, section III, pages 117, 118, 126-129.* But, if a healthy veneration remain, which to an Assembly of so many illustrious Theologians, who had the charge of this translation and its examination, by just right we owe according to the command of the Apostle, whereby he wills that the spirit of the Prophets be subject to the Prophets, 1 Corinthians 14:32; we believe that even now it is incumbent upon each and every Doctor to seek and teach the force of the Originals; and to the same we permit to compare the several Translations noted in the margin also, and, when necessity requires it, sometimes even to recede from our Version, and to indicate that, but with due modesty and prudence. The Orders of Holland in an Edict to promote the peace of the Church,

published on April 9, 1675, mandates in *article V*, “One neither ought to subject the New Translation to critical analysis nor cite it disparagingly, unless one does so humbly and unpretentiously to address a difference of opinion.”

§ 35: The Reading of the Scriptures, Part 1

The Scripture is to be translated so that an entrance might be opened to all. And thus we now affirm in addition, that *the translated Scripture* is to be Read *promiscuously before and by Christian People, without any special permission of men*; because what is incumbent upon all by way of duty ought not to be conceded to some by way of privilege: *yet this is to be done in such a way that, in reading parts of Scripture especially beneficial and useful, place be given to the counsel of Pastors and of Those more highly Trained*; for this is not so much a prohibition as a method of learning, tending to easier progress and greater edification. Of course, this also has already been observed among the Jews for ages, concerning whom JEROME, *Præfatione ad Ezekielem, opera, tome 5, page 377*, relates, “Unless one among them has come to the age of priestly ministry, that is, has completed his thirtieth year; it is not permitted to him to read the beginnings of Genesis, nor the Song of Songs, nor the beginning and ending of Ezekiel’s scroll,” namely, on account of the sublimity of the mysteries that are delivered therein: consult CARPZOV’S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti, chapter V, § 5, 6, pages 212, 214-216*. Nevertheless, this assertion of Jerome VITRINGA tries to render dubious, *de Templo Ezechielis, tome I, chapter I, pages 2-6*. On the other hand, the Hebrews desired that those younger begin their Reading from *Leviticus*, because this Book was by far the most useful in daily practice at home and abroad in the temple and synagogues: see HOTTINGER’S *Thesaurum Philologicum, pages 78, 480, 490, 491*.

We prove our thesis:

1. From *the Commandments* to Read. Of course, what is commanded promiscuously to all, is to be permitted promiscuously to all. But the Reading of Sacred Scripture is commanded to all. Both *implicitly, α.* in the reproving of ignorance of the Scriptures, Matthew 22:29, which implies the obligation to meditate deeply upon Sacred Scripture, so that it might be granted to arrive at a knowledge of its subject matter. *β.* In the blessing proclaim over those meditating upon the Sacred Scripture, Psalm 1:1, 2; Revelation 1:3; which commends the practice of reading and meditating upon Sacred Scripture, and sets it

forth for imitation. And *explicitly*, in the Old Testament, in which it is commanded to all in their private capacity to meditate upon the Word of God and to hand it on to their families, Deuteronomy 6:6-9; in particular, the Reading of the Scripture is enjoined upon the King, Deuteronomy 17:18, 19; and the public reading of Scripture is commanded to the Priests and Elders every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles, Deuteronomy 31:10-13; whence you might yet rashly conclude that the reading of the Law, either privately, or even publicly in the sacred assemblies of the people, was not at other times either done or decent and necessary; which from other examples, passages, and arguments could be most easily refuted: for it no more follows from this, than if from the appointed reading of the Divine Word, Creed, Decalogue, etc., in our Churches, on some particular occasion, one might conclude that those at other times either are not read, or ought not to be read by all. From this commandment the decency and usefulness of the public reading of the Scriptures in the Vernacular Language is sufficiently evident: for what ought at some time or other to be done, that of itself is not able to be evil and unlawful; but, with no divine prohibition hindering, it shall also deserve to be commended in other circumstances also: consult our AUTHOR'S *Commentarium in præcipuas partes Pentateuchi* on Deuteronomy 31:10-12, § X, page 734. No less is this expressed *in the New Testament*, in the commandment of the Lord, John 5:39, upon which passage our AUTHOR desires that it be well observed, α. that the speech is directed promiscuously to the Jews, *verses* 15-17; β. to whom it was permitted without any special indulgence, but rather the searching of Scripture is commanded, so that ἐρευνᾶτε/*search* is Imperative; in which manner its force appears best to satisfy the scope of the Savior, and His reasoning: but, if you should wish the searching of the Scripture be attributed to the Jews through the Indicative mood, which also is permitted by the word ἐρευνᾶτε, *ye search*; even in this manner the place is opposite to the Papists, because that practice of the Jews is not thus reprehended, but is commended with praise: γ. our AUTHOR notes that a reason is added from the Evangelical argument and eternal Life, found among them, not according to a vain opinion of the Jews, but rather a settled determination: how the word δοκεῖν, *to think*,¹ is used of a true and certain view and

¹ John 5:39: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think (δοκεῖτε) ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."

determination, no less than of a false opinion, see GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, page 204. There are similar Apostolic commandments, Colossians 3:16; 1 Thessalonians 5:27; 2 Peter 1:19: see GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, page 204; and *Commentarium meum* on 2 Peter 1:19.

2. From the *Practice of the Church*. For what the Church has always performed, and the practice of which in this matter is commemorated with praise, that is even now lawful; indeed, in this the example of the ancient Church moves us to imitation. The practice of the Jewish Church *publicly reading* the Sacred Scripture is abundantly evident out of Nehemiah 8:2-9, on which passage consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter I, pages 432, 433; out of Acts 15:21, Μωσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει, ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος, *for Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day*, on which passage see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales*. Now, it is quite well-known that this was the custom of the Jews, from the most ancient times to complete yearly in the Synagogues the Reading of the Pentateuch, divided into certain Parashot, and then also the Reading of certain Haphtarot out of the Prophets; see § 19 above: which the Christian Church diligently imitated, whence also the Ecclesiastical order of *Readers* among the offices is reviewed, see *Chapter XXXIII:12 below*. Indeed, since in the latter times of the Jewish republic the Hebrew dialect was passing into disuse, and the Chaldean or Syriac dialect was coming into its place, the Jews are recorded to have had in their Synagogues in Palestine Translators, who were rendering in Chaldean what things had been read in Hebrew out of the Sacred Codex by the Reader: in the imitation of which custom learned Men also maintain that what things had been read out of the Hebrew Books were translated into Greek in Egypt; see CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part I, chapter V, section V, page 218, part II, chapter I, pages 433, 434, chapter II, § 5, pages 506β, 508, number 2, § 7, pages 522, 523; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, columns 393, 394, 432, 758, 763, 1383, 1397, 1398. The pious were no less accustomed *to read* and meditate upon the Scriptures *privately* in all previous ages, Psalm 119:24; Acts 8:28; 2 Timothy 3:15; Acts 17:11, which passage, although it is to be expounded of the more noble and advanced among the Thessalonians,

nevertheless makes against the Papists; because some among the Thessalonians are at that time commended as εὐγενέστεροι, *more noble*, than the rest, because in addition to the reception λόγου μετὰ προθυμίας, *of the Word with readiness*, they themselves were also searching the Scriptures: but from the phrase and especially from the context it is certain that the Bereans are here treated, who are commended jointly as εὐγενέστεροι, *more noble*, than the Thessalonians on account of their private and daily searching of the Scripture: consult GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, book II, *special part I, article I, chapter II, page 204*. That by τὰς γραφάς, *the Scriptures*, in Acts 17:11, the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* are to be understood, NIEUWLAND confirms, *Lectonibus exegeticis*, book IV, *epistle XVI, pages 579-582*, against someone that believed that that term was to be explained *in this place* of parchments and skins containing the deeds and oracles of Jesus Christ, inscribed in the same, and confirmed by trustworthy witnesses, which Paul carried with him for the conviction of the Jews everywhere. The pious and diligent care of the Jewish Church, whereby for ages and also in this later time, there is a commendation and clear sanctioning to each and every one, even from earliest youth, of the study and private reading of the Scripture, that each one at his own home have a copy of the Law written out, if it could be done, with his own hand; is able amply to be demonstrated out of HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, pages 89-93; PRIDEAUX'S *An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, column 1384. Nothing else was instituted in the true, Christian Church; while from the reading of the Fathers, whose many passages upon this matter TURRETIN noted, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus II, *question XVIII, § 4*; and also LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Evangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 8, pages 145, 146, it abundantly appears how solicitous the Church and her Doctors always were in commending to and inculcating in all the Reading of the Sacred Scripture: see also JEWEL'S *adversus Hardingum*, article XV, *opera*, tome I, pages 119-133.

3. From Reasons: taken,

α. *From the divine design of Scripture for the use of all.* For, what was designed for the use of all, its use is to be conceded to all, and no one is to be kept from it: but that this is so designed see Habakkuk 2:2, upon *which passage* see the *Commentarium* of our AUTHOR; and Romans 1:7.

β. *From the manifold, necessary, and most useful end* that the Scripture has, and is not able to fulfill apart from Reading. For

what Scripture according to the intention of God furnishes to every believer as eminent and absolutely necessary uses, which he is not able to obtain without the Reading of Scripture, that is to be read in the presence of and by each and every one in a known language. There are these uses: *direction*, Psalm 119:9; Galatians 6:16; *information*, 2 Timothy 3:16; *consolation*, Romans 15:4; *defense*, Ephesians 6:17 compared with Matthew 4:4, 7, 10; *nourishment*, 1 Peter 2:2.

γ. *From the state of believers*, who are not to be suppressed so far below the Clergy in the lawful handling of Scripture; since all are *Prophets taught by God Himself*, John 6:45; Joel 2:28, 29; but the searching of and meditation upon divine mysteries is especially fitting for Prophets. They are *Priests*, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, who hence are *to be admitted unto the holy*, and are not able to be kept from holy things. The divine Law is to be examined by them daily, so that thence they might be able to learn the manner of Priestly worship acceptable to God. They are additionally *Judges of all things according to the divine Law*, which hence they have need to search assiduously, 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1.

4. Indeed, the Papists, pressed by the force of truth, are time and again forced to give their assent to us, as the more noble of them willingly lend their agreement to us, which GERHARD shows from many passages cited out of their writings, *Confessione catholica, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, thesis VIII, pages 188-203*, in which are things especially worthy of mention, which are cited out of ERASMUS' *Præfationem Paraphrasum in Novum Testamentum, pages 189, 190*.

§ 36: The Reading of the Scriptures, Part 2

The principal opponents are:

*The Ancients following the Gnosimachi,*¹ concerning whom JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *de Hæresibus, opera, page m. 585*, says, “The Gnosimachi are those that are opposed to the inquiry and knowledge of the Christians, to such an extent that they say that vain and unnecessary is the labor of those that seek any Knowledge out of the divine writings. Neither does God require anything from the Christian, except noble and good actions. And so it is better for one to follow their own intention with a simple and untutored heart, say they, than to expend much care in learning doctrines and sentences.”

The Papists, who without the permission of Bishops, Inquisitors, or Superiors, which later Popes have further limited, assert that the Reading of Scripture is noxious, etc., and deny the Absolution of sinners until the Bible has been returned to the Ordinary. The Reading of the Scriptures is *dangerous and pernicious*, from *Facultatis Parisiensis contra Erasmum Censura, article IV, title XII*, where the Parisian Theologians thus declare: “In this tempest arises the *dangerous and pernicious* translation of the Scripture into the vulgar Tongue from the evident ill will of men. If it be sometimes useful to some, it is not therefore rashly to be permitted to all. For in fact, in a matter not necessary for salvation, it is better to look to the profit of the many by interdicting that, than by permitting it for the advantage of the few with grievous harm to the many; whence also translation of this sort is rightly condemned.” These are the words in GERHARD’S *Confessione catholica, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, thesis VIII, page 172*. Indeed, if we listen to *Alfonso de Castro,*² *book I adversus Hæreses, chapter XIII, page 33*, the reading of the Sacred Codex is more harmful than the reading of Gentile Philosophers: “Not without reason did we advise above that that the books of the pagans are to be read with great caution.

¹ It is doubtful that the Gnosimachi were actually a well-defined sect, but they stood in opposition to the Gnostics, that is, they were doctrinally indifferent, and believed that true religion consists of a good life.

² Alfonso de Castro (1495-1558) was a Franciscan theologian of the School of Salamanca. His work was largely devoted to the defense of Roman Catholicism by means of civil and criminal law.

Therefore, since *more harm* is brought in by the sacred books translated into the vulgar tongue *than by the reading of pagan Philosophers*, that is with good reason restricted, even if no prohibition is made concerning the other.” A good number of similar, crude pronouncements of the Papists shall be given by GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, *special part I*, article I, chapter II, *thesis VIII*, pages 185-187. Rule V (or IV) of the Index of Prohibited Book prepared by the Council of Trent has it thus, as it is found in the *Indice Expurgatorio Hispanico anni 1667*, pages XXV, XXVI: “Since experience teaches that from the permission of the Sacred Books in the vulgar Tongue arises more detriment than advantage on account of the temerity, ignorance, or malice of men; the Bible, extant in the vulgar Tongue, is prohibited, with all its parts, printed or in manuscript.... Now, so that scruples might be avoided, which are able to arise at this point, and so that the reader might distinguish what belongs to vulgar idiom or otherwise, it is declared that the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Chaldean, Syriac, Æthiopic, Persic, and Arabic are not vulgar idiom; which is understood of the original languages, which today are not used commonly in familiar speech; so that the reader might see that all others are vulgar.” Pope Pius IV¹ somewhat softened this harsh sentence, permitting it to the judgment of the ordinary Parish Priest or Bishop to grant the Reading of the Bible to those that they understand are able from Reading of this sort to reap, not harm, but an increase of faith and piety: while he denies the Absolution of sinners to the one that without this permission read the Bible in the vulgar tongue before it was handed over: this is indeed expressed by Tridentine Rule IV of the Expurgatory Index, published by commandment of Pius IV; see *Indicem Expurgatorium Romanum anno 1667*, page 4. *Sixtus Senensis, Bibliotheca Sacra*, book VI, annotation CLII, page 482: “The Most Holy Synod of Trent in the Index of prohibited volumes, in the fourth rule, decreed in these words: *Since by experience it is manifest that, if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted everywhere without discrimination, more detriment than advantage arise from it on account of the temerity of men; in this respect let it be fixed in the judgment of the Bishop or Inquisitor, that with the counsel of the Parish Priest, or Confessor, they might be able to grant the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, translated by Catholic authors, to those that they understand are able from Reading of this sort to reap, not harm, but an increase of faith and piety:*

¹ Pius IV reigned as Pope from 1559 to 1565. In 1562, he reconvened the Council of Trent to moderate some of the Council’s pronouncements that had occasioned unrest among the principal Roman Catholic nations.

which authority let them have in writing. But let not those that may presume to read or have the Bible without such authority, except with the Bible previously returned to the Ordinary, be able to receive the Absolution of Sinners.” Bellarmine set this forth as the sentence of the Catholic Church, *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter XV, Controversiis, tome I, column 139*. But this moderation was soon retracted again near the end of the sixteenth century. Pope Clement VIII, in the following Observation made upon the fourth Rule just now cited, which is found in the *Indice Expurgatorio Romano anno 1667, page 6*: “It is to be observed concerning the aforementioned fourth rule of the Index of Pope Pius the IV of blessed memory, that by this impression and edition no authority is newly granted to Bishops, or Inquisitors, or Superiors of Regulars, to grant a license to purchase, read, or keep a Bible published in the vulgar tongue, since hitherto by the mandate and usage of the Holy Roman and universal Inquisition the authority to grant licenses of this sort for reading or keeping vulgar Bibles, or other parts of the Sacred Scripture, both of the New and of the Old Testament, published in whatever vulgar language, was taken from them: ...which is indeed to be kept inviolately.” Apart from the fact that, at the time of the Rule published by Pius IV mentioned above, there was no Version of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue approved by the Roman Church, which sort was not thereafter admitted in regions in which the Inquisition is strong. But to permit the Reading of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, this is permitted only by a Bishop, Inquisitor, or Superior; and to deny to these the authority to grant a license of this sort: or to concede to Bishops and Inquisitors this authority, and to take care that such an approved Version be not found: is to make sport in a serious matter: see MOULIN’S¹ *Novitatem Papismi, book I, chapter LVIII, page m. 175-183, especially pages 175, 176*; CABELJAUW’S² *Catholyk Memorie-voek, part I, chapter V, pages 140-155, especially 143, 144*. At the same time, the judgment of Clement VIII just now reviewed is to stand as the judgment of the Church, until it be publicly revoked: since the Council of Trent not only acknowledges that *supreme authority over the universal Church has been granted to the Popes, Session XIV, chapter VII, de Pœnitentia, pages 128, 129*, but also what things *concerning Censorship of Books were accomplished by the Fathers appointed to Trent, it ordered that they might be exhibited to the most*

¹ Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658) was a Huguenot pastor and theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Sedan (1621-1658).

² Pieter Cabeljauw (c. 1608-1668) was a Reformed theologian.

*holy Roman Pontiff, so that all this might be concluded and made public by his judgment and authority, last Session, day 2, Decretal 3, page 270b, compared with Session XVIII, page 161. And so it is not strange that Clement XI also in the year 1713 in the Bull *Unigenitus* condemned the following Quesnellian Theses, in which QUESNEL¹ had commended to all the Reading of the Sacred Codex in the Vulgar Tongue. Thesis LXXX on Acts 8:28: The Reading of the Holy Scripture *between the hands even of a man of business and of finances, mark that this is for the entire world.* Thesis LXXXI on Acts 8:31: *The holy obscurity of the word of God is not a reason for the Laity to dispense with the reading.* Thesis LXXXII on Acts 15:21: *Sunday, which has succeeded the Sabbath, must be sanctified by readings concerning piety, and over all of the Holy Scriptures. It is the milk of the Christian, even that which God Himself, who knows His own work, has given to him to feed upon. It is dangerous to want to wean him.* Thesis LXXXIII on John 4:26: *It is an illusion to imagine that the knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be communicated to this sex [women] by the Reading of the Holy Books, after this example of the confidence with which Jesus manifests Himself to this woman. It is not from the simplicity of women, but rather from the proud knowledge of men, that the abuse of the Scriptures has come, and that heresies have been born.* Thesis LXXXIV on Matthew 5:2: *When we open the New Testament, it is the mouth of Jesus Christ that opens for us. What is it to close it to Christians, but to snatch this holy book from their hands, or to restrain them from the means of hearing it.* Thesis LXXXV on Luke 11:33: *The Scripture, and especially the Gospel is our lamp.... To prohibit the Reading to Christians, this is to prohibit the use of the light to the children of the light, and to make them suffer a form of excommunication.**

We acknowledge likewise with our AUTHOR that from this severity somewhat recede, *both the Practice of those dwelling among the Reformed*, some of whom are led by the shame of the Roman Decrees, others are not able so to enslave to themselves men entire in blind obedience: *and the doctrine of many of the more judicious*; which is able to be seen from what is cited at the end of § XXXV of GERHARD'S *Confessionis Catholicæ*, tome 2, page 188-203; and from the theses of

¹ Pasquier Quesnel (1634-1719) was a French Theologian. Although he graduated from the Sorbonne with distinction, he fell out of favor as he began to embrace Jansenist doctrine. Beginning with his banishment from Paris in 1681, Quesnel suffered persecution for the rest of his life. The publication of *Unigenitus* marks the end of Roman Catholic toleration of Jansenism.

Quesnel just now recited; and also from *Epistolis Philippe Vlaming*¹ contra *David Pierman*, in which the Quesnellian Theses regarding this are defended against the Bull *Unigenitus*, and it is shown the the *Jansenist* Theses are upheld, especially the granting of the Reading of the Sacred Scripture to the common people also: see *Epistolas Philippe Vlaming contra David Pierman*, tome I, Preface, § XVII, Epistle X, § 7, pages 280-284, Epistle XI, § 5, pages 313-317, and the little book subjoined under the title, *Kort Begrip van 't boeje Beweerde Dryheid der eenvoudige Catholijken in 't lezen der Heilige Schriftuure*: add also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 9, tome 2, page 1265b, in which he reviews various writings by *Antoine Arnauld*,² in which this Jansenist vehemently contends that the Reading of the Sacred Scripture to all, even the Laics, is to be conceded, and evinces it with the most resplendent arguments: add what things from the Table of the Jesuits, which is called, *Jansenism destroying all Religion*, Grade IX, LEYDEKKER exhibits in his *Historia Jansenismi*, pages 582-584. Moreover, time will show what is to be retained of the following Decree, and what the result of the same is going to be, the Decree, I say, mentioned in the New Notices at Amsterdam, February 24, 1759, out of letters sent from Rome on February 7: "To the *Index* returned in the past year by order of the Congregation³ is conjoined a Decree, whereby translation, printing, and reading of the Bible in the *vernacular Language* are permitted, only let the translation be approved beforehand by the Holy See. This Decree is additionally confirmed by a special Brief of the deceased Pope Benedict XIV,⁴ which likewise is inserted in the new edition."

The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, *fundamental error*, of the Papists on the Question is the *Obscurity of Scripture*, which they set forward as a pretext without justification.

Their true *Scope/Goal*: that the common people, more thoroughly educated by the clarity of Scripture, might not detect Papal

¹ Philippe Louis Verhulst (died 1753) was a Roman Catholic.

² Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694) was a French theologian, philosopher, and mathematician, and an intellectual luminary and apologist for the Jansenists of Port-Royal.

³ In 1571, the Sacred Congregation of the Index was established to evaluate questionable works, and to make recommendations to the Pope concerning these works.

⁴ Benedict XIV reigned as Pope from 1740 to 1758. He laid restraints upon the Sacred Congregation of the Index, opening up publishing to a significant degree.

Errors and Superstitions, but rather that they might all remain subject to the authority of the Church.

They object in vain:

1. *Passages of Scripture,*

α. Matthew 7:6, in which it is said that *a Holy Thing is not to be given to Dogs*. Thus already in the Twelfth Century Pope Innocent III, in a Decree to those of Metz, says that *dogs and swine* that tear in pieces a holy thing and despise pearls are they that in the Diocese of Metz read the Sacred Scripture translated into the language of Gaul; and hence argue the ignorance of the Priests:¹ see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam, Century XII, chapter III, § 4, column 1578*. Sixtus Senensis, in his *Bibliotheca Sancta, book VI, annotation CLII, page 482*, has: "Therefore, there is to be a restraint...of such abundance and liberty of the vulgar Versions, lest contrary to the Holy precept of the Savior it be given to be devoured by Dogs, and pearls be given to be crushed under foot by swine." From which, nevertheless, he distinguishes those *that are gifted with a right faith upon God and approved manners*, since to these he is willing that translations of the sacred volumes *be granted*. But Hosius, *de expresso Dei Verbo, tome I, page 664*, simply writes: "To permit the Reading of the Scriptures by the Laity is to give a holy thing to dogs and to cast pearls before swine." And GERHARD, *Confessione catholica, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, page 185*, cites more men that in the same manner and sense apply this saying of Christ.

But *We Respond* that not one of those that are tolerated in the communion of the Church is able to be treated as a *Dog* or *Pig*, impure, trampling, devouring: for he that is indicated by these similitudes is to be cast out from the holy people of Christ and His tame sheepfold.

β. Hebrews 5:14. In the Scripture, besides *Solid Food*, useful for Teachers and for the more learned among the people, is also the Milk of babes, comparing *verses 12, 13; 1 Peter 2:2; Psalm 19:7*.

2. *They object the Practice* of the Church, both *Christian*, see Bellarmine, *book II de Verbo Dei, chapter XV, Controversiis, tome I, columns 140-144*, and *Jewish*, see Bellarmine, *pages 139, 140*.

But to this Objection our AUTHOR adequately *Responds*; on whose words, with respect to the *Christian Church, that it made use of the Scriptures only in the Three Languages, as a figment previously exploded*, see

¹ Pope Innocent III, reigning from 1198 to 1216, wrote a letter to Metz, urging the persecution of the Waldenses because of their reading of the Scripture in the vernacular tongue.

what things I taught in § 33. Consult also for the blunting of this Objection GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, pages 180-184. On Nehemiah 8:9, consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter I, pages 432, 433. That the vernacular use of the Hebrew Tongue did not cease in the time of Ezra, with the Chaldean or Syrian dialect substituted even at that time, JACOB ALTING will show in his *Dissertatione de Constantia vernaculæ Judæis Hebrææ Lingvæ in Captivitate Babylonica*, which is *Dissertation I*, in *Heptadibus VII, opera*, tome 5, pages 195-197.

3. *They object Reasons taken,*

α. *From the Obscurity of Scripture*, on account of which the Reading of it is to no purpose. For what is not able to be understood by the people, that ought not to be Read by them, say they: see GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, page 205, argument I.

Responses: 1. In § 25, 26, it appeared that such Obscurity was without justification used as a pretext by the Papists. 2. The Obscurity of the Scripture, which nevertheless is necessary to be known for salvation, should rather furnish an argument for exertion in Reading than for neglecting it. What things concerning the *Majesty* of Scripture our AUTHOR here adds, make to enervate what *Bellarmino* sets forth in the *Seventh Place*, book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter XV, *Controversiis*, tome I, column 146.

β. *From the disadvantages following from a promiscuous Reading.* For, what bring more disadvantage and harm than advantage to the people, that is not to be permitted to them: The Reading of Scripture brings more harm than advantage to the people: Therefore. For hence arise heresies, curiosity, desire for popularity, errors in practice, etc. Thus again *Bellarmino*, book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter XV, *Controversiis*, tome I, columns 145, 146, § *Fifth*; and others cited by GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, pages 205-207, numbers 2, 3.

Responses: 1. It is the fallacy of false cause. If these evils arise from the Reading of Scripture, that will only happen because of the wickedness of the man reading: and so the Reading of Scripture will only be the cause *per accidens*, *circumstantially*, but the wickedness of the man *per se*, *efficiently*. The very best things of all are not without abuse of this sort. The impious abuse the longsuffering and grace of God unto lasciviousness and hardening in sin, Ecclesiastes 8:11; Jude 4. The Use

of the Reading of the Scripture is not therefore to be abrogated. 2. No more the Reading than the hearing of the Scripture is going to produce evils of this sort. 3. No more in the people than in the Clergy are those evils going to arise from the Reading of Scripture: contrarywise, heresies everywhere get their rise, not from the common people, but from Teachers. 4. On the other hand, Ignorance of Scripture is to be held as the true cause of heresies and errors, Matthew 22:29. CHRYSOSTOM, in his *Proœmio in Epistola ad Romanos, opera, tome 9, page 426*, says, τὰ μυρία ἐφύη κακὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν ἀγνοίας· ἐντεῦθεν ἢ πολλὴ τῶν αἰρέσεων ἐβλάστησε λύμη· ἐντεῦθεν οἱ ἡμελημένοι βίοι, *countless evils are produced by ignorance of the Scriptures: hence the manifold outrages of heresies sprouted: hence the dissolute lives.* Contrariwise, from the Scripture is the knowledge of the truth, a conviction of errors, a correction of vices, and a most powerful incitement to holiness, 2 Timothy 3:15; it hinders curiosity, Romans 12:3; discourages pride, James 4:6, etc.: consult GERHARD, *Confessione catholica, tome 2, book II, special part I, article I, chapter II, pages 206-208.*

γ. From *the Unity of the Church*, which of course requires the public use of the Scriptures in whatever language is most common; without which the frequenting of the *public Assemblies* would be even more neglected: see *Bellarmino, book II de Verbo Dei, chapter XV, Controversiis, tome I, column 145, § the Fourth argument*, etc. But our AUTHOR easily explodes these reasonings with three words. Consult § XXXV, XXXVI, of CHRISTOPH LOEBER'S *Defensionem doctrinæ orthodoxæ de omnibus concedenda Scripturæ Sacræ Lectione, occasione Bullæ Anti-Quesnellianæ*, in BUDDEUS' *Miscellaneis Sacris, part III, pages 281-312.*

§ 37: The Sense of Scripture, Simple or Composite, Part 1

So that the Reading of the Scripture might be useful, *the Understanding of the Sense* ought to attend.

The Sense (which in Greek is able to be called διάνοια/*intention*, and νοῦς/*mind/meaning*, which latter word especially in that signification, which occurs here for us, occurs in the New Testament, 1 Corinthians 2:16:¹ consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*,² book II, tractate II, section I, article I, page 166) is the Meaning signified by the mind of the Spirit in the words and phrases of Sacred Scripture.

Concerning the Sense of Scripture in this §, our AUTHOR observes:

1. That commonly said by us to be only *One*:

But, α. sometimes *Simple*, called *Literal*, when by the *Literal Sense* is understood that which is most closely and immediately signified by the very letters, or the words composed of the letters. Again, the *Literal Sense* is used sometimes more strictly, sometimes more broadly: that more strictly *Literal Sense* is what I have just declared; and thus it is distinguished from the *Mystical Sense*, which is not so much signified by the words, as by the things indicated by the words. The more broadly *Literal Sense* comprehends in itself the entire complex of the Sense intended by the Holy Spirit, whether in a type, or in the antitype, and thus also contains under it the *Mystical Sense*; and it is distinguished only by the multiple spiritual Uses, which the Sense intended by the Spirit additionally furnishes.

The *Literal Sense* occurs here in the stricter signification; which also is otherwise called the *Grammatical*, because it is in τοῖς γράμμασιν, *tois grammasin, the letters*, and because by the help of Grammar, as well as of Rhetoric and Logic, is elicited that simple and genuine Sense. It is likewise called *Historical*, namely, that which relates a matter done or

¹ 1 Corinthians 2:16: "For who hath known the mind (νοῦν) of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind (νοῦν) of Christ."

² Solomon Glassius (1593-1656) was a German Lutheran divine and critic. He was Professor of Divinity at the University of Jena. His *Philologia Sacra* was a groundbreaking work in Biblical Hebrew.

said.

Our AUTHOR adds, *Whether it be expressed in the proper words or in Improper speech*, since the Fathers sometimes distinguish the *Literal Sense* from the *figurative* or *tropical*;¹ but which is wont to be comprehended under the *Literal*, as it is opposed to the *Mystical*: and it is indeed the *Literal Sense*, as *Salmeron, opera, tome I, tractate VII, page 73b*, holds, even “what the Holy Spirit as author of the Scripture first intended to signify by the Words, whether according to the proper signification cohering with the Grammar, or through tropes and figures:” see GLASSIUS’ *Philologiam Sacram, book II, tractate II, section I, articles I, II, pages 166-169*.

Again, *whether it be in the text κατὰ τὸ ῥῆτὸν*, according to the express terms, or *κατὰ συνακολούθησιν*, according to the consequences; since legitimate Consequences are comprehended under the explicit words of Scripture, and ought to be said implicitly and materially to be contained in them and to lie under them; the appropriate use of which we gave as confirmed in *Chapter I, § 29, 30*.

And this Simple Sense obtains in the precepts, dogmas, histories, or prophecies set forth simply, for example, in *Isaiah 7:14*, where no composite Sense obtains from the typical and antitypical, but birth from a Virgin is promised to Messiah alone; consult *Chapter XVIII, § 10*; in *Psalm 16:10*, which passage also has regard to Christ alone, and is not able to be referred to David as a type, according to *Acts 2:24-32*.

β. But sometimes the Sense of Scripture is *Composite*, made up of the *Literal* already declared, signified through *Words*, and of the *Mystical* or *Spiritual*, signified by the typical or parabolic *Matter*. That is, that is the *Mystical* Sense that is not indicated immediately by the Words themselves, but by the *Matter* signified by those words, whether proper or figurative: indeed, it is referred to something other than that which the Words immediately signify. Now, it is called *Mystical*, inasmuch as it indicates something more abstruse and sublime than the Words manifest: and *Spiritual*, inasmuch as it represents a *Spiritual* matter.

1. For the illustration of this *Composite* Sense, the word of Jonathan to the boy concerning the seeking of his arrows, *1 Samuel 20:21, 22*, is wont to be adduced, for the words of Jonathan’s command had a simple and literal sense with respect to the boy; but at the same time they were symbolic and had a latent signification with respect to

¹ That is, *involving a trope or figure of speech*.

David. 2. For the confirmation of the same Sense Compounded from the Literal and the Mystical, *Parables* are effective, in which through the Literal and Grammatical Sense, which the letters make manifest, some other spiritual thing, which the Spirit especially intends, is represented to the intellect; in such a way that the thing, first signified by the letter, is a sign and figure of the thing intended by the Spirit: whence then the Sense emerges, not as *twofold*, but as *one composite*, so to speak; and in no way would one be able to be said to follow the mind of the Spirit, that wills to adhere to the external *σχέσει*/*habit* of the Parable: but through the literal representation of a corporeal matter we are introduced to an acquaintance with the more secret mind of the divine Author: concerning *Parable* and establishing the correct interpretation of them consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section V, pages 217-226; and SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica*, book IV, Exercitation V, pages 691-703. Also especially substantiating this are *the many examples of Typical Predictions*, in which are to be considered two parts, as it were, of one and the same Sense intended by the Holy Spirit, who under the letter had regard to a mystery, so that the full Sense is not able to be had, unless the truth of the antitype is joined with the truth of the type: for example, in Exodus 12:46, the law concerning not breaking the bones of the paschal Lamb pertains both to the paschal Lamb in a figure, and to Christ in a mystery; which *John* taught in John 19:36; if this typical relationship of the unbroken bones of the Lamb to Christ be conjoined with the external observance of the law concerning the Lamb, only then is the sense fully exhausted. The promise made to David, 2 Samuel 7:12-14, had regard both to Solomon and to Christ, comparing Acts 2:29, 30; Hebrews 1:5. Therefore, it has a Composite Sense, which would be fulfilled by degrees, partly and less perfectly in the type, more fully and perfectly in the antitype, in which manner in the end the one Sense, intended by the Spirit, determines every complement: which against others, who here consider the Messiah alone, our AUTHOR defends, *Exercitationibus Textualibus* VII, Part VI. Add Hosea 11:1, on which passage our AUTHOR is to be seen, both in his *Commentario ad Prophetas minores*, and especially in his *Exercitationibus Textualibus*, Part I, Exercitation XX, § 3, in which our AUTHOR distinctly teaches that the latter words of this verse, *וּמִמִּצְרָיִם קָרָאתִי לְבָנִי*, and *out of Egypt I called my son*, are not able to be torn from what things precede and the remaining context in such a way that they might be referred directly to Christ, as if they were spoken of Him alone: but that they literally have regard undoubtedly to

the Israelite people and their past deliverance out of Egypt. But, when *Matthew* in Matthew 2:15, narrating the lodging of the Infant Christ with His parents in Egypt until the death of Herod, adds, ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου, *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son*: from this formula of citation our AUTHOR at the same time concludes that *Israel*, who on account of distinguishing love was called *the Son of God*, by special divine love having been preserved for a time from death in Egypt, and afterwards summoned from there by divine calling, while yet undeveloped and weak; in these things in the writing of *Hosea* it is to be observed that he exhibits a type of the Messiah, the only begotten and most beloved Son of the Father, who from the sword of Herod was to be hidden in Egypt, and from there to be recalled into Canaan, while yet a boy, but loved above all others. And so he observes that, what was already of old fulfilled literally in *Israel* as a type, in a mystery its true and full fulfillment followed through the recalling of Christ out of Egypt; in such a way that its entire fulfillment according to the intention of God was not previously obtained. While the remaining things, which follow in *Hosea* and involve notable imperfection, as our AUTHOR observes, ought on the other hand to be applied to the type alone, not to the antitype, because the people of *Israel* did not represent the person of Christ in all things, whom *Matthew* teaches by his citation to have been portrayed in this calling out by analogy. But, that the speech is concerning Messiah alone in *Hosea* 11:1, in the words בְּנֵי/child and בְּנֵי, *my son*, with an addressed at the same time directed to the Jewish people, GERHARD TEN CATE¹ judges, translating the text, *While He was a child, O Israel! then I loved Him, and out of Egypt have I called my Son*. Now, he believes that God the Father thus speaks of Messiah with respect to the last words of *Hosea* 10, *in the morning time the King of Israel in perishing perished*, in which, that Christ was to be cut off from the Jews, as the *most wicked wickedness* to be committed by them,² he thought to be predicted, with the context painstakingly drawn there from *Hosea* 10:9; when he maintains that *Hosea* 11:1 is subjoined to what was immediately preceding, so that the crime of the Jews, repudiating and murdering the

¹ Gerhard Ten Cate (1699-1749).

² *Hosea* 10:15: “So shall Bethel do unto you because of your great wickedness (מִפְּנֵי רַעַת רַעַתְכֶם): in a morning shall the king of Israel utterly be cut off (בְּשֶׁחַר (בְּדָמָה נִדְּמָה מִלְּךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל).”

true Messiah, might be magnified, by the opposite love and care of God the Father toward Him in His infantile state according to His humanity for the good of His people, and from the divine excellence of this *child*, inasmuch as He was also the proper *Son* of God. If these things flow in a clear stream, the Composite Sense of Hosea 11:1 should not be admitted: but indeed there is not time now to undertake an examination of this exegesis: let the Reader compare with those passages of our AUTHOR cited above GERHARD TEN CATE'S *Epistolam de Rebus Jesu Christi ex Prophetis ad Leonardum Offerhaus*,¹ after Offerhaus' *Spicilegiorum historico-chronologicorum*, pages 697-740.

For the confirmation of the Composite Sense appeal is especially to be made to the language of ἀλληγορουμένων, *speaking allegorically*, used by Paul himself, Galatians 4:24. Ἀλληγορία/*allegory*, of course, is λέξις ἕτερόν τι λέγουσα, ἕτερου ἔννοιαν παριστῶσα, καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, *a word/phrase expressing something else, presenting a conception of the other, according to likeness for the most part*, as it is in FAVORINUS; HESYCHIUS has similar things, Ἀλληγορία· ἀλλό τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ὑποδεικνύουσα, *Allegory, intimating something other than what was heard*. That which is also observed in the *Allegorical Sense* of Scripture, which Sense we say obtains when words or deeds beyond the literal Sense are related to signify a spiritual thing concerning Christ as head of the Church, and concerning the Church itself as His body. But learned Men observe that the word ἀλληγορεῖν, *to allegorize*, signifies either αἰνίττεσθαι,² τροπολογεῖν,³ *to signify something else under the covering of the words*; or *to interpret the sense which lies under the covering of the words*. Hence the saying of Paul, ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, *which things are allegorized*; either they are interpreted in such a way that those things narrated in the Law and out of the Law he wishes to be *spoken allegorically*, so that by the historical deeds and words something else more sublime is signified: or in such way that those things are said to be, either *understood and expounded*, or *obliged to be understood and expounded, allegorically*. Indeed, this understanding, this allegorical exposition of the Mosaic History here cited concerning Sarah, Hagar, and their sons, some consider as possible, others as necessary; so that

¹ Leonard Offerhaus (1699-1779) was a German historian. He was a professor of history at Groningen, beginning in 1725.

² That is, *to speak darkly*.

³ That is, *to speak figuratively*.

Paul might say, either *these things are able to be expounded unto another Sense*, or *these things we ought to interpret in another Sense*, which two far differ. For, if Paul asserts that these things which he sets forth are spoken allegorically in the Law, and therefore are to be expounded allegorically necessarily, the Composite Sense is manifestly established from this. But if, on the other hand, he only asserts that these external events in the house of Abraham are able to be expounded in such a way that they might be applied to something spiritual by Accommodation; the force of the demonstration from this discourse of Paul, that allegorical histories are found in the Old Testament, is altogether destroyed. Nevertheless, thus Men not unworthy think, that Paul produces this argument, not so much for the sake of confirmation, as for the sake of illustration; just as he adduces the similitude of *seed*, when he discusses the Resurrection of the dead, 1 Corinthians 15:36-38. And that Paul in Galatians 4 is able to appeal to a *hearing of the Law*, verses 21 and 22, although he does not so much explain the Sense of the History recounted in the Law, as by an allegorical Use accommodate this to a spiritual matter: likewise that the Apostle appeals to the Law, when he draws from it a tropological Use, 1 Corinthians 9:8-10. Or they believe that Paul thus argues *ad hominem* against men given to allegorical study, by indicating that this allegory is far more suitable than many that they were wont to weave; of which sort of argument he makes use in 1 Corinthians 15:29.

It is not absurdly said that, while Paul here cites a History illustrious in comparison with others, which has regard to Abraham, the common father of believers, and to the first constitution of his family, very admirable in its circumstances; to which an allusion not obscurely appears in Isaiah 54, a prophecy of which is also cited here in *verse 27*: the Apostle in these words, ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, *which things are allegorized*, signifies that God willed that in the first constitution of the house of Abraham and the external events of it there be some emblem, a figure and exemplar, representing to the eye the diverse genius and diverse lot, which with respect to spiritual state would befall the twofold posterity descending from Abraham: which emblematic representation, obtaining in this history above others, God took care to have explained elegantly to us by Paul. From the established comparison of which the Legalists, desiring to comply with the Law, ought to have been driven to shame, when they realize that they refer Hagar and her seed to a servile capacity; and hence they hear from Paul that they, no less than Hagar and

her son, are to be handled as slaves in ejection, not in taking possession of an inheritance. At the same time, it is right to observe that this is the only passage in which mention is made of ἀλληγοροῦμένων, *speaking allegorically*, and that these things that Paul mentions are affirmed by him of the unique History of the Old Testament. Consult on this text our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* L, Part V; WESSELIUS' *Dissertationes Leidenses* XI, § 7, 8, especially pages 383-385, in which he teaches that Paul in this discourse is not setting forth *Sarah* and *Hagar* as Prophetic Types from this hypothesis, that all the more notable and more lengthy Histories of the Old Testament were Typical; but that according to BEZA, PAREUS, and SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT,¹ this is proven by the Apostle from the Prophetic testimony cited in *verse* 27; now, according to RIVET this exposition was immediately inspired in Paul by the Spirit.

Only in words do they differ, who in the place of this sort of *One Composite Sense* acknowledge in such places a *Twofold Sense*, Literal and Mystical, or Allegorical, clearly to be conjoined: consult RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Novi Testamenti Libros*, § XXIV, pages 54-56; GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate I, section I, pages 159, 160. With respect to this Literal and Mystical Sense, the *Jews* distinguish between the Sense מִשְׁמָע/heard, or פְּשׁוּט or פְּשׁוּט/naked/simple, in which manner they refer to the Literal Sense of Scripture; and מְדַרְשׁ/midrash/inquiry, from דָּרַשׁ, which to them is Allegorical or Mystical interpretation: whence *Elias Levita* has, קראו מדרש פרוש שאין על, דרך פרוש, *all interpretation that does not follow its own Literal Sense is called Midrash*.

2. Our AUTHOR notes the method of operation of the *Papists*, who concerning the manifold Sense of Scripture speak with a perverse Goal, namely, that *they might assert the Obscurity of Scripture, and the Ecclesiastical right of Interpretation*, with *Bellarmino*, book III, *de Verbo Dei*, chapter III, columns 169-171, where in setting down a certain question concerning the Judge of Controversies he says, and first concerning the Senses of Scripture, in the plural. And then he asserts that it is *proper to Scripture*, since it has God as its author, on many occasions to contain two Senses, the *Literal* and the *Mystical*. He says that the *Spiritual* or *Mystical* Sense is again divided three ways by *more recent Theologians*, *Allegorical*,

¹ Sebastian Schmidt (1617-1696) was a German Lutheran Theologian and Hebraist. He studied under Buxtorf the Younger, and his efforts to interpret Scripture with philological accuracy influenced Philipp Jakob Spener. He commented on much of the Scripture.

Tropological, and Anagogical. He acknowledges that this distinction of the *Spiritual Senses*, in the plural, *was not always observed by the Ancients*, who generally made use of those terms in a broader sense and promiscuously. He goes on, *Of these Senses a Literal is found in every sentence of the Old and New Testaments; neither is it implausible that sometimes multiple Literal Senses are found in the same sentence. But every Spiritual Sense is indeed found in each Testament, yet a Spiritual Sense is not found in every sentence of Scripture, etc.*

They call the Sense *Allegorical*, according to *Bellarmino*, book III, *de Verbo Dei*, chapter III, columns 169-171, *when the words of Scripture besides the literal Sense signify something in the New Testament that pertains to Christ or the Church*, as it is in Galatians 4:24. They call it *Tropological*, *when the words or deeds are referred to the signification of something that pertains to morals.* Just as what is said in Deuteronomy 25:4 concerning not muzzling a threshing ox, *and literally is said of true oxen, spiritually, says he, signifies that preachers ought not to be prohibited from receiving sustenance from the people, as the Apostle explains in 1 Corinthians 9.* They call it *Anagogical*, *Bellarmino* proceeds, *when the words or deeds are referred to the signification of eternal life.* Just as that in Psalm 94 (Psalm 95 according to the Hebrew text), *to whom I swore in my wrath, if they will enter into my rest, which literally is understood of the promised land, is also referred spiritually to eternal life, as the Apostle explains in Hebrews 4.*

The Papists are wont to summarize their Fourfold Sense of Scripture in this couplet:

*The letter relates what was done, Allegory what you should
believe,
The Moral what you should do, Anagoge whither you should
direct your course.¹*

They vindicate the Literal Sense by Jerome, the Allegorical by Ambrose, the Anagogical by Augustine, and the Tropological by Gregory the Great: see GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate I, section II, article I, pages 160-163; SPANHEIM'S *Collegium Theologicum Heidelbergæ de Principio Theologiæ*, part IV, § 13-16, *opera*, tome 3, column 1194, "First, the *Unity of the Sense of Sacred Scripture* is to be regarded, so that the Sense of each passage is singular, intended by the Holy Spirit,

¹ Latin: *Littera gesta docet, quid credas Allegoria, Moralia qui agas, quo tendas Anagogia.*

called in the Schools *literal*, or *historical*, or *grammatical*, subdivided into *proper* and *figurative*. Nevertheless, in such a way that what is *formally* one, might sometimes be *objectively* and *materially* composite, insofar as it is referred to diverse subjects, and acquires a twofold complement in *type* and *antitype*: so that unto one subject the narration is *inadequate* and *incomplete*, unto the other *complete* and *adequate*. This obtains in the typical oracles, which are called *complex* and *composite*, and are sometimes fulfilled *literally* in the type, *figuratively* in the antitype; sometimes either *literally* or *figuratively* in either, of which there are obvious examples in the Scriptures. Not thereby is introduced a *multiplicity* of the Sense of Scripture with the Papists. 1. Those err *extensively*, when they attach multiple senses to each passage. 2. In alleging a *multiplication*, when they invent a fourfold sense, *literal*, *allegorical*, *tropological*, and *anagogical*. 3. In alleging a *division*, when they oppose as members ἀντιδιηρημένα, *separated one from another*, what things coincide, neither is *tropology* diverse from *allegory*. 4. In confounding *heterogeneous things*, the *sense* and the *application* of that sense, for various uses *theoretical* and *practical*. 5. With the worst possible *end* also, that they might evince that the Scripture is ambiguous, obscure and not its own interpreter.”

§ 38: The Sense of Scripture, Simple or Composite, Part 2

After these things, thus related and explained, our AUTHOR subjoins his own ἐπίκρισις/*epicrisis*, *critical evaluation*, through distinct Theses.

1. *It is to be insisted on*, says he, *that the Literal Sense is only One*. In his *Compendio* he contrived beforehand that this Literal Sense *should everywhere obtain*; compare GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article III, canons III, IV, pages 177-180: and he wills that the same *be not despised with the Fanatics*, see above, § 30, and GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article III, canon I, page 169; and as a דבר קטון, *small matter*, with the Jews, see GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate I, section II, article III, page 165. While elsewhere the *Jews* also maintain that the meaning of the proper and grammatical Sense is to be held as first and most important, whence is this rule of the Rabbis, אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו, that is, *Scripture does not depart from its simplicity*, or beyond its simple and Grammatical sense.

Now, our AUTHOR believes that this Literal Sense is only *One*; while we heard that it did not appear implausible to *Bellarmino* that sometimes *multiple Literal Senses* are found in the same sentence, with whom most Papists are ὁμόψηφοι, *in agreement*; see GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article III, canon II, page 170. But, α. One and True are interchangeable; neither is that able to be the true Sense of Scriptures except it be the *One* Sense. And indeed, as many as are the genuine Senses of Scripture, just so many are its forms: But the form of Scripture is not able to be manifold: Therefore.

The Major is evident: for the Sense and signification of the words and phrases of Scripture according to the intention of the Holy Spirit is their form, since through it they are indications of divine things. Therefore, according to the number of Senses and significations, the number of forms is multiplied.

The Minor is thus proven: One thing has only one form, because the unity of the thing depends upon the unity of the form, which

is the basis of individuation. Scripture is not manifold, but one, proceeding from one Holy Spirit, and comprehended in the Books of the Old and New Testaments. Therefore.

β. God, because of His Wisdom and Goodness, is not able to be presumed to have willed to make sport of us in uncertain Obscurity. And indeed, what has diverse Senses is ambiguous. But God of His Wisdom was able, and of His Goodness was willing, to speak clearly. The Wisdom of God requires that God speak in a manner accommodated to His Scope/End, which is, to make the simple wise unto salvation through the Scripture.¹ Now, this Scope/End, if God had spoken ambiguously, He had not be able to attain.

γ. Indeed, the sufficient Perspicuity of Scripture was also proven, § 25, 26: but what is Perspicuous is not able to have a manifold Sense.

And so, when Interpreters explain literally any text in a twofold manner, of which one is not able to be subordinated to the other, only one shall be true, and intended by the Holy Spirit, the other false. For example, in Hebrews 2:16, the ἐπίληψιν, *taking hold, not of Angels, but of the seed of Abraham*, the more Ancient Theologians everywhere explain of the Assumption of a human nature by the Person of the Λόγου/Logos: others think that Paul here speaks of the relief or liberation from misery, and the connected vindication, of the seed of Abraham, that is, of true believers collectively. Which two things, although they are both actually true, yet they found a Sense so diverse that these two concepts in the same place and in the same phrase are not able to be subordinated to each other. Therefore, the Holy Spirit was able to intend only one or the other of these two, not both at the same time. But which is to be selected, the propriety of the expressions, a consideration of the scope and context, with the illumination of the Spirit, ought to teach: consult Chapter XIX, § 17.

In vain *do the Papists Object,*

α. Various passages of Scripture; since, for example, in Ezekiel 2:10, by the *scroll written on the front and on the back*, a twofold Sense of one Scripture is not signified; but the multitude of matters inscribed on this scroll, namely, of the strokes to be inflicted upon the Jews.

On 1 Corinthians 10:6, 11, see GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section II, article II, page 164, where it is most

¹ See Psalm 19:7; 2 Timothy 3:15.

evidently apparent from the entire context that *Moral Types*, not *Prophetic Types*, are to be understood. That is, the Apostle makes mention of the most grievous sins that the Israelites, having been endowed with the greatest benefits by God, had committed in the desert, and of the most grievous punishments that followed upon the same. These were not actual Prophecies concerning definite, future events of a later time, which one may by no means avoid: but Paul says that these Types fell out for this end, *lest we should lust after evil things, as they lusted*. Therefore, for our use also they were Examples, of the insufficiency of whatever external grace, of human ill will towards it, and especially of God's most righteous vengeance: Examples warning us and to be closely attended to by us, lest we, while in the midst of the greatest blessings of God, should at any time fall into similar evils of fault and punishment: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XLII, Part V, § 7-9; and GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section II, article II, page 164.

But in 1 Thessalonians 5:23, there is a treatment, not the Sense of Scripture, but the various parts of man; see below, *Chapter XIII*, § 11: and ORIGEN'S allusion to this passage is nothing but altogether inane, when in *Homily II, in Leviticum, opera, tome 2, page 193*, he writes, *the Scripture consists in a body, a soul, and a spirit*, that is, in a Sense historical, moral, and mystical; *the body was for those that went before, the soul for us, and the spirit for those that in the future age are going to obtain the inheritance of eternal life, and are going to come unto the heavenlies and the truth of the law*.

β. Reasons: see GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate I, section II, article I, page 162, and tractate II, section I, pages 171, 172: unto all which our AUTHOR solidly responds. 1. It has already been seen that the *Wisdom of God* does not so much import a manifold sense, as rather overturn the same. 2. *The Fecundity and Fullness of the Word* is sufficiently manifest in the mystery, and vigorous combining, of the things: for the words of Sacred Scripture include many things under themselves, but which have a certain connection among themselves, coordinate and subordinate; which are not completely diverse, nor do they fight among themselves.

γ. In *the utterance of Caiaphas*, John 11:50, 51, concerning the Advantage of the death of Christ, there is only One True Sense, which God intends by His Providence; although Caiaphas thought otherwise: but the sense of Caiaphas is not the Sense of the Holy Spirit.

To this *first* Thesis concerning the *Unity* of the Literal Sense, compare GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article III, canon II, pages 170-177.

2. Our AUTHOR proceeds with a second Thesis on the Spiritual or Mystical Sense. In which in general one may observe that, α. the Terms *Allegory* and *Anagoge* in origin and signification are not so distinct that they are not able to be interchanged with perfect ease. β. And that the so-called threefold Spiritual Sense is not able to be set, each Sense in a distinct relation to the others, and against the Literal Sense, so that hence so manifold a Sense of Scripture might emerge: while also in the first and Literal Sense some things are referred to Christ and the Church, others to life and morals, others to eternal life: and Allegory and Anagoge may often easily be subordinated to each other, so that what things, here inchoate, have a regard to the Church might afterwards obtain a complete fulfillment. γ. Neither does the three-horse team of Christian virtues, *faith*, *hope*, and *love*, which are joined by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 13:13, make for this threefold Spiritual Sense, *Allegory*, *Anagoge*, and *Tropology*, since there the Apostle treats of disparate, yet always in this life to be closely conjoined, virtues, not of disparate Senses of Scripture.

In particular, of the *Allegorical Sense* our AUTHOR declares that *that is not to be admitted everywhere, but only where and when the Holy Spirit dictates*. In such a way the he ends up in opposition to the ἀλληγορομανία/*allegoromania*, both, 1. of the Jews, following the steps of Philo the Jew, who wrote two books *Allegoriarum Legis*, being very devoted to Allegories after the manner of the Alexandrian Jews; consult HOTTINGER'S *Thesaurum Philologicum*, pages 238-244, in which he discusses in detail the allegorical study of the Jews: and, 2. of ORIGEN, the Alexandrian Doctor, in whom daily intercourse with the Alexandrian Jews was able to ingrain the sickness of allegorizing; and concerning whom EPIPHANIUS, in *Hæresi LXIV*, chapter IV, *opera*, tome I, page 528, says, ἀλληγορεῖ ὅσαπερ δύναται, *he allegorizes as much as he is able*; and also JEROME, in his *Prologo ad Amabilem in Decem Jesaiæ Visiones*, *opera*, tome 5, page 52, *Origen wanders in the free spaces of allegory*; see BUDDEUS' diatribe *de Allegoriis Origenis*, in *Parergis historico-theologicis*, pages 139-188, and his *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VIII, § 8, tome 2, pages 1584, 1585a; and CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, prologue, § IV, pages 20, 21: and, 3. of many Papists, who so revel in the study of allegorizing, that they are branded with censure by the more

sensible in the Roman communion itself; indeed, that in the Council of Trent itself, Session IV, the Fathers judged that the reveling in Allegories was to be restrained; see PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS' *Historiam Concilii Tridentini*, book II, page 179; by whose efforts, nevertheless, the *κακοῦθες*, *ill habit*, of allegorizing has not been done away with in the Roman Church. But also thus near the end of the past Century a man even of our communion published a work, in which he contends that the entire Scripture of both testaments is Allegorical, even all the Histories of the Old and New Testaments, in which either all natural things are explained allegorically, or the future happenings of the Church are prefigured; see SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum*, opera, tome 3, columns 1006, 1007. After *Jacobus Brocardus*¹ had advanced similar follies in the Sixteenth Century, whose itch for allegory the French Synod of La Rochelle and the Dutch Synod of Middelburg in 1581 and 1582 attempted to restrain;² see GERDES' *Syllabum Italorum Reformatorum*, pages 185, 186. It would be well with the Church, if all that are drawn to the excessive study of allegorizing should desist.

At the same time, according to MAIMONIDES, *More Nebochim*, third part, chapter XLIII, page 473, the many Doctors of the Jews given to Allegories do not even think that this is entirely the Sense of Scripture; but they hold Allegories as certain pleasant enigmas to charm the minds of the hearers. It is not fitting for Christians at this point to rave more than these. The Allegoromania of ORIGEN has been censured for ages, concerning which JEROME, in his *Prologo ad Amabilem*, says, *Origen makes his own genius sacraments of the Church*: while according to the opinion of Jerome the Scripture is to be understood, not according to the will of the reader, but according to the authority of the writer.

Certainly concerning the Ceremonial Law in general the Apostle asserted that it has *σκιάν τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, *a shadow of good things to come*, Hebrews 10:1, *τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι*, *but the body is of Christ*, Colossians 2:17 (how that latter phrase pertains to this, see Chapter XI, § 20), whence in the Ceremonial Rites one is free to transfer the pious meditations of the mind to Christ and His grace as the antitype: while, nevertheless, one is often able to determine the

¹ Jacopo Brocardo (c. 1518-c. 1594) was an Italian humanist and scholar. He converted to Protestantism, and is remembered for his controversial interpretation of Revelation, in which he uses Kabbalistic interpretive techniques.

² Both of these were Synods of the Reformed churches.

mystical significations of specific rites with probability, rather than with absolute certainty. But Scripture nowhere supplies a similar, general pronouncement concerning all the Ancient History being of allegorical significance also. Paul concerning a History more illustrious than the others in kind only affirms, ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, *which things are an allegory*, Galatians 4:24, and how variously this very word is hitherto explained we saw in § 37. Therefore, if we indulge in allegorical interpretation of the Sacred History beyond that in which the Scripture expressly goes before, our Allegories are only going to be held as human interpretations, which are able to illustrate, to delight, and often to hold the mind attentive, yet not to demonstrate. And so such Allegoria is also only to be held as an Application of Scripture; it is not able to be obtruded as the Sense of the Spirit. Wherefore it is not expedient, with more solid practices neglected, to give oneself completely to the study of allegorizing, since its fruit is necessarily not so great: for I shall not be able in this way to prove any doctrine of religion that I have not already learned elsewhere from the Scriptures, nor to add anything to the revealed doctrine of salvation; neither should anyone gather some history to be accomplished later from the old History allegorically explained, unless that antitypical history be also already past, even thus with the event narrated elsewhere; or, if it be yet future, it should be abundantly evident from other abundantly clear prophecies. But what is accomplished by Allegories of this sort, concerning which we ourselves ought always to remain in doubt, to learn what is already evident from elsewhere? And, if we be less happily versed in allegorical study, nothing is equally conducive to expose the Sacred Scripture to the mockery of Libertines and Atheists. Let us be very mindful here of the admonition of CALVIN *on Galatians 4:22*, where concerning the free-fancy of allegorizing he writes: *there are speculations of this sort, which display an appearance of ingenuity, but no appearance of solid doctrine: this is to make sport with impunity in the handling of the Scriptures: this is a device of Satan, to lessen that authority of Scripture: this is a profanation, which takes away the true use of Sacred Scripture, etc.* While concerning the same Allegoromania SPANHEIM *the Younger* gravely warns in his *Elencho Controversiarum, opera, tome 3, column 1006*, “What is to be said in this age, in which are explained the Writings of Moses, David, Solomon, and the Prophets (not to mention the pronouncements of the Savior, the Histories, and the Parables of the New Testament) in such a way that neither the Sacred Writers themselves, nor the Fathers of the Old

Testament, nor the Apostles, nor the simpler ages of Christianity, nor even the ages prior to us, saw fit to follow in any way that sense, which with oracular authority is today ascribed to the Holy Spirit. And thus to Scripturary Libertinism, Pyrrhonism,¹ every man's Fantasy (who turns his φαντάσματα/*fantasies* into δογματικὴν Θεολογίαν, *dogmatic theology*), the cavils of the Skeptics, and ever new schemes of interpretation, the way is opened wide. And, as each one prevails by his imagination and confidence, so he will obtrude upon the people his conjectures, ruminations, waking-dreams, as τὴν ἀνωτάτω σοφίαν, *the highest wisdom*, instead of a settled faith."

Therefore, here, if anywhere, it is necessary φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, *to think soberly*, and μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, *not to think more highly than one ought to think*, according to Romans 12:3; consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, sections II, III, pages 185-193; RUMPÆUS' *Commentationem criticam ad Libros Novi Testamenti*, § XXIV, pages 50-59; my *Orationem de Eo quod Nimium est in Scientia Theologica*, pages 18, 19, 43-46.

But if we admit not Allegories, except when and where the Holy Spirit expressly dictates; and extend not Allegories beyond their Scope/End and what is seemly, so that the perfections of Christ or the Church be not injured by the want of Type or Parable: then *Symbolic Theology* ought also to be called *Argumentative*, which otherwise is to be denied, when it is speech concerning Ecclesiastical Allegories. But, with the cautions that I just enumerated applied, Symbolic Theology is certainly Argumentative, because, 1. Allegories of this sort have the Holy Spirit as author, and are according to His intention. 2. Because Christ and His Apostles make use of them, for the confirmation, no less than the illustration, of doctrines. 3. Otherwise the force of proof is to be denied to all Types and Parables: consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article III, canon V, pages 180, 181.

3. The third Canon is: Tropology and frequently Anagoge are referred more properly to the Use, rather than to the Sense, of Scripture, which one Sense admits these various Uses, according to 2 Timothy 3:16. Anagoge, and even Allegory, are able often to be referred to the theoretical Uses of διδασκαλίας καὶ ἐλέγχου, *doctrine and refutation*: Tropology has regard to the practical Use of ἐπανορθώσεως/*correction* or παιδείας/*training*.

¹ Pyrrhonism is a school of skeptical philosophy. Its origins are usually traced back to Pyrrho of Elis (c. 360-c. 270 BC).

But *τρόπος*/*trope* here does not denote a rhetorical *figure*, but rather *morals* and the habit of life, *τὰ ἥθη*, *the manners*.

4. Against the *Jews*, and against those that do not decline to undertake the patronage of Jewish trifles of this sort, our AUTHOR observes that the *Sense is not to be elicited in any way from the Letters in the Kabbalistic manner*; just as the *Jews*, the relating of whose trifles is the refuting of the same, boast that the *Kabbalah*, that is, *receiving*,¹ together with the other part of the Oral Law preserved in the Mishnah, was delivered by God to Moses on mount Sinai; and that the *Theoretical Kabbalah* does indeed contain hidden knowledge, which applies itself to searching out the deepest mysteries of the written Law, and elicits Senses especially sublime and arcane, hidden in the Scripture, from Letters transposed, or resolved into numbers, or changed in other ways. *Menasseh*² in *The Conciliator, the last question in Exodus*, enumerates thirteen appearances of this Theoretical Kabbalah, all which the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN explains in his *Philologo Hebræo, Dissertation XXVI*. Its threefold method, more famous than the rest, our AUTHOR specifies as *Gematria, Temurah, and Notarikon*.

גֵּימַטְרִיָּא/*Gematria* is a word corrupted from the Greek *γεωμετρία*/*geometry*; but it is taken in the Kabbalah in a broader sense, and principally denotes here Arithmetic,³ but secondarily also Geometry, that is, the dimensions of the sacred structures, like the Ark, Tabernacle, Temple, etc. It is the former method of *Gematria* when they observe that diverse words by their letters express the same number, and they explain one of those by another: for example, two, three, and four make nine, and five and four likewise make nine; of these words, which thus agree, they put the one in the place of the other. Thus, when God promises in Zechariah 3:8, *כִּי־הֵנִי מְבִיא אֶת־עַבְדִּי צַמַּח*, *for, behold, I will bring forth my servant the Tzemach/Branch*, they ask, What or Who is the

¹ *קַבְלָה*/*Kabbalah* is related to the verb *קָבַל*, *to accept or receive*.

² Menasseh Ben Israel (1604-1657) was a Portuguese Rabbi, Kabbalist, and printer. In 1610, his family settled in Amsterdam. With the publication of his *El Conciliador*, an attempt to resolve apparent contradictions in the Hebrew Bible, his rising reputation gave opportunity to enter into relationship with many of the great Dutch theologians of the age. He established the first Jewish printing press in Holland.

³ The numerical value of the Hebrew characters: א=1, ב=2, ג=3, ד=4, ה=5, ו=6, ז=7, ח=8, ט=9, י=10, כ=20, ל=30, מ=40, נ=50, ס=60, ע=70, פ=80, צ=90, ק=100, ר=200, ש=300, ת=400.

Tzemach/Branch? The response is through Gematria: *צמח*/Tzemach has a value of one hundred and thirty-eight,¹ as does *מְנַחֵם*/Comforter:² now, this name *מְנַחֵם*/Menachem, is numbered by the Kabbalists and Talmudists among the names of Messiah; whence Kabbalistically by *צמח*/Tzemach Messiah is understood there: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Miscellaneas, Disputation VI*, which is on Zechariah 6:9-15, § 15. In this way they prove that the world was created in the beginning of year, formerly begun in September, because in the words, *בראש השנה נברא*, *in the beginning of the year it was created*, the same number is observed as in *בראשית ברא*, *in the beginning He created*,³ that is, one thousand, one hundred and sixteen. The latter method of Gematria inquires into the reasons why the dimensions of the Sacred structures, the Ark, Tabernacle, Temple, etc., are so carefully narrated to us in Sacred Scripture, and from the same it carves out mysteries.

תמורה/Temurah/exchange, from *המיר/מיר*, *to change*, has a place when by the exchange or transposition of letters one word comes up in the place of another. The first method is called *אתבש*/Athbasch, that is, when ת signifies א, ש signifies ב, ר signifies ג, etc.:⁴ Menasseh proves this sort from Jeremiah 25:26, in which the Prophet, so that he might not irritate *the King of Babylon*, calls him *the King* of *ששח*/Sheshach, instead of *בבל*/Babel, by taking ש in the place of ב, and ר in the place of ל. JEROME supports this opinion of the Jews in explaining the name of the King of *ששח*/Sheshach, and commends the same in his *Commentario ad locum*. But it is better, either, 1. to derive this name from a deity of the Babylonians called *שח*/Shach, with the first letter ש thus repeated, upon which matter GROTIUS has *on this passage*, “The Chaldean teaches us that *the Babylonian King* is signified here also. No other King through circumlocutions was to be named beside him, under whose government Jeremiah was for some time living. But the Prophet himself, when he was living in Egypt, explains this name in Jeremiah 51:41. The Jews, and Jerome with them, think that *ששח*/Sheshach is *בבל*/Babel through an exchange of letters that they call *אתבש*/Athbasch, that is, in which the last letter of the Alphabet is put in the place of the first, the penultimate in

¹ The numerical value of the letters: צ, ninety; ח, forty; ה, eight.

² The numerical value: מ, forty (twice); נ, fifty; ה, eight.

³ The first two words in Genesis 1:1.

⁴ That is, the last letter of the alphabet, ת, signifies the first letter, א; the next to last letter, ש, signifies the second letter, ב; and so on.

the place of the second, and vice versa, and so on. But others are rather inclined to think that this name, with the first letter repeated, derives from שַׁח/ *Shach*, which is the name of one of the Goddesses of Babylon, on account of which he that was called מִשְׁחַיִל/ *Mishael*¹ is called by the Babylonians שַׁחֲמֵי/ *Meshach*, Daniel 1:7. From the same source Σακχαῖα/ *Sakchaia* is the name of feast days among the same Babylonians, as Athenæus, in *Banquet of the Learned*,² book XIV, section 10, relates out of Berosus³ and Ctesias.⁴ Dio Chrysostom⁵ also mentions it, “de Regno” IV, calling it the Σακκῶν ἑορτήν, *Sacian feast*.” This latter opinion, which also satisfied SCALIGER, *book VI de Emendatione Temporum*, page 276, was then pleasing to more, among whom was GLASSIUS, *Grammatica Sacra*, book IV, tractate III, observation XIII, pages 830, 831, and *Rhetorica Sacra*, tractate I, chapter XXII, page 512; as well as BUDDEUS, *Historia ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section V, § 14, tome 2, pages 705b, 706a; and LE CLERC upon the passage; all of whom see. Or, 2. to give place to the conjecture of MICHAELIS, in his notes on the passage, who, when he had advised, *Whence Babel might have this name, the opinion of Interpreters are various, but all uncertain*; and, when he had then briefly reviewed the twofold opinion just now mentioned by us, subjoins, “What if it is formed from the Arabic שַׁח, *he shows fortitude and resolve, and fierce strength in war; he is clothed in Full Armor*; in such a way that with the root double according to the form לְגַלְגַּל,⁶ הַטֹּט,⁷ Babel might be called *a warrior, as if about to fight with incredible strength all the aforementioned nations?*” The other method, which BUXTORF

¹ That is, *who is what El/God is?*

² Athenæus of Naucratis (late first, early second century AD) wrote *Deipnosophistæ* (or *Banquet of the Learned*), a dialogue in which the characters discuss a wide range of topics.

³ Berosus (early third century BC) was a priest of Belus in Babylon, who wrote a history of the Chaldeans, which survives only in the fragmentary citations of other authors.

⁴ Ctesias of Cnidus (fourth century BC) was a Greek physician and historian. He wrote a twenty-three volume history of Assyria, Babylon, and Persia, but it survives only in an abridgment by Photius and in the quotations of other authors.

⁵ Dio Chrysostom (c. 40-c. 115) was a Greek orator, philosopher, and historian of the Roman Empire. Although much of his work is lost, eighty of his orations survive, as well as other fragments.

⁶ לְגַלְגַּל signifies *a heap or wave*; לְגַלְגַּל, *a wheel*.

⁷ הַטֹּט signifies *to shine*; הַטֹּט, *an ornament*.

especially relates to Temurah, but which otherwise is called צִירוף / *Tsiruph*, that is, *combination*, arises from a diverse combination of letters through metathesis:¹ thus, for example, in Psalm 21:1, it is said, יְהוָה יִשְׂמְחֵנִי בְּעֹזֶיךָ יְיָ, *O Lord, in thy strength the king shall joy*; here יִשְׂמְחֵנִי, *he shall joy*, by metathesis is מְשִׁיחַ / *Messiah*, as if the Prophet meant to say, *O Jehovah, in thy strength King Messiah shall joy*. Thus מַלְאָכֵי, *my angel*, with the letters transposed is declared to be מִיכָאֵל / *Michael*, Exodus 23:23. חָרָם / *anathema, devoted to destruction*, by metathesis is רְחָם / *mercy*, and otherwise רַמָּח, a symbolic, numeric word meaning two hundred and forty-eight, the very number of members in the human body. Hence they thus play: if he upon whom an anathema is pronounced should repent, then in the place of חָרָם / *anathema* רְחָם / *mercy* follows: if he repents not, then the חָרָם / *anathema* intensifies, and enters into his רַמָּח, *two hundred and forty-eight*, members, and the whole man perishes. In the same manner, in all Languages Anagrams² are established.

Finally, by נוטריקון / *Notarikon*, with the word taken from the Latin tongue and corrupted, is designated that part of the Kabbalah by which from the individual letters of any significative just so many other sayings are formed: for example, the individual letters of מַכְבֵּי / *Maccabæus* denote just so many entire words, which occur in Exodus 15:11, מִי־כַמְכָה בְּאֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה, *who is like unto thee among the gods, O Lord*; that from the initial letters inscribed on the banner of Judas, son of Mattathias, General of the Jews, the name of the *Maccabees* was formed and took its rise, several with GROTIUS maintain, which also appears the *most likely of all* to SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti, epoch IX, chapter III, § 3, column 451*, while BUDDEUS presents himself as doubtful in this matter, *Historia ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti, tome II, period II, section VII, § 1, page 916, column 2*. Similarly in אָדָם / *Adam* they find אֶפְרָח / *dust*, דָּם / *blood*, מָרָה / *gall*; and so here and there in other words also.

It can happen that these games might agree with the matter; but this happens by accident, neither is a solid foundation provided in Kabbalah of this sort upon which you might conclude that a matter ought thus to be: as the matter is among Anagrammatists, so *Alstedius* by

¹ That is, *transposition*.

² That is, *a word or phrase constructed by rearranging the letters of another word or phrase*.

anagram is called *Sedulius*, which nevertheless was not properly intended by his name; neither was he *Sedulous* because he was named *Alstedius*.

Concerning the three species of Kabbalah just now explained, and the authority of interpretations of this sort, consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram*, book II, part I, section III, article VII, pages 193-200; BUXTORF'S *de Abbreviaturis Hebraicis*, page m. 62-65; SCHULTENS' *Excursus III, adversus Honertum*, § VII-IX, pages 175-178: and in general concerning the Kabbalah of the Jews and the Kabbalists read those treating more fully, HOTTINGER in his *Thesauro Philologico*, book I, chapter III, section V, pages 437-456, and WOLF in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, part II, book VII, pages 1191-1247, and whom he cites as additional authors.

These Kabbalistic games are wrongly defended, as if they have a foundation in Sacred Scripture, for example, from the changed names of *Abram* and *Sarai*, who instead of אַבְרָם/*Abram* and שָׂרַי/*Sarai* were then called אַבְרָהָם/*Abraham* and שָׂרָה/*Sarah*, Genesis 17:5, 15, where learned Men speak of the ך, the initial letter of the name יהוה/*Jehovah*, and the symbol for the number ten, removed from the name of *Sarai*, and replaced with a ה, symbol for the number five, in the name of *Abraham* and of *Sarah*: so that it might be signified that Messiah, who was going to be true יהוה/*Jehovah*, promised first under the name of *the Seed of the Woman*,¹ of which promise *Sarai* was the sole heiress, hence called *the Princess*² of *Jehovah*; was going to be born of the seed of Abraham and Sarah. And that thus, for the greater consolation of the Church, a Man also, namely, Abraham, was received into a sort of custody of this deposit concerning the Messiah to be born. And that thereafter Messiah was commonly anticipated as the Seed of the Man, when the entire line of heirs of the promise were fashioned in their names by the letter ך/*yod*, אִצְחָק/*Isaac*, יַעֲקֹב/*Jacob*, יְהוּדָה/*Judah*, and especially *David*, whose name, previously written דָּוִד without the ך, after the promise was made, began to be written as דָּוִיִּד with the ך. But that then, lest the promise concerning the Seed of the Woman be obliterated, the promise concerning the *Virgin* giving birth was added, whose proper name then, מִרְיָם/*Miriam/Mary*, instead of the twofold ה had again the ך, even positioned in the same place and between the same letters, where it is ה in the name of אַבְרָהָם/*Abraham*; so that it might be signified that, from this woman alone, without her knowing a man, indeed according to *the*

¹ Genesis 3:15.

² שָׂרָה/*Sarah* signifies *princess*.

innermost bowels of the mercy of God, Messiah was going to be born, with respect to the רחם/womb in the midst of the letters ר and ם. As these and similar things out of JACOB ALTING'S *Dissertatione de Kabbala Scripturaria*, Heptad V, Dissertation I, § 1-66, opera, tome 5, pages 118-123, and out of others, MARCKIUS relates, *Exercitationibus textualibus VII, Part III*. It is far simpler to learn the reason of the change of name from אַבְרָם/*Abram* to אַבְרָהָם/*Abraham* from God Himself, who in the case of the inserted ה leads us to the word הַמֶּלֶךְ/*multitude*, saying, *thy name shall be Abraham*, כִּי אֲבִי-הַמְּלֶכֶת גּוֹיִם נִתְּתִיָּהּ: , *for a father of many nations have I made thee*. But שָׂרַי/*Sarai*, while previously she was called *my Princess*,¹ as Abraham also was able to call her with respect to himself, now may be called absolutely and antonomastically *Princess*, from whom not only *peoples*, but also *Kings of people*, would be born, according to Genesis 17:16. Now, it was far more glorious to be called *Princess* absolutely, than *my Princess*. And this does indeed appear to be able to be pled so much more simply as the reason for the changed name of *Sarah*. It does not at all appear that the ך in the names יִצְחָק/*Isaac*, יַעֲקֹב/*Jacob*, etc., is sought from the name יְהוָה/*Jehovah*; contrariwise, that ך is simply the characteristic letter of the third person, masculine, singular, of the future/imperfect tense of the verb, whence these names were formed.² The name מִרְיָם/*Miriam/Mary* does not occur in the Prophetic Word of the mother of Messiah, although if we wish to make sport, in הַעֲלֵמָה, *the virgin*,³ a double ה is also able to be observed, etc. See what things more MARCKIUS, *Exercitationibus textualibus VII, Part III*, brings into the light against these Kabbalistic reasonings, so that he might show that the same are destitute of any foundation, especially in § VIII, XI.

Neither is it to be said that patronage is found for Kabbalah in Revelation 13:18, in which John signifies that the name of the Beast is reckoned from *numbers*. 1. For in this passage the explanation of the name with the help of Arithmetic depends upon divine authority, of which we are elsewhere destitute. 2. It is one thing to indicate simply the number of a name, when the name itself is left unsaid, which hence comes to be searched out according to that number; it is a far different thing sedulously to seek among all the words expressly delivered,

¹ Note the first-person, singular possessive ending (יָ).

² יִצְחָק/*Isaac* is formed from צַחַק, *to laugh*; יַעֲקֹב/*Jacob* from יָקַב, *to follow at the heel*; יְהוּדָה/*Judah* from יָדָה, *to praise*.

³ Isaiah 7:14.

without any indication given by the Holy Spirit, mysteries of this sort by Mathematical analysis, etc.

And so, just as mysteries, gratuitously elicited by Theoretical Kabbalah from the words of Sacred Scripture, are obtruded in the place of the Sense of Scripture; so hardly any other use for this Kabbalistic Art is given, except when one wishes to argue *ad hominem* with a Kabbalistic Jew, and to show by a turning back of the method that also the mysteries of the Christian faith are able to be demonstrated from the Old Testament by this method of proceeding, legitimate according to the rule of the Kabbalistic art. For example, when a Jew denies that by *שִׁילֹה* / *Shiloh*, Genesis 49:10, Messiah is understood, he is able to be refuted by Kabbalah; for *יבא שִׁילֹה*, *Shiloh comes*, by Gematria indicates *מְשִׁיחַ* / *Messiah*; that is, the numerical value of each is three hundred and fifty-eight. Thus, that the Creator of the world is the Triune God, by the Kabbalistic sport according to Notarikon is elicited from the trilateral word *בְּרָא*, which also has the initial letters of the words, *אב* / *Father*, *בן* / *Son*, and *רוח הקדש*, *Holy Spirit*; by which very letters the first word of the Bible also begins.¹ Just how ridiculous argumentation of this sort is, is evident, inasmuch as the Socinians *Enjedinus*² does not dread to substitute three other words, *בליעל ראש אתה*, *thou art the head or prince of the wicked*, in *Explicatione Locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, pages 2, 3. *Ibn Ezra* himself, in his *Commentary on Genesis 14:14* and *Daniel 11:31*, acknowledges the vanity of this Kabbalistic Art, of interpreting Scripture by Gematria; and asserts that the Scripture does not speak by Gematria, because in this manner every word could be turned at pleasure to a good or evil sense: his words are cited by WOLF in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, part II, book VII, chapter II, § I, pages 1211, 1212.

Moreover, what things our AUTHOR mentions concerning the Mysteries that they seek in the Letters *Majuscule*, *Minuscule*, *Suspended*, etc., pertain to an *eighth* species of Kabbalah, which is called *קְטוּמוֹת אוֹתֵיּוֹת*, *closed and opened*; and a *tenth*, which contains *אֲוֵיּוֹת קְטַנּוֹת וְגְדוּלוֹת*, *letters small and great*, concerning which the Most Illustrious LEUSDEN, *Philologo Hebræo*, *Dissertation XXVI*, pages 276-278, is able to be consulted, and his student PETRUS DINANT, *de Achtbaarheid van*

¹ Genesis 1:1: “In the beginning God created (בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים) the heaven and the earth.”

² Georgius Enjedinus (died 1597) was an overseer of the Socinians churches of Transylvania.

Gods Woord, chapter V, § 102, 106, pages 937-939, 945, 946: and concerning which there is so little reason to invest labor, as long as it is not solidly evinced that that sort of irregular form of a letter is from God, and not from human copyists. The Conjecture of a certain *Anonymous* author concerning the *suspended Letters* in the Sacred Codex see in *Symbolis Litterariis Bremensibus*, tome I, part II, chapter I, page 1 and following, who holds this figure of this sort of suspended letter as a mark of a letter previously omitted in the text, whether rightly, or at least according to the opinion of the copyists, who thereafter copied the Codex. HARENBERG in *Bibliotheca Bremensi nova*, classis II, fascicule II, chapter I, § 15, pages 241, 242, asserts that the Jews, with the second Temple overthrown, inserted the figures of Letters suspended, closed, marginalized, majuscule, and minuscule in their Bibles, so that they might implant in their countrymen a hatred for Jesus and for Christians, and at the same time false explications of more than one pericope, as he then labors to prove from the very examples of the things. The Mysteries that some Kabbalistically extort from the Final Closed letter ם,¹ found in the midst of the word הַרְבֵּה לְ, of the increase, Isaiah 9:7, our AUTHOR relates in his *Exercitationibus textualibus XVI*, Part VI, § 8, pages 530, 531.

5. The fifth Thesis of our AUTHOR has regard to the Citation of Passages from the Old Testament made in the New; whether κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν, according to the letter, or κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν, according to the sense/ thought, of which latter method of citation I have exhibited an illustrious specimen in *Dissertatione mea* on Ephesians 5:14.² Both indeed are most frequently made according to the *Literal Sense*, as when in Matthew 1:22, 23 is shown the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah 7:14; and in John 19:24 it is taught that what was predicted in Psalm 22:18 has been fulfilled. That which is everywhere done to prove the truth of the Christian Religion by argument from the Prophecies of the Old Testament cited in the New Testament, by many is admirably demonstrated against *Collins*, who dared to contend that the Citation of the ancient Prophecies in the New Testament was done only by Accommodation or Allegory deviating from the *Literal Sense*: see LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, chapter 6, pages 143-163. Sometimes the Citation is made according to the *Mystical Sense*,

¹ When the latter ם appears at the end of a word, it is written as ם.

² See Appendix 2.

for example, when in Matthew 2:15 the text of Hosea 11:1 is cited; consult § 37 above: and when in John 19:36 an appeal is made to Exodus 12:46; see again § 37 above. And sometimes a Citation of Passages of the Old Testament is made as a Usurpation of expressions in the Old Testament occurring through naked *Accommodation*. We acknowledge with our AUTHOR that recourse is not to be made to this without great necessity; consult WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra*, book I, *Exercitation VI*, § 22, pages 169, 170: nevertheless, at the same time we hold with our AUTHOR that *Accommodations* of this sort, through which the words of the Old Testament are accommodated and applied by the Writers of the New Testament to subjects other than those of which the same were made use in the Old Testament, are not able to be denied altogether:

α. On account of *the altogether clear Examples* that evince the same. For example, when upon the occasion of the Infanticide at Bethlehem, Matthew 2:17, 18, the prophecy of *Jeremiah* is cited, Jeremiah 31:15, that the prophecy is able to be applied to the Infanticide at Bethlehem only by *Accommodation*, our AUTHOR proves in a remarkable *Dissertation*, which is XX of *Part I*, *Exercitationibus textualibus*: 1. From the place of this weeping in *Jeremiah*, which is *Ramah*, such as was situated in Benjamin, Ephraim, Naphtali, and Gad, all altogether distinct from *Bethlehem of Judah*. 2. From the principal and impulsive cause of the voice heard. The weeping is attributed to *Rachel*, of whom Joseph and Benjamin were born; not to *Leah*, who begat *Judah*. The former is said to weep עַל־בְּנֵיהָ, *over her children/sons*, with the phrase repeated, not just little children; not those of another, but her own. Which very sons *were not present*, that is, all were carried away from the sight of their mother, וְנִנְּנָה, *they were not*, that is, וְאֵין שָׁמָּה, *there were none*; while in Bethlehem and its neighborhood were killed only the children ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω, *from two years old and below*. 3. From the solace that God sets in opposition to this bitter weeping of *Rachel*, Jeremiah 31:16, 17, speaking of the return of the children of *Rachel* from captivity, while from death the Bethlehemite infants were not able to return.

They Obect: Matthew writes τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Ἱερεμίου, *then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah*. I respond: This phrase is to be distinguished from the other, whereby something is said to be done, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ

προφήτου, *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet*, as it is in *verse 15* and elsewhere, which appears to express the scope/end/goal of God speaking in the Prophets. But *to be fulfilled* in a general sense is nothing other than for something said *to be done*, to be fulfilled in event, or for it to follow its truth with action; in which manner the same are quite frequently done, just as there is nothing new under the sun. Therefore, in Matthew, citing the words of Jeremiah, is to be understood a similar *fulfillment* in a similar event, not the first, but *another*; not with respect to the subject but the *predicate*, since the same predicates are able to agree with many subjects; not the individual, but *specific* or *generic*: since the weeping in Bethlehem undoubtedly was, 1. most grievous, 2. upon the occasion of children snatched away, 3. not far from the city of Jerusalem; in which heads this weeping agrees with the other in Jeremiah. The Most Illustrious VRIEMOET, *Thesibus scripturarum*, DCCXXXI, supplies an explanation, according to which it would not be necessary to admit here a Citation through the Mode of Accommodation; but whether it proceeds rightly, let others judge. So it stands: “The passage of Jeremiah 31:15 treats generally of the bitter cries of the people of Israel, from the earliest ages, through a great many calamities, and unto those increased with the number of citizens nearly wiped out, of which evils, since the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem makes up a certain part, hence this prophecy is applied to the same in Matthew 2.” VRIEMOET illustrates this thesis at somewhat greater length in *Observationum miscellanearum*, chapter XIV, § 2, pages 323, 324. Various other explanations of the prophecy of *Jeremiah*, that it might be reconciled with the citation of *Matthew*, but everywhere sought out with great industry, you may read in WILLEM ALBERT BACHIENE’S *Geographiam Sacram*, part II, tome I, chapter III, pages 352-357, 492-495. Of the sense of the words in Jeremiah 31:15-17, and their context, compared with Matthew 2:16-18, GERHARD TEN CATE discusses prolixly, *Epistola de Rebus Jesu Christi ex Prophetis ad Leonardum Offerhaus*, after Offerhaus’ *Spicilegiorum historico-chronologicorum*, pages 664-697, whose argument, whether it be more satisfactory, let the learned reader weigh.

Our AUTHOR thinks that the matter holds in a similar manner, if you compare Deuteronomy 30:11-14 with Romans 10:6-8. Learned men greatly weary themselves to show in the former place that Moses speaks of the same subject, namely, the sum of the Gospel, as Paul, and that the Apostle did indeed cite these words in the literal sense. But, if

we reflect rightly upon this matter, no such opposition in Moses appears between Leviticus 18:5, *If ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments, the man that does them shall live in them: I am Jehovah*, which saying the Apostles cites as a formula for Legal Righteousness; and between those things that are found in Deuteronomy 30. If indeed Moses also speaks here of *his Precept* at that time given to Israel, that is, of the keeping and doing of the divine Law by Israel, with an entire embrace, just as this was contained in the Pentateuch and in this book of Deuteronomy: he does not prophesy that this precept *is not going to be* far off in the future, but he asserts that it is not now far off; so that no prophecy is to be sought here concerning matters to come under the New Testament: and Moses intends no other thing by those phrases, that it is not what is said, *who shall go up for us into the heavens, who shall go over the sea for us?* than that his precept is no further hidden or far off from Israel, that anyone for the sake of the revealing of that might be obliged to ascend into the heavens or to pass over the sea; but that the same is near in the mouth and in the heart, so that they might speak of it and have it as a thing known, or at least might be able easily to become acquainted with it. While Paul treats of the Righteousness of Faith, set over against the Righteousness of the Law; and so in the prior interrogation, *who shall ascend into heaven?* he has regard to one that might open heaven to them and show the entrance to that; whence it is subjoined that by that interrogation Christ is brought down from heaven, or His Ascension is most wickedly denied: in the latter interrogation, *who shall descend into the abyss?* he had regard to one that might undergo death and infernal sorrows thus to liberate us from them; whence it follows that by that interrogation Christ is brought up again from the dead, or His death for us is most wickedly taken away: and finally *the word that is near in the mouth and in the heart*, Paul openly interprets concerning the Gospel of the death and resurrection of Christ, *verses 9 and 10*, insofar as that was expressed by the confession of the mouth, and at the same time was believed by the faith of the heart. In which place Paul, among other things, from the expression of Moses, *who shall go over the sea for us?* not only according to the Hebrew text, but also according to the Septuagint, far recedes by his own, *τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, *who shall descend into the abyss?* especially if you have regard to the annexed declaration: whence, although here also various methods of reconciliation have been devised, perhaps it will be best to acknowledge that Paul in the place of Moses' expression has substituted another better agreeing with his own purpose.

Therefore, in this place there shall be a total Accommodation of the Mosaic words, or a Translation unto another subject and equally also unto a somewhat different sense: so that Paul means this, that indeed the Law leaves, nay, makes, man uncertain and anxious by that formula of Righteousness understood according to the letter, *the man which doeth those things shall live by them*: but that the Gospel, through the faith and confession of it, bears away that uncertainty and anxiety, the Gospel, I say, proclaimed concerning Him, who for us has merited heavenly life, and through death has freed us from death; in that it relates that Christ in this manner died and revived for our Justification, so that hence the prophetic formula of the Righteousness of faith out of Isaiah 28:16 (which the Apostles cites in *verse 11*), ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται, *whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed*, might also be plainly set over against that Mosaic formula. Whence also Paul did not say that *Moses thus describes the Righteousness by faith*, just as he had spoken concerning the Righteousness by the Law, *verse 5*, neither does he place the formula of the Righteousness of faith in the words of Moses, adduced in only the smallest part and mixed with his own words, and certainly not as expounding that Righteousness of faith; but in the summary of the Gospel subjoined, in support of which he cites Isaiah. Although the Mosaic Precept, even with respect to that word in Leviticus 18:5, is to be acknowledged as tacitly Evangelical, insofar as the elect learn from the external appearance of the Law their impotence, and penetrate into the inner marrow of the Israelite Covenant. Thus our Most Illustrious AUTHOR in his *Commentario ad Novissima Mosis* learnedly discusses this Mosaic passage, comparing it with the Pauline; see his *Commentarium in præcipuas quasdam partes Pentatuechi*, pages 691-706.

If the words of Paul in Romans 10:18¹ be compared with Psalm 19:4, especially in the Septuagint Version,² it is hardly able to be doubted that they have regard to that passage: hence from ancient times among the Fathers there arose those that Interpreters of great reputation in more recent times have followed, who interpreted the former part of

¹ Romans 10:18b: "...their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world (εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν)."

² Psalm 19:4: "Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world (הַיָּמִים מִלְּמַדְּבַר וּבְהַרְצָה הַיָּם אֲנֻכִּים וְרַגְלֵיהֶם אֵלֶיךָ; εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν, in the Septuagint). In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun..."

Psalm 19 mystically, as if it might contain a prophecy concerning the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel. Others think that Paul by these wants to prove that God had already of old granted to the Gentiles a knowledge of Himself in some measure by the light of nature, while He was revealing the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews alone, with the words of the Psalm cited to such an extent in the proper sense. Others, hardly finding a suitable way to reconcile Paul with David, deny altogether that Paul borrowed the words from David.

This, considering either text without prejudice, appears to be able to be evident, that Paul speaks of the preaching of the Gospel now extended to all Nations: and David in Psalm 19 commends previously the doctrine concerning God that Nature furnishes, then the doctrine of the Law, or the doctrine revealed in the written Word, in such a way that he raises the written Word far above Nature; but that the argument in *verse* 4 still pertains to the instruction of Nature. That, moreover, both passages of David and of Paul so agree in expression that it is hardly, and not even hardly, able to be doubted that the Apostle borrowed the phrase from David. Therefore, so that we might reconcile both divine Writers, and not say that Paul drew the words of David unto an alien sense; it appears that nothing is able to be said more aptly than that Paul by no means proves from the words of David the future, Universal Preaching of the Gospel: but the Universal Preaching of the Gospel, being thus already sufficiently evident as begun from the event, Paul would set forth to be done in words suited to this matter, which David had formerly used concerning the preaching of Nature, by a certain sort of Accommodation or Translation; as if he should say, Certainly it is now able to be said truly of the preaching of the Gospel, what David sang concerning the heavens and expanse, namely, that their sound and words have reached all the way to the ends of the earth and are able to be heard by all. In the text there is certainly no formulaic expression indicating proof, but a simple setting forth of a thing known publicly. For it ought not to be objected that so universal a calling of the Gentiles had not yet been made, when Paul wrote these things: for this is against the entire Apostolic intention as expressed, neither is it able to be admitted, with the truly stupendous beginning of this great matter observed, and with a comparison made with the first ages; consult Colossians 1:6, 23; and see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XX, § 8, 9, *pages* 673-681. On these twin passages closely illustrated the *marginal Notes* of the DUTCH are also worthy to be consulted on Romans 10:6-8, 18.

β. Besides the manifest Examples of this sort for the Citation and Use of the Scripture of the Old in the New Testament by mere Accommodation, our AUTHOR commends *Accommodation's*, 1. *Universal Use*. For Translation of this sort is common among all, not only out of Sacred authors, but also out of the profane; just as, for example, we, being about to describe the calamitous overthrow of some splendid city now laid waste, employ elegantly those words of Virgil out of *Æneid*, book II, verse 361:

Who could relate the calamity of that night, who by speaking the dead? etc.

2. Its *Appropriate Use* in applying the words of Scripture, as we compare *spiritual things with spiritual*, 1 Corinthians 2:13, which we do daily in our prayers, hymns, and sermons with profit; hence by no means inappropriate to the Sacred Writers. What? shall we say that this is inappropriate for the Apostles? When in such a translation are recalled into the memory of the faithful both other sayings of Scripture and other events in the Church: Is not rather an Accommodation of this sort appropriate with respect to these uses? Neither is this to be disputed simply, what is appropriate or inappropriate for the Spirit, since we recognize that thus He quite frequently spoke; and in many citations the heavenly wisdom both of the Prophets and of the Apostles is not otherwise able to be defended, but either the former or the latter are exposed to the ridicule of impious men. Concerning Grotius' method of interpreting Prophecies, and in what sense he supposes the same to be often cited in the New Testament, see VITRINGA'S *Præfationem Commentarii in Jesaiam*, pages 9-15; CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter I, § 13, page 35, § 22, pages 60-62. But these things shall be spoken of *the Sense of Scripture* and its *Understanding*.

§ 39: Private and Ministerial Judgment

Moreover, it is to be observed with our AUTHOR concerning the Exposition of the genuine Sense and the conjoined separation from falsehoods, what is wont to go under the name of *Controversies of Interpretation* and of *Judgment*. As far as the *Subject* of this *Judgment* and *Interpretation* is concerned, in the power of which the Right of interpretation and judgment resides; the Judgment of private Discretion comes here to be distinguished from the Judgment of public Determination: likewise the Judgment ὑπηρετικὸν/*servile* or *Ministerial* from the Judgment αὐτοκρατορικῶ/*autocratic* of absolute and legislative authority. Therefore, we hold distinctly:

1. That the *Private Judgment of Discretion* is competent to individual believers illuminated by the Holy Spirit: for,

α. This is committed to them, Romans 14:5; 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1; 1 Corinthians 7:23; 10:15.

β. This their practice is commended, Acts 17:11.

γ. This their Right is established by general assertions of Paul, 1 Corinthians 2:15; 2 Corinthians 4:2; Hebrews 5:14.

The *Roman Church* takes from Private Individuals this Judgment of Discretion, when they maintain that everyone depends entirely upon the Judgment and supreme authority of the Church, and in blind faith receives whatever the Church decides is to be believed.

See what things were written upon this matter by *Valerian the Great*, a Capuchin,¹ in his *Judicio de acatholicorum et catholicorum regula credenda*, as related by BUDDEUS in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 9, tome 2, page 1277.

Unto which cause they abuse, α. the Apostolic Admonition, Hebrews 13:17. *We respond*: That obedience toward Overseers ought not to be

¹ Valerianus Magnus (1586-1661) was an Italian Capuchin (a subdivision of the Franciscans), appointed as Apostolic missionary to Germany, Hungary, and Poland.

blind and universal, but *in the Lord*, by comparison with Ephesians 6:1, who is to be heeded above men, and to whom alone we owe blind obedience, Isaiah 1:2; Matthew 17:5; that this blind obedience is to be furnished to human Overseers, the Lord Jesus Himself does not at all impress upon the nations in Matthew 23:2, 3, concerning the genuine sense of which passage, see below in § 42, *Part I*, and *Chapter XX*, § 37, *Part III*. β. The saying of the same Apostle, whereby he refers to *the Discerning of Spirits* among the peculiar gifts of the Spirit, 1 Corinthians 12:10, not common to all. *We respond*: Paul speaks of the greater extraordinary gifts: but this does not take away the lesser ordinary gift, which also varies in degree in different people. γ. They cry out that the *ἰδίαν ἐπίλυσιν*, *private interpretation*, prohibited by Peter, 2 Peter 1:20, is thus set up. In which passage, *a*. we do not indeed think that the common reading of the Greek text is to be disturbed, by putting *ἐπηλύσεως*/*approach* or *ἐπελεύσεως*, *coming on*, in the place of *ἐπιλύσεως*/*interpretation*, so that it might be referred to the Holy Spirit coming upon the Holy Writers through the revelation of divine mysteries and the impulse to share those things with the Church. Neither, *b*. do we urge that the word *ἐπίλυσιν*¹ pertains to the first setting forth of Scripture; whether the expression be sought from the opening and loosing, as it were, of the mouth and lips, or from the sending forth of runners with the bars removed from the doors in the race-course. *c*. We acknowledge that *ἐπίλυσιν* is to be taken of the explication and interpretation of the Scriptures and of the resolution of doubts occurring therein; just as the verb *ἐπιλύειν* is used of the explication of the sense of the parables, Mark 4:34:² in which very thing, in 2 Peter 1:20, 21, they are aptly distinguished among themselves according to the intention of the Apostle, who wants those things that he relates in *verse 21* concerning the first setting forth of the word to be considered as the reason whereby he would confirm those things that were said in *verse 20*. But, although Peter now asserts that *not all*, that is, no *prophecy of Scripture* is *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως*, *of private interpretation*,³ he does not deny *ἰδίαν ἐπίλυσιν*,

¹ Ἐπίλυσις is a *loosing*; and figuratively *the loosing of difficulties*, or *interpretation*.

² Mark 4:34: “But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded (*ἐπέλυε*) all things to his disciples.”

³ 2 Peter 1:20: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation (*ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*).”

private interpretation, with respect to the *subject*, that is, the explanation of the Unlearned; thus he would contradict himself, who in *verse 19* had commended to every believer attention to the prophetic Word, so that thus they might be rendered altogether persuaded concerning the truth of Apostolic doctrine: which use from attention to the prophetic Word they would not be able to take up without Judgment concerning the sense of the prophecies: but he rejects interpretation that is *ιδίαν/ private* with respect to its *origin*, made *θελήματι ἀνθρώπων*, *by the will of men*, arising from one's own brain; which according to the reason added from the divine origin of Scripture in *verse 21*, is made all the more manifest: for, because everyone is the best interpreter of their own words, what Scripture had proceeded from the Holy Spirit as author, the interpretation of that was to be sought from that same Spirit speaking both in the context and elsewhere in Scripture: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* L, Part VI, § 9 and *following*; my own *Commentarium Belgicum* in 2 Peter 1; PETRUS VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, section I, chapter X, § 21, pages 128, 129. Against the error of the *Papists* just now refuted is to be read SAMUEL WERENFEL'S *Dissertatio apologetica pro Plebe Christiana adversus Doctores Judicium de Dogmatibus Fidei illi auferentes*, *Opuscula*, pages 1-40.

Neither does *Hobbes* leave this Judgment of Discretion of Private Persons in good repair, against whom COCQUIUS disputes concerning this matter in *Anatome Hobbesianismi*, locus III, chapter VI, *Exercitation I on Article XVII, chapter XVII, Hobbesii de Cive*, "Whether the word of a legitimate Interpreter of the Scriptures is the Word of God?" pages 55-57. Here *Hobbes* is followed by the *Earl of Shaftesbury* in his *Characteristics*; see LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, chapter 5, pages 112, 113.

2. That a *Ministerial Judgment*, *Public* and externally *Definitive*, is competent to the Overseers of the Church, to whom the interpretation of Scripture and vigilance against heresies have been committed: which is evident, α. From the commandment with respect to the former, Malachi 2:7; Matthew 28:19; 2 Timothy 2:15; with respect to the latter, Acts 20:30, 31; 2 Timothy 2:16; with respect to both, 2 Timothy 4:2. β. From practice, Nehemiah 8:9, in which our AUTHOR maintains that exposition, rather than translation, is understood; consult CARPZOV'S *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter I, pages 432, 433; BUDDEUS' *Historiam ecclesiasticam Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section VI, § 3, tome 2, pages 735a, 736b: Acts 8:35; 1 Corinthians 15:12 and

following, in which the Apostle refutes the heresy that was denying the Resurrection of the dead. To which, γ. the specific reason of their Duty is added, 1 Corinthians 4:1. Where again the Many are more influential than individuals, in public Consistories, Classes, Synods, to be revered above private Doctors and by them, Acts 15:28, 29; 1 Corinthians 15:29, 32, 33.

The *Remonstrants* put little weight on this Judgment, Public and Definitive in the external court of the Church, and all but deprive the Church of it, to establish absolute freedom of thought concerning Religion; they defer the determination and accommodation of all controversies to the return of Jesus Christ; and, even while they detest the tyranny of Popery, they bring in an insurmountable Skepticism, and wrongly equate the Reformed with the Papists. Wrongly, I say; since not one of the Reformed attributes to the Church Supreme Judgment, ἀνυπεύθυνον, *not accountable*, and Infallible of itself: neither do they contend that the Church is above Scripture; but always subject the Church to the Judgment of Scripture; by Scripture as the norm do they want all the determinations of the Church and its overseers to be examined even by every private individual; only to be approved, not because of the authority of the one speaking, but because of the agreement of the same with the Scripture.

But, with these conditions posited, the Judgment of the Overseers of the Church, Public and Definitive, whereby they affirm not only, *thus it appears to me*, but also *this is the Sense of Scripture*, and what with due veneration is received and externally heard; we judge is not to be denied. α. For, if to each private person the Judgment of Discretion is competent, which the *Remonstrants* acknowledge; how much more to the Overseers of the Church, especially when many come together in Council? β. Do not the greater gifts granted to the Overseers procure a singular veneration of their opinion? γ. And if no determination against deadly errors be granted, how shall a heretic be recognized? in what manner and by whom shall he be cast out, except by the Overseers of the Church? δ. Therefore, the preservation of order, peace, and orthodoxy requires this sort of Definitive Judgement of the Church, and subjection to the same in the external court of the Church: while an appeal from the same is always granted with respect to the internal court of conscience; in which court the Judgment of the Church obliges one no further than he has been persuaded concerning its agreement with the Scriptures: see *Confessionem Remonstrantium*, chapter I, § 10-12, pages 4, 5;

Censuram Confessionis Remonstrantium, chapter I, § 10-12, pages 18-22; *Apologiam Remonstrantium*, pages 29 and following; TRIGLAND'S *Antapologiam*, chapter III, pages 46-52. Add *Confessionem*, chapter XXV, § 2, numbers 5, 6, page 322; *Censuram Confessionis*, chapter XXV, § 2, numbers 5, 6, pages 329, 330; *Apologiam Remonstrantium*, pages 295, 296a; Limborch's *Theologiam Christianam*, book VII, chapter XIX, § 34-37; VITRINGA'S *Orationem de Synodis*, pages 26, 43-47, 71-93, in which among other things you may read, pages 85-88, "But if the Ministers of Christ discern of late *deadly* errors, covered with the veil of captious reasoning, that assail the *Foundation of the Faith* and shake it; that ambition and obstinacy have come into the parties; that the peace of the Church is disturbed; that schisms and the secession of parties is happening: they understand that reason requires of their office, that they admonish the authors of new and false doctrine concerning their error, and return them to the way by refuting, convincing, and disputing in a Spirit of gentleness, patience, and Christian charity: if these efforts fail of expectation, they abstain from public judgment no longer: which either is not at all in the Church, or is to be exercised in this case. If you should say that there is no public judgment: then there is no Society. For no Society is able to stand without discipline: all discipline involves judgment. There is no force of Law, no use of Law, without judgment. Now, the Law of a religious Society, since it embraces Things to be Believed as much as Things to be Done, is exercised in the sight of God in the Church concerning faults of Doctrine as much as of Manners: I do not deny that schism follows upon this Ecclesiastical judgment, if any oppose, and persist in maintaining the difference of opinion; but the fault of which those bear, that by a determination of private judgment separated themselves from the brethren, and *went out from them*,¹ as by the determination of public judgment they are shut out from their communion. Certainly the Church in extreme cases does not fear this schism; neither did the Apostles fear it, etc. Therefore, since to the Churches of Christ, and their Synods, the right of judgment concerning the doctrine of the Faith is not able to be denied; indeed, since they are bound to that judgment in certain cases, if they want their society to be whole and safe: no one, I suppose, would disagree with me that it is more correctly done, if what is the right, the duty of an individual Church, in cases of greater moment, on which the welfare of many Churches turns, be transferred to Synodal Assemblies, composed of the

¹ 1 John 2:19. See also Romans 16:17, 18.

Overseers and Doctors of the Churches, the best of their kind and the most skillful in divine things, so that deliberation concerning a matter common to many might be managed with so much the greater prudence and a better outcome.” In which things, optimally written, I altogether agree with that Most Illustrious Man. On this controversy it will also be helpful to look into LEYDEKKER’S *Facem Veritatis*, locus II, controversy IV, pages 41-44, compared with the *Præfatione*, ***** I.

What our AUTHOR adds concerning the public Assemblies, Classes, and Synods of the Overseers of the Church; *in the summoning, directing, confirming, and defending of which, pious Magistrates have their rights, by no means to be infringed by impious neglect or abuse*: concerning this see Chapter XXXIII, § 26, 32.

3. Moreover, *Normative and Directive Judgment* ought to be attributed to the *Scripture itself*, which, as the fountain of divine law and the most absolute norm of faith, ought *to direct* the understanding in Judgment concerning controversies of faith, and ought and is able to supply that understanding, whence definitions in controversies of this sort are sought by the subaltern Judge; which is the function of Law in every republic; ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, book IV, chapter IV at the end: Δεῖ γὰρ τὸν μὲν νόμον ἄρχειν πάντων· τῶν δὲ καθ’ ἕκαστα τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν κρίνειν, *for Law ought to rule all, but in particulars magistrates and the republic ought to judge*; namely, by application of the Law to particular cases; whence Law is also able to be called *Judge* in a broad sense and *the normative Judge*, distinct from a *personal Judge*. This same Scripture, as the norm of its own Interpretations also, is the highest rule, Isaiah 8:20, on which text see § 4 of this Chapter; 2 Peter 1:19, 20, of which passage I have recently spoken, but see more on § 32.

4. But whether there be in addition any Judge *Supreme, Absolute, Infallible, ἀνυπεύθυνος, not accountable*, in interpreting the Sense of Scripture and deciding Controversies concerning matters of Faith, there is great controversy. Our AUTHOR will untangle this Question, by proceeding, 1. Negatively, § 40-42; 2. Positively, § 43. The orthodox opinion concerning this controversy is set forth by VAN MASTRICHT, *Gangræna Novitatum Cartesianarum*, Section I, chapter X, § 19, pages 125-127.

§ 40: The Supreme Judge: Neither Enthusiastic Experience, nor Reason

Negatively, & an *Enthusiastical Spirit* ought not here to be set up as the Supreme and Infallible Judge, for the same reasons that were given above, § 30, 31, against this as a Principium of Faith.

Nevertheless, with this *Enthusiastical Spirit* our AUTHOR does not wish to be compared *Zwingli's nocturnal counselor*. This has regard to the narration of *Zwingli* in *Coronide de Eucharistia, opera, part II, folio 249*, where he narrates that, while he was working in Zurich to the end that the Mass might be altogether abolished, it was objected against him by a certain Scribe, that all the examples that he had previously set forth to prove that *this is*¹ is to be taken as *this signifies*, were parabolic; but that not one was adduced, in which was only a simple trope, which sort he imagined in the words of the Lord's Supper: that he responded, as indeed was the case, that in the explication of the parable, when Christ said, *the seed is the Word of God*,² there is a simple trope, in which *it is* manifestly ought to be taken as *it signifies*; and that all acquiesced to this response, so that the decree concerning the abolition of the Mass followed. Nevertheless, while they continued to insist that examples be produced that were not conjoined with any parable, and time was running on, and he was still not able to recollect a clear passage of this sort; it happened that at night in a dream he was very distress in soul over this matter: but behold, “ὄπὸ μηχανῆς, *by some contrivance*,” says he, “a counselor appeared to be present (whether he was black or white I remember nothing, for I recount a dream), who said, O sluggard, you shall certainly respond to him with what it written in Exodus 12, *for it is the Passover, this is the passing over of the Lord*!” consult ECKHARDUS' *Fasciculum Controversiarum cum Calvino, chapter I, question VI, pages 26, 27*. But observe, this particular Spirit does not occur as the authority ending the controversy that was agitated concerning the Lord's Supper and the true interpretation of the sacramental words; but *Zwingli*, who had already long since obtained a true understanding of this controversy from the Scripture itself, as the normative Judge and best Interpreter of itself,

¹ Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:24.

² Luke 8:11.

is only further confirmed in this his opinion, not by the authority of an Enthusiastical Spirit outside of Scripture, but from Scripture itself, which remained to him the Norm and supreme Judge in deciding the Question: consult RIVET'S *Exercitationem CXXIV in Genesin, opera, tome I, pages 478, 479*; GERDES' *Introductionem in Historiam Reformationis, tome I, § 127, 128, pages 321-325*; WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I, book I, chapter XXIV, § 27, pages 380, 381*. The Zwinglian interpretation of the words of Exodus 12:11 is defended against the Lutherans by WENDELIN¹ in his *Exercitationibus theologicis LXXXVII, pages 1331-1333*.

2. Neither is *human Reason* or any *Philosophy* to be held as such a Supreme and Infallible Judge. Which our AUTHOR wishes to be observed against the *Socinians* and many *Philosophers*, who show that they thus think, either in their practice, in denial of the mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Satisfaction, and other things that Scripture plainly relates; or who sometimes confess this even in words. HOORNBECK, *Socinianismo confutato, tome I, book I, chapter VI, pages 89-94*, most clearly proves both concerning the *Socinians*. In that place, that I might relate only one or the other example out of *Ostorodus' Institutionibus*, you may see *Chapter IV, page 30*, cited, in which he, disputing against the Trinity, says: "But if anyone should say that this our reason does not prevail, since in Sacred Scripture such things are written concerning Christ as the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, etc., to this we respond that it is indeed greatly to be deplored, that men stick in such deep darkness, since it is impossible for the same matter to be at the same time both false and true. Therefore, if Reason, that is, the mind, or the intellect plainly shows that the Trinity of persons in God is false, how would it ever come into the mind of man endowed with understanding that it is nevertheless able to be true and able to be proven by the Word of God?" *Ostorodus* in *chapter VI*, where he disputes against the divine nature of Christ, *page 43*, says: "But we say, what Reason attests to us, and that as evidently and clearly as the Sun shining at noon, that it is impossible, and therefore false, that two natures are found in Christ." Although elsewhere the *Socinians* contradict themselves and speak as if they agree completely with us: see HOORNBECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum, tome I, book I, chapter VI, pages 111, 112*. To the *Philosophers* that our AUTHOR mentions are to be added especially

¹ Marcus Friedrich Wendelin (1584-1652) was a Reformed Theologian and educator. He served as Rector at Zerbst from 1610 to 1652.

Spinoza, see SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum, opera, tome 3, columns 1002, 1003*; LEYDEKKER'S *Dissertationem contra Bekkerum, section XXIV, § 34, pages 445-450, 453*, who¹ nevertheless also speaks chastely enough in appearance elsewhere, see LEYDEKKER'S *Dissertationem contra Bekkerum, section XXIV, § 34, pages 454-456*: and the Author of the treatise entitled, *Philosophiæ Sacræ Scripturæ Interpretis*; which thesis, that *Philosophy is the Interpreter of Sacred Scripture*, the Curators prohibited to be taught or defended at the Academy of Leiden; as the Most Illustrious HEIDANUS and COCCEIUS against the book just now mentioned also communicated their opinion in writing to the Nobles of Holland; see HEIDANUS' *Consideratien, etc., pages 138, 139*; SPANHEIM'S *Epistolam de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis, pages 67-69*, who against the Dissertation concerning Philosophy as the Interpreter of Sacred Scripture sets forth twelve arguments in his *Elencho Controversiarum, opera, tome 3, columns 999-1001*, which are altogether worthy to be diligently weighed: consult VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum, prior Section, chapter X, § 1-18, pages 105-125*; WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam, Part II, Century XVII, § 29, page 726*, in which you may see that *Lodewijk Meyer*, a Physician of Amsterdam, and publisher of *Posthumorum Spinosæ*, is held as the author of the *Exercitation* of that *Paradox* concerning Philosophy as the Interpreter of Scripture;² and WALCH'S *Miscellanea Sacra, book I, Exercitation VI, § 3, 7, pages 146, 151, § 13-24, pages 159, 172*, in which he specifically expostulates against *Johann Lorenz Schmidt's* new Germanic Version of the Pentateuch.³ Let me not now mention the *Remonstrants*, those defenders of the Socinians, in HOORNBECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum, tome I, book I, chapter VI, pages 94 and following*; nor repeat those things just now observed in *Chapter I, § 32*. Compare the theses

¹ That is, Spinoza.

² *Philosophia Sacræ Scripturæ Interpres* was published anonymously, and was initially thought to be the work of Spinoza. It was actually penned by Lodewijk Meyer (1629-1681), a Dutch Enlightenment scholar and Rationalist philosopher.

³ Johann Lorenz Schmidt (1702-1749), a radical Wolffian, began a translation of the Bible (*Wertheim Bible*) in keeping with the rationalistic spirit of the age. For example, he refused to use the New Testament in the interpretation and translation of the Old, denied the Christological bearing of Old Testament passages, and removed much traditional religious language. Schmidt's Pentateuch ignited public controversy, and so his translation was never finished.

committed to the press by a student of the Most Illustrious RÖELLIUS for a public defense, and which Röellius himself applauded with a Poem subjoined, although the airing of those theses was hindered, in *Judicio Ecclesiastico laudato*, chapter II, § 5, page 36. Add VRIESIUS' *Exercitationem de Officio Philosophi circa Revelata*. The Theses concerning holding Reason as the highest Interpreter of the Scriptures, and not acknowledging the Scripture, or God speaking in the Scripture, as the Interpreter of itself/Himself, being equivalent to the doctrine of the Socinians, from the writings of those that confess themselves to be committed to Reformed Rites, are set forth and refuted with gravity by WITSIUS, *Twist des Heeren met zynen Wyngaard*, chapter XXI, pages 281-290. The inane thesis of BRAUN¹ concerning this matter, out of his *Disputatione* IV, § 8, our AUTHOR also sets forth, *Narratione Apologetica contra Braunium*, § XL, pages 38, 39; and that these he calls to a more accurate examination in an *Appendice Narrationis Apologeticæ*, § LXXVI, pages 170 and following, in which at the same time he nevertheless shows just how much in this matter Braun contradicts himself and speaks ἀσύστατα, things incoherent.

The *πρῶτα ψεύδη*, fundamental errors, of the Socinians and Pseudo-philosophers are: the Confusion of Reason and Revelation; the hypothesis concerning the ambiguity of accommodating Scripture to Reason; that the principia of Philosophy are certain, and hence what Philosophy does not perceive is false.

Their *Scope/Goal*: to defend their Errors, which are contrary to Scripture.

We urge against them: α. What Reason is nowhere extant as sound and infallible in the concrete, that is not able to arrogate to itself certain and infallible Judgment concerning divine matters of certain truth: but, that sound and infallible Reason in the concrete is today sought in vain, shall be abundantly proven from those things that are to be said in Chapter XV concerning the universal Corruption of fall man, especially in § 27-29. The Fallibility of Reason in each one of us is sufficiently gathered from the variety of judgments in all those things that depend upon the dictate of Reason. Indeed, common Notions, indited in the mind by God, survive; but even those in this destitute state of man are much obscured and corrupted in many things and diminished in all

¹ Johannes Braun (1628-1708) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1680-1708).

things, and hence are to be emended and completed by Revelation. The power of reasoning, perceiving, judging, extrapolating, survives in man, but has been greatly injured and hence is to be restored by the internal grace of the Spirit, correcting and corroborating, especially in the business of saving Religion; in this way to a certain extent vision, hearing, speech, motion, and not rarely intellect, judgment, memory, even in decrepit old men often are not altogether lacking, but are not at all able to furnish the same thing as in young or vigorous men. And, although we do learn many truths through this power of Reasoning properly applied, even in the business of Religion; yet that use of Reason is not always proper in all, or even in any, men, so that many truths of reason everywhere might not remain hidden to reason, and also the most filthy errors might be mixed by reason with revealed truths: which is the learned and pious observation of the *Theologians of Leiden* in *Judicio Ecclesiastico laudato*, chapter II, § 9, page 46, deservedly withdrawing from Reason the Supreme and Infallible Judgment in matters of faith and interpretation of the Scriptures. β. Sacred Scripture confirms this our opinion, when *Reason* in Spiritual things, exceeding its capacity, Scripture plainly pronounces to be *blind*, with this blindness not even completely removed in the regenerate. But to that which, 1. in Sacred Things is blind, Judgment, much less Supreme and Infallible Judgment, is not to be committed concerning Sacred Things: for if *the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch*, Matthew 15:14. But according to 1 Corinthians 2:14, ψυχικὸς—ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*, and, when he undertakes to judge concerning them, *they are foolishness to him*: neither is it strange that *he cannot know them*, for *they are to be discerned spiritually*: see STEPHEN DE BRAIS' *Lecturas theologicas de Auxiliis*, after *Analysin Epistolæ ad Romanos*, pages 444-505: add 2 Corinthians 3:5. 2. What is above Reason, that is not to be judged by Reason: but Scripture teaches us, and faith embraces, truths that are placed above the orbit and sphere of Reason. Therefore. For, as the Senses do not assume to themselves Judgment in those things that are above Sense, and belong to Reason: so neither is Judgment competent to Reason concerning those things that are supernatural and are above Reason: but see 1 Corinthians 2:7; Matthew 13:11. The Imperfection of the Degree of Illumination in believers, conjoined with the sublimity of these Mysteries, drives even the regenerate to their prayers, *Open thou mine eyes, etc.*, Psalm 119:18, and presses from them humble confessions,

I am brutish, etc., Proverbs 30:2-4. γ. Not only is *Reason* blind in spiritual matters, but it is also *averse* to divine truth, and *adverse* to it, Romans 8:7. But to that which is wont to make opposition to divine truth, which is for us the sole norm of faith and life; to that, I say, Judgment concerning the truth of faith and the sense of divine revelation is not at all safely committed. On the other hand, from of old *Philosophers* were called the *Patriarchs of Heretics*, as it is in TERTULLIAN'S *contra Hermogenem, chapter VIII, opera, pages 236*, the truth of which saying experience also confirms. δ. Therefore, the method of Scripture is completely contrary, which commands to take the mind captive and to submit to the Word of God, 2 Corinthians 10:4, 5. Now, what ought to submit to Scripture and to be judged by Scripture, to that supreme Judgment concerning the Scripture and its argument is not able to be committed. For thus the matter stands, both here with respect to Reason, and with respect to the Church in the controversy with the Papists. Indeed, ε. if Reason be here the Supreme and Infallible Judge, Scripture and its Interpretation would be subject to Reason and human judgment: but one would for good reason dread to arrogate such a thing to himself concerning the divine Word, which is so prejudicial to its dignity. According to 1 John 5:9, *the divine witness is greater than human witness*. And rightly, ζ. does our AUTHOR observe that this Judgment of which we treat is not transferred to Reason or Philosophy, even in the very smallest matter delivered by the Holy Spirit in the Sacred Books, since by that very thing that substance of divine Faith, ultimately resting upon the Word of God, would be taken away as such. But this would be absurd: since the formal reason of Faith, why I believe this, is the Word of God and its infallible truth, 1 Thessalonians 2:13. But, if to Reason we commit the Supreme Judgment in matters of faith, the final analysis of Faith shall be in us; and the supreme reason why we thus believe shall be this, that *so it appears to us*: consult VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum, prior Section, chapter X, pages 105-148*; LEYDEKKER'S *Facem Veritatis, locus II, controversies II, III, pages 29-40*; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ, tome I, chapter III, section XIX, § 1355-1359*. MILL, in his *Oratione de Fatis Theologicæ exegeticæ, in Miscellaneis Sacris, page XXI*, from a Manuscript of אֲשֶׁרִי תַמִּימִי אֲשֶׁרִי תַמִּימִי, *Blessed Are the Undeiled in the Way*, relates this method, which the *Karaites*, to be commended above the Rabbis in exegetical method, maintain is to be used in the explication of Sacred Scripture: "They teach that use is to be made of *Reason* and *the Judgment of Intellect* that attends to

the words and connection of the text, and also legitimately deduces by consequence other truths from the things said; but that also the light of *Scripture* ought to be added, and hence they are wont elegantly to call Reason and *Scripture* שתי הנרות בשתי ידינו, *the two lights in both our hands*. But, where a more profound and abstruse Sense of *Scripture* occurs, that it is not to be too thoroughly searched out, nor is it therefore to be rejected, because we are not able to grasp it: for, for that reason it is called הנבואה/*prophecy*, as inspired by God,¹ and what is more sublime than all reason, which is to be brought into subjection to *Scripture*; as what has God as author, and is confirmed by so many miracles that there is sufficient certainty concerning the Word of God, and so we are able to believe, although we do not everywhere understand it.”

The *Objections*, briefly and vigorously resolved by our AUTHOR, do not much delay us; for example,

α. *With the help of Reason we elicit the true Sense. Response:* We acknowledge this, and taught the manifold Use of Reason in Theology, *Chapter I, § 32*. But already at that time we observed at the same time that Reason is here, not the principal, but the minister: whence with no greater right of Reason would you conclude it to be the Supreme and Infallible Judge in matters of Faith, than you might assign the same to the Senses of sight and hearing; since they also intervene in learning and grasping the true Sense of Sacred *Scripture*.

β. *The Judgment of Discretion is competent to human Reason. Response:* The Judgment of Discretion, 1. differs much from the Supreme and Infallible Judge, which we yield to no man. 2. The Judgment of Discretion is more private, proper to individual believers, and does not serve the universal Church as a norm. 3. We do not attribute the Judgment of Discretion absolutely to human Reason or individual men: while we do assert that that Judgment is competent to believers, we believe that it is able to be exercised rightly only with the illumination of the Holy Spirit.

γ. In matters known *Naturally* also, we certainly admit the Judgment of Reason also. *Responses:* 1. Matters known *Naturally* are thereupon considered as such, in which, even as such, the foundation of the truth is not our Concept, Idea, or Judgment; but the matter itself, and the conformity of our Concept with it. 2. But to what extent the

¹ The verbal root, נבא, signifies to announce.

same matters are also revealed in Scripture and are the object of faith, the divine Word as such founds our faith, and compels us unto assent: and to this revealed Word the Judgment of Reason is to be subjected, even in matters known by nature. Thoroughly compare WITSIUS' *Exercitation XVII, tome 2, Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, which is concerning the *Use and Abuse of Reason concerning the Mysteries of Faith*; SALDENUS' *Otia Theologica, book IV, Exercitation VII*, which is concerning the *Operations of human Reason and of the Holy Spirit in Spiritual matters*, pages 718-733, in which against the *Author of Exercitationis de Philosophia Sacrae Scripturae Interprete* he admirably explains what then is the Operation of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of believers concerning revealed Truths, so that they might be savingly known and evaluated, and then turned into practice, which without Him Reason is not capable of furnishing; and for the denial of which hyperphysical operation the ignorance of that Exercitator is not at all sufficient. *Byvoegsel tot het Formulier van Ondertekeninge gestalt by de Classis van Walcheren anno 1693, article I.* CAMPEGIUS VITRINGA in his *Oratione de Synodis*, pages 95-98: "The Doctrine of Religion would be obscure to no one: all would readily consent to the judgments, even *as spiritual men discern spiritual things*.¹ But pride works, and also the corruption of intellect, so that all do not obtain it of themselves. They stumble over certain Dogmas in the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, which according to their capacity they do not perfectly understand, or with difficulty they harmonize with certain of their own prejudiced notions, which they most falsely call *right Reason*. These idols of their minds they worship, venerate, adore: with these *they draw near to consult the mouth of the Lord* (Ezekiel 14:3, etc.); holding it as certain and established among them to believe nothing that sounds different, although most clearly revealed. And so they seek this counsel out of audacity, to the end that they, abusing their genius and erudition, might bend the sense of the Divine Oracles and accommodate it to their hypotheses, which they imprudently and arrogantly contrive for themselves without the Word of God, and make in such a way that the Spirit says and teaches nothing other than what was to be said and taught according their own opinion and sense of judgment; even if to someone, holding and treating the Word of God with greater reverence and modesty, it may prove manifest that the interpretations that they set forth are not elicited from the Scriptures, but are intruded upon them violently and insolently, as if it were proposed, not to seek the Doctrine

¹ See 1 Corinthians 2:13, 14.

of Faith from the Scripture, but to emend what they find in them. But, if the dogmas of Scripture be inconsistent with Reason, you say, O good people! what Reason are you speaking of, right and sound, or false and adulterous, a mockery of your thoughts? Reason indeed, rightly so called, is a splendid thing, a Divine gift, common to all, which few use, most abuse, being mad with reason itself. This no one, skilled in the interpretation of the Divine Word, or in declaring the mysteries of Faith, thinks is to be neglected: but modest men thus suppose that in the most excellent nature of God, and in His counsels and words, and in their connection and end, there are a great many things that not only do we not know, but the capacity of our mind does not reach; whether because it did not seem good to God to reveal to us in this world all their extent and rationale (for He only revealed things necessary to know for instilling faith and supporting hope), or because the nature of our mind cannot contain an understanding of Him: here they halt; they assent to things clearly revealed; they bridle excessive curiosity and command their minds to be silent, and forbid it impudently *to intrude upon* and dispute *what it hath not seen* (Colossians 2:18). Indeed, they recognize that the harmonious and rational consent of all parts of revelation concerning the way of salvation is so beautiful that they illuminate, not destroy nor subvert, each other mutually, and Reason itself also: but that contrary to those things those especially err in accommodating the system of Christian Theology to reason, even those that insolently boast of it; of which sort are those that make the Savior *not God*, and yet teach that He is to be worshipped and adored as *God*. I have adduced these things so that it might be revealed that the fault is not *in the Canon of judgments concerning Faith*, if one should apply it circumspectly to resolve questions concerning Religion.” Moreover, consider STAPFER, *Theologicæ polemicæ, tome 2, chapter x, § 219-232, pages 1024-1034*, in which he responds to the Objection of the Anti-scripturists taken from passages that are said to furnish for us ideas little worthy of God, unless help be afforded to them by a suitable interpretation sought from the principles of Reason: and also BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VIII, § 12, tome 2, pages 1757b-1758*, in which against *Richard Simon* he teaches that Protestants and Socinians do not have the same Principium of Religion and of interpreting Sacred Scripture; neither do those that do not make with the Socinians in this part therefore regard it as necessary to pass over unto the camp of the Papists: add § 13, *tome 2, pages 1794b-1796*.

§ 41: The Supreme Judge: Not the Church, Part 1

λ. On this eminence, not even the *Church* is to be placed, whether *of the Elect*, which is truly called the *Invisible Church*, or *of the Called*, in which are mixed many *Reprobates*; or the *Universal Church of Clerics and Laics together*, as *Bellarmino*, book III, *de Ecclesia*, chapter XIV, tome 2, *Controversiis*, column 187, joins the *Entire Body of the faithful* and the *Entire Body of the Bishops*; or the *Representative Church of Overseers*, upon whom that privilege is wont chiefly to be bestowed by our Adversaries, whether it be represented in *Councils*, or in *one Roman Pope*: concerning the remaining Overseers of the Church considered individually there is no controversy, whom our Adversaries readily concede to be liable to error. Yet we except here the *Extraordinary Doctors of the Old Testament*, namely, the *Prophets*, and the first that founded the Church of the *New Testament*, namely, the *Apostles*, whom we willingly acknowledge to have been blessed with the gift of *Infallibility* in teaching, and through whom the Holy Spirit to have exercised Judgment Supreme and ἀνυπεύθυνον, *not accountable*, in matters of faith: at which point, nevertheless, we assert that those very Prophets and Apostles are to be considered after the likeness of Ministers, through whom the *Spirit*, by whom they were moved,¹ was delivering His sentence as the Supreme Judge.

Moreover, in every case mentioned we deny to the Church Supreme Judgment in the Interpretation of Scripture, and in the Decision of controversies of Faith: 1. Because the private Judgment of *Discretion* belongs to individual believers, in accordance with § 39, which ought to remain free: neither by an αὐτοκρατορικὴν/*autocratic* and ἀνυπεύθυνον, *not accountable*, determination of the Church is it lawful to take from believers free recourse to the Sacred Scriptures. 2. Because all things are to be examined by the Scripture, which as the sole and supreme *Rule* of the Church is also addressed to its individual members. But a subordinate Judge, to whom the Law was given by the Prince, according to which he ought to judge, is not able to arrogate to himself Judgment Supreme and ἀνυπεύθυνον, *not accountable*, from the

¹ 2 Peter 1:21.

Law at pleasure, when controversy at length arises: but it belongs to the Prince himself to interpret his Law: which God does in Scripture, to which He accordingly sends all, Deuteronomy 5:32; Isaiah 8:20, concerning the sense of which passage see § 4 above; 2 Peter 1:19, 20, upon which passage see my *Commentarium*. 3. Because every Church in this world is *Fallible*, see below *Chapter XXXII*, § 16: both of the *Elect*, which indeed is not able to err finally in the foundation and necessary articles, but never in this life is to be said to be so infallible that it is liable to no error; and this Church is truly *Invisible*, neither are its member able to be infallibly discerned by other men, see *Chapter XXXII*, § 3, 4, 8; and so this is not able to sustain the part of a *visible Judge* concerning the sense of Scripture and controversies of faith: and of the *Called*, who often, and sometime even universally in particular places, are able to err, Romans 11:20; Acts 13:46: and of the *Prelates*, who, *α. As men*, are liable to error, Romans 3:4, whom even our Adversaries would not deny to be able to err as individuals; but what the individuals do not have separately, that does not belong to all of them conjointly; neither is a Council, which is made up of fallible members, able to be infallible: consult below, *Chapter XXXIII*, § 26. *β.* They themselves are subject expressly to error in rebukes and prophecies, Isaiah 56:10; Ezekiel 7:26; Matthew 24:24. *γ.* Indeed, they are judged on account of their presumption of *Infallibility*, Jeremiah 18:18. *δ.* And in very grievous errors with great frequency are found the very High Priests and Councils both under the *Old* and under the *New Testament*. Examples bear this out: *Aaron*, when he prepared the golden calf and built an altar before it, Exodus 32:2-5; *Urijah*, at the commandment of *Ahaz* constructing an altar according to the form of the idolatrous altar of *Damascus*, and sacrificing on it, with the altar that *Solomon* had caused to be made by divine commandment set aside, 2 Kings 16:10-16; *Caiaphas*, regarding the Lord *Jesus* as a plague upon the republic, accusing Him of blasphemy, and hence obtaining a sentence of death against Him, which example *TURRETIN* frees from many Exceptions, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus XVIII, question XI, § 14; the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*, who as individuals were liable to grievous errors in faith and practice, and who notwithstanding as public Doctors were instructing the people, but to both of these sects the members of the highest Politico-Ecclesiastical Council among the Jews were devoted, Acts 23:6; *Councils of the Prophets and Elders*, for example, of the four hundred Prophets about the time of *Ahab*, all whom a Spirit of falsehood was bringing into one, 1 Kings 22:6, 19-23; and of the Elders in the time

of Christ, who even with one accord by the consent of the Elders present repudiated the true Messiah, and judged Him worthy of death as a blasphemous, Matthew 26:65, 66.

Under the *New Testament*, there are *Examples in Paul of Samosata*,¹ etc., who, at least all those reviewed by our AUTHOR, were Ministers in the Church of the first dignity; Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, who called Christ a ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον, *mere man*, denied His Deity and preexistence before His birth of the Virgin Mary. Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium in Illyricum, who held the same heresy concerning the Son of God as Samosata, and nonsensically said that the Holy Spirit is neither God nor a person of the Trinity.² Arius, Prebyter of the Alexandrian Church, and ἐξηγητῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν, *Interpreter of the Divine Scriptures*, whose errors concerning the Son of God as less than the Father, a creature made ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *from non-being*, a created God, the instrument of the Father in Creation; and concerning the Holy Spirit, not even God, but a creature of the Son; are well-known: no less well-known are the factions and tumults that the Arian heresy stirred up.³ Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who similarly impugned the Deity of the Holy Spirit, and asserted that He was only a created force, ministering to the Son, a created force, I say, that would be in all spirits.⁴ Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, who erred, as it was commonly thought, from the truth concerning the Union of the two Natures in Christ.⁵ Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, who was the first patron of the Eutychian heresy, and condemned at the Council of Chalcedon.⁶ Peter

¹ Paul of Samosata (200-275), Bishop of Antioch from 260 to 268, was a monarchian and adoptionist. In 269, he was deposed by a Synod at Antioch.

² Although the exact character of Photinus' (died 376) beliefs are not clear, he appears to have in some way denied the full and proper Deity of Jesus Christ.

³ Arius' (c. 250-336) doctrine created a faction in the Church, which long after his death continued to cause trouble, and even to threaten the very being of the true Church.

⁴ Macedonius I of Constantinople (flourished 340-360) was the progenitor of a heretical group known as the Macedonians, who denied the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

⁵ Nestorius (c. 386-451) taught that in Christ, there are not only two natures, but two persons, Jesus of Nazareth and the eternal Son of God. Some believe that this was not actually Nestorius' view, but rather his opponents' caricature of his beliefs.

⁶ Dioscorus was Patriarch of Alexandria from 444 to 454. Dioscorus supported Eutyches, the champion of Alexandrian monophysitism. Although he was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, he continued to be

Mongus, Bishop of Alexandria, previously Archdeacon of the Alexandrian Church, thrust into the Alexandrian chair by turbulent men, was the head of the faction of the Eutychians; but thereafter, since he appeared in letters written to embrace the Council of Chalcedon, he was confirmed in the Alexandrian Patriarchate by the Emperor, but left his own sect among the Eutychians without a definite leader/ head, hence to be called the *Acephali*.¹ *Peter Gnapheus*, Overseer of the Antiochene seat, thereafter was numbered among the heads of that same sect.²

That many Doctors congregated together are no less Fallible, is taught by the examples of entire *Councils* erring even *under the New Testament*, of which sort, for example, are the Councils of Rimini and Seleucia under Constantius in the Fourth Century, confirming Arianism;³ the second Ephesian, *ληστρικὸν/Robber's*, Council in the Fifth Century, in which, with Dioscorus of Alexandria as President, the Eutychian heresy was approved;⁴ the Second, Pseudo-*Ecumenical Council of Nicea*,⁵ which rescinded the Acts of the Seventh *Ecumenical Council of Constantinople*,⁶ and established the veneration of images.

To this Argument from the sought and abundantly confirmed *Fallibility of the Church*, *Bellarmino* is able to be set in opposition, *book II de Conciliis, chapters VI-IX, tome 2, Controversiis, columns 75-102*, in which he tries to enervate the same with a great many arguments, but to no purpose.

From what has been said, as the Fallibility of the Church is evident in general, so certain *Particulars* are added against the *Roman Church*, which, α. *with the others is without a promise of Infallibility*, while Paul admonishes these very Romans, Romans 11:20-22, *καλῶς: τῆ ἀπιστίας ἐξεκλάσθησαν*, etc., *well; because of unbelief they were broken off, etc.* β. *And it has had many Bishops erring in faith; Liberius* in the Fourth Century subscribing to an Arian formula at the behest of Constantius,

recognized by many as Patriarch until his death in 454.

¹ That is, *the head-less*. Peter Mongus was Patriarch of Alexandria through twelve tumultuous years, from 477 to 489.

² Peter the Fuller was Patriarch of Antioch from 471 to 488.

³ In 358, Emperor Constantius II convened two councils (one in the West at Rimini, and one in the East at Seleucia Isauria) to settle the Arian controversy, which adopted a compromise, that is, the Semi-Arian position.

⁴ The Second Council of Ephesus was held in 449.

⁵ The Second Council of Nicea was held in 787.

⁶ This iconoclastic Council was held in 786.

when he was wearied with two years of exile:¹ see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Century IV*, *chapter XI*, *columns* 911, 915, 916, *opera*, *tome I*; BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, *book II*, *chapter II*, § 5, *tome 1*, *pages* 458, 459a. Vigilius, who in the Sixth Century actually changed his opinion three times concerning the case of the Three Chapters and of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, and by the condemnation of the Three Chapters involved himself in the crime of *heresy* by the judgment of most of the Latins and Africans of that time:² see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Century VI*, *chapter X*, § 4, *column* 1123, § 9, *columns* 1127, 1128. Honorius I, who asserted Monothelitism, and condemned those that opposed, in the Seventh Century; afterwards Pope Honorius himself was then also anathematized by the Sixth Ecumenical, or Third Constantinopolitan, Council:³ see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Century VII*, *chapter VIII*, § 3, *columns* 1220, 1221, § 6, *column* 1224, *chapter IX*, § 4, 5, *columns* 1227, 1228. John XXII, who in the Fourteenth Century denied that the Souls of the saints are received into heaven, and enjoy the vision of God before the day of the Resurrection; but he, when near to death, recanted:⁴ see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Century XIV*, *chapter III*, § 3, *columns* 1744, 1745, *chapter V*, § 11, *column* 1764. John XXIII, who in the Fifteenth Century at the Council of Constance was to be deprived of office, having been accused of denying the future Life and the Resurrection of the dead: see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Century XV*, *chapter II*, § 2, *column* 1819, and likewise in *Xeniis Romano-catholicorum*, *Dilemma XIV*, in *Antidoro*, § 2, *columns* 1143, 1144, *opera*, *tome 3*. And according to Canon Law, says our AUTHOR, it is possible to have Bishops deviating from the faith: so indeed in *part I* of the Decree of GRATIAN, *Distinction XL*, *chapter VI*, *Si Papa*, *columns* 211, 212, it is read that *the Pope is to be judged by no one, unless he be found a deviant*

¹ Liberius was Roman Bishop from 352 to 366.

² Vigilius was Roman Bishop from 537 to 555. The Three-Chapter Controversy was instigated by the Emperor Justinian. In order to reconcile Monophysite Christians to the Greater Church, which had embraced the Chalcedonian formula, he called for the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, certain writings of Theodoret, and a letter of Ibas of Edessa, since these "Three Chapters" were particularly offensive to the Monophysites. He called for the subscription of the Bishops of the Church, which occasioned the controversy. The Fifth Ecumenical Council condemned the Three Chapters.

³ Honorius I was Roman Bishop from 625 to 638. In 680, he was anathematized by the Third Council of Carthage as a Monothelite, asserting that Christ had but one energy and will, rather than two energies and will.

⁴ John XXII was the Roman Pope from 1316 to 1334.

from the faith: in the place of which the *Gloss* on that place has, *unless he be found a heretic*: but, if this be impossible, for what reason is that restriction added? γ. *Never in the Church was the Roman Church acknowledged as the Universal Judge, whatever it might sophistically urge*, with the Easterners and Africans everywhere setting themselves in opposition; consult below *Chapter XXXIII, § 7. δ. In Judgment concerning the most weighty heads*, as this very thing concerns the supreme and infallible Judge in matters of faith, *it has changed and changes even now*; not daring according to its infallibility and authenticity to remove the quarrels and grave disagreements that are between the Thomists and the Scotists, and other sects among them, they thrive. A good number of this sort of varying and contradictory Decrees and Brevia of the Roman Popes in the doctrine of religion are related by SPANHEIM, *Stricturis adversus Bossueti Expositionem Doctrinæ catholicæ, chapter I, opera, tome 3, column 1054, chapter II, columns 1076-1078*; add his *Xenia Romano-catholicorum, Dilemma II, in Antidoro, § 2, columns 1123, 1124. ε. And also it was formerly convicted of Apostasy, Idolatry, Tyranny*, which things compelled our fathers to secede from that Church, *and of all Authority unjustly usurped*: consult below *Chapter XXXII, § 12. ζ. The Roman Church itself is not able to deny its own Fallibility in its own Head*, when it acknowledges that the Pope as a private Doctor is indeed able to err; see *Bellarmino, book IV de Romano Pontifice, chapter II, Controversiis, tome I, column 960*; but not as the Pope *speaking ex Cathedra*: thus the Parisian Jesuits in the College of Clermont in 1661 defended this thesis: “Christ committed the government of His Church to the Popes in such a way that He granted to them the same Infallibility that He Himself has, as often as *they speak ex Cathedra*.” Now, this *Cathedra* denotes, not a certain pulpit in which the Pope shall sit; but speech with a quality of some sort, with the necessary means for Infallibility applied. And so in this way the same man is able to be orthodox as Pope, but a heretic as a private man: but why does not he, erring as a private man, consult himself as Pope, so that he might cease to err? They do not distinctly explain what that *Cathedra* is, and by what marks it is able to be discerned with certainty whether the Pope rightly applied all the requisite means for Infallibility, and so is to be said to have *spoken ex Cathedra*, or not. *Philippe Vlaming*, himself a Papist author, acknowledges that this is doubtful, especially concerning the more ancient times, *Epistle XIII contra David Pierman, § 9, tome 2, page 380*. While according to the understanding of the Papists he occupies the *Cathedra* of Peter from the time that he is elected and inaugurated,

and so it would appear that he ought always to be believed to speak ex Cathedra. Moreover, the Papists in a variety of ways restrict this Infallibility, when they state that the Pope is indeed able to err as a private Doctor even in universal questions of Right, both of faith and of manners; but in addition that the Pope, even with a General Council, is able to err in particular controversies of Fact, which depend upon human testimony, although not in questions of Right, as it is in *Bellarmino, book IV de Romano Pontifice, chapter II, Controversiis, tome I, column 960*: while the Jesuits everywhere call the Pope the Infallible Judge, both in questions of Right and of Fact, which two are frequently not even able to be separated from each other; see TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus XVIII, question XI, § 3, 23*. On the other hand, *Philippe Vlaming* maintains the Fallibility of the entire Church in matters of Fact, *Epistle III contra David Pierman, tome I, pages 49-71*. Thus they sometimes say that the Pope is able to err in those things that pertain to Manners, but not in those things that concern Faith: while both in the dogmas of Faith and in the precepts of Manners, that are prescribed to the whole Church, and that have to do with matters necessary for salvation, or with those things that are of themselves good or evil, *Bellarmino*, on the other hand, pronounces him Infallible, *book IV de Romano Pontifice, chapter II, Controversiis, tome I, column 973*. And certainly, if to the Pope the perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit is given to grant Infallibility to him in matters of Faith, why is he not also able to have the same for those things that pertain to Manners? Neither is he able to err against good Manners by establishing anything according to the plenitude of his power that is unjust or illicit of itself; since by that most grievous error in Faith it is previously held that that belongs to it of Right. But that is correct, which LOUIS ELLIES DU PIN, *the Parisian Theologian*, with protracted effort expended, would present as proven, that the Roman Popes are not Infallible in judgment, *Dissertation V de Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina*. On the question, *Whether the Pope is able to err in Faith?* see WHITAKER, *Controversy IV, question VI, opera, tome 2, pages 694-714*.

§ 42: The Supreme Judge: Not the Church, Part 2

Yet the Papists contend mightily for this Right of their Church, whose πρῶτον ψεῦδος, fundamental error, in this Question is able to be specified, namely, the believed necessity of a Supreme and Infallible Visible Judge of Controversites in this world besides the Scripture, which is the Roman Church, and that Infallible. While this very Question concerning the Supreme Judge of Interpretations and Controversies is able to be considered as a primary one, because of which nearly all the rest concerning Sacred Scripture are moved, which hence is able and ought to be held as the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, fundamental error, in Controversies concerning the Authority of Scripture with respect to us, concerning its Purity and Integrity, Perspicuity and Perfection, all which are called into doubt by the Papists, so that they might teach men that in matters of faith recourse is necessarily to be had to the Tribunal of the Church. Now, the Council of Trent thus determined concerning the controversy that we now treat, Session IV, Decree II, page 33: “Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees that no one, relying upon his own discretion, shall, in matters of faith and of manners pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wrest the sacred Scripture to his own sense, or against that sense which holy mother Church, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, has held and does hold.”

But, when the *Papists* bestow upon their *Church* that privilege of defining infallibly matters of faith and of interpreting ἀνυπευθύνως, without accountability, the Sacred Scripture, they contend for it, as our AUTHOR says, *after the manner of the Andabatæ*,¹ as if fighting in the dark, with eyes closed, as it were, without discrimination, as JEROME loved to say; see ERASMUS’ *Adagia*, pages 624, 685. For, what is here to be understood under the name of *Church* is not consistent among them. *With some* arguing for the *Pope*, like *Gregory of Valentia, de Analysis*, book VII, “It is the Roman Pope himself, in whom that authority resides, which is in the Church for judging absolutely all controversies of faith.” *With others* arguing for *Councils*, like the *Parisians*, and others; who place

¹ The *Andabatæ* were blind-folded gladiators.

Infallibility of Judgment concerning matters of faith in a general Council; see TURRETIN'S *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus XVIII, question XI, § 4, which, whether it be superior or inferior to the Pope, they again dispute: while Benedict XIII, deposed by the Pisans, refused to obey on this pretext, that the Pope is above a Council;¹ see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XIV, chapter IV, § 4, column 1755: with the School of Paris defending the contrary; see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XIV, chapter V, § 11, column 1765: just as the Councils of Constance and Basel also asserted themselves to be above the Pope; see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter II, § 2, 4, columns 1819, 1820: which latter Nicholas V² confirmed; see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter II, § 4, column 1822: while Martin V himself took part in the former;³ see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter II, § 3, column 1819. Soon Calixtus III⁴ enacted that no one may appeal from the Pope to a Council; see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter III, § 2, column 1824: so also Pius II;⁵ see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter III, § 3, column 1825. And thereafter this quarrel was frequently agitated between the Gallican and Transalpine Churches, with the Gauls/French fiercely defending that the power of the Pope is less than that of a Council; also, that the Pope has a peculiar power in matters of faith, but that his decisions are not certain without the consent of the Church: with the parasites of the Pope upholding the contrary: see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century XV, chapter IV, § 1, column 1830, chapter IX, § 3, columns 1864-1866, and also Century XVI, chapter III, § 1, column 1895; PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS' *Historiam Concilii Tridentini*, book VII, pages 711, 716, 717, 746, 747, 770, 791, book VIII, pages 837, 957; TURRETIN'S *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus XVIII, question XI, § 4, near the end. Concerning the authority of a General Council above the Roman Pontiff, LOUIS ELLIES DU PIN learnedly discourses in *Dissertation VI de Antiqua Ecclesiæ*

¹ The Council of Pisa met in 1409 to end the Papal Schism. The Council deposed Benedict XIII (reigning in Avignon) and Gregory XII (reigning in Rome), and elected Alexander V. Since neither Benedict nor Gregory was willing to cooperate, rather than ending the schism, the Council compounded the problem with a third claimant.

² Nicholas V reigned as Pope from 1447 to 1455.

³ Martin V reigned as Pope from 1417 to 1431.

⁴ Calixtus III reigned as Pope from 1455 to 1458.

⁵ Pius II reigned as Pope from 1458 to 1464.

Disciplina. The Infallibility of the Pope is also powerfully opposed by a writer attached to the party of the Jansenists, *Philippe Vlaming*, in his *Epistolis contra David Pierman, Epistles XIII, XIV, tome 2, pages 365-466.* Concerning the Controversy, whether a Council be above the Pope, or the Pope above a Council, *Bellarmino* on the opposite side also discourses, but concludes the latter, *tome 2, Controversiis, book II de Conciliis, chapters XIII-XIX, columns 112-132.* Finally, with yet others arguing for a Council approved by a Pope; thus *Bellarmino, book II de Conciliis, chapter II, tome 2, Controversiis, columns 67, 68,* “All Catholics consistently teach that General Councils confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff are not able to err:” compare *PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS’ Historiam Concilii Tridentini, book VII, pages 711, 716, 717, 746, 747, 770, 791, book VIII, pages 837, 957;* which yet little differs from all authority bestowed upon the Pope alone, if with *Baronius, Annalibus, tome 4, on 373 AD, § XXI,* you think that upon his will hangs *the ratification of decrees of faith and the change of things ratified.* While concerning this Judge of Controversies *Bellarmino* speaks doubtfully and waveringly, *book III de Verbo Dei, chapter IX, tome I, Controversiis, column 190:* “That Judge is not able to be Scripture, but the Ecclesiastical Leader, either alone, or with the counsel and consent of his fellow-Bishops.” In this same manner the Council of Trent also decreed, according to *Andradius, book II Defensionis Tridentinæ fidei:* “We attribute this great authority (says he) of interpreting the Scriptures, not to individual Bishops here and there, but to the Roman Pontiff alone, who is the head of the Church, or to all prelates gathered into one at his command:” see also *Bellarmino, book III de Verbo Dei, chapter III, column 172, 173:* compare *BUDDEUS’ Isagogen ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter V, § 8, tome 2, page 792, § 10, pages 818-825,* and in the *Addendis, page 1830;* *CANZIUS’¹ Usum Philosophiæ Leibnitianæ et Wolffianæ in Theologia, tome 2, chapter XVII, pages 1050 and following.*

The Papists object: 1. *the Example of the Old Church of the Jews,* by arguing in this way: Moses and Aaron and their successors were the Supreme and Infallible Judges of controversies of faith: The Roman Pontiff is Moses and Aaron, in the succession for their judiciary power. Therefore.

Responses: 1. The Major is false, for they both were ministerial Judges, and neither decided controversies by his own authority; but Moses as an intermediary reported to God, and thence to the people,

¹ *Israël Gottlieb Canz (1690-1753)* was a German philosopher and theologian, teaching logic, metaphysics, and theology at Tubingen.

Exodus 18:19 and *following*. Aaron was commanded to respond out of the Law and according to it, Deuteronomy 17:11. 2. The Minor is false, for the Roman Pope has succeeded neither to Moses, nor to Aaron. Not *to Moses*, because he was an extraordinary minister of God, to whom there is no successor; the Pope is ordinary: Moses had an immediate calling from God, which He confirmed with many miracles; but not so the Pope. Not *to Aaron*, for, having been called by God, he took to himself the priestly honor, Hebrews 5:4: but the Pope took it without a call. The Old Church had a typical High Priest: the New has the true High Priest, with whom presenting and actually offering Himself, the types and shadows cease, and who neither admits of a successor, nor needs a vicar.

They adduce various Passages for the confirmation of the Major, which nevertheless do not prove it: see these Passages, produced especially from the Old Testament in *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IV, columns 174-176, and chapter V, columns 177, 178. For example, they appeal to Deuteronomy 17:8 and *following*, to which place in particular our AUTHOR well responds in his *Medulla Theologicæ*, that it is not there treated of the Pope specifically, but of civil Judges and Judgments; in which they were not *Infallible*, but nevertheless as the supreme Magistrates were to be externally heeded in the Republic without resistance. But external Acquiescence in the decision of Civil quarrels made by an appointed Judge does not evince an *Infallible* Judgment belonging to the High Priest or Sanhedrin concerning Sacred things; in which, upon the sentence of the Priests or Elders, because they bore sentence contrary to the Law and Prophets, they do not rest, neither *Jeremiah*, Jeremiah 26:11-15, nor the Princes with the people, Jeremiah 26:16, nor the Lord, John 9:16, 22, compared with verses 35-37, nor the Apostles, Acts 5:29, etc. On Deuteronomy 17:8 and *following* consult our AUTHOR, *Exercitationibus textualibus* XII, Part V, § 9, 17; LODEWIJK GERARDUS VAN RENESSE, *van het Regeer-Ouderlingschap*, part I, chapter VI, pages 70-75.

Neither do the other Passages cited for the *major* in the *Compendio* come any closer to making the case; for example,

α. Exodus 18:26, from which it follows that Moses was a superior Judge to other inferior judges, but not absolutely supreme: for in verse 16 he says that in judging he makes known to the people the statutes and laws of God; in verses 19 and 20 he takes counsel from Jethro that he refer the questions of the people to God, and disclose His response to the people, which he also applied; such that he was unwilling

to render judgment upon the blasphemer, Leviticus 24, and the profaner of the sabbath, Numbers 15, except with the sentence of God previously known, as a faithful servant in all the house of God, Hebrews 3:5.

β. 2 Chronicles 19:11, where indeed the office of Amariah the Priest is distinguished from the office of Zebadiah, the Royal Superintendent: but supreme Judgment of controversies of Religion is not attributed to him: compare our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XII, Part V, § 10, 18; and RENESSE'S *van het Regeer-Ouderlingschap*, part I, chapter VI, pages 73, 74.

γ. Ecclesiastes 12:11, where there is a discussion, not concerning *the typical Priest of the Old Testament*, but either in general concerning God as *the Shepherd* of His people, or in particular concerning *the true Priest of the New Testament*, Christ Jesus, who is that *good and chief Shepherd of the Church*, Ezekiel 34:23; John 10:11; 1 Peter 5:4, by whom *Wisemen* as subordinate Pastors *are given* to the Church,¹ and by whose Spirit they are animated.²

δ. Haggai 2:11, 12, where not one Priest, but *the Priests* are commanded to be asked, and, having been asked, to answer *from the Law*; which pertains to Ministerial and externally definitive Judgment.

ε. Malachi 2:7, where the duty of the people *to ask the Priest concerning the Law*, and his duty as the *Angel/Messenger of Jehovah*, the legate and herald of God, to interpret the Law according to the mind of the Lawgiver, are set forth: nevertheless, it is intimated in *verse 8* that the Priests often abdicated this responsibility, with which rebuke in view care is to be taken lest anyone in blind faith admit the Judgment of Priests as Infallible and ἀνοπεύθουνον, *not accountable*.

ζ. Matthew 23:2, 3; Infallible, Supreme, and ἀνοπεύθουνον, *not accountable*, Judgment in settling matters of faith is not attributed in a simple way to the *Scribes and Pharisees*. But, *a.* when they are said *to sit in the doctoral chair of Moses*, to them is attributed the authority to teach, either after Moses, after his likeness and in his place; or from Moses, or his written Law. *b.* Moreover, when the Lord commands *to observe all that they were saying was to be observed*, those things are manifestly to be restricted to the Mosaic commandments, which they themselves were neglecting in the worst ways imaginable: for otherwise the Lord on many occasions reprov'd a number of Pharisaic doctrines and

¹ See Matthew 23:34.

² See 1 Peter 1:10, 11; 2 Peter 1:21.

commanded that those doctrines be shunned, which, therefore, His disciples were not obliged to follow. *c.* In addition, *the heavy burdens that they were binding on, verse 4*, are to be explained, *either* of human commandments, which they were adding to the divine Law: since it ought to be denied that the Lord Jesus relates these things to those that He willed to be kept by His disciples; who of course adduced those things rather, so that He might indicate that the evil deeds of the Scribes were not to be imitated, in this, that they, thus acting, were drawing back from the divine Law, who nevertheless were teaching that there is to be no drawing back; and that they were not leading the way in those things that they were commending: *or* of divine precepts, which they were rigidly pressing unto external minutiae not mentioned in the Law, not otherwise pronouncing men free from transgression of the Law, as the example of *the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin* demonstrate, *verse 23*, compared with Leviticus 27:30; Deuteronomy 14:22; from the observation of which Law, which the Savior does commend with respect to even those parts, *verse 23*, they themselves greatly and indeed departed in far weightier matters, which the Lord expressed in proverbial speech: compare our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales XVII, Part II*.

2. What Passages are set forth *in the second Objection* out of *Bellarmino's book III de Verbo Dei, chapter V, Controversiis, tome I, columns 177 and following*, so that it might be demonstrated that both *Infallibility* and *supreme Authority* have been conceded to the Church of the New Testament in the writings of the New Testament, to these our AUTHOR best responds on our behalf whether in his *Medulla*, or in his *Compendio Theologiae*.

From them some draw a conclusion from the example of *Peter* to the *Roman Pope* in this manner: Peter was the Supreme and Infallible Judge of controversies of faith.

The Roman Pope is Peter by succession unto his office. Therefore.

But, since Peter was a *servant* and minister in the Church of God, 2 Peter 1:1, and a *συνπρεσβύτερος*, *fellow elder*, 1 Peter 5:1, he is not able to have Supreme Judgment in it. And, since the Minor is manifestly false, as shall be proven at length below, *Chapter XXXIII, § 4-7*; the passages of Scripture adduced for confirmation of the Major do not prove what was to be proven; for example, Luke 22:32, compared with PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS' *Historia Concilii Tridentini, book VII, page*

715, because the promised perseverance of faith, which Peter had in common with all believers, differs much from a bestowal of Supreme Judgment concerning the Word of God to him.

From the writing of the New Testament others argue for the Judgment of the Church in this manner:

Whose Judgment is final concerning controversies of faith, he is the Supreme and Infallible Judge of controversies of faith. Final Judgment concerning controversies falls to the representative Church. Therefore. They find the Minor in Matthew 18:17, etc.

Response: α. The Major is true concerning final Judgment simply considered, which is only able to proceed from supreme and infallible authority. But in this way the Minor is false: for final Judgment simply considered does not belong to the representative Church, since it is to be examined by Scripture, Acts 17:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:21, neither does it proceed from Supreme and Infallible authority, which the Church does not have of itself. β. But, if the Judgment of the Church is called final *κατὰ τὸ*, *relatively*, that is, in the class of inferior ministerial Judgments, or because of the authority of Scripture, from which it makes its pronouncements, then the controversy is at an end. γ. The text of Matthew 18:17 does not prove what is to be proven: *a.* Εἶπε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *tell it to the church* (with Francis Lucas Brugensis¹ also observing), properly has regard, not to the *universal* Church, much less the Roman; but to whatever *particular* Church, in which the offended and offending brethren abide: but the Papists do not now hold individual Churches to be infallible. *b.* Christ speaks particularly concerning those things that the Church might decide in a clear case of an indicted sinner: yet we are able to concede that the saying of Christ by analogy applies also in controversies of faith, by comparison with Titus 3:10; therefore, the heretic is to be considered as in the place of Heathen man and publican. But, *c.* we are commanded to *hear the Church*, not absolutely, for this privilege belong to Christ, Matthew 17:5; but when it teaches whatsoever Christ commanded, Matthew 28:19, 20, so that that saying, *he that heareth you heareth me*, Luke 10:16, might apply; and thus also it does not have absolute and ultimate Judgment concerning scandals and heresies: otherwise those

¹ Francis Lucas Brugensis (1552-1619) was a Jesuit scholar, who labored in the collation of manuscripts. He was skilled, not only in Greek and Hebrew, but also in Syriac and Chaldean.

that Christ made Stewards by the grant of the Keys, at the same time He made lords in His house, which is denied in 1 Peter 5:3; 2 Corinthians 1:24. The commandment to hear the Church does not any more imply its Infallibility, than the commandment to hear parents implies their Infallibility, when children are commanded to hear their precepts, Proverbs 6:20, 21; 23:22: compare our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Textuales* XXXI, Part V, § 10, 12. On Matthew 16:18, 19, see below, Chapter XXXIII, § 5. On 1 Timothy 3:15, see what things have already been observed above in this Chapter, § 7. *d.* Now, from the words of Christ in Matthew 18:17, in the Council of Trent those that were less addicted to the party of the Pope, like the Gallicans, were wishing it to be observed that *Peter himself is sent to the Church as to a Judge*, in PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS' *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, book VII, page 767.

3. *They Object Reason*, especially from the *Necessity of a Judge* in the Church; see *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IX, tome I, *Controversiis*, column 190, 191, to which compare the *Response* of our AUTHOR. Namely, *α.* We acknowledge the *Necessity of a Judge* in the Church. *β.* But it does not then follow thence that there is a *Necessity of a Supreme Visible Judge*, nor that that *Supreme Judgment* belongs to the Church. Who that *Supreme Judge* might be, we shall see in § 43. But the Church is an inferior, ministerial Judge, altogether bound to the rule of Scripture.

On *Objection 4* in the *Compendio* consult *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter VI, columns 181-184, and the *Response* of our AUTHOR on that place, to which add Chapter XXXIII below, § 26, number 5.

On *Objection 5*, see *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapters VII, VIII, columns 184-189, and book IV *de Romano Pontifice*, chapter III, columns 962 and following.

[Which by restriction, etc.] This response is sufficiently illustrated from those things that were said in § 41, and above in this same § 42.

Compare on § 41, 42, CALVIN'S *Institutionem Christianæ Religionis*, book IV, chapters VIII, IX; likewise GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, tome I, book I, general part II, chapters I-III, pages 193-337. SPANHEIM hisses at the defense of this Pontifical doctrine read in *Bossuet*, *Præfatione Speciminis Stricturarum ad Libellum Episcopi Condomiensis*, opera, tome 3, part II, columns 1031, 1032.

What things are thus observed against the Papists are also able to prevail against *Hobbes*, who assigns what they attribute to the Church to the *Christian Magistrate*, asserting, 1. that *Christian Kings Alone* are the

Interpreters of Sacred Scripture. 2. That the Apostles themselves were not the Interpreters of the Old Testament Scriptures in such a way that all that were desiring to be Christians were obliged to their interpretation. 3. That the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture so depends on the authority of the State that it is a sin for subjects to judge of the commandments of Princes, whether they be consonant with the Sacred Scripture, or not, etc.: see COCQUIUS, *Hobbesianismi Anatome*, locus III, chapter VI, pages 49-55, who on pages 58-63 subjects the *Exercitationem* to Article XXVII of chapter XVII of Hobbes' book *de Cive*, just now mentioned, that is, Whether the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture so depends upon the authority of the State that it is sinful for subjects to judge of the commandments of Princes? COCQUIUS, *Hobbesianismi Anatome*, locus III, chapter VII, pages 64, 66, refutes the *παρερμηνείας/misinterpretations* of Hobbes, who from Luke 10:16, where Christ says to His disciples, *He that heareth you heareth me, etc.*, says that it is able to be inferred that he that hears his Christian King hears Christ: and on the words of the Savior, *whoever denieth me, etc.*, answers, that Whatever command from the King does this, it is not he, but his King, that denied Christ: likewise he says that the reason why many Thessalonian Jews did not believe Paul was because Paul came to them without any mandate from the State.¹ See BUDDEUS, *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter I, § 27, page 109; LELAND, *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, epistle 3, pages 61-65. The Earl of Shaftesbury in his *Characteristics* followed Hobbes on this point; see LELAND, *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, epistle 5, pages 111-113.

¹ Acts 17:1-9.

§ 43: The Supreme Judge: The Holy Spirit

Finally, our AUTHOR asserts positively: *Therefore, there is no such Judge, Supreme and ἀνυπεύθυνος, not accountable, and Infallible Interpreter of Sacred Scriptures and Controversies of Faith, than the Holy Spirit speaking by infallible Inspiration, as in the case of the Prophets and Apostles, even in the Scripture.* He proves this assertion from this, α. that *He has all the requisite necessities of such a Judge for the Interpretation of Scripture and decision of Controversies of Faith.* A Supreme and Infallible Interpreter of the Law and Judge ἀνυπεύθυνος, *not accountable,* of controversies ought in judging to be free from all error; to be led by no zeal of parties; to have supreme authority, so that no appeal from him is granted; to be intimately acquainted with the Sense intended by the Lawgiver; to be endowed with sufficient coactive power. But all these do not belong to the Church, neither to Councils nor to Popes, nor to an Enthusiastical Spirit: but they unite perfectly in the divine Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. He, as truth itself, is not able to err, John 16:13. But in § 41 we have evinced the Fallibility of the Church in general, and of the Roman Church in particular. The Spirit as true God is altogether ἀπροσωπολήπτῃς, *without respect of persons,* Romans 2:11: but the Roman Church here is not at all able to be supposed to be beyond parties, for it is a party at the bar, their Ecclesiastical Assemblies and Popes stand accused as falsifiers and corruptors of Scripture. From the Church and an Enthusiastical Spirit appeal to the Scripture is always granted: but the Spirit speaking in Scripture has supreme authority, acknowledges no superior to whom appeal might be made. If each person is the best Interpreters of his own words, no one is ultimately able to be consulted concerning the Interpretation of Scripture better than the Spirit, who is the author of Scripture. If you desire in a decisive sentence sufficient Perspicuity concerning the Sense of Scripture and controversies of faith, we saw above in § 25, 26 that this is not able to be denied to the Spirit speaking in Sacred Scripture. Finally, the Spirit is endowed with coactive power, which He has, both internal καταχρηστικῶς/*improperly* so called, of opening men's minds and moving their assent, and of irresistibly

ingenerating in this way faith; it is used of the power of the Spirit in the conversion of men, and He applies the ministry of the Word as a means subservient to Himself, concerning which see the assertion of Paul, 2 Corinthians 10:4, 5: and also external, of restraining and destroying obstinate heretics, of which He rarely makes use in this life, because δεῖ—καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, *there must be also heresies among you*, 1 Corinthians 11:19, and the kingdom of God is not advance by corporal coaction, but by spiritual demonstration, 1 Corinthians 2:4.

β. Not only is the Spirit fit to exercise that Judgment, but we are also continually sent to this Judge. Now, to what Judge God sends us in the Old and New Testaments, not conditionally, but absolutely, he is the Supreme Judge of Controversies and Infallible Interpreter of Scripture: to the Scripture itself, or to the Spirit speaking in Scripture, God in the Old and New Testaments unconditionally sends us; while to inferior Judges we are sent conditionally, if they teach what things the Spirit has taught them in Scripture. The truth of the Minor is able to be made abundantly apparent out of § 33. Christ Himself and the Apostles in controversies of Faith appeal to the Scriptures and to the Spirit speaking in them, Matthew 22:29; John 5:39; Luke 24:27; 2 Peter 1:19; Acts 15:15, 28.

γ. For this reason *Judgment* is attributed also to the Word of this Spirit. Indeed, properly speaking God or His Spirit is the Supreme Judge, but Scripture is the Supreme Law, from which that Judge makes His pronouncements, Romans 2:16: but hence improperly, and by metonymy of adjunct, *Judgment* is also able best to be assigned to Scripture, which is done in Isaiah 2:3, 4; see our AUTHOR'S *Commentarium in Prophetas minores* on Micah 4:3, § VIII, pages 168-173; John 12:48: no less than elsewhere Scripture is said *to speak*, Galatians 4:30; *to cry*, Romans 9:27; *to accuse*, John 5:45: whence Scripture is not able to be said to be *mute* and *speechless* and so incapable of Judging; it is no more able to be said to be *mute* than the Church in the written Canons of its Councils, or than the Fathers in their writings.

The Papists Object, as it appears in *Bellarmino*, book III *de Verbo Dei*, chapter IX, *Controversiis*, tome I, columns 190, 191, α. that *the Judge ought to be diverse from the Norm*. Responses: 1. We grant here a distinction of this sort, which consists in a diverse consideration of one and the same Scripture, which is in itself the *Norm*, the *Judge*, if you consider that the Spirit, the author of the Scripture, speaking in Scripture, gives sentence through the Scripture. 2. Not in the controverted sense is it necessary

in the kingdom of Christ or any worldly kingdom; since even ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, book III, chapter XVI, page 454, book IV, chapter IV, page 465, acknowledges that in prescribing Justice in a general sense the Law holds the position of Judge: but in particular application, ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα, *in things particularly*, the Interpreter of the Law discharges the office of Judge, but ministerial and subordinate; in which sense also the Church is a Judge, but one that is bound to the written Law.

They Object, β. that *No one is able to be Judge in his own cause*. But, 1. Our AUTHOR rightly *Responds*, *every one is always the best Judge of his own words*. 2. Place is given for a recoiling of this argument: for the Church therefore is not able to be considered the Supreme Judge of controversies, because it would be Judge in its own cause and the Rule of itself; for the principal controversy is concerning the power and Infallibility of the Church. But when it is asked, whether the Church is Judge, or whether the Roman Church is not able to err: shall that very Church sit as Judge, and shall there be an obligation to believe it, because it declares itself to be such? Of course, they are unwilling for the Sacred Scripture to be Judge, which nevertheless all acknowledge to be the Infallible Word of God: but the Church, or the Pope, will sit as Judge in his own cause, and will be the Infallible Judge of his own Infallibility, concerning which there is the greatest contention; and it is evident that the Church or Pope is not only able to err, but also often has erred.

They Object, γ. that *the Spirit in the Scriptures does not deliver a clear sentence*. *Responses*: 1. The Scripture in itself is Perspicuous enough, as we saw above, § 25, 26, but ambiguity and disagreement concerning the mind of the Spirit is from the blindness and ignorance of the reader, or from hardness of heart against the light by permission of God, by comparison with Acts 6:10, 11. 2. But this Ambiguity and Obscurity, if such there be, does not take away the authority of Scripture; but shows the necessity of the illumination of the Spirit, and of the ministry expounding the Scriptures.

They Object, δ. that *No end of Heresies and quarrels is thus to be expected*. *Responses*: 1. Quarrels and controversies concerning Faith and the Sense of Sacred Scripture are in no way able to be quieted by the authority of human judgment; since our faith is not able to be settled upon a human word, nor do we owe blind obedience to any man. 2. Experience teaches that, the Visible Judge acknowledged in the Roman Church notwithstanding, a great many controversies have arisen among the Papists, all which that Visible Judge according to his Infallible

authority has never composed. 3. God does not will that all Heresies cease altogether in the Church, on account of the several reasons mentioned by our AUTHOR in his *Compendio*, in comparison with 1 Corinthians 11:19, and in our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationibus Miscellaneis, Disputation II*, § 1-5. 4. It is not required that Scripture always *de facto* convict the heretic, and shut his mouth, so that he might not respond; which often does not happen because of the obstinacy of men: it is sufficient if *it convicts de jure*, that it has whence he is able sufficiently to be convinced, unless he is contumacious; and the Spirit furnishes this in the Scripture.

On Objections γ and δ , consult CANZIUS' *Usum Philosophiæ Leibnitianæ et Wolffianæ in Theologia*, chapter XVII, § 1443-1453, pages 1066-1073.

See the orthodox Sentence of the Fathers concerning *the Judge of Controversies* set forth by LEYDEKKER, *Veritate Euangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 5, pages 140-142: add TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus II, question XX, § 14; SPANHEIM, *Exercitatione de Præscriptione in rebus Fidei*, Section IV, § 4, Section V, § 3, columns 1092, 1093, 1099, *opera*, tome 3.

On § 43, see also GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, tome I, book I, general part I, article I, chapter III, pages 85-92.

§ 44: The Object of Interpretation: the Whole Scripture

On *the Object of Interpretation*, to which our AUTHOR now comes, he maintains that it is to be extended to *the Whole Scripture*, not restricted to *the Gospels of the Lord* alone, or some *Pericopes of the Gospels* and *Epistles*, wont to be read aloud and explained on the Lord's Day, and making a circuit yearly, as the same in many Calendars also are wont to be assigned to particular Lord's Days. That is, when in the primitive Church the Sacred Books in their entirety were wont both to be read and to be explained by the Bishops in order, yet with particular texts selected on the feasts of Christ's Nativity, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost: certain Pericopes were chosen from the Gospels and adapted to certain times of the year; until Charlemagne near the beginning of the Ninth Century appointed *Paul Warnefridus the younger*, first Deacon of Aquileia,¹ whence he is called Paul *the Deacon*, and finally a Monk Monte Cassino; until, I say, he appoint him out of the Homilies of the Fathers to subjoin to particular texts what thing make for their explication; which he furnished in a book that thence was called *Homiliarium/Homiliary*: from which time today's division of the dominical texts was established, and the practice grew, that in the place of Sermons anniversary *Lectiones/Readings* of those Homilies, taken by Paul from the Fathers and arranged under the particular texts, were subjoined to the texts read aloud, whence his work is also called *Lectionarium/Lectionary*; and also *Postillarium/Postillary*, because those homilectical, or explanatory, Readings were called *Postils*, by a word barbarously constructed from *post/after* and *illa/those*, since they were following *post illa, after those things*, that had been read aloud from the Sacred text. But what is set forth in writing, that today's division of those Gospel Pericopes is attributed to JEROME, does not approve itself to Critics of keen judgment: see SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica, Century IX, chapter XIV, § 7, columns 1414, 1415*; RUMPÆUS, *Commentatione critica ad Novi Testamenti Libros, § XXXIX, pages 176-201*; BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam, book II, chapter VIII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1640-1645a*.

Now, those postillary Readings and their yearly repetition was

¹ Aquileia is a town in northeastern Italy.

received by the common consent of the Church, so that the rude common folk, who were not able to read Scripture, nor to preserve it in memory, might thereby more easily learn the History of Christ and some principal testimonies concerning the articles of Faith and Christian duties toward God and the neighbor.

But in this way the Reading of the Bible gradually fell into disuse, and the attentiveness of those learning, together with the diligence and progress of those teaching, was necessarily much diminished; while the Ministers considered nothing, but acquiesced in those Readings and Homilies.

It is certainly superior, therefore, that the explication be extended to the whole Scripture, whether the Books in their entirety be expounded in continuous order, or a text be select from here or there according to the time and emergent circumstance, with the rule of the maximum edification of the Church always in view. Thus, α . Paul led the way, Acts 20:27. β . To this end the entirety of Scripture was committed to writing for us, Romans 15:4. γ . And the explication of the entirety of Scripture furnishes for us eminent and most ample uses, 2 Timothy 3:16.

Whether the yearly explication of the Dominical texts be altogether abrogated, as was done in a great many of the Reformed Churches of France, Scotland, and the Netherlands: or the abuses originating in the Papacy be excised, but the use of explaining the Dominical texts in an annual course be retained in some measure, as was done in the Protestant Church throughout Germany, England, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, and Hungary, in which regions something was conceded to the rudeness of the people, with the integrity of the Word preserved, no less than the liberties of the Pastors and Church. Indeed, *with the Integrity of the Word preserved*, because in other sermons the Pastors declare to the people the whole Word of God in the Old and New Testaments in order, although one be allotted to the Dominical texts, of which sort something also obtains in some of our Churches. *With the Liberty of the Pastors and Church also preserved*: because thus they are not bound to them, indeed, as often as they please or the circumstances require, either they may put other texts in their place, or they may augment the same texts by the addition of what precedes or follows, or diminish them.

This is well done in a variety of ways: only let it ever be for the sake of the progress and edification both of the teachers and of the

learners. Among the *particular Questions* set forth at the *General Synod of Middelburg* in 1581, the *Twentieth* was this: Whether it is expedient to explain the Dominical Gospels before the people? *Response*: It is better that an entire Book of the Old or New Testament be explained, than this or that part of it: yet with this prudence applied, that Books be selected of the sort that most suit the Condition of the Church. VOETIUS, *Politicae Ecclesiasticae*, part I, book II, tractate II, chapter III, page 607: “In the selecting of texts to be explained the Preacher is to have regard to the necessity and present state of his Church. For he ought to know what exhortations, what corrections, what didactic instructions, what consolations, what reproofs, are even now required by these. Beyond this necessity it appears to be intended, and in our well constituted churches observed, that entire books, or at least whole chapters, be explained in continuous order. To bind themselves and others to the *Dominical* texts perpetually breaking into the order, appears less advantageous. For the whole counsel of the Lord is not able to be set forth to the Church by occasion of those texts: unless against the art and method of preaching one should wish to rove about, and to bring not a few doctrines to the text rather than bring them from the text. Finally, whoever the author of those sections may have been, it is not able to be denied that other texts to be set forth to the hearers upon the pretext of sounder sermons could have been selected, and could have been partly added to, partly substituted in the place of, those already selected. I judge that it is not at all suitable to these things, that Preachers in whatever parts of the world, and at whatever time, be bound to the explanation of those dominical texts, even indeed on those stated Lord’s Days; when the present posture of affairs and of Churches appears to require other texts, and other treatments. Apart from the fact that among the dominical texts some occur, the explication of which ought to be discharged not so much in one, as in two, three, or more Lord’s Day meetings. Finally, this inconvenience appears to follow from this postilophagia, that such Dominical Sermons constantly breaking in upon the order fosters ignorance and idleness among both the Preachers and the Hearers: as experience has proven:” see what additional things follow there.

In particular our AUTHOR maintains that the *Prophecies* are to be contemplated with diligence, according to the admonitions of the Lord, Matthew 24:15, and of His beloved disciple, Revelation 1:3; by which appointment the Obscurity that obtains in certain and many

Prophecies ought not to discourage us; since, on the other hand, this furnishes an argument to whet our diligence, while frequent meditation upon the prophetic Writers gradually makes those things easier that at first appeared to be impossibly difficulty, Daniel 12:4: consult CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter I, § 23, pages 65, 66.

Nevertheless, in the Prophecies *that contemplation must be coupled with all prudence, that is, lest we be completely immersed in those Prophecies, with the more necessary doctrine and practices neglected, or we mold the Prophecies according to our pleasure, or we draw all thing to hypotheses already assumed by us*, for example, Periodic hypotheses, concerning which see below, Chapter XXXII, § 29-31.

Before all things, the exposition of Controverted Passages is not to be neglected, so that they might be useful for the silencing of adversaries, Titus 1:9; 2 Timothy 2:16, 25. For this is *to do what is no less useful than to deliver Systematic Theology*: for this has likewise been done of old, and yet remains especially necessary. As long as errors do not cease, the solid refutation of the same is not to be forgotten. In the midst of a time of peace, arms are still to be handled, lest we become unaccustomed to them. How much more when we see ourselves surrounded on all sides by enemies, who never cease to oppose true doctrine; moreover, new arms are constantly being forged, with which they might rise up against us: against whose darts our soul is hence to be fortified.

§ 45: The Means of Proper Interpretation

The requisite *Means* for the successful *Interpretation* of the Scripture are set forth by our AUTHOR. Positively in § 45. Negatively in § 46, 47.

He commends, and not without good reason, before all things *Prayer* to God, that He might be pleased to bless us with the illumination of the Spirit; since, as each one is the best interpreter of his own words, so God Himself, author of the *ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΥ*/*inspired* Word through the Spirit, knows best how to teach and explain to us the intention of His own words through the illumination of the same Spirit, Psalm 119:18. Now, *James* commends prayer as the proper means of acquiring and increasing saving wisdom, James 1:5, 6. AUGUSTINE, *book III de Doctrina Christiana, chapter XXXVII, opera, tome 3, part I, columns 48, 49*: “But also students of the venerable books are to be admonished, that it is principal and especially necessary, that they pray so that they might understand. Since in these books, to which they are devoted, they read that *the Lord gives wisdom, and from His presence knowledge and understanding*;¹ from whom also they received that very devotion, if it is furnished with piety.” Excellent prayers of this sort for asking the heavenly wisdom and grace of the Spirit, as especially necessary in the explication of the divine Word and matters of faith, are found at *the end of book I of HILARY’S de Trinitate, chapters XXXVII, XXXVIII, columns 785, 786.*

Our AUTHOR then requires *a humble, teachable, attentive, and pious Spirit*. For a profane Spirit is to be kept far from the handling of the divine and most holy Scriptures: a mind puffed up with an opinion of vain wisdom will likewise accomplish little here: but the Spirit is to be imbued with a holy and filial fear of God, which teaches us to handle the writings of our heavenly Father reverently: having been persuaded of our natural blindness in spiritual things we ought to lay our high spirits low, and in the full obedience of faith to submit ourselves to the divine testimony revealed to us in the Scripture, so that from it we might be

¹ Proverbs 2:6.

instructed unto salvation¹ by the Lord through the Spirit. Indeed, the great Teacher loves disciples of this sort, James 4:6; Psalm 25:9, 14; Isaiah 66:2; Matthew 11:25: consult AUGUSTINE, *de Doctrina Christiana*, book II, chapter XLI, XLII, *opera*, tome 3, part I, columns 33, 34.

When thus by Prayers we have commended ourselves to God, and have brought a Spirit well disposed to the searching of the Scripture, our diligent *Labor* is additionally required in searching out the true Sense of Sacred Scripture. To this end makes the collation of *various Interpretations*, ancient, indeed even Jewish, to be sought in their Targumim, but also the Interpretations of the Rabbis. For the easier understanding of the Sense of the divine Word also makes the mind instructed in the *Helps* of human *Literature*, Philology, Philosophy, and *History*; yet in such a way that the authority of the sacred history always remains superior to foreign history: and that we would not without great necessity gather out of foreign literature in the explanation of the Sacred Scripture, merely to show our erudition; but only for the illustration of Sacred Scripture does that store of erudition serve us. Neither unwelcome, nor useless to read in this case, is the *Oratio de Subsidiis Scientiæ Theologicæ*, which the Most Illustrious VAN IRHOVEN² delivered in the year 1739, when he laid down the Magistracy of the Academy at Utrecht; inasmuch as he commends familiarity with Languages, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, other nearby Eastern; with the Antiquities of the Hebrew, Greeks, Romans, and other Nations; with History, Sacred and profane; with Chronology and Geography; with the Critics; with Philosophy, namely, Logic, Metaphysics, Pneumatics, Physics, Geometry, Ethics, Rhetoric; as eminently useful and altogether necessary for the Theologian and Interpreter of the Scriptures.

Just as also our AUTHOR among the other helps for Interpretation desires an investigation into the *Original Languages*, so that we might be able rightly to attend to the emphasis of the *Original Expressions*, which is often particular in them. Indeed, *Weigel* strays a great way, who in *Confessionibus*, page 34, writes: “True Theology is easy, and it does not require *artes dicendi*, the *spoken arts*, Grammar, Dialectics, Rhetoric, and Languages, as of no use, and the Apostles and Prophets were none the less Theologians without them.” But the infused

¹ See 2 Timothy 3:15.

² Willem van Irhoven (1698-1760) was a Dutch Reformed Minister and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology (1737-1740), and then as Professor of Church History (1740-1760) at Utrecht.

habits of the Prophets or Apostles greatly differ from our acquired habits. And a distinction is also able to be made here between each private believer, and the public Interpreter of the Scriptures. Our AUTHOR observes that many *Anabaptists* are also to be noted here with Weigel as despising the helps of Literature, Languages, etc., in the Interpretation of Scripture, which has already been observed in *Chapter I*, § 32. Consult also STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS' *de Studii Theologici ratione*, pages 63 and following, who specifically on pages 66-72 contemplates this question, Whether Philosophy, or Human Arts, make rather for the use of Theology; and if either of these disciplines is to be omitted, which would appear to do less damage to theological studies by its absence? Now, read BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book I, chapter IV, tome I, pages 104-332, who differs from many, and practically all, concerning *Theological Prolegomena*.

But for the Interpreter of the Scriptures attention is especially to be given to *the Scripture itself*, as the sole Rule and Guide Star of all true interpretation, and the true spiritual meditation of which to our AUTHOR is the *Key of Knowledge*, taken away by the Pharisees, Luke 11:52, namely, when they were teaching the people to adhere to the external husk of the Law, or were seducing their souls from the written Word to human traditions.

That regard to the Scripture itself is to be held as principal in the Interpretation of Scripture, is proven, α. *from passages frequently adduced*, Luke 16:29; 2 Peter 1:19, 20; etc.: β. *from the parallel with human writings*, which, each and every one, generally have their own idioms, and they are not more successfully understood than if you learn to explain the phraseology of the author from diverse passages of his own compared one to another: γ. *from the requirements of a norm, especially infallibility, perspicuity*, since what things are in one place set forth more obscurely are more clearly explained elsewhere, and ready application: δ. to which many also refer Nehemiah 8:8, וְשׁוֹם שְׂכָל וַיְבִינּוּ בַּמִּקְרָא, which they then interpret: *and by expounding the sense, they gave understanding through the Scripture itself*, as JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS translate it; in the place of which others have, *in the reading, in reading, in the midst of reading*; while others also simply translate it, *they caused to understand the Scripture*: consult VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, prior section, chapter X, § 20, page 127, in which he defends the first proposed version of this passage against the author of *Exercitationis Paradoxicæ de Philosophia Scripturæ Interprete*. HILARY, *de*

Trinitate, book I, chapter XVIII, *opera*, columns 776, 777, piously advises: “For he is the Best Reader, who expects, rather than imposes, an understanding of the things said from the things said, and who carries away more than he brings: neither does he force what he before the Reading presumed was to be understood to appear to be contained in the things said. And so, when the speech shall be about the things of God: let us concede to God the knowledge of Himself, and let us attend upon His words with pious veneration. For He is the best witness to Himself, who is not known except through Himself.”

Unto this normative use of Scripture pertains the *Analogy*, both of *Faith*, and of *Context*. The former expression is found in Paul, Romans 12:6, εἶτε προφητείαν, *whether prophecy*, that is, ἔχοντες/*having*, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, *according to the analogy of faith*: by which the Apostle there understands either the quantity and *Measure of faith* granted to each one, or rather (because he had expressed this with another phrase in *verse 3*, μέτρον πίστεως, *the measure of faith*, which ἐκάστῳ—ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε, *God measured to every man*), *the Agreement with the certain truths of Scripture, confirmed by unbroken tradition*; as Theologians take the word here: the consistent harmony and agreement of all the heads of faith, exhibited in the more luminous sayings of Scripture, just as ἀναλογία/*analogy* means *proportion* to Mathematicians and Geometers. And Theologians *desire that before all things attention be given to this Analogy of Faith because of the Uniformity of the divine Word* in the exposition of it, so that hence one might be able to be certain of the truth or falsity of an Interpretation in a general way: for, as no truth is able to agree with what is false, so no truth is able to be inconsistent with another truth: whereby, if the Interpretation of a Passage is inconsistent with the fixed doctrine of faith, it shall be repudiated as false: thus the Analogy of Faith teaches, that *God is Spirit*; whence I know that, when in other Passages *human members* are ascribed to Him, this is to be understood improperly. At the same time, this Rule of Interpretation is general, by which one is able to be certain of the truth or falsity of it in general; but not proper/particular, whence I might be made more certain that this is the genuine exposition of this or that passage. For an Interpretation can be consistent with the Analogy of Faith, and yet be alien to the true sense of this or that passage: whence it is not uncommon that six or seven true and orthodox Interpretations are given of one and the same passage, only one of which is able to be said to be genuine.

Therefore, so that at this point we might separate what is genuine from what is alien, in addition to the Analogy of Faith special attention must be given also to *the Analogy of Context*, lest the sense of Scripture be rendered vague, and whatever be inferred from whatever. Thus the Theologian ought not to draw back in the exposition of the divine Law from the Rule of the Lawyers, *law XXIV, de Legibus, book I, Digest,*¹ *chapter III, in which they state that it is not civil to judge or to answer, except with the entire Law considered, together with that one particular of it set forth.* The Jews also hold that *those that do not consider what things have gone before and what things follow pervert the Scripture.* Likewise, AUGUSTINE notes that this is *the fraud of the heretics, libro contra Adimantum, chapter XIV, opera, tome 8, column 93, that they pick out certain bits from the Scriptures, with which they would deceive the ignorant, not connecting what things were written above and below, by which the will and intention of the writer is able to be understood.* To this has regard the Consistency of any Exposition with the entire phrase, the things preceding and following, in the time and place of the writing, according to the admonition of JEROME on Matthew 25:13: “I always admonish the prudent reader: that he rest not in superstitious interpretations and what things are said in an abbreviated fashion according to the will of imaginative men: but consider the things prior, middle, and following, and tie together for himself the entirety of what things are written:” especially also with the Scope/Goal of the one speaking, which in the exposition of Scripture CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA will not to be neglected, in *Johannem, book X, chapter II, opera, tome 4, page 861, in which he says, Οἶμαι γὰρ ἐγωγε τοὺς εἰς ἕκαστα τῶν λεγομένων συνιέναι ὀρθῶς, εἰς τὸν τοῦ θεωρήματος ἀποβλέπειν σκοπὸν, σὺν πολλῇ τῇ φρονήσει κατασκέπτεσθαι δεῖν, for I suppose, for my part, that those that wish rightly to understand anything that is said, must give attention to the purpose of the discussion, and ought attentively to consider the sense.* Thus, for example, when I read in Genesis 1:3 that God created *Light*, it is not repugnant to the Analogy of faith, by *Light* to understand metaphorically *Angels*, whom God also created, and most likely on the same day: but this is repugnant to the Analogy of Context, which teaches that in that place Moses speaks concerning *Light*, properly speaking, in opposition to darkness. WESSELIUS, in *Oratione de Simplicitate prudenti in Oratore Sacro, pages 23, 24: “Certainly to this Simplicity of Matters it is repugnant to conjoin in*

¹ *The Digest, or Pandects*, was a compendium of Roman law, compiled at the command of Justinian I.

an Ecclesiastical sermon many sentences/opinions, if only they be true in themselves, and not contrary to the analogy of faith and of Scripture: under this pretext, that all are true, and that the Holy Spirit foresaw the setting forth of them by various interpreters, and thus willed to furnish for us in one passage more than one truth; just as Augustine speaks unto this sense in the *Libris de Doctrina Christiana*, book III, chapter XXVII. For all truth is not contained in each and every passage of Scripture, neither do words signify in every place what they are capable of signifying, but what they must signify in the individual Passages, according to the scope of the speaker and according to the connection of the words. So that I might illustrate this matter with only one Example, I adduce the words of Paul in 2 Corinthians 4:6, *God said that Light should shine out of the darkness*. It is true that God *had said*; that the original, tangible Light should emerge from the abyss of darkness, the Light of His Word should go forth in the darkness of the world, the Light of Faith should arise in the darkened hearts of the Elect, and finally the Light of heavenly glory should shine after the darkness of death. But all this variety of Light, corporeal and spiritual, is not on that account to be conjoined, nor is it understood by Paul, who beyond all doubt had regard to the original Light produced at the Beginning of the world. For the Comparison of the Old Creation with the New is manifest in his words.”

Besides this twofold Analogy, *Parallel Passages*, *Similar* and *Dissimilar*, are yet to be considered in Interpretation, the *σύγκρισις*/*syncrisis/comparison* or collation of which is of no small use, since those passages are wont everywhere to shed light upon one another: only let care be exercised, lest passages be held as Parallel, which are not such, for example, by comparing Jeremiah 31:33 with Romans 2:14, 15, which has been the continuous fault of the Socinians, proof of which the *Catechesis Racoviana*, for example, exhibits on almost every page.

On § 45, consult SPANHEMIUS' *Collegium Theologicum Heidelbergæ de Principio Theologiæ*, part V, § 12-15, *opera*, tome 3, part 2, columns 1195, 1196; STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS' *Theses theologicas inaugurales de Verbo Dei*, theses LXXXV-XCII, pages 465-472, where he explains what is to be done by the Theologian in the Reading of Scripture, and what is to be avoided.

§ 46: The Use of the Fathers in Interpretation, Part 1

Controversy is agitated with the *Papists* concerning the use and authority of the *Fathers* in the explaining of Sacred Scriptures and in matters of faith. The *Fathers*, as it is well-known, are wont to be called the Doctors/Teachers of the Ancient Christian Church, who both in word and in writing set forth the doctrine of salvation, vindicating the same against the enemies of truth, and committing the history of the Church to writing so that posterity might ever remember; with the rationale for the name sought both from *age*, for they preceded our age by many years, indeed many centuries, and hence they are to be received as Fathers of great age; and from *office* and *doctrine*, for they begat children to God in the Church by inculcating doctrine in the disciples. To what extent their age and succession is to be extended, all do not share one and the same opinion: for some conclude it at the thousandth year or tenth Century after Christ, others at the sixth, yet others at the fifth or five hundredth year: and the observation of DANÆUS and others is not able to be denied, who have observed that the doctrine and worship of Religion evidently declined in the East after CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, but in the West after AUGUSTINE. It is especially evident that after the six hundredth year the purity of doctrine and worship, with errors and superstitions increasing by the just judgment of God, suffered a great blemish: and that the liberty of the ministry in preserving religion was less thereafter, with the tyranny of the Papacy in Boniface III established by the Emperor Phocas soon after the beginning of the Seventh Century.¹ Just as the later Doctors of the Church also had less authority, because they were further removed from the age of the Apostles, and were not at all equal to their predecessors in zeal for piety and in the glory of doctrine. Inquiry is made concerning the authority of these *Fathers*, with their age hardly determined with sufficient certainty, in matters of faith and interpretation of Scripture. We highly value the

¹ Boniface III was elected in 606, but did not take up the office until 607 (and served less than a year). He is significant in the annals of the Papacy in that, due to his relationship with the Byzantine Emperor Phocas, he was able to secure for the Bishop of Rome the title of *Universal Bishop*.

authority of the orthodox Fathers, and we make use of the same as Witnesses, from whose writings both the history and the doctrine of the Ancient Church, and also our agreement in matters of faith with the ancient Church, are able everywhere to be evident: nevertheless, we recognize that their authority is only human and Ecclesiastical, which is of no weight in matters of faith, except insofar as it agrees with Scripture; indeed, in the Interpretation of Scripture it stands highly prized, yet it obliges the assent of no one.

The *Papists* here are divided into three parties. There are those that equate the writings of the Fathers with Scripture, and bestow upon them almost the same faith and authority, as the *Glossator Decreti on Distinction IX, chapter III*, asserts that the Writings of the Fathers are authentical, both of each and of all, writing in *column 29*, “He speaks according to those times, when the writings of Augustine and of the other holy Fathers were not as yet authentical: but today *all* are commanded *to be embraced unto the last jot*.” which sentence others among the *Papists* expressly refute. That is, others, on the other hand, acknowledge that their writings are merely human, which as such are not able to be the norm of truth, or the rule of the interpretation of Scripture, with *Cajetan*, in his *preface to Quinque libros Mosis*, whose words are in *RIVET, opera, tome 2, page 1050*. Others, holding a middle position, concede that the individual Fathers separately have a human and fallible authority: but either what the greater part of the Fathers understand thence from the Apostles, or especially in what there is a universal consent of all the Fathers, that they judge to be infallible and divine in the doctrines of faith and Interpretation of the Scriptures: thus a great many of the *Papists*, siding with the *Council of Trent*, which states, *Session IV, decree I, page 31b*, “*Traditions* pertaining both to faith and to manners are to be received with an equal affection of piety as the books of the Old and New Testaments:” and it forbids, *decree II, page 33*, “the interpretation of Scripture *contrary to the Unanimous consent of the Fathers*.” *PETRUS SUAVIS POLANUS, Historia Concilii Tridentini, book II, pages 177-180, 182, 183*, records contentions of the Tridentine Fathers concerning this matter.

The *Scope/Goal* of the *Papists*, when they appeal to the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture, our *AUTHOR* observes to be this, *that they might decline the tribunal of Scripture, better protect their errors, and control interpretation themselves*.

On this controversy read *HEINRICH ALTING’S Theologiam*

Elencticam novam, locus II, controversy IV with the Papists, pages 73-84; TURRETIN'S Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question XXI, pages 179-184; JOHANN HEINRICH HOTTINGER'S Analecta historico-theologica, Dissertations VII, VIII, in which he supplies an Introduction to the Reading of the Fathers, and discusses the Use of the Fathers: and his Dissertationum miscellanearum Πεντάδα, where in Dissertation I he treats of the Abuse of the Fathers, in Dissertation II he sets forth a Catalogue of Spurious Ecclesiastical Writings. JEAN DAILLÈ'S libros duos de Usu Patrum ad ea definienda Religionis capita, quæ sunt hodie controversa: and especially RIVET'S tractate de Patrum Auctoritate, which is set before Critici Sacri libris quattuor, opera, tome 2, pages 1047-1067, where in chapter I he teaches, What are the Fathers? What is the authority of the Fathers and for what?; in chapter II, Of what sort and extent according to the opinion of the Orthodox is the authority of the Fathers in matters of faith and manners?; in chapter III, Of what sort and extent according to the opinion of the Papists is the authority of the Fathers?; in chapters IV and V the opinions of the Papists are assessed and brought to nothing; in chapter VI by arguments and examples is shown the frailty of such a consent, of which sort the Papists boast, in the understanding of the Scriptures and in Theological disputations; in chapter VII by examples it is shown with refutation that the Papists think little of the Fathers even when agreeing completely, cast aside the interpretations of the Fathers, set the Pope before all the Fathers; in chapter VIII it is shown, How the authority of the Fathers is to be used in disputation with heretics; in chapter IX there is an admonition concerning the errors and blemishes of the Ancients; in chapter X it is taught that those Papists often note the errors and blemishes in the Fathers, and hence are unjustly angry with us for this; in chapter XI are indicated the Reasons why the Fathers sometimes speak incommodiously, and Cautions for reading the Ancients, from observations of various ones; in chapter XII it is observed that the Records of the ancient Fathers have been corrupted and adulterated in many ways formerly and at the present time; in chapter XIII it is taught that already of old, and also recently, spurious books have been ascribed to the Fathers, and various reasons for these frauds are treated; as are also in chapter XIV the indications and notes of spurious writings. In like manner, consult BUDDEUS, Isagoge ad Theologiam universam, tome 1, book II, chapter III, where he indicates who then should be understood by the name of Fathers, § 2, pages 535-537; who is able to be consulted concerning their writings, § 2, pages 537-546; what is to be embraced concerning their authority, § 9-11, 13, 14, pages 569- 601, 604-610. While in Isagoge ad Theologiam universam, tome 2, book II, chapter VII, § 4, pages 1062-1065, he

additionally warns that in this cause the Papists incorrectly appeal to VINCENT OF LERINS,¹ who in his *Commonitorio* commends the constant, more ancient Tradition of the Fathers as the best Rule of the Interpretation of Scripture and Controversies of Faith: since he was more addicted to the Semi-Pelagians, in the writings of the Fathers of the previous age he sought whatever patronage he could plausibly gather for their error.

Our AUTHOR observes that here the *Papists* imitate, both the *Pharisees*, who were κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, *holding the tradition of the elders*, Mark 7:3, and who were wont to say, ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, *that it was said by them of old time*, Matthew 5:21, etc.; and many ancient Heretics, wont to appeal to the Fathers, among whom were the *Donatists*, concerning whom AUGUSTINE on Psalm 57 (more correctly, Psalm 58), *opera, tome 4, column 407*, says, “But those, turning a deaf ear to the Gospel, and not permitting us to read the Words of God, which they boast that they have preserved from the flame and desire to remove from the tongue, speak their own things, speak vanities: This one said this, and that one said that. Indeed, I also say, And this one said this, and that one said that: and I speak the truth. But what is that to me? You do not read to me out of the Gospel those that you have named, and I do not read out of the Gospel those that I have named. Let our books be removed from the midst, and let the codex of God proceed into the midst: Hear Christ speaking, hear the truth speaking.” Concerning the similar manner of acting among the Pelagians see SPANHEIM’S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam, Century V, chapter VII, § 2, number 4, column 991*.

In a word, we say with our AUTHOR, 1. that the Papists are refuted out of Matthew 5:21, 22, etc. That is, what norm and criterion of truth Moses, the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles set forth and commended in the Old and New Testaments, that alone is to be credited with this name. But they do not commend the writings of the ancients in addition to or beside the Scripture, or of the Fathers past, present, or future; but constantly the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments alone. The Minor is able to be proven by a lengthy induction of the passages already quite frequently cited. Indeed, it is so lacking that Scripture sends us away to the Unanimous Consent of the Fathers in

¹ Vincent of Lerins (died c. 445) was a Gaulish monk. He is most remembered for his rule in separating orthodox truth from error (namely, what is believed “everywhere, always, by all,” is to be embrace), and his Semi-Pelagianism.

searching out its sense and matters of faith, or much commends Traditions *πατροπαράδοτους*, *handed down from the Fathers*, that, on the other hand, it manifestly rejects and condemns the ancient Fathers departing from the truth of Scripture unto false comments and worship, Ezekiel 20:18, 19; Matthew 5:21, 22; Mark 7:5, 8-13: therefore, the Exegetical Traditions of the Fathers are not always true and are not always to be followed.

2. We say here that the things requisite for the *Criterion* of true Interpretation, enumerated by our AUTHOR, are wanting, especially *Infallibility*, on account of the fallibility of all the Fathers; who, whether they be regarded as individuals separately, or all conjointly, were not Prophets nor Apostles, who, having been furnished with an immediate calling and extraordinary gifts, had a special claim to *Infallibility*: but the Fathers were men, fallible and liable to error, into which they also frequently fell *for want of the knowledge of the Original Languages, from the common errors of the time, from the zeal of disputation, etc.* That the individuals were fallible, the Papists everywhere concede: but what is true of the individuals, is also true of the many or all, gathered together from the individuals; for the whole retains and presents again the nature of the integrating parts: and, although authority increases with respect to degree because of multitude, yet it is not changed in kind, that the human might rise to the divine. The dogmatic and exegetical Errors of the Fathers, whether peculiar to some, or even common to a great many, are also set forth by us in a long series; which neither *Bellarmino*, nor *Sixtus Senesis* in his *Præfatione* to book V of *Bibliothecæ Sanctæ*, pages 324, 325, or other learned men in the Roman communion are able to deny. Consult the Writers commended above: HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia Elenctica nova, locus II, controversy IV with the Papists, pages 78, 79*; JEAN DAILLÈ, *libris duis de Usu Patrum ad ea definienda Religionis capita, quæ sunt hodie controversa, book II, chapter IV, pages 252-294*; RIVET, tractate *de Patrum Auctoritate*, which is set before *Critici Sacri libris quattuor, opera, tome 2, chapters IX-XI*; SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica, Century IV, chapter V, § 4, column 848, § 2, column 851*.

3. Moreover, we argue against the Papists from the Lack of unanimous Expositions of this sort, since the Father frequently disagree and rarely agree: and a judgment concerning the Consent of the Fathers is hardly able to be made, since many writings of the Fathers have perished, and the Commentaries upon the whole Bible of exceedingly few or none survive; concerning many writing it is hardly evident

whether they proceed from the Fathers themselves, for not a few counterfeit and spurious have been pawned off for ages as the *γνησίους/legitimate* or genuine writings of the Fathers, with Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine already lamenting this matter; and, on the other hand, those genuine monuments of the Fathers that survive are discovered to have been variously interpolated, and to have been corrupted with respect to sense, not only by the carelessness and ignorance of copyists, but also by the audacity of the monks, who, before the invention of the art of printing were almost alone in the possession of the Fathers in their monasteries, corrected and emended them at will; and especially by the wickedness of the Jesuits, who, with new Indices composed, which they call Expurgatory, removed from the monuments of the Fathers what things were adverse to their superstition, but replaced what things seemed to be advantageous for fostering it: and so this infallible Criterion of true Interpretation is extremely difficult for the Learned themselves, but altogether impossible for the common people to search out, from whom the private Judgment of Discretion is certainly taken away in this way: see HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia Elenctica nova*, locus II, controversy IV with the Papists, page 80; HOTTINGER, *Dissertationum miscellanearum Πεντάδι*, Dissertation II; DAILLÈ, *libris duis de Usu Patrum ad ea definienda Religionis capita, quæ sunt hodie controversa*, book II, chapter V, pages 295-304, book I, chapters III, IV, pages 11-120; RIVET, tractate *de Patrum Auctoritate*, which is set before *Critici Sacri libris quattuor, opera, tome 2, chapters XII-XIV*; GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, tome I, pages 602-608; SIXTUS SENENSIS, *Bibliotheca Sancta*, book IV at the end, pages 320-323.

4. But finally, whatever the Papists may boast concerning the Consent of the Fathers, and however they may wish to appeal to that; the Papists themselves repudiate the Authority of the Fathers, and freely draw back from it, whenever it is not advantageous to their cause, while they give more credence to one supreme Pontiff, than to a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, and Gregories, as Cornelio Musso, Bishop of Bitonta, preached on Romans 14, and wrote on page 606.¹ Erasmus on Jerome, tome 3, page 28, wrote: *When it is advantageous, the authority of Jerome prevails among us: when it is not advantageous, he hardly prevails at all: and afterwards they*

¹ Cornelio Musso (1511-1574) was a Conventual Franciscan and Bishop of Bitonta in southern Italy. He was one of the great preachers of his day, called the "Italian Demosthenes". Musso was prominent in the debates over Justification at Trent, and wrote a commentary on Romans.

condemn us as too little trusting, while none believe less rightly than those that believe uncritically. Let us hear one *Melchior Cano*, who, in his *Locorum Theologicorum*, book VII, chapter III, after he had prefaced from AUGUSTINE, “God willed this felicity to be in the divine volumes alone, that in them there would not be any error,” rightly subjoins, “Every one, no matter how learned and holy, is mistaken sometimes, is blind occasionally, slips from time to time.... And so the Ancient Fathers shall be read by us with reverence indeed, but as men, with discrimination and judgment:” see CALVIN, *Præfatione Institutionis Christianæ Religionis ad Gallicum Regem*, *5, 6; TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus II, question XXI, § 10; DAILLÈ, *libris duobus de Usu Patrum ad ea definienda Religionis capita, quæ sunt hodie controversa*, book II, chapter VI, pages 305-352; RIVET, tractate *de Patrum Auctoritate*, which is set before *Critici Sacri libris quattuor, opera*, tome 2, chapters VII, X; GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, tome I, book I, *generalem partem* II, chapter XIII, pages 569-602; PETRUS ZORNIUS,¹ *Historia Eucharistiæ Infantium*, chapter XII, § I, pages 140-143. The *Fathers* themselves did not desire that so much would be made of their writings: see above on Chapter I, § 32; add HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia Elenctica nova*, locus II, controversy IV with the *Papists*, pages 80, 81; TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus II, question XXI, § 9; RIVET, tractate *de Patrum Auctoritate*, which is set before *Critici Sacri libris quattuor, opera*, tome 2, chapter II; DAILLÈ, *de Usu Patrum*, book II, chapter II, pages 212-233. Concerning the opinion of today’s *Greeks* about this matter, and against it, see JAKOB ELSNER, *nieuwste Beschryving van de Grieksche Christenen in Turkyen*, chapter V, § 28.

What things our AUTHOR has concerning *holding all things to the last jot*, have regard to the words of the *Glossator Decreti Gratiani*, which in defining the state of this Controversy I cited above.

¹ Peter Zorn (1682-1746) was a German Lutheran theologian, historian, and linguist. He held a variety of academic posts.

§ 47: The Use of the Fathers in Interpretation, Part 2

To the *Objections of the Papists* our AUTHOR responds in the best possible manner, at whose nervous and exceedingly concise strictures all their devices readily vanish.

1. For example, they argue: What infallible Norm and Criterion of true Interpretation the Scripture itself sets forth and commends to us, the same without doubt is to be acknowledged and received: but it sets forth or commends to us the sayings and writings of the Ancients, or Fathers: Therefore. But we deny the Minor in the sense controverted: neither is this proven by Job 8:8, and similar passages alleged by them.

From 1 Corinthians 14:32, 33, only a seemingly subordination is evident, which the Apostle wills for good reason to obtain in the Church among men *living at the same time*: while he ascribed to no one of those men judging a Judgment normative, authentic, supreme, and infallible: but the spirit of those prophesying is willing to be tested by the sole norm and Lydian stone of the Word of God, by comparison with 1 Thessalonians 5:21; Acts 17:11; thus 1 John 4:1.

2. When they allege *Reasons* in addition, and say, for example, that *the Fathers are not members of the parties in today's Controversies*; *We Respond*, It is not sufficient that a Judge not be a member of the parties, for thus children playing in the street could most frequently be constituted as Judges to settle disputes: accurate knowledge of the controverted cause is additionally required; which is wanting in the Fathers in today's various controversies, whence those paying less attention often also spoke with more imprudence than they would have done after the quarrel concerning such a cause was brought forward.

In order to enervate the Objections of the Papists in this cause, see also the Writers cited on § 46; HEINRICH ALTING, *Theologia Elenctica nova, locus II, controversy IV with the Papists, pages 82-84*; TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ, locus II, question XXI, § 11-18*.

On § 46, 47, in addition consult VOETIUS' *Disputations I and II de Patribus seu Ecclesiæ antiquæ Doctoribus, Disputationum theologiarum, volume I, pages 75-106*.

§ 48: Hermeneutical Canons, Part 1

Our AUTHOR yet supplies for us hermeneutical Canons rightly to be observed: 1. that *the Exposition of Scripture* ought principally to be made by the very *Words of Scripture* found elsewhere, but those that are *Clearer*, not *obscurer*, or equally *obscure*: AUGUSTINE, *book II de Doctrina Christiana, chapter IX, opera, tome 3, part I, column 19*, well advised, *In order to illustrate obscurer expressions let examples be drawn from clearer expressions*. But, although it is hardly able to be sufficiently commended, that in the Interpretation of Scripture we ought to make the Biblical style familiar to ourselves, according to the example of Paul and others, who with him were led by the same Spirit, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 13; nevertheless there is not to be such a scrupulous adherence to the Biblical expression that we altogether abstain from other words that are suitable to denote a matter, and are well-known by use, which sort of word is *Sacrament*, which, having been received by Ecclesiastical use, has become the most familiar for designating the *signs* and *seals* of the Covenant of Grace; or even from those that the impiety of heretics playing with the words of Scripture has required to be used, which sort of word is ὁμοούσιος/*homoousios*.¹

2. That there is to be an *adherence*, as far as possible, to *Propriety of Speech*. The Most Illustrious GOMAR, on Matthew 6:11, *opera, part I, page 65a*, says that *it is an altogether certain rule of right interpretation that there is to be no withdrawal from the proper signification of the word to an improper, unless a counterbalancing consideration necessarily requires this*. Christ and the Apostles everywhere observe this Canon, in citing the prophecies of the Old Testament in their native signification; and that this is to be embraced is urged, α. both by the *Perspicuity* of Scripture, § 25, 26, asserted against the *Papists*; β. and by the *Goodness* of God, through which there is to be no thought of withdrawing from the most ἐμφύτω/*natural* signification of the words without sufficient warrant, either in the text, or in the context, or in parallels; γ. and by the

¹ The term, ὁμοούσιος/*homoousios*, was used by the orthodox of the fourth century to express that Christ shares *the same nature* with the Father, and also to expose the error of the Arians, who were content with the words of Scripture, but not its sense, on this matter.

prohibition of *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως*, *private interpretation*, 2 Peter 1:20, which is nothing other than that by which we alter at will the signification of the phrases and words with the thread of the text and the force of the words neglected, and pervert it from the intention of the Spirit; which is exactly what is done, if this rule does not prevail. Thus, when the Lord commands us to ask, Matthew 6:11, τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, *our daily bread*, this rule urges us to explain this petition of corporeal food, as long as no necessity of drawing back from the propriety of the words presses us, which does not appear to be the case here; see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Juveniles, Disputations XVII-XXI*. So in Isaiah 65:20 this rule requires us to explain the words of the Prophet of a promise of extraordinary Longevity; not rashly to explain these things improperly of an eminent measure of spiritual gifts, Knowledge, etc.: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Textuales XXV, Part IV*.

Nevertheless, on the other hand, there is not to be an *excessive adherence to the Propriety of Words*, neither is τὸ ῥητὸν, *what is expressly stated*, to be so urged that we attribute to the Spirit either *contradiction*, or *overturning of faith*, or *manifest absurdities*: which three inconveniences concur, when we wish to adhere to the propriety of the letter in the explication of the words of the Eucharist, *This is my body*; see below, *Chapter XXXI, § 20*: or when we attribute to God, an infinitely perfect Spirit, bodily members, and human affections; see *Chapter IV, § 14, 26*: or when the *Word* is said to *have become Flesh*; see *Chapter XIX, § 19, etc.*; consult GLASSIUS' *Philologiam Sacram, book II, part I, tractate II, section I, article IV, pages 182-185*.

3. Similarly that *there is to be no passing from the Literal Sense to a Mystical Sense upon slight grounds*. Accordingly, in our AUTHOR'S *Medulla Theologiæ* it is read: *A Mystical Sense is not to be imposed without slight grounds*. Perhaps it is better to delete that *without*, if you consult the *Compendium*: otherwise only those will be refuted that impose a Mystical Sense *without* any *foundation* at all, however *slight*, although there is to be no passing to this without *weighty grounds*. Since otherwise, α. faith is converted into vain opinion; β. we easily fall into the vice of ἀλληγορομανίας/*allegoromania*, so highly prized of old in ORIGEN; γ. Scripture is explained with manifold frivolities, while by this practice we make that similar to a *Lesbian rule*, a *wax nose*, from which profane calumny we rightly shrink, when the Papists prate against Scripture.

But a Mystical Sense is not always to be altogether rejected, especially in the Prophetic Writings: for example, when the moral and spiritual Worship of the New Testament is described in phrases taken from the Ceremonial Worship of the Old Economy, Isaiah 19:19; 66:20, 21, 23; Zechariah 14:16; Malachi 1; 2; 4:5. While the overly carnal and crass conceptions of the Jews in the explication of the Prophecies verily hold them blinded in unbelief: consult Chapter XVIII, § 13, Objections 1, 4, and Chapter XX, § 32, in which is treated the Spirituality of the Kingdom of Messiah against the Jews.

§ 49: Hermeneutical Canons, Part 2

Finally, our AUTHOR adds that *the Force of the Words and Phrases of Scripture is also to be held in exposition, as far as the Analogy of Faith and Context allows*. This is certainly urged, α. by the breadth of the Divine word, Psalm 119:96; β. by the Wisdom of God, whereby He, knowing best the force and use of the words, did not use them in a restricted sense, unless with a sufficient indication added. Thus, when Christ is called *God*, this title ought to be thought to be attributed to Him, not merely analogically and in a slight sense on account of this or that similitude, as with Angels¹ and Magistrates,² but in the full and proper sense. Thus under *Bread* in the Lord's Prayer is comprehended whatever pertains to both sustenance and clothing, according to the *Heidelberg Catechism, Lord's Day L*.³ The Breadth of the Sense of the *Decalogue* especially is gathered from Rules,⁴ which our AUTHOR sets forth

¹ For example, Psalm 8:5: “For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels (מַלְאָכִים, *than God or the gods*), and hast crowned him with glory and honour.”

² Exodus 22:28; Psalm 82:1, 6, 7.

³ Heidelberg Catechism 125: “*Which is the fourth petition? Give us this day our daily bread; that is, be pleased to provide us with all things necessary for the body, that we may thereby acknowledge Thee to be the only fountain of all good, and that neither our care nor industry, nor even Thy gifts, can profit us without Thy blessing; and therefore that we may withdraw our trust from all creatures, and place it alone in Thee.*”

⁴ Westminster Larger Catechism 99: “*What rules are to be observed for the right understanding of the ten commandments? For the right understanding of the ten commandments, these rules are to be observed: 1. That the law is perfect, and bindeth everyone to full conformity in the whole man unto the righteousness thereof, and unto entire obedience for ever, so as to require the utmost perfection of every duty, and to forbid the least degree of every sin. 2. That it is spiritual, and so reacheth the understanding, will, affections, and all other powers of the soul; as well as words, works, and gestures. 3. That one and the same thing, in divers respects, is required or forbidden in several commandments. 4. That as, where a duty is commanded, the contrary sin is forbidden; and, where a sin is forbidden, the contrary duty is commanded; so, where a promise is annexed, the contrary threatening is included; and where a threatening is annexed, the contrary promise is included. 5. That what God forbids, is at no time to be done; what he commands, is always our duty; and yet every particular duty is not to be done at all times. 6. That under one sin*

below, *Chapter XI*, § 31. Now, the *Analogy of Faith* is not sufficient here; but a consideration of the *Analogy of Context* ought to be added, according to the things that we observed on § 45: so that quite frequently a certain Interpretation is to be called *false*, which, considered simply in itself, contains nothing *false*; insofar as it agrees with the *Analogy of Faith*, but is not able to be reconciled with the *Analogy of Context*: which does not allow multiple and widely diverse Interpretations of one passage, and what Interpretations, therefore, are not able to be subordinated to each other, to be conjoined, because of the *Unity of the Literal Sense* asserted above, § 37, 38, and the *Perspecuity and Normative use of Scripture*, concerning which § 25, 26, 32.

Therefore, that hermeneutical Rule, that *the Words of Sacred Scripture signify whatever they are able to signify*, is false, if it be taken without any limitation, and with no regard had to the *Analogy of Context*, as often happens in practice; through imitation of the Jewish Rule, that it is allowed to explain Scripture בְּכָל־פְּנִיִּים וְשֶׁאֵין־אֶפְסָר, *in whatever way it is possible for it to be done*; whence those Kabbalistic interpretations by Gematria, Temurah, Notarikon, etc., flowed forth, as BUXTORF *the Younger* observes, *de Punctorum Antiquitate et Origine*, page 100.

What is commonly said, that *Words mean whatever they are able to mean*, this, in other words meaning the same thing, they observe to be promoted by the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS on Habakkuk 2:9, § 45, page 186b, “To what all things predicated are applicable, certainly concerning this it follows that something is said:” yet as the things predicated are such as are permitted to their subjects. In a similar manner the same COCCEIUS writes on Romans 10:6, § 121, pages 162, “It is impossible for anything to be done in the world, concerning which the words of the Holy Spirit might be able rightly and aptly to be used, with all reasons agreeing, that the Holy Spirit speaking in prophecy might not have regard to it, and might not mean for the reader to accommodate those words to that matter, and πληροφορεῖσθαι, *to be certain*, of their signification.” But that *Impossibility* is not so easy to

or duty, all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded together with all the causes, means, occasions and appearances thereof, and provocations thereunto. 7. That what is forbidden or commanded to ourselves, we are bound, according to our places, to endeavour that it may be avoided or performed by others, according to the duty of their places. 8. That in what is commanded to others, we are bound, according to our places and callings, to be helpful to them; and to take heed of partaking with others in what is forbidden them.”

approve as *possible*; unless under *all agreeing reasons* is comprehended, in addition to the Analogy of Faith, the *rationale* of the Analogy of Context and of the Scope of the Author speaking: compare what things I have commended in § 45 of *this Chapter* out of WESSELIUS' *Oratione de Simplicitate prudenti in Oratore Sacro*.

Concerning the use and abuse of this Rule, that *Words signify all that they are able to signify*, consult at length LEYDEKKER'S *Facem Veritatis*, locus II, controversy VI, pages 48-53, with the added *Preface*, *****4b; and ANTONIUS HULSIUS'¹ *Specimines Theologiæ hypotheticæ*, part I, *Disputation II*, which is *Concerning the Interpretation of Sacred Scripture*, pages 9-26, and part II in the *Vindications of Disputation II Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture*, pages 3-63, and *Disputation XXIV*, which is *on the Question, How and to what extent the Prophets of the Old Testament prophesied of the Matters of the New Testament, and in what manner might whatever belongs to the quarrel surrounding this argument be able to be removed from the Church?*; to which add MARCKIUS' *Commentarios*, especially upon the *Minor Prophets and the Song*, and the strictures everywhere met there upon the interpretations of the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS.

Without danger we hold with our AUTHOR: *A Word is able to signify all that according to the intention of God and its Context has regard to, and is able to be referred unto, its one signification.*

¹ Antonius Hulsius (1615-1685) was a Dutch Reformed philologist and theologian.

§ 50: Scripture's Highest End

Thus it has finally come unto the *Ultimate End* of Scripture; which is able to be said to be twofold, with one subordinated to the other, and both set forth clearly enough by our AUTHOR: namely,

α. *The Elect's Salvation*, which nevertheless does not always and in all follow upon the every preaching and use of the Scripture, because God does not intend the Salvation of all those externally called, and hence does not grant the Spirit of Grace to the same, by a comparison of Isaiah 53:1; Acts 13:46-48; 2 Corinthians 2:16; in which manner then God does not fail of His own *End* in the preaching of the Word, inasmuch as in it He only intends the *Salvation* of the *Elect*, not of all.

β. *God's Glory*, which the Lord willed to reveal in the subject matter of Scripture, in such a way that He luminously discloses the same both in the damnation of the unbelieving revealed in the Word, and in the salvation of the Elect, Romans 9:22, 23.

**Theological Disputation on
Mark 15:25 and John 19:14**

§ 1: The Chronological Paradox

There is a very famous ἐναντιοφανές, *apparent contradiction*, that occurs in the History of the Lord's Passion, if you compare Mark with John in the placement of a certain fixed point of time regarding the Passion of the Lord. Namely, Mark in the narration of those things that the Lord suffered on Golgotha, has in Mark 15:25, ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, *and it was the third hour, and they crucified Him*. But John, being about to exhibit the final scene that Pilate acted out with the Lord, and in which he next delivered Him to be crucified, notes in John 19:14, ἦν δὲ Παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη, *and it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour*. But, if it were already roughly the *Sixth Hour*, when Pilate condemned our Lord to death, in what manner was Mark able to make mention of the *Third Hour* when he is in the relation of the history of the suffering of the Cross, which Christ afterwards suffered on Mount Golgotha?

§ 2: Literature on the Chronological Paradox

I would do what has already been done, and lose my labor, if I should wish to review all the diverse ways that the most learned Interpreters have undertaken to remove this uncertainty; and should commemorate the difficulties that are able to be moved against the particulars of those opinions: which the very patrons of the same generally acknowledge, whence you will hardly find a sentence in which they thought themselves to be able to stand on solid ground: but they everywhere spoke very doubtfully in this intricate matter. This is to be acknowledged without reluctance, while in *δυσνοήτοις*, *things hard to be understood*,¹ of this sort, in which a definitive demonstration is sought in vain, it is sufficient to show that the matter holds good in this or that way. Now, you may find the conjectures of Learned Men concerning the resolution of this *ἐναντιοφανεῖ*, *apparent contradiction*, related and also called to examination in JOHANN CHRISTOPH WOLF'S *Curis philologicis et criticis* on John 19:14, and quite a few other erudite men that he cites, STEPHANUS MORINUS² in his *Dissertatione de Horis Salvificæ Passionis Jesu Christi*; JOHANNES LOMEIERUS³ in his *Dierum Genialium Decade prima Dissertatione quinta*; ANTONIUS BYNÆUS⁴ in his *de Morte Jesu Christi*, book III, chapter IV, § 37-44; to whom WOLF adds from the Lutherans, FRANZ WORGER;⁵ THOMAS ITTIG;⁶ SALOMON DEYLING, whom see in his *Observationibus Sacris*, part I, *Observations* XLVII, LII, § 4; CHRISTOPH HEINRICH ZEIBICH;⁷

¹ See 2 Peter 3:16.

² Étienne Morin (1625-1700) was Professor of Oriental Languages at Amsterdam (1686-1699).

³ Johannes Lomeier (1636-1699) was a Dutch Reformed minister and historian.

⁴ Antonius Bynæus (1654-1698) was Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages at Deventer.

⁵ Franz Worger (1643-1708) was a Lutheran Minister and Theologian.

⁶ Thomas Ittig (1643-1710) was German Lutheran Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Leipzig (1697-1710).

⁷ Christoph Heinrich Zeibich (1677-1748) was a German Lutheran Minister and Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Wittenburg.

FRIEDRICH ERNST KETTNER;¹ GUSTAV GEORG ZELTNER,² whose threefold Dissertation, certainly worthy of reading, *de Horologio Johannis, de Horologio Cajaphæ*, and *de Horologio Pilati*, has been inserted in HASE'S and IKEN'S *Thesauro Novo Dissertationum in Novum Testamentum*. To which are added ROBERT BAILLIE,³ in his *Opere historico et chronologico*, book II, chapter II, question XIV, pages 86-90; FRIEDRICH SPANHEIM the Younger, in his *Chronologia Sacra*, part I, chapter XIV, columns 66, 67; ABRAHAM CALOVIUS, *Bibliis Illustratis*, tome I, *Chronico Biblico*, section VIII, question XIII, pages 146-150. With these join in addition those that are conversant in narrating the History of our Lord's Passion, or in the explication of Jewish Antiquities. While JOHANNES MARCKIUS also, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus* XXXIV, Part IV, § 2, has briefly set forth the various opinions concerning this question.

¹ Friedrich Ernst Kettner (1671-1722) was a German Lutheran Pastor and Theologian.

² Gustav Georg Zeltner (1672-1738) was a German Lutheran Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Altdorf (1706-1730).

³ Robert Baillie (1602-1662) was a Scottish Presbyterian Pastor and Theologian. During the English Civil War, he was among the Scottish Commissioners sent to the Westminster Assembly. His writings preserve invaluable information about the history of the times.

§ 3: Resolution to Focus on the More Plausible Solutions

While in the Writers cited each reader will be able to satisfy his desire for knowledge unto satiety, as to what is thought and furnished by learned Men in either resolving or cutting this knot: I, in this little Dissertation, shall touch only lightly upon the sum of the matters; and, with those things dismissed that withdraw farther from the straight path, I shall especially linger over those things that approve themselves to me as more probable, and shall strive to confirm them more distinctly.

§ 4: Possible Resolution through Textual Emendation

It could be thought overly rash, and a cutting, rather than a loosing, of the knot, if we should correct Mark out of John, by reading ἕκτη/*sixth* in the place of τρίτη/*third*, or John out of Mark, by reading τρίτη/*third* in the place of ἕκτη/*sixth*, to which one may come only when all else has altogether failed; which sort of necessity is not perceived to be present here yet. Nevertheless, it is one thing as a result of bare conjecture to change the Reading of the Sacred Codex; it is another thing again to prefer to the Vulgar Reading another, somewhat less common Reading, but which is nevertheless supported by the authority of some Codices, by the testimony of the Ancients, and which is able to be accommodated without any incongruity to the matter which the speech concerns; especially if in addition one might detect the source of the error that caused or was able to cause the Copyists to stray from the genuine reading. That the matter thus stands in John in the Reading of the ordinal ἕκτη/*sixth* in the place of τρίτη/*third*, following BYNÆUS, *de Morte Jesu Christi*, book III, chapter IV, § 37, 43, most recently BENGEL, in his *Apparatu Critico ad Novum Testamentum*, contends, both of whom hence believe with others that the Reading of τρίτη/*third* in the place of ἕκτη/*sixth* here in John is to be vindicated by right of restoration. Thus *Bengel*, among other things, after he had observed that in no case is it easier to be led astray than in numbers; and that copyists often import a number, sticking in their mind from one passage, into another: “*Eusebius* of Cæsaria thinks that Γ,¹ a note of the ternary, was changed by the copyists into the ἐπίσημον/*distinguishing* mark of the senary:² to which opinion subscribe *Severus of Antioch*,³ *Ammonius of Alexandria*, and *Theophylact*, as they have it, *Wettstein*’s⁴

¹ Γ is the third letter in the Greek alphabet, with a numerical value of three.

² Σ has a numerical value of either six or two hundred.

³ Severus of Antioch (465-538) was the Monophysite bishop of Antioch, a controversialist, and a prolific theological writer.

⁴ Johann Jakob Wettstein (1693-1754) was a Swiss Theologian. His career was stormy; he was suspected of Arianism and Socinianism. Nevertheless, his work in the collation of New Testament manuscripts has had enduring value.

Prolegomenis, page 6. I saw on parchments the distinguishing mark, most exactly resembling Γ.... Moreover, the use of such notes, and the similitude of these two, have great antiquity....”

That that custom of expressing *numbers* by letters, so that γ might denote three, and ζ six, etc., has great antiquity, indeed, is perhaps coeval with the Apostles, so that they themselves might also be able to make use of such abridgements of writing, in the passage just now cited from Bengel, WETTSTEIN very commendably argues against Mill, namely, in *Prolegomenis ad Novum Testamentum*, chapter I, § 8.

“Therefore, we readily allow this reason to be added to those above, that the change, having been introduced early either individually or conjointly, and widely circulated, is inscribed in them.... *Cam.* has [τρίτη], and also the codex which is with Wettstein, that is, Bezae, that is, *Cantabrigensis*.¹... Nonnus,² as we have seen: the *Chronicon Paschale Alexandrinum*;³ and in it an ancient writer (whom some falsely think to be Peter of Alexandria⁴), asserting thus to have τὰ ἀκριβῆ βιβλία αὐτό τε τὸ ιδίόχειρον τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, *the accurate books and autograph of John preserved unto his own age in the Ephesian Church*. The authority of the assertion concerning the autograph of John Johann Frick⁵ defends in his exceptional book *de Cura ecclesiae veteris circa canonem*, page 130 and following. Certainly in a matter of this sort the Alexandrian writer appealed to that autograph, in which everyone would wish to become acquainted with the very thing itself, being ready sharply to criticize the writer, if he had been mistaken.... But nevertheless, if one should remain uncertain about the autograph, it must be the case that he thus had exemplars at that time of undoubtedly impressive antiquity. And so,

¹ Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis is a fifth century uncial of the Gospels and Acts, and is categorized as a Western text-type.

² Nonnus of Panopolis (flourished c. 400) was a Greek epic poet. His *Dionysiaca* and *Metabole* (a poetic paraphrase of the Gospel of John) survive.

³ The *Chronicon Paschale Alexandrinum*, composed in the seventh century by a Greek Christian, is a history of the world from the time of Adam to the time of the author.

⁴ Peter I served as the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, but ultimately was installed as Patriarch of Alexandria from 300 to 311, shepherding the church through the Diocletian persecution.

⁵ Johann Frick (1670-1739) was a Lutheran Minister and Theologian.

if the writer of the *Chronicon* and the author cited in it, if Nonnus as well, were engaged in the function of copyists, and Johannine codices proceeded from their hand, and this reading in the codices, which they approved, was extant: I would imagine that we are going to concur. But why is it now otherwise? With good reason do we rejoice when the true reading depends upon the greatest number of codices possible: but certainly in this place the matter compels that we be content with a lesser number of codices. There are elsewhere genuine readings, not resting upon a great many codices, which nevertheless, admitted by Erasmus, and familiar to us, we defend.” Certainly, unless the opinion that I strive below to commend and to render probable in the highest degree stand, this opinion of Bynæus, Bengel, and others approves itself to me more than the other methods of reconciliation. But it hinders that, as Bengel cautions, *nearly all Codices today, together with the Versions, have ἕκτη/sixth*, and that a convenient way of bringing the Evangelists into concord with the common Reading preserved remains, as shall be apparent further on. Moreover, it is hindered by the close and immediate conjunction of these words, ὥρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη, *and about the sixth hour*, with those that immediately precede, ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *it was the preparation of the Passover*: for which fact a suitable explanation is hardly evident, if in *John* in the place of ἕκτη/sixth should be read τρίτη/third; but the best explanation, if the common reading be preserved. For in this way the Evangelist shall indicate in a fitting manner the reason why the Leaders of the Jews press and urge Pilate so hard, that without any further delay or postponement he pronounce a condemnatory sentence against the Lord Jesus, and deliver Him to be crucified: namely, since the Passover was yet to be sacrificed and eaten by them, by comparison with *John* 18:28, and at the same time the preparatory Day of the Feast of Passover, πρωῒα, *the morning*, of which they had led the Lord to the judgment hall of Pilate, according to *John* 18:28, had now advanced almost to midday, so that *it would be about the Sixth Hour*: see FRANS BURMAN *the Younger's*¹ *Harmoniam Evangelistarum* on *John* 19:14, pages 714-720, compared with IKEN'S *Dissertationibus philologico-theologicis*, volume II, dissertation IX, or I, de

¹ Frans Burman the Younger (1679-1719) was a Dutch Minister and Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1714-1719). He was the son of Frans Burman (1628-1679), a Dutch Reformed and Cartesian Theologian, serving as Professor of Theology (1662-1671) and of Church History (1671-1679) at Utrecht.

Tempore ultimo Christi Paschatis, chapter V, § 2, pages 389, 390.

§ 5: The Sixth Hour of the Day of Preparation? of the Trial?

It is even less necessary with others to expound the *sixth hour* of John with reference to the time when *παρασκευὴ τοῦ Πάσχα*, *the preparation of the Passover*, began, but not with reference to the hour now completed, since it would have to be read *ὥρα ἕκτη*, *at the sixth hour*, with the *ι* subscript, which does not appear in the text; neither will that reading and interpretation be reconciled in the best way either with that intervening particle *δὲ*/*but/and*, *ὥρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη*, *and about the sixth hour*, or with the entire thread of the history. Moreover, it is a doubtful *εὑρημα*/*invention/shift*, that in John he might relate the *sixth hour* to the day of *παρασκευῆς τοῦ Πάσχα*, *the preparation of the Passover*, the beginning of which would have to be regarded from the third hour after the middle of the preceding night, and which would be finished on the third hour of the afternoon of this very fourteenth day of the month of Nisan, at which time the Passover Lambs began to be sacrificed, or which would also be a day longer than what is customary, of fifteen hours rather than twelve. The *sixth hour* of this day would exactly coincide with the *third hour* of the natural day mentioned by Mark, the beginning of which is from the rising of the sun. This reconciliation of the two Evangelists would be attractive, if that device both of beginning the preparatory of the feast Day from the third hour of the middle of the night, and also of extending it through fifteen entire hours, were not altogether destitute of all authority. See what things are said in opposition both by DEYLING, in his *Observationibus Sacris*, part I, *Observation* LII, § 4, which are also repeated by WOLF out of *Miscellaneis Lipsiensibus*, and also *Observationibus* XLVII, § 6; and by ZELTNER in his *Dissertatione de Horologio Cajaphæ*. Neither does that conjecture, which ZELTNER took up as worthy of embellishment, but which WOLF reminds had already previously come into the mind of ANDREW MASIUS¹ also, any more approve itself to us; according to which the *ὥρα ἕκτη* of John would not be the *sixth hour* of the day, reckoned in

¹ Andrew Masius (1516-1573) was among the most learned Roman Catholic scholars of his age and in no field is that more evident than in the field of Oriental languages. He also served as Counselor to William, Duke of Cleves.

one way or the other, but roughly the sixth hour from the beginning of the Acts or of the whole process with Christ in judgment both of the Jews, and of the Romans, continued all the way to this point: which time of the events conducted with Christ before the tribunal should be reckoned from the first or second hour after the middle of the night; and thus the *sixth hour* of John well agrees with the second or third hour of the natural day, or our seventh or eighth hour of the morning. But no matter how cleverly this hypothesis has been devised, John was obliged more distinctly and clearly to set forth an indication of this sort of unusual computation of hours, if he had desired his words to be understood according to this intention. Compare what things WOLF sets against this opinion.

§ 6: The Sixth Hour of the Roman Civil Day?

ZELTNER, in his *Dissertatione de Horologio Pilati*, commends yet another opinion, according to which John the Evangelist is here to be thought to have reckoned the hours according to the manner of the Romans, whose natural day, indeed, was not differing from that of the Jews, but who were beginning their Civil Day from the middle of the night, which is also our custom: John will here mention the *Sixth Hour* of that Civil Day, about which Hour the sun was rising, with the night of the feast of Passover finished, and so will indicate that in the very earliest morning Pilate sat ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, upon the judgment seat, being about to pronounce judicial sentence. While Mark will make mention of the common third hour of the Jews, with the beginning reckoned from the rising of the sun. On behalf of this opinion WOLF, with those more ancient passed over, cites also EDZARDI¹ in his notes on chapter I of *Berachoth*. And VRIEMOET, *Thesibus selectarum controversiarum Antiquitatum Israeliticarum*, CXXXVII, indicates that he also inclines unto the same, writing: “The ἐναντιοφάνεια, apparent contradiction, between the passages in Mark 15:25 and John 19:14 is thus tidily removed, that the third hour when Christ was Crucified is according to the computation of the Jewish hours; but the sixth hour, when He was led forth from Pilate, is according to the Roman computation in the hall of the Procurator.” This opinion is not without its reasons, with which its patrons attempt to support it. They suppose that it is beyond question that Pilate, although living in the province, reckoned the time according to the Roman manner: especially in an investigation of a criminal case, an account of which he was bound to render to Cæsar, which, with the moments of time so much more carefully noted, he was able to do. Now, they believe that John in this passage followed this Roman method of computing the time, because he was present for these judicial acts, and perhaps noticed the hour of time now passing on the sundial, which was in the judgment or reception hall of Pilate. So much the more, because the Evangelist was narrating the examination undertaken and the

¹ Georg Elieser Edzardi (1661-1727) was a German Hebraist. He taught Greek and Oriental languages at Hamburg.

sentence brought by the Roman Prætor: while John himself, during the time of the writing his Gospel, was also living among the Gentiles, and wrote his Gospel especially out of regard for them. And they maintain that thus John also spoke according to the custom of the Romans, John 20:19, οὐσῆς οὖν ὀψίας, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, *it being then evening, on that day, the first day of the Sabbaths*: since that evening after the setting of the sun according to the Jews pertains to the second day of the week, not the first. Certainly we do not deny the truth of some of the reasons that we just now brought forth: yet we do deny that they by legitimate consequence prove that which is here to be demonstrated. Again, other things are assumed upon too slight a foundation. And when in other passages of the Gospel of John, where he mentioned the *tenth*, *sixth*, and *seventh hour*, and *the twelve hours of the day*, John 1:39; 4:6, 52, 53; 11:9, no one thinks of the Roman manner of reckoning; we do not see for what reason we might be bound to admit that Roman manner in this one passage. Neither do we think that Interpreters would have yielded to this opinion, unless they had been persuaded that John is able to be brought into agreement with Mark in no other way. But when we attend diligently to the circumstances of the history of the Lord's Passion, it appears to us altogether impossible that only the sixth hour of the morning was then reckoned according to the reckoning of the Romans and our method of counting. I ask that you weigh carefully how many hours and how much of the morning of this day had already passed with the Lord Jesus. It was already undoubtedly beyond μεσονύκτιον/*midnight*, when in the first place the Jewish Senate, congregated in the hall of Caiaphas, was dismissed. Then those Elders gave some space of time to rest. The Sanhedrin is gathered a second time, *when the daylight had arrived*, Matthew 27:1, Πρωΐας—γενομένης, *when morning was come*; Mark 15:1, εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ πρωΐ, *straightway in the morning*; Luke 22:66, ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, *as soon as it was day*. (Now, the Jews were at that time in that season of the year that answers roughly to the beginning of our April.) In this second assembly, the members of the Sanhedrin again call the Lord Jesus to examination; they condemn Him a second time. Then they solemnly conduct Him toward the judgment hall of Pilate, which according to the topographical layout of the city of Jerusalem was not situated in close proximity to the hall of Caiaphas. When they had arrived there, Pilate first goes out to the Jews, to ask what heads of accusation they might produce against the Lord Jesus. He returns into the Judgment Hall, to examine the captive

Jesus. With this business accomplished, he pronounces Jesus guiltless. And, when the Jews press hard, crying out against this captive, he sends them with Jesus in bonds to Herod, whose house was again at a distance from the judgment hall of Pilate. Here Herod questions Jesus ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς, *in many words*; the ἀρχιερεῖς, *chief priests*, and Scribes accuse Him εὐτόνως/*vehemently*; Herod σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ, *with his men-of-war*, mock the Lord of glory in most unbecoming ways.¹ When Jesus was returned to Pilate, the Prætor couples Him with Barabbas, and leaves it to the decision of the people which of these two they might desire to be released to them. Then Pilate makes arrangements for Him to be flogged; he allows the flogged to be treated as a laughingstock by the soldiers: with which accomplished He is again set before the Jews by the Prætor, if perchance he might be able to move them to compassion with the Lord innocent and having already been the recipient of such frightful measures. Pilate again calls Jesus within the judgment hall for an examination concerning the crime of blasphemy charged against Him; afterwards Pilate goes out alone, if by any means he might set Jesus free, in whom after all those things and repeated examinations he was discerning no crime worthy of death. And with all these things accomplished Pilate now leads Jesus out to the people, and sits down in the judgment seat.² But who is able with any appearance of truth to imagine that all these things were able to be accomplished within the juncture of time when the day had begun to dawn and within the sixth hour of the morning? To us this appears to be altogether ἀδύνατον/*impossible*. Wherefore, no less here than elsewhere, we believe that the Jewish manner of reckoning has been observed by our Evangelist, who have twelve hours in their day, which they begin to count from the rising of the sun; which then were longer in the summer and shorter in the winter: but in the time of the Feast of Passover, which happened around the Vernal Equinox, their hours were almost equivalent to ours; so that the sixth hour of the Jews was our eleventh or twelfth hour about midday. That the day had already hastened to this point is not at all able to seem strange, if we attentively consider all that had been transacted on this morning. Neither are we moved from this opinion by the example that we heard advanced above out of John 20:19, as if John had also followed there, not the Jewish, but the Roman

¹ Luke 23:7-11.

² John 19:13.

manner of reckoning. Indeed, LOMEIERUS in his *Dierum Genialium Decade prima Dissertatione quinta*, page 220, responds, “John, when he narrates that Jesus appeared to His disciples οὔσης—ὀψίας, τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη τῆ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, *at evening, on that first day of the week, when the doors were shut*, indicates part of the natural day, and its last part; without respect to the civil day, which the Jews were counting from evening to evening, the Romans from midnight to midnight.” In addition, Interpreters are indeed produced that expound the ὀψίαν/*evening* of John of the very late Evening and in the first part of the night; because Cleopas with his companion, when they were drawing near to Emmaus, say to Jesus, Μείνον μεθ’ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστὶ, καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα, *abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent*.¹ When, with Jesus agreeing, they then reclined at table in Emmaus, and from there they returned to Jerusalem, where they related to the Apostles congregated together those things that had happened to them, before the Lord appeared to that assembly: now, Jerusalem and Emmaus were more than two hours distant from each other. But it is not necessary for us to defer this appearance of the Lord unto such a late hour of the evening. Jesus was even able to appear to the Apostles according to the Jewish manner of reckoning the civil Day, before the first Day had expired. The Jews made express mention of two evenings, the evening of the day and the evening of the night; and the former evening they now begin to reckon from the half hour after noon, when the sun begins to go down: they were especially beginning the evening from the time of the evening sacrifice, at the third hour of the afternoon according to our reckoning. But it is even more likely that the disciples, directing their steps toward Emmaus, so that they might all the more easily persuade the Lord to turn aside with them, spoke in a certain measure, if not hyperbolically, at least κατ’ αὐξήσιν, *for amplification*, by saying that *night approaches and the day has declined*; so that perhaps they reached Emmaus not much after the second hour: and doubtlessly their fervid desire to share with the Apostles this unexpected happening and their joy hastened their journey in returning to Jerusalem. In which manner it is easily conceived that both the disciples of Emmaus and the Lord Himself were able to be present at the assembly of the Apostles at Jerusalem even before the setting of the sun on the first day of the week: consult

¹ Luke 24:29.

LAMPE on John 20:19, and what things I have noted on MARCKIUS' *Compendio Theologiæ*, chapter XXIX, §24, in note *i. l.*

§ 7: The Sixth Hour More Broadly Defined?

But when we thus acknowledge that John made mention of the *Sixth Hour* according to the Jews' common manner of reckoning the natural day from the rising of the sun, so that that sixth hour falls upon our eleventh or twelfth; the difficulty already moved from the beginning remains to be resolved, in what manner this reckoning is to be reconciled with that of Mark, who makes mention of the *Third Hour*. Certainly, if the Lord at about the sixth hour was still standing before the tribunal of Pilate, He was not able to have been already affixed to the cross at the third hour according to the same reckoning. To which another scruple is also added, moved by those that refer the *sixth hour* in John in one way or another to some earlier moment of the day; as if thus the time were too narrow, which must come between the condemnation of the Lord made by Pilate and the moment of gathering darkness, if we attend to the matters accomplished in the meantime; while the Evangelists expressly relate that there was darkness from the sixth hour unto the ninth, Matthew 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44. Thus BYNÆUS, *de Morte Jesu Christi*, book III, chapter IV, § 43: "That at the sixth hour, or about the sixth hour, darkness arose, Matthew, Mark, and Luke uniformly assert. Therefore, about the sixth hour Pilate by no means sat for judgment. For it was not possible that all the things that are narrated might happen in so small an interval. For Jesus was condemned by Pilate, sitting for judgment. Thence the Roman soldiers led Him outside of Jerusalem to the place of punishment. After vinegar mixed with gall was given to Him to drink, He was fixed to the cross. Then His garments were divided by lot, and those passing by idly mocked Him. After all these things at last the darkness arose. Therefore, about the third hour Pilate sat for judgment. After the third hour Jesus was crucified. About the sixth hour, or at the sixth hour, the darkness arose." You may read similar things in DE DIEU'S *Animadversionibus* on Mark 15:25; likewise in SAMUEL REYHER'S¹ *Dissertation de Crucifixi Jesu titulis et de Hora Crucifixionis*, chapter XII, which is found in MENTHENUS' *Thesaurο Dissertationum in Novum Testamentum*. But that

¹ Samuel Reyher (1635-1714) was a German mathematician and astronomer.

ὥσει/*about* in John, ὥρα δὲ ὥσει ἔκτι, *and about the sixth hour*, admits some latitude. Neither will Bynæus or anyone else grant it as easily proven that all those things just now enumerated went before the descending of the darkness: since the Evangelists made mention of the darkness in such a way that they record at the same time the descending and duration of it, and then subjoin only those things that happened about the time of the end of the darkness, having regard to the death of the Lord, and the immediate preparation to that. While some things previously mentioned were able to happen even while the darkness was lasting. Hence also the doubt just now set forth has not appeared so great to other learned men, that they think that it is not possible that a sufficient response might be given to this. Thus MORINUS, *de Horis salvificis Passionis Jesu Christi*, pages 84 and following: “That the sixth hour is to be assigned to the crucifixion, Saint Luke manifestly teaches; for, after he described the entire sequence of that, he adds, ἦν δὲ ὥσει ὥρα ἔκτι, *and it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour*: for thus he signifies that the sixth hour was fulfilled, and that the darkness happened at the same time.... But in fact Saint John appears to object, who in John 19:14 relates that ὥρα ὥσει ἔκτι, *at about the sixth hour*, Pilate said to the Jews, *Behold your King*, and, with them opposing, he attempted to free Him from death; and so He was not yet condemned, not yet delivered to the executioner, much less affixed to the cross. But the particle ὥσει/*about* resolves the whole problem; for it has not a little latitude on both sides, and it was possible that the whole hour was included in the scope.... In this way Saint Luke was able to say that it was ὥσει ὥραν ἔκτι, *about the sixth hour* when Jesus was fixed to the cross, although that hour was immediately going to pass into the seventh; and on the other hand Saint John was able to say that it was ὥραν ὥσει ἔκτι, *about the sixth hour* when that hour was imminent, and the fifth hour preceding was soon going to end.... And so, with the sixth hour approaching Christ was condemned, and, with the same complete, He was crucified. But perhaps the space of an entire hour will appear briefer than is able to suffice for the innumerable injuries to which He was exposed, and for the journey from the judgment hall to Golgotha; it will be able to seem this way to those that do not consider the energy of the fury now for some time restrained; in a half part of the night the entire case was drawn up, and in a small part of the early morning it was conducted and concluded; therefore, after

judgment was passed the Jews, for a long time panting after the blood of our Redeemer, busied themselves to quench their thirst without any delay: hence, although they rejoiced in His sufferings, and were watching with joy His faltering under the weight of the heavy cross, nevertheless, lest even in this manner His death should be delayed for a few moments, they compelled Simon of Cyrene to bear it without delay, so that He might hasten to that all the more quickly.” Similarly CALOVIUS, *Bibliis Illustratis*, tome I, *Chronico Biblico*, section VIII, question XIII, page 150, has already advised us: “And this is a common opinion of the Learned, that *the crucifixion* happened *at the sixth hour*, when the darkness arose.... Neither does the comparison of John 19:14 with Luke 23:44 create...a difficulty here.... For what would prevent that knot from being loosed in this way, that according to *John* it was ὥρα ὡσεὶ ἕκτη, *about the sixth hour*, when Christ began to be condemned, because the *sixth hour* was *soon imminent*: but according to *Luke* in this sense it is understood to be *about the sixth hour*, that the sixth was not very long past: or even that those things that were completed by half an hour before or after the sixth hour are also understood as having been completed about the sixth hour: now, those things were easily able to have been completed within an hour, especially by the enemies of Christ rushing headlong and hastening the death of Christ with fury and all the force and zeal of malice: namely, His condemnation, delivering up, escorting to the place of punishment, and crucifixion. The words of the Evangelists are not to be understood with *Mathematical rigor*, but ὡς ἐν πλάτει, *loosely*, and *morally*, or according to *civil usage*, and so the particle *about* is added.”

§ 8: Greater and Lesser Hours?

But let us return now to the principal difficulty, which yet remains, namely, in what way Mark's *Third Hour* might be able to be reconciled with John's *Sixth* reckoned according to the manner of the Jews; so that we might see whether we are able to loose the same with any probable explanation. Eminent men have tried to bring the Evangelists into agreement by the help of the distinction between the greater and lesser hours, so that John mentions the lesser sixth hour, but Mark speaks of the greater third hour, which will not stand in opposition to John's sixth hour. They, of course, divide the day into four quadrants, Nehemiah 9:3, just as the night was wont to be divided into four vigils, Mark 13:35. But they divided the day into these greater hours in diverse ways, whence they elicit the agreement of the Evangelists in more than one way. There are those that allot to the individual greater hours three hours equally, so that the second greater hour began from the fourth lesser hour, and the third greater hour from the seventh lesser hour: see ZELTNER in his *Dissertatione de Horologio Cajaphæ*, § 18-24. But, when according to this manner of reckoning the Lord was crucified at the beginning of the third hour, that is, the seventh lesser hour; darkness was already upon the face of the land for an hour before the crucifixion of the Lord, which nevertheless at length followed, when He was now affixed to the cross. And, although that division of the day into quadrants is admitted, whence shall it be proven these individual quarter parts went by the name of the first, second, third, and fourth hour? In addition, how shall it be rendered plausible that Mark, who soon makes mention of the sixth and ninth lesser hours, verses 33 and 34, in the case of the third hour understands the greater hour without any additional indication? Others, with GROTIUS on Matthew 27:45, assign the four parts of the day in accordance with the diverse, more solemn hours of prayer, which were the third, the sixth, the ninth, of which, as when the pouring out of prayer is treated, mention is made, Acts 3:1; 10:3, 9. According to this reckoning, the first quadrant will have only two hours, but the fourth four hours. They think that these hours, the third, the sixth, and the ninth, were announced with the sound of the trumpet, especially at the time of the greater Feasts: and by these hours they believe all the intervening time,

which came between one and the other stated hour of prayer, was denominated, since these hours were of greater note than the rest, so that something might be said to happen *at the third hour*, which happened between this third hour and the following sixth hour. And so John might relate that it was *about the sixth hour*, when Jesus was about to be delivered to undergo the punishment of the cross, since the sixth hour was now nearer than the third. But Mark will testify that it was *the third hour*, when they crucified the Lord (which was accomplished with the greatest speed), since the middle of the time between the third and sixth hour had not yet completely elapsed, although the end of the third hour and the beginning of the sixth were already at hand. But again, with what evidence will it be evinced that it was customary among the Jews that what things happened in the intervening time between two stated hours of prayer of this sort, they referred to one or the other of these hours? In what manner in particular would one persuade someone that Mark, when he narrates the event that happened about the sixth lesser hour, said *it was the third hour*, and understood the same of a quadrant of the day, which had all but passed; when afterwards in *verses 33 and 34* he again expressly makes mention of the *sixth* and *ninth* lesser hours?

§ 9: The Preferred Harmonization

More than other ways of reconciliation, that has long pleased me that refers the determination of the time occurring in Mark 15:25, not to the time of day of the Crucifixion; but to the interval of time that came between the Crucifixion of the Lord and the parting of His garments. And so the words of the text of Mark 15:25, ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, are to be rendered, *but it was the third hour and they crucified Him*, that is, from which they had crucified Him, after they had crucified Him. DANIEL HEINSIUS greatly commends this opinion in his *Exercitationibus Sacris* on Mark 15:25, whom, although he dissembles, BAILLIE in his *Opere historico et chronologico*, book II, chapter II, question XIV, page 88, conjectures to have been able to receive it from that most learned Roman Monk MARCELLUS. LOMEIERUS, in his *Dierum Genialium Decade prima Dissertatione quinta*, follows Heinsius. With a certain measure of doubt CALOVIUS, in his *Chronico Biblico*, section VIII, question XIII, page 149, supports this opinion. *Perhaps*, says he, *the explanation of Daniel Heinsius is rather to be approved, etc.*, which he then frees from the objections moved by Baillie, *Opere historico et chronologico*, book II, chapter II, question XIV, pages 88, 89: yet subjoining thereafter, *we nevertheless add another solution to be evaluated by the learned, etc.* To this DEYLING also, in his *Observationibus Sacris*, part I, Observation XLVII, § 5, especially inclines: “After so many learned men have exerted themselves in vain to reconcile John with Mark, it appears that it is hardly possible for us to determine which opinion might be closer to the truth. At the same time, since something must be said and set up, I would subscribe to the opinion of DANIEL HEINSIUS before the others, etc.” Nevertheless, it soon follows in § 6: “However, lest I conceal anything, this opinion itself is not without difficulty.” However, the difficulty that he then mentions is of almost no moment. WOLF, in *Miscellaneis Lipsiensibus*, and also *Observationibus XLVII*, § 6, with all things rightly weighed, indicates that he retreats especially unto this same opinion: “Having thus finished this labor, we will descend no further into an examination of the remaining positions, in the place of which we would declare that the opinion of *Heinsius* pleases us above the others.” RELAND, in his *Antiquitatibus Hebræorum Sacris*, part IV, chapter I, § 17, with the reconciliation that is sought out of the distinction between these

greater and lesser hours rejected, subjoins disjunctively: “And so I would believe that those things of Mark, *and it was the third hour, and they crucified him*, are to be referred to the division of the garments of Christ, which was done in the third hour after Christ had been crucified: as in Nehemiah 7:73 it is read, *καὶ ἔφθασεν ὁ μῆν ὁ ἕβδομος καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν πόλεσιν αὐτῶν*,¹ *and the seventh month came on first, and the sons of Israel were in their city*. Or, if the act of crucifixion is able to be said to have taken its beginning at the third hour, in John 19:14 *τρίτη*/*third* should be read in the place of *ἕκτη*/*sixth*, etc.” The solution of Heinsius OFFERHAUS prefers to the others, *Spicilegiorum historico-chronologicorum, Dissertatione de Vita Salvatoris*, page 544, where, with other ways of reconciliation rejected, he concludes: “And so to me the explanation of Daniel Heinsius on Mark 15:25 is still especially satisfying, who translates the copula *καὶ*/*and* as *after, after which*. So that the words of Mark 15:24, 25 are to be rendered: *And those that had led Him to the cross divided His garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take. It was indeed the third hour, AFTER they had crucified Him*: so that it indicates the time when they divided His garments, the third hour after the crucifixion: at least the particle *καὶ*/*and* ought to be taken in this sense in the Septuagint of Joshua 7:25, *and they burned them with fire καὶ*/*AFTER they had stoned them with stones*. CHRISTIANUS STOCKIUS,² *Observationibus ad Novum Testamentum*, yields to this same opinion.

¹ Thus the Septuagint.

² Christian Stock (1672-1733) was a German philologist and professor of oriental languages at Jena (1698).

§ 10: The Preferred Harmonization Defended

It makes for this interpretation, 1. that the Division of the Garments after the Crucifixion was just now mentioned, *verse 24*, and that this history of the division of the garments of our crucified Lord immediately precedes *in that very place*, when it follows in our *verse 25*, ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, *and it was the third hour, and the crucified Him*. 2. It could appear somewhat incongruous, if Mark after the relation of the division of the garments, which came after the Crucifixion, should return to determine the time of the Crucifixion itself: but these words of Mark in *verse 25* are able to be referred to the time of the division of the garments without any scruple; since this time is nowhere expressly determined in the Gospels, but it is related in a general way with other circumstances that this division of garments followed after the Crucifixion. 3. The particle καὶ/*and*, which joins two members of a sentence, is best translated by the Hebraism *After*; as NOLDIUS,¹ in his *Concordantiis Particularum Hebræo-Chaldaicarum* on the letter ו, *number 42, pages m. 295, 296*, confirms this use of the letter ו by many examples in the writings of the Hebrews. For example, thus we have it in Judges 4:1, *and the children of Israel proceeded to do evil in the eyes of Jehovah*, וַאֲהִי־וַיָּדָם מָת, *and Ehud was dead*, that is, AFTER Ehud was dead, as it is also translated by the Dutch, and in Greek, καὶ Ἄωδ ἀπέθανε, *and Ehud was dead*. In Job 14:10, וַיִּגְבַּר יְמֹתַי וַיִּחַלְשׁ, *And man dies and is weakened*, that is, AFTER WHICH, AFTER he is weakened. HEINSIUS chiefly appeals to Joshua 7:25, in which, after the stoning of Achan was related, upon whom it is then said, *verse 26*, that a great heap of stones were erected: between which in the plural number it is related concerning the entire family and possession of Achan, וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ אֹתָם בָּאֵשׁ, וַיִּסְקְלוּ אֹתָם בְּאֲבָנִים: *and they burned them with fire, and stoned them with stones*; which he explains of a Burning following after the stoning, since one that has been burned with fire is not then able to be stoned: in which Heinsius follows the *Targumist*, who translates it, בתר דרגמו יתהון

¹ Christian Nolde (1626-1683) was a professor of theology at Copenhagen. He published his *Concordantias Particularum Hebræo-Chaldaicarum* in 1679.

באבניא, *after they stoned them with stones*. Thus we read in Exodus 34:4, *and he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and Moses rose up early in the morning*, וַיַּעַל אֶל־הָרַ סִינַי כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתוֹ וַיִּקַּח בְּיָדוֹ שְׁנֵי לְחֹת אֲבָנִים: , *and he went up into mount Sinai, as Jehovah had commanded him, and he had taken*, καὶ ἔλαβε, *and he took*, in the Septuagint, that is, AFTER he had taken in his hand the two tables of stone: in which manner the hasty judgment of LE CLERC concerning disturbed order vanishes. Likewise, in verse 33, וַיֵּכַל, *and Moses finished speaking with them*, וַיִּתֵּן, *and he had given upon his face, and he had imposed upon his face*, that is, AFTER he had imposed a veil upon his face, in comparison with verses 34, 35. In Amos 7:9, *and the high places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be reduced to wilderness*, וַיִּקְרָא, *and I will rise*, Drusius translates, *after I will have risen up against the house of Jeroboam with the sword*. Perhaps it is thus to be read in the midst of Zechariah 3:5, וַיִּשְׂימוּ, *and they set a clean mitre upon his head*, וַיִּלְבְּשׁוּהוּ, *and they had clothed*, or *after they had clothed him with garments*, by comparison with verse 4: see the *Commentarium* of MARCKIUS and the *notas* of MICHAELIS. This Hebraism CONSTANTIN L'EMPEREUR¹ also recognizes in his *notis ad Middoth*, page 69, although perhaps less opportunely he applies the same to the text in 1 Samuel 7:6, judging that the ו/and in וַיִּצְיָמוּ, *and they fasted*, here signifies *after*. BOCHART likewise establishes this use of the particle ו/and, *Hierozoico*, part I, book III, chapter X, column 823, although again we are unwilling to undertake to support the application of this manner of speaking to the text in Genesis 49:27, concerning which MARCKIUS is to be consulted in his *ad præcipuas quasdam partes Pentateuchi*: but this even now does not so much make for our matter. Thus BOCHART: "In Genesis 49:27, Benjamin is a ravening wolf. In the morning he eats the prey, and at evening he divides the spoil. Which two times there signify, not the entire day, as they maintain, but the entire night, of which one part is evening, and the other morning. And so the copula AND here is Ordinalive, and it is the same as *after*, as if the Prophet had said: *The Tribe of Benjamin shall be like a rapacious wolf, which has prey to be eaten unto the morning time, after he divided that about the time of the evening*. For the division of the prey is prior to the eating of it. Such also is Joshua 7:25, *and they burned them with fire, and stoned them with stones*, that is, בְּתַר דְּרַגְיָמוֹ, *after they had stoned*

¹ Constantin l'Empereur (1591-1648) was a Dutch Hebraist and Orientalist. He served as Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Harderwijk (1619-1627), and then at Leiden.

them, as it is found in the *Chaldean*. Job 14:10, and man dies, $\psi\eta\eta\eta\eta$, and is weakened, that is, after he has been weakened.” 4. It is added that Mark makes use of the *aorist* tense of the verb $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, to crucify, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, and they crucified Him. Now, the *Aorist* in the New Testament is known often to come in the place of the *pluperfect*. PASOR¹ observes this, *Grammatica Græca sacra Novi Testamenti*, book I, chapter XXIII, number 9, page 235. Thus we read in Mark 16:14, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omega}\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\eta\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota$, and He reproveth their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe those that had seen² Him raised. John 7:39, $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \eta\eta\ \Pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$, for the Holy Spirit was not yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.³ Hebrews 1:3, $\delta\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\omega\eta\ \acute{\eta}\mu\omega\eta$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\acute{\alpha}$, etc., when He had purged⁴ our sins, He sat down, etc. In the history of our Lord’s Passion the *Aorist* similarly occurs as to be taken in the *pluperfect* tense, John 18:14, $\eta\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{Καϊάφας} \acute{\omicron}\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, now Caiaphas was he, who had given counsel,⁵ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon$, to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people, in comparison with John 11:49, 50. Likewise, John 18:24, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\alpha\varsigma$, now, Annas had sent⁶ Him, $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \text{Καϊάφαν} \tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, bound unto Caiaphas the high priest. And in verse 26, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omega\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\epsilon\ \text{Πέτρος} \tau\omicron\ \acute{\omega}\tau\iota\omicron\nu$, one of the servants of the high priest, being a relative of him whose ear Peter had cut off,⁷ saith. Likewise, Matthew 27:37, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\iota$, and he had set up,⁸ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\eta\ \alpha\iota\tau\iota\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta$, over His head His accusation written, if you compare verses 35, 36. And also, in Matthew

¹ Georgius Pasor (1570-1637) was a Reformed theologian and learned philologist; he served as Professor of Theology at Herborn (1607-1626) and Professor of Greek at Franeker (1626-1637).

² Θεασαμένοις is aorist in form, but clearly pluperfect in sense.

³ Ἐδοξάσθη is aorist in form, but pluperfect in sense.

⁴ Ποιησάμενος is aorist in form, but clearly pluperfect in sense.

⁵ Συμβουλεύσας is aorist in form, but pluperfect in sense.

⁶ Ἀπέστειλεν is aorist in form, but pluperfect in sense.

⁷ Ἀπέκοψε is aorist in form, but pluperfect in sense.

⁸ Ἐπέθηκαν is aorist in form, but pluperfect in sense.

27:35 and Mark 15:24, the participle of the aorist σταυρώσαντες signifies, *after they had crucified*.¹ Also, Mark 15:15, φραγελλώσας, *after they had scourged*. 5. In addition, it is to be observed that Mark in this brief verse makes use of two verbs, the one in the imperfect, the other in first aorist, ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν: but if the latter verb was not to be translated *they had crucified*, but *they were crucifying*, why, I ask, when ἦν, *it was*, precedes in the Imperfect, does not ἐσταύρουν follow correspondingly in the Imperfect? Certainly Mark would not change the tense of the verb in this brief pericope without reason. The same construction of speech plainly occurs in John 7:39, *already cited*,² where the same distinction in signification also comes to be observed between the verb of the Imperfect tense, ἦν, *He was*, and the verb of the first Aorist, ἐδοξάσθη, *He had been glorified*. 6. But if, in addition to all these things, we should be able to bring in a probable reason why the soldiers waited for three hours after the crucifixion to divide His garments; hardly anything else could be desired in order to value this opinion above all the others. Which we would not soon abandon, even if the reason for this matter did not occur to us, as it frequently happens in the circumstances of the sacred history. But here, not without a great appearance of truth, it is conjectured that the soldiers were delayed for so long a time, before they might divide the Lord's garments; because, before they had completely finished what things were pertaining to the Crucifixion of the Lord and of the two thieves, that darkness spread, which endured through the three hours: which unusual phenomenon was able to strike these soldiers with fear and bewilderment, uncertain as to what might follow upon this matter; who, being accordingly astonished, sat, keeping watch over the crucified, until by degrees the darkness was dispelled again and the ordinary light returned, when they divided the garments of our crucified Lord among themselves: consult Matthew 27:54; 28:4; Luke 23:47, 48.

¹ Matthew 27:35: "And they crucified him (σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτόν, or, *and after they had crucified him*), and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." So also Mark 15:24.

² John 7:39b: "...for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified (οὐπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη)."

§ 11: A Possible Objection Answered

It is no objection that the Crucifixion of the two thieves mentioned at last in Mark 15:27 most likely followed immediately upon the Crucifixion of Christ, and was not delayed for three whole hours. Since, 1. the Evangelist rightly narrates first in continuous succession those things that have regard unto the Crucifixion of Christ Himself and its consequences, even if those should happen somewhat later: which sort of circumstances pertaining to the execution of this punishment were the title affixed to the Cross and the division of His garments. Only after these have been related do Matthew and Mark subjoin the Crucifixion of the two thieves with Christ, as a fellowship given to the Lord to increase His reproach. 2. Although they might have divided the garments of the Lord sooner, they do not appear to have done it before the Crucifixion of the thieves was accomplished, which *Luke* also narrates in the prior place, Luke 23:32-34, but in Matthew and Mark the division of the garments precedes in the order of narration. 3. Similarly in Matthew 27 the Crucifixion of the two thieves related in *verse* 38 is preceded by the continuous activity of the Watch of Jesus' cross, *verse* 36, which is immediately conjoined with the division of His garments mentioned in *verse* 36; because of course the Watch of the Cross was also pertaining to the circumstances and consequences of the suffering endured by the Lord Himself; with which the crucifixion of the thieves did not have so close a tie, which was added more circumstantially to the suffering of the Lord to aggravate His shame: seeing that it is otherwise certain that the crucifixion of the two thieves was first accomplished, before the soldiers composed themselves to sit by the Lord's Cross and to keep watch over it. 4. Not dissimilarly could a quarrel be moved concerning the history of the Title affixed to the Cross, which is not narrated in its own place by *Luke*, Luke 23:38, if you compare the other Evangelists. But it is able to be observed that *Luke* wanted to relate that particle of the history, although somewhat later, so that thus in the argument related of this Title, *This is the King of the Jews*, also written in *Latin*, he might indicate what furnished the opportunity for even Roman soldiers in their ignorance to mock our crucified Jesus in the manner that precedes in *verses* 36, 37. But that is enough.

This Disputation was defended publicly on December 4, 1754, by JOHANNES HABBEMA, of *Frisian Leeuwarden*, now Doctor of Theology and Minister of the Divine Word in the towns of t'Wyzel and Kooten.¹

¹ Johannes Habbema (1732-1800) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Pastor.

Theological Disputation on
Ephesians 5:14

§ 1: Questions on Ephesians 5:14

When the Apostle had admonished the Ephesians, Ephesians 5:8, that, with the manner of their remarkable conversion considered, which they had undergone with respect to their spiritual state, through which these, who previously were pure *darkness*, were made *light in the Lord*, *they should walk worthily as children of light*: and when he had added that other precept, *verse 11*, by which he not only wills that the faithful Ephesians stay far from communion with the works of darkness, which are without any good fruit; but also earnestly commands that they reprove works of this sort, even those that are intent upon perpetrating them, convict them of a most indecent manner of living, and recall them to better fruit; after other things with which he had confirmed these admonitions, he urges the same with an argument taken from authority, *verse 14*, διὸ λέγει, Ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, *wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light*. Various things are able to be asked concerning this text, in the abundant explaining of which Interpreters appear to have been engaged in their very office: however, I believe that a gleaning remains here for me after the harvest for the purpose of exercise. So that I might express my mind distinctly, I call attention to a few heads, which it is agreeable now to pass over briefly. It is asked, namely, 1. Who then is introduced as speaking, when the Apostle writes, διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*? 2. From what source are the words that occur in this sentence borrowed? 3. Whether by the terms ὁ καθεύδων, *one that sleeps*, and νεκρῶν, *the dead*, are set forth to us two different sorts of men? 4. Whether to the regenerate and faithful alone this speech is here directed, or to the unregenerate, who in a natural state after the fall yet lie insensible in their errors and sins in the sleep of spiritual death? 5. In what way the dead might be able to be made spiritually mindful, that they might wake up and arise? 6. What is the meaning of the promise subjoined to the admonition, *and Christ shall dawn upon thee*? And whether supernatural grace is only going to follow upon the right use of natural gifts? 7. Finally, how does the Apostle, in citing this prophecy, reach the goal that he intends?

§ 2: Who is the Speaker? (Part 1)

As far as the *first* Question is concerned, you can see the diverse opinions of Interpreters concerning this matter enumerated both in POOLE'S *Synopsi Criticorum*,¹ and in WOLF'S *Curis philologicis et criticis, on this passage*. Namely, various interpreters think that the supplement of the phrase, *διὸ λέγει*, *wherefore he says*, is to be fetched from the context, whether they reach back to Πνεῦμα, *the Spirit*, mentioned in *verse 9*, or to Κύριον, *the Lord*, in *verse 10*, or to Χριστὸν/*Christ*, at the end of this *verse 14*, which opinion of OEDER is specifically called in for examination by WOLF: from whom, as you learn that this opinion last mentioned is to be indicated as undoubtedly harsher; so it is observed, that those that supply the text in the ways previously set forth thus interpret the same, that either, with the remaining things in this Epistle and in this context delivered by Paul, there is an imposition, as if those things did not so much proceed from the Holy Spirit; or the manner of speaking agrees more with the sermons of the Prophets, than with the writings of the Apostles and especially of Paul. To the word φῶς/*light*, which had immediately preceded, a number of learned Men more or less earnestly return: but who by the φῶς/*light* again in a diversity of ways understand either the Light of the Holy Spirit speaking and admonishing within the regenerated and illuminated man, or the Light of the Word or the ancient Scripture, which is a torch to the feet and a lamp to the path of the faithful, Psalm 119:105, or the man filled with Light, in comparison with *verses 8 and 13*. BEZA *on this passage* hesitantly sets forth this opinion: “*He says*, that is, Scripture, or God speaking through a Prophet, or even light itself by personification, just as in Hebrews 12:5, ἡ παράκλησις, *the exhortation*, is said διαλέγεσθαι, *to reason with or speak to*, us as children. Now, it appears that this was taken partly from Isaiah, etc.” GROTIUS with greater παρῶρησίᾳ/*license* embraces this exegesis: “*Διὸ λέγει*, *wherefore that light*, that is, the man filled with

¹ Matthew Poole (1624-1679) was an English, Nonconformist Presbyterian Pastor, Theologian, and Exegete. Having been ejected from the ministry by the Act of Uniformity (1662), he undertook the compilation of his massive and masterly *Synopsis Criticorum*, a verse-by-verse history of interpretation. Poole's *Synopsis* was tremendously influential in the work of Matthew Henry and Jonathan Edwards.

light says to another. Paul does not appear to me to adduce some passage, but to ascribe to the light, that is, to the man filled with light, words that are worthy of him.” Grotius is followed by JAKOB ELSNER, in his *Observationibus Sacris*, “Διὸ λέγει,” says he, “I understand with Grotius, φωῶς/light, that is, *the man filled with new light*, verse 13, who is commanded ἐλέγχειν, *to reprove*, those ἔργα σκότους, *works of darkness*, verse 11, as φωῶς/light and a child of the φωτὸς/light, verse 8, in such a way that the words here following contain a prescribed formula whereby one ought ἐλέγχειν, *to reprove*, wicked men and to call them back to the light.” The Most Illustrious JAN VAN DEN HONERT cites Grotius and Elsner and professes to stand in their footsteps, in his *De voornamste heilige eu schriffuurlyke Sinnebeelden, uit verscheidene oudheden opgeheldert, door wylen Arnoldus Ruiquig*, on the word *Opstaan/rise*, tome 2, pages 1045-1048, as far as τὸ φωῶς, *the light*, is introduced as speaking by personification: but he explains τὸ φωῶς λέγον, *the light speaking*, of the Holy Spirit speaking not through testimony that He had taken care to be consigned to writing by holy Men; but through internal testimony in the heart of the regenerate man, who himself, now as made Light in the Lord, according to this convicting light of the Spirit, is held to refute, and to excite to duty, both himself and others; in which manner the twin signification of τοῦ φωτὸς, *the Light*, occurring together in verse 8, comes into consideration. I discover that the Most Illustrious PETRUS LAAN,¹ in his *Concionibus selectis, Sermon XVII*, pages 303, 304, understood it of *the Light of the Word speaking*, which he thinks to have been understood by the Apostle immediately before in verse 13 by τὸ φωῶς, *the light*. Unless these learned Men had held it as certain that the following words read in verse 14 are nowhere found in any certain place of the Old Testament codex, and are not borrowed from there; I believe that most of them would not have stooped so easily unto this opinion. Now, the Apostle is not accustomed by this, διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*, or a similar formula, to introduce either the Holy Spirit speaking in express words, unless he is reciting His words read in the Old Testament, or even a man filled with the Light of the illuminating and sanctifying Spirit. Where any defect of speech is perceived, indeed it appears that it is to be supplied most suitably from the immediate context: but that in the case of the formula of which the Apostle here

¹ Petrus Laan (1696-1743) was Professor of Theology at Franeker from 1738 to 1743.

makes use, λέγει, *he says*, or διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*, it is not always able to be done so conveniently. For example, in Ephesians 4:8 we also have διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*: it would be most nearly at hand to accommodate this declaration τῷ Χριστῷ, *to Christ*, of whom the Apostle had just made mention in *verse 7*, teaching, ἐνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ*. It immediately follows in *verse 8*, διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*. However, what words are cited in *verse 8* out of Psalm 68:18 are not composed in such a way that in them we are able to propose to ourselves Christ the Lord speaking in particular; since, on the other hand, in them the speech is made either to Christ according to the construction of the Hebrew text, or concerning Christ according to the form of the words in the Pauline citation. Now, the more reluctantly I consent in understanding under the verb λέγει, *he says*, in our text the noun φωτὸς/*light*, the more difficultly is the signification of the noun φωτὸς/*light* in the immediately preceding *verse 13* determined; yet to what is more attention to be paid than to the more remote *verse 8*, when the name of φωτὸς/*light* is not ever repeated in our text, but is supplied from the immediate context. For by no means beyond controversy is it posited, whether τὸ φῶς, *the light*, in *verse 13*, occurring twice, once in each hemistich, comes in one and the same sense, or in diverse senses, the first metaphorical, the next proper, or in more than one metaphorical sense. Therefore also, because neither is it certain, whether τὸ φανερούμενον¹ is to be taken actively or passively; whether φῶς/*light* is to be taken as the subject or the predicate of the latter clause; whether πᾶν/*all/whatsoever* is to be construed with τὸ φανερούμενον in the nominative; whether indeed πᾶν/*all/whatsoever* in the accusative case is to be supposed to be the object, concerning which the action expressed by τὸ φανερούμενον belongs. Hence the manifest divergence of opinions among Theologians in the explanation of that verse; some of which, for example, consider the latter words, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστὶ, as a common saying, by which the native force of natural Light is indicated, for the confirmation of that which the

¹ Ephesians 5:13: “But all things that are reprov’d are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light (τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται: πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστὶ).”

Apostle had already said concerning metaphorical Light: or they believe whatever works of darkness are thus made manifest through the refutation of spiritual Light are thus indicated, so that they might be set in clear light. Others through that entire verse discuss either the Light of the Spirit shining within and the man filled with this light; or the Light of the Word declaring all things and also shining within the regenerate man; or the Light of the divine omniscience and providence; or even the final Judgment or the light of the last day, on which the universal Judgment shall be held by the Lord, in which every work shall be brought into the light, with all that is hidden, whether good or bad, comparing Ecclesiastes 12:14; 1 Corinthians 3:13: although WOLF taxes this opinion in OEDER, who certainly incorrectly drew the argument of *verse* 14 here, as if he would refer the word by which Christ on the last day is going to compel the dead in their Resurrection, properly so called, to appear before His tribunal; yet I see that the same with respect to the sense of *verse* 13 has approved itself also to the Most Learned MARTIN,¹ certainly not an Interpreter of the least rank, writing on *this passage* in his *notis Gallicis ad Biblia Sacra*, after other things having regard to this also, which had been set down before on the prior part of the verse: “[*Because the light*] The light of the last day. [*It is that manifests all*] It will be that which will manifest all the actions of men, Romans 2:16, so that the *present* tense is put many times in this text in the place of the *future*, as in *verse* 6, and often elsewhere”: with whom compare also DIODATI in his *notis Gallicis* on *verses* 13 and 14.

¹ David Martin (1639-1721) was a French Reformed Pastor. He produced an annotated French Bible.

§ 3: Who is the Speaker? (Part 2)

But, so that I might return to the question proposed, Interpreters appear to have raised a tempest in a teacup, and to have applied excessive labor in resolving the doubt, where all things appear to me to be altogether plain. Certainly that λέγει, *he says*, or διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*, thus posited absolutely as it occurs here, is to the Apostle a familiar formula for citing the text of the Old Testament, answering to the Hebrews' manner of speech in citing the old Scripture, רמא רכל, *wherefore he says*, רמאנ רכל, *wherefore it is said*: see SURENHUSIUS'¹ Βίβλον καταλλαγῆς on *this passage*. Indeed, as one is able to prove from the inspection of Concordances, in the citation of the words of the Old Testament it is most frequently read with greater fullness, λέγει ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture says*: ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ ἢ λέγουσα, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled, which saith*, John 19:24; καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα γραφή λέγει, *and again another Scripture saith*, John 19:37; τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει, *for what saith the Scripture?* Romans 4:3; λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, *for the Scripture saith*, Romans 10:11; etc.: or, καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει, *as the prophet saith*, Acts 7:48; καὶ αὐτὸς Δαβὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν, *and David himself saith in the Book of Psalms*, Luke 20:42; καὶ Δαβὶδ λέγει, *and David saith*, Romans 11:9; Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει, *for Esaias saith*, Romans 10:16; etc.: καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, *as God hath said*, 2 Corinthians 6:16; λέγει Κύριος, *saith the Lord*, 2 Corinthians 6:17; λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ, *saith the Lord Almighty*, 2 Corinthians 6:18; καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, *as the Holy Ghost saith*, Hebrews 3:7; etc. But elsewhere, especially in the writings of Paul, it occurs simply, λέγει, *he says*, or διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he says*, where to supply the sense one ought to think of the Sacred Scripture, בנותה, ἢ γραφή, which through personification in the placed cited and more frequently elsewhere is said to *speak*, although it is properly *God* or the *Spirit of God* that speaks in Scripture as its principal author; in which manner sometimes indeed from the context this expression is able aptly

¹ Willem Surenhuys (1666-1729) was a Dutch Reformed scholar and Hebraist. He was Professor of Oriental and Greek Languages at Amsterdam (1704-1729).

to be supplied, as in 2 Corinthians 6:2, λέγει γάρ, Καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου, etc., *for he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, etc.*, where from verse 1 in sense ὁ Θεός, *God*, is able to be repeated, συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖξασθαι ὑμᾶς, *we then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.* Λέγει γάρ, *for He saith*, namely, ὁ Θεός, *God*, that God, whose grace we do not want you to have received in vain. Thus in James 4:6, διὸ λέγει, Ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, etc., *wherefore it saith, God resisteth the proud, etc.*; supply ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture*, out of verse 5, ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει, etc., *or do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, etc.* But the method of this sort of supplement of the sense from the immediate context does not fit all places, where the formula of this sort of citation of the ancient Scripture occurs; in § 2 we have already shown this from Ephesians 4:8. And so under that λέγει, *it saith*, ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture*, shall everywhere be understood, which will be said *to speak* as the word of God Himself and of His Spirit κατ' ἐξοχήν, *par excellence*: or let the Hebraism in this formula of speech be noted also, to which it is known that the Writers of the New Testament are not strangers, by which an active Verb of the third person, which does not have a nominative expressly added, bears the sense of a passive, impersonal expression, such that λέγει, *it saith*, is the same as λέγεται, *it is said*, and διὸ λέγει, *wherefore it saith*, is the same as *for what reason, or wherefore, it is said*: when from this familiar formula of citing the sacred Codex it was yet sufficiently well known, that a *saying* of this sort alleged is not to be sought in some out of the way place, but in the γραφῇ θεοπνεύστῳ, *inspired Scripture*, written by Moses and the Prophets. This Hebraism is illustrated with many examples by BUXTORF in his *Thesaurus Grammatico*, book II, chapter X, pages 417, 418; and by GLASSIUS in his *Grammaticis Sacris*, tractate III, canon XXIII, pages 301-304. With respect to the grammatical analogy on the expressions, it is by no means incorrectly observed, that an active verb of this sort, of the third person, without a nominative of agent added, is set down elliptically; and that a present participle of the same root and form is able to be understood to complete the imperfect sense, so that λέγει, *he says*, is the same thing as ὁ λέγων λέγει, *the one saying says*: see FRANCIS STERCK, *Dissertatione theologica inaugurali*, chapter I, § 4-7. But thus the one saying that yet remains an indeterminate subject, which is to be searched out and

defined from the context and use of the expressions; and at the same time *the one saying says* means the same things as an impersonal *it is said*. The more recent French version prefers this, which renders that διὸ λέγει, *wherefore it says, c'est pourquoi il [est] dit, this is why it is said*; which the Reverend MARTIN rightly illustrates, noting, “The Greek, *he says*, in the place of *it is said*, as in Ephesians 4:8; Matthew 19:5; Galatians 3:16; Hebrews 1:6, 7; 4:4; 7:17; and in 1 Peter 2:16, *it contains*, in the place of *it is contained*;¹ for it is common for the Hebrews thus to make use of an active verb in the place of an impersonal verb, as in Genesis 16:14;² Numbers 26:59;³ 1 Samuel 23:22;⁴ 2 Samuel 21:8;⁵ 24:1;⁶ Isaiah 9:6.⁷” But HEINSIUS had already advised us in a similar manner in his *Exercitationibus Sacris* on Ephesians 5:14, “Moreover, that λέγει, *he says*, which precedes, is in the place of λέγεται, *it is said*, or λέγει ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture says*, when the Scripture is cited, which is common among the Hebrews, who everywhere use רמא, *he says*, in the place of נאמר, *it is said*, we have advised in more than one place.”

¹ 1 Peter 2:16: “Wherefore also it is contained (περιέχει, in the Active Voice) in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.”

² Genesis 16:14: “Wherefore the well was called (קרא לביאר, *one calls the well*) Beer-lahai-roi; behold, it is between Kadesh and Bered.”

³ Numbers 26:59: “And the name of Amram’s wife was Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, who was born (ילדה אתה, *whom she bore*) to Levi in Egypt: and she bare unto Amram Aaron and Moses, and Miriam their sister.”

⁴ 1 Samuel 23:22: “Go, I pray you, prepare yet, and know and see his place where his haunt is, and who hath seen him there: for it is told me (אמר אלי, *one saith to me*) that he dealeth very subtilly.”

⁵ 2 Samuel 21:8: “But the king took the two sons of Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, whom she bare unto Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth; and the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she brought up (ילדה, *whom she bare*, or, *who were born*) for Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite...”

⁶ 2 Samuel 24:1: “And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David (ונתח את דוד, *and one moved David*, or, *David was moved*) against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.”

⁷ Isaiah 9:6: “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called (יקראו לו, *and one shall call His name*) Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”

§ 4: Who is the Speaker? (Part 3)

Lest anyone should much hesitate in admitting the observation that I have proposed, it is fitting for me to provide illustration and confirmation of the same by one and another example. We have in Acts 13:35, διὸ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, Οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν, *wherefore he saith also in another, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.* Our Version translates it, *Waarom hy ook in enen anderen [Psalm] zegt, etc., wherefore he also says in another [Psalm], etc.* If that λέγει, *He saith*, is taken actively, and the person speaking is supplied from the immediately preceding context, it is to be understood of God the Father: but the words alleged from Psalm 16:10 ἀναμφισβητήτως/*indisputably* belong, not to God the Father, but the Son Messiah, according to the interpretation of the Apostles; hence these words of Luke are more easily rendered impersonally, *wherefore also it is said or was said*, unless we supply ἡ γραφή λέγει, *the Scripture saith*. An ellipsis of the substantive also obtains in the adjective here occurring ἐν ἑτέρῳ, *in another*, which according to the truth of the matter indeed the DUTCH supplies by the noun ψαλμῶ/*psalm*, which had also preceded in verse 33, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ γέγραπται, *as also in the second psalm it is written*: but the words that had immediately preceded in verse 34 were borrowed, not from the book of *Psalms*, but from Isaiah 55:3; whence perhaps under that ἐν ἑτέρῳ, *in another*, the more common substantive τόπω/*place*, ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ, *in another place*, would be better understood, just as our DUTCH Translators also took the matter in Hebrews 5:6, where in the place of καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, *as also in another he saith*, they have, *Gelijk hy ook in ene andere [plaatse] zegt, as he also in another [place] says*; even if the twin testimonies found in verses 5 and 6 are both fetched from the book of *Psalms*, which nevertheless is not indicated in verse 5, as is otherwise done in Acts 13:33. Similarly in Hebrews 4:5, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, *and in this again*, Our Translators rendered it, *Ende in deze [plaatse] wederom, and in this [place] again*. Indeed, when Paul had related in Luke's Acts 13:34 concerning God the Father, ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, *that He raised Him up*

from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he subjoins, οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι Δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὄσια Δαβὶδ τὰ πιστά, *He said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.* But these words are also in Isaiah 55:3. God the Son the Messiah appears to speak, rather than God the Father; see the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS' *Historiam Exaltationis Christi*, book II, chapter VI, whence it could also be considered, whether it be well-considered to refer that οὕτως εἶρηκεν, *He said on this wise*, and equally also the following λέγει, *He saith*, in verse 35, not so much to God the Father, but either to supply οὕτως εἶρηκεν ἢ γραφῇ, *the Scripture said on this wise*, or to expound the same passively and impersonally, οὕτως εἴρηται, or ἐρρέθη, *it is said on this wise*. In the same manner they judged of the text in Hebrews 4:3, 4, εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἶρηκεν, Ὡς ὡμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, etc., εἶρηκε γὰρ πού περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης οὕτω, Καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεός, etc., *for we which have believed do enter into rest, as He said, As I have sworn in my wrath, etc.: for He spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God said, etc.;* who rendered these words in French, *Suivant ce qui a été dit, etc.: Car il a été dit ainsi en quelque lieu, etc., according to that which had been said, etc.: for it had thus been said in some place, etc.;* where again the Reverend MARTIN has in his *Notis*, "The Greek, *He has said*: but it is a Hebraism in the place of *it is said*." But when it follows in addition in verse 7, πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, σήμερον, ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων, etc., *again, He limiteth a certain day, saying in David, etc.*, when certain words of Psalm 95 are repeated, having already been set forth in Hebrews 3:7 and following, with this preface, διό, καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, *wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, To day if ye will hear His voice, etc.*, I would rather suppose that in the unbroken context that the Holy Spirit is contemplated as speaking again and again, so that under that repeated εἶρηκεν, *He said*, and the following ὀρίζει, *He limiteth*, is understood τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, *the Holy Spirit*, from what precedes.

§ 5: Who is the Speaker? (Part 4)

Moreover, with our text the Pauline pericope in Romans 15:9-12 is able to be compared, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσι, etc. Καὶ πάλιν λέγει, Εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν, Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, etc. Καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει, etc., and that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, etc. And again He saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles, etc. And again, Esaias saith, etc.: in which, when in the first place is a formula of citation, καθὼς γέγραπται, as it is written, and in the fourth place, καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει, and again, Isaiah saith; in the intervening place we have, καὶ πάλιν λέγει, and again He saith, which λέγει, He saith, is to be repeated in sense under the following καὶ πάλιν, and again: now, this λέγει, He saith, posited absolutely after γέγραπται, it is written, is to be supplemented by ἡ γραφή, the Scripture, or is to be expounded by λέγει, He saith, that is, ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, in the Scripture. Not to repeat the text of Ephesians 4:8, in which we saw that that διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith, is not able to be supplied from the immediate context; but it ought necessarily to be explained, wherefore the Scripture saith, or wherefore it is said, namely, by the Holy Spirit in Sacred Scripture: before I turn to other things, the Pauline context of Hebrews 1:6-12 is worthy of notice, ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην λέγει, Καὶ προσκυνήσατωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ. Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα· πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος· ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἢ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός σου, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου. Καί, Σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, Κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται, καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἐλίξεις αὐτούς

καὶ ἀλλαγῆσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι, *And again, when He bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him. And of the angels He saith, Who maketh His angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire: But unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment: And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Four diverse passage of the Old Testament are here adduced by that λέγει, *He saith*, express or understood, namely, Psalm 97:7; 104:4; 45:6, 7; 102:25-27.

We do not, as might be expected, devote any attention to *Socinus*, who denies that the καί/*and* at the beginning of Hebrews 1:10 is to be more sharply divided from the words that follow, and to be held as an indication of a new testimony concerning Christ the Son of God to be cited out of the Old Testament and to be added to those going before: to whom BECMANN¹ responds with fullness, *Exercitationibus Theologicis*, VIII, pages 123-125.

If we wish to supplement this λέγει, *He saith*, out of the antecedent context, it is to be referred to God the Father, unto whom alone squares the expression of those things that occur in *verse 5*, τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων, Υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; Καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν, *for unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? and again, I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to me a Son?* but one may not affirm the same concerning those things that are alleged in *verses 6-12*. And indeed, if we consider those passages in reverse order, in Psalm 102 God, or a divine person, is most certainly not introduced as speaking, but it is most manifestly, as also the Title has it, *a Prayer of the afflicted, or for the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his meditation or complaint before Jehovah.*² Unto that *Jehovah*,

¹ Christian Becmann (1580-1648) was a German Reformed theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Zerbst (1627-1648).

² Psalm 102 (title): “A Prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and

by which name Paul in Hebrews 1 teaches us specifically *God the Son* is indicated, in the words cited by him is directed a speech from a subject of this sort, that in the immediately preceding *verse* 24 he had prefaced this complaint from himself before Him, or he professes that this prayer was to be poured out by himself before Him, *I was saying*, or, *I shall say*, *O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days; thy years are unto every generation!* Which things certainly do not square with God the Father speaking. In the next place, in Psalm 45 the Prophet is introduced as speaking by the Holy Spirit, if you attend to *verse* 1, *my heart is gushing forth a good word; I am going to speak my poems concerning the King; my tongue is the pen of a swift scribe:* in which context, moreover, the speech in this epithalamium¹ is directed both to the King, *verses* 2-9, and to the Queen, *verses* 10 and *following*. But, either the Prophet himself, the author of this Song, is believed to extend in this Psalm unto the praises of Messiah and His spiritual bride, as the words of *verse* 1 most simply and immediately pertain to Him; or he may be thought to represent other persons speaking also; I believe that to accommodate the argument of *verse* 1 to God the Father is certainly going to please very few. But, if in *verse* 1 God the Father is not speaking, it does not appear that He is able to be introduced in *verses* 6 and 7 either as the person speaking, to which neither does the structure of the oration in *verses* 6 and 7 urge us in any way: where Messiah is addressed twice by the Name **אֱלֹהִים** / *Elohim* / *God*; and speech is made in the third person concerning God the Father as *His God*, anointing Him; and not one single word is added that ought to be believed to proceed from God the Father specifically. The situation is no different in Psalm 104, in which God the Father does not meet us as speaking; but rather the Prophet, by his own example going before all the pious, rouses his soul to the praises of God, *verse* 1a, *Bless Jehovah, O my soul*; then turning from his own soul to God, so that he might bear witness before Him, addressed in the second person, to his own piety and most devout veneration, *Jehovah my God, thou art very great; thou art clothed with honor and majesty*, *verse* 1b; in which context, moreover, speaking concerning God in the third person, whether in soliloquy, or to all hearers and readers, *verses* 2-32, he relates in a sublime style Jehovah's magnificent works, both of Creation and of Providence, on account of which He was to be praised eternally: returning to himself in *verses* 33

poureth out his complaint before the Lord (**תפלה לעני כי יעטף ולפני יהוה ישפך**)
 :שׁוֹתֵי.”

¹ That is, a poem celebrating marriage.

and 34, and promising that he is going to persist continually in that to which he had roused his soul, and that he had immediately begun to fulfill in *verse 1*, *I will sing to Jehovah in my life; I will sing a Psalm to my God as long as I shall be. My meditation of Him shall be sweet; I will be glad in Jehovah:* even while to the impious, who are not roused by so many stupendous works of Divinity, so many benefits of benign Providence, to proclaim the praises of God in words and works, in holy zeal and by the prophetic Spirit he gravely threatens and predicts eternal destruction, *verse 35a*, *let sinners be consumed, or sinners shall be consumed, from the earth, and let the wicked be, or the wicked shall be, no more;* and with a clause filled with emotion he reaches deeply to stir his own soul, just as he had done in the exordium of the Psalm, and at the same time each soul, to extol that Jehovah, who has openly manifested Himself in such wonderful and divine works, *verse 35b*, *Bless thou Jehovah, O my soul; praise ye Jah!* From which simple abstract of the argument of this Psalm it is immediately evident that Jehovah the Father is not able to be considered as the person speaking, when for the praise of Jehovah it is related concerning Him in the third person, *verse 4*, *who maketh His angels spirits, His ministers a flaming fire.* In addition, that I might teach this in passing, in Hebrews 1:7, 8, the use of the preposition *πρὸς* is worthy of consideration, *καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει—πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν*, *and of the angels He saith...but to the Son.* And indeed, the words cited in *verses 8 and 9* are directed toward the Messiah, God the Son, by direct address, but what things are repeated out of Psalm 104:4 in *verse 7* it is altogether clear are expressed not *to* the Angels but *concerning* the Angels. Hence, so that *πρὸς*, in these twin expressions so closely connected with each other, might be taken in one and the same sense, since in *verse 7* it is not able to have the more common signification of *to*, the matter is to be set right in one or the other way; for either a comma is to be set before *λέγει*, *He saith*, and the sense is to be arrested after these words, *καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους, πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν*: in which case there is an elliptical expression, to be translated, *and [with respect to] the Angels, but [with respect to] the Son He says:* which would be fully expressed, *καὶ ὅσον μὲν πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους προσήκει, ὅσον δὲ πρὸς τὸν Υἱόν προσήκει*, *as far as the Angels are concerned, as far as the Son is concerned.* Or *πρὸς* in this place shall carry the notion of *περὶ*/*concerning*, and *concerning the angels He saith, but concerning the Son He saith.* Each is able best to be compared with the diction of the Greeks, and also *πρὸς* does thus occur in the

place of $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ /concerning in the New Testament, Luke 20:19:¹ see WOLF'S *Curas philologicas et criticas* on Hebrews 1:7. BEZA also translates *verse 7, And concerning the Angels He saith*; and he adds in his *notis*, “Concerning the Angels, $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. Hebrew: $\text{לָא} / \text{to/ concerning, } \text{לְע} / \text{concerning.}”$ To which things compare what SCHULTENS has on Job 5:8:² *Nothing is more common than for לָא / to/ concerning to be taken for לְע / concerning. Let Job 42:7, 8 suffice, לֹא דִבַּרְתָּם אֵלַי נְכוּנָה, ye have not spoken concerning me the thing that is right. Likewise MARCKIUS, in his Exercitationibus textualibus, Part III, Exercise XV, § 12, on Psalm 2:7:³ ...Others expound לָא / to by לְע / concerning, so that it might be about, or concerning, by comparison with Genesis 20:2;⁴ 2 Kings 19:32;⁵ Job 42:7; Psalm 69:26;⁶ Jeremiah 27:19;⁷ 40:16;⁸ 51:60;⁹ Ezekiel 21:28;¹⁰ etc.: just as also $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma / \text{to}$ is sometimes used in Greek, Hebrews 1:7; 4:13;¹¹ etc. Similarly the Reverend MARTIN translates it, *Car quant aux Anges, il [est]**

¹ Luke 20:19: “And the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against ($\pi\rho\delta\varsigma / \text{concerning}$) them.”

² Job 5:8: “I would seek unto God ($\text{לֹא-לֵא} / \text{ל}$), and unto God ($\text{וְאֵל-לֵא} / \text{הִים}$) would I commit my cause...”

³ Psalm 2:7: “I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me (לֵא), Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”

⁴ Genesis 20:2: “And Abraham said of Sarah (אֵל-עֵרָה) his wife, She is my sister: and Abimelech king of Gerar sent, and took Sarah.”

⁵ 2 Kings 19:32a: “Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king (אֵל-מֶלֶךְ) of Assyria, He shall not come into this city...”

⁶ Psalm 69:26: “For they persecute him whom thou hast smitten; and to the grief (וְאֵל-מְכָאוֹב) of those whom thou hast wounded they talked.”

⁷ Jeremiah 27:19: “For thus saith the Lord of hosts concerning the pillars, and concerning the sea, and concerning the bases, and concerning the residue of the vessels ($\text{וְעַל-הַמִּזְבֵּיִם וְעַל-הַמְּכֻנּוֹת וְעַל-יְתֵר הַכִּלִּים}$) that remain in this city...”

⁸ Jeremiah 40:16: “But Gedaliah the son of Ahikam said unto Johanan the son of Kareah, Thou shalt not do this thing: for thou speakest falsely of Ishmael (אֵל-יִשְׁמָעֵאל).”

⁹ Jeremiah 51:60: “So Jeremiah wrote in a book all the evil that should come upon Babylon, even all these words that are written against Babylon (אֵל-בָּבֶל).”

¹⁰ Ezekiel 21:28a: “And thou, son of man, prophesy and say, Thus saith the Lord God concerning the Ammonites, and concerning their reproach (אֵל-בְּגִי); even say thou, The sword, the sword is drawn...”

¹¹ Hebrews 4:13: “Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do ($\pi\rho\delta\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\nu \eta\mu\iota\nu \acute{\omicron} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$).”

dit. Mais [il est dit] quant au Fils, for, as for the Angels, He says [it is said]...but as for the Son, He says [it is said]. As also DE BEAUSOBRE and LENFANT¹ render it: *Mais à l'égard des Anges, voici comme il en parle: Au lieu qu'il dit, en parlant du Fils, But with regard to the Angels, here is how He speaks: Instead He says, speaking of the Son.* But this is ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ, *in passing.*

From the things just now observed I think that it is now sufficiently evident that, when it is asked concerning the specific person speaking in the passages out of Psalm 104, 45, and 102, cited by Paul, this cannot rightly be said to be God the Father: and so, when that λέγει, *He saith*, of the Apostle with respect to these three passages shall be supplied from what precedes by Θεὸν/*God*, who said, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, etc., *Thou art my Son, etc.*, God the Father is not able to be contemplated as speaking in those passages, except in that most general sense, in which *πάντα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*, *all Scripture is God-breathed*, 2 Timothy 3:16, and *πάσαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατέρας ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*, *in time past God spake to the fathers by the prophets*; which the Apostle in Hebrews 1:1 does indeed oppose *to the speech of God made in these last days ἐν Υἱῷ*, *through the Son*, but understanding the Son *ἔνσαρκον/incarnate*, *Θεάνθρωπον*, *the God-man*, walking about on the earth: while the speech formerly delivered to the Fathers by the Prophets pertains equally to God the Son and God the Father, 1 Peter 3:18-20, *Χριστὸς—θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασί ποτε, ὅτε ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε*, etc., *Christ...being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, etc.* 1 Peter 1:11, *ἐρευνῶντες [προφήται] εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας*, [*the prophets*] *searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory*

¹ Isaac de Beausobre (1659-1738) was a French Protestant Pastor, best known for his *Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*. Jacques L'Enfant (1661-1728) was a French Protestant Theologian and Minister. They worked together to produce a new French translation of the New Testament, with a large introduction and annotations.

that should follow: to which purpose are those things that Paul cites in Hebrews 1 out of Psalm 45, and to which they have regard. Therefore, when *God the Father* in the passages before us is said *to speak* only by means of the inspiration of the Prophets by the Holy Spirit, this does not differ much from the common supplement of the word ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture*, in the verb λέγει, *He/it saith*, or of the interpretation of λέγει by λέγεται, *it is said*, which others perhaps will prefer from the similar use of that λέγει, *He/it saith*, in many passages.

§ 6: Who is the Speaker? (Part 5)

But you may say that the text alleged in the first place from Psalm 97:7 hinders. Since that, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ, and let all the angels of God worship Him, could appear to be a divine mandate of such a sort that no creature would be capable of commanding the good Angels with such authority, in which manner the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS reasons, *Dissertationibus Academicis*, XVIII, § I, “Suddenly by an Apostrophe¹ the speech is turned toward *Elohim*, to whom the Adoration of *Jehovah* as *Lord of the whole earth* is commanded.² Yet notwithstanding the *Person speaking* is also *Jehovah*, God the Father or the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the Prophet in the Spirit heard and wrote this commandment; he did not give it. For, that the Prophets or Apostles as Ministers of God commanded evil Angels in the name of God, is evident from Acts 16:16-18; but it is unheard of to give commandments to Good and Holy Angels, and to exhort them to their duties concerning God. Therefore, God speaks here of God, one Divine Person concerning Another, commanding the Angels as His creatures to worship Him. Which mystery Paul indicates, when concerning God Introducing the Firstborn into the world he says, He said concerning *God the Firstborn*, and the Lord of every creature and of the whole world, *Let all the Angels of God worship Him.*” But, with due reverence for this man kept, I believe that to this commentary an answer is able to be returned, that not incorrectly are the words of the *Psalm* that are treated taken to be an exhortation, whereby the Angels are incited to their proper duty: why this sort of urging of Angels and whatever creatures to ascribe praise, glory, and worship to God would not be befitting every pious man urged by God, I do not think that reasons are able to be alleged; much less, when the contrary practice is also expressly confirmed by examples from Psalm 148 in its entirety; Psalm 103:20-22; so that it is not altogether unheard of for Prophets, as Ministers of God, to exhort Good Angels to their duties concerning God; in which manner they indicate τὸ πρέπον, the propriety, of that matter itself, and demonstrate by their pious wish

¹ That is, an exclamatory passage addressed to a person (usually absent).

² Psalm 97:6, 7: “The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory. Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols: worship him, all ye gods/Elohim (הַשָּׁמַיִם יְהַלְלוּ וְכָל-אֲדָמָה יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לֵאלֹהִים).”

their zeal to advance the glory of God. At the same time, an exhortation of this sort, proceeding from a holy Man urged by the prophetic Spirit and recorded in the Canon, with respect to rational beings, for example, Angels, unto whom it is directed, obtains the force of a precept entirely because of the *θεοπνευστία*/*inspiration*, whereby it was brought forth. And so the argument brought forth by the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS is hardly sufficient to conclude that God the Father ought to be considered properly as the person speaking in Psalm 97:7b. The Most Illustrious ALPHEN, in his *Explicatione analytica* of Psalm 97, pages 117-119, following the torch that he believes the Apostle displays in Hebrews 1:6, thinks that God the Father is introduced as speaking in the prior seven verse of this Psalm, and as discoursing in exalted manner concerning the economic Kingdom of His glorious exalted Son: but he thinks that in the other part of the Psalm the speech is continued by someone that piously reveres Jehovah, the reigning Son, and he then speaks to this very King with a reverent address, *verses* 8 and 9, and exhorts those sharing his faith as subjects of this King to fulfill their holy and joyous duties, and supports their souls with strong consolations, *verses* 10-12. I acknowledge that the layout of the Psalm is thus neatly arranged. But whether a convincing argument for this exegesis occurs in the words of the Apostle in Hebrews 1:6, I doubt: yet unless the Illustrious Interpreter had taken occasion from them, I do not know whether this division of the Psalm would have come to mind. Certainly from what precedes it sufficiently appears, if I am not mistaken, that the same *λέγει*, *He saith*, with the three passages following cited in *verses* 7-12, is not able to be urged with such force that you might conclude from it that God the Father is to be contemplated in them specifically as the person speaking. In the same manner, why might not that *λέγει* in the first place in *verse* 6 be taken similarly in the much more common sense? The argument of Psalm 95, which came just a little before, clearly evinces that sacred hymns are given in which partly men, and partly a Divine Person, speak: indeed, in *verses* 1-7a the reader undoubtedly meets the pious people of God inciting one another to joyous and reverent worship of Jehovah, their God and King: in *verses* 7b-11 a weighty admonition or dehortation from a divine Person, supported with a threat, follows; which divine Person the Apostle taught us to be the Holy Spirit, who sternly calls every one from hardness toward the royal voice of the Messiah, the Son of God, Hebrews 3:7, *διό, καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε,*

etc., *wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, To day if ye will hear His voice, etc.* In the same manner the matter is able to be compared with Psalm 97, so that in that place the Holy Spirit Himself first prophesies through the Prophet concerning the glorious Kingdom of Messiah; and then He supplies the words of this King to His Ministers, by which they might learn in a suitable manner to extol this King, and to admonish and comfort His subjects. Which again in the more common sense explained above at the end of § 5 is indeed able to be attributed to God the Father; nevertheless, others think that even here our attention is not so fixed by the λέγει, *He saith*, of the Apostle upon the first person of the Deity speaking in the Psalm, that they might not also on this verse explain the λέγει by λέγεται, *it is said*, or λέγει ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture saith*: see JAMES CAPPEL¹ in *Biblicis Criticis* on Hebrews 1:5. Let us also attend on this passage, Hebrews 1:6, to the French annotation of the Reverend MARTIN: “[*Il [est] dit, He saith, or it is said*] Greek, *He saith*; as it is not God the Father Himself that speaks in the Psalm from which these words are taken, but the Prophet, as in the other citations of the Psalms that are added in the following verse, it is necessary to supply in all these places, as some versions do, the word *Scripture*, and to translate it, *the Scripture saith*; or to translate it, as we have done, by the impersonal verb, *il est dit, it is said*, in accordance with the style of the Hebrews, as can be seen on the Note on Ephesians 5:14.” This Note we cited at the end of § 3; and from all the things hitherto considered we now conclude that the διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he saith*, in this our passage, Ephesians 5:14, is to be taken as a formula for the citation of the Scripture of the Old Testament; and that the λέγει is best supplied by ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture*, or that the active λέγει is to be taken as the impersonal passive λέγεται, *it is said*. In which opinion we especially agree with the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS in his *Commentario* on this passage, § 77, where you read: *Verse 14, διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith. Grotius: τὸ φῶς, the light, that is, the pious man. And he thinks that they are not the words of Scripture. But it is better that it is a confirmation from the words of Scripture. But also with PISCATOR, whose Scholium on this passage is this: “Λέγει, he/it saith. Namely, ἡ γραφή, the Scripture. There is a similar ellipsis in James 4:6.” Likewise with LE CLERC in his Notis ad Hammondum in Novum Testamentum on Ephesians 5:14: “Διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith. Γραφή/*

¹ James Cappel (1570-1614) was the older brother of Louis Cappel. He was Professor of Hebrew and Theology at the Academy of Sedan.

Scripture is to be understood.” And also with WOLF writing on this passage: Now, while I myself consider which of these diverse opinions is most safely able to be adopted, I deny that those have ever satisfied me that refer the διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith, to the φῶς/light mentioned immediately before, that is, the man filled with divine light, who is wont and ought to make use of this formula for the correction of others. But there is one reason why I am not able to plant my foot here. I see that Paul, elsewhere making use of this formula of exhortation, always goes back to some passage of Scripture. So, for example, Ephesians 4:8, διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith, where he brings forth a passage of a Psalm. And so I am unwilling to draw back from the force and notion of the phrase in this passage either. After he had already also said before that this φράσιν/phrase, διὸ λέγει, wherefore he saith, used by Paul elsewhere, always recalls the reader to some passage of Scripture; and that this is evident from Romans 15:9, 10. In interpreting the verb λέγει, He saith, impersonally by λέγεται, it is said, the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS has also gone before, *Historia Exaltationis Jesu Christi*, book III, chapter IX, § 5, although, being doubtful, he is more hesitant in determining whether by this verb in our text the Scripture of the Old Testament ought to be thought to be alleged, or not. Discoursing in the place cited concerning the text of Psalm 68:18, cited by Paul in Ephesians 4:8, he writes: Moreover, those preceding words of the Psalm Paul cites in such a way that he sets down first, διὸ λέγει, propter quod, wherefore, in the Vulgate, or quapropter/wherefore in Beza, he saith, with the Syriac having here, it was said. Certainly, when the verb λέγει, He saith, is active here without any person speaking added, either the Prophetic Scripture, or God, or the Spirit, or the Prophets who thus spoke in the Scripture by the urging of God, is indeed able not incorrectly to be understood. Which sort of names are sometimes added elsewhere; but I doubt whether it might not be simpler to take that Verb Impersonally, and to render it here passively, it is said, by an obvious Hebraism, comparing 2 Corinthians 6:2; Hebrews 1:7; James 4:6; etc. To which you might best refer the text of Ephesians 5:14 also, διὸ λέγει, Ἐγείραι ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light; in which, nevertheless, others just as here want to understand some agreeable name, if regard is not to be had to τὸ φῶς, or the light, by personification, of which mention was previously made in verse 13. On which passage this also is to be noted, that, while the words adduced there are never found thus, with respect to the whole or to one or the

other member, in the Old Testament, Isaiah 9:2; 26:19; 60:1, 2, which texts are generally wont to be cited here, or in any other place, it is perhaps no less fitting to refer that impersonal expression to the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel thus speaking with Paul continually, as a summary of Evangelical preaching with respect to duty and promise, by comparison with Romans 13:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:6; etc. Into which matter Most Learned Men have gone before, rather than that on account of the general phrase, it is said, they should think here, either concerning some Apocryphal Book, or even of some lost Canonical Book. And let these things suffice as a response to the first Question propounded above.

§ 7: What Are the Sources? (Part 1)

And so I proceed to the *second Question* set forth in § 1, Whence were the words borrowed that occur in this verse? Ἔχομεν βεβαιοτέρων τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων, ἃ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνονται ἐν ἀνυχμῶ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, *We have a more sure prophetic words; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts*, says Peter, 2 Peter 1:19, being about to confirm the Apostolic preaching from the writings of the Prophets; see my *Commentarium* on that passage. Similarly in our text Paul teaches according to the manner customary to the Apostles. For I think that it is sufficiently evident from those things that we have discussed above that by that διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he saith*, at the beginning of the verse we are sent off to the Scripture of the Old Testament. Hence the opinions just now mentioned of those that maintain that these words are either of the man filled with light, or of the Spirit speaking in the regenerate man, or of the Lord now speaking through Paul, or of the preachers of the Gospel under the New Testament, all thus redoubling repeatedly, come together of themselves. Hence likewise are to be rejected the opinions, surveyed and dexterously confuted by WOLF, of those that maintain that the Apostle has alluded to the blowing of the trumpet, which at the beginning of the new year, as they say, was formerly wont to be sounded publicly among the Jews, and especially to the words customarily added by the herald; or of those that hold the three declarations of the Apostle occurring in this verse as three verses of a Song that had customarily been sung piously in the Churches at that time; or of those that say that the word of Christ is here related, with which in the general resurrection He is going to address each and every dead man, by saying, Ἐγείραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead*, to which formula Paul added of himself, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, *and Christ shall give thee light*. Indeed, if our assertion should stand, of which we have little doubt, that διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he saith*, is to be held as a formula for alleging the Sacred Codex of the Old Testament, fail also do those things that are now read in the

books of the Ancients concerning the words of this verse drawn by the Apostle out of some Apocryphal writing, a monument of a bygone age, since they were not finding these things to occur with sufficient clarity in the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. Or now they make them the words of a Prophet or of some Apocryphal writing of the same in general, with JEROME *on this passage*, who, responding to the question, *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead. One may ask, who then is he that says: Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead: or of whose testimony does the Apostle make use?* then subjoins some other things, namely: *But another, as the Apostle would figure a προσωποποιῖαν*, taking on of the character, *of the Holy Spirit, will relate these sayings for an exhortation to repentance. I, according to my own humble ability diligently sifting all the edition of the ancient scriptures, and the very scrolls of the Hebrews, certainly never found this written. Unless perhaps we might say this also: just as formerly the Prophets were speaking in the assembly of the people, thus saith the Lord, and because the Lord hath spoken: so also the Apostle being full of the Holy Spirit, in words that Christ was speaking in him, suddenly erupted and spoke, thus saith the Lord: but in the first place he responds: And indeed he that is content with a simple response will say that he has brought forth these readings in hidden Prophets and those that are called Apocryphal: just as it is manifest that he has done in other places also: not that he would approve the Apocrypha, but so that he might make use of the verses of Aratus,¹ Epimenides,² and Menander³ to confirm those things that he had just set forth. Yet not all things that Aratus, Epimenides, and Menander wrote are holy, simply because he testified that they said something truly. Indeed, FABRICIUS, in his *Codice pseudepigrapho Veteris Testamenti*, chapter CCXVII, pages 1105, 1106, also cites Hippolytus, as if he had also related that the argument of our text was drawn by Paul from the apocryphal writing of some Prophet: yet the words of the Blessed Martyr do not clearly display that, which words are able to be explained of the Canonical writing of some Prophet, as well as of an Apocryphal writing. Now, the words of our text are found in HIPPOLYTUS' *libro de Antichristo*, chapter LXV, and are less dexterously explained by the same of the last Resurrection: Περὶ*

¹ Aratus (c. 315-240 BC) was a Greek didactic poet. He is cited by Paul in Acts 17:28.

² Epimenides (*circa* seventh century BC) was a Greek Seer, Philosopher, and Poet. He is cited by Paul in Titus 1:12.

³ Menander (c. 342-c. 290 BC) was a Greek Comedic Playwright. He is cited by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:33.

μὲν οὖν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν ἁγίων, λέγει Δανιήλ· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν γῆς χώματι ἀναστήσονται· οὗτοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον—Ἡσαΐας λέγει· ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, ὅτι ἡ δρόσος ἡ παρά σου ἴαμα αὐτοῖς ἐστίν. Ὁ Κύριος λέγει· πολλοὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης λέγει· ἔγχειαι ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἐξεγέρθητι ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάσκει σοὶ ὁ Χριστός, *Moreover, concerning the resurrection and the kingdom of the saints, Daniel saith, And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall arise, some to everlasting life.... Isaiah saith, The dead men shall arise, and they that are in their tombs shall awake; for the dew from thee is healing to them. The Lord saith, Many in that day shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. And the prophet saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light:* on which words COMBEFIS, after some other things, ingeniously noted, “Hippolytus also thought that this prophetic saying was seized upon by Paul; whether from the Apocryphal Book just now referenced, or that he thus brought together those things of the genuine Isaiah, Isaiah 60, *Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem, etc.*, and made use of them for the true light, Christ, as the Holy Doctor not improbably perceived.” Or in particular they appeal to the Apocalypse of *Elijah* or some other Apocryphal work of this Prophet with EPIPHANIUS, *adversus Hæreses, book I, tome 3, heresy XLII, opera, tome I, page 372*, where after citing our text he adds: Πόθεν τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ τὸ, διὸ καὶ λέγει, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς δὴλον διαθήκης; τοῦτο δὲ ἐμφέρεται παρὰ τῷ Ἡλίᾳ. πόθεν δὲ ὀρμᾶτο ὁ Ἡλίας; ἀλλὰ εἷς ἦν τῶν Προφητῶν, etc., *Whence then did the Apostle fetch those words, wherefore he saith? Certainly from no other place than the Old Testament. For these things are found in the work of Elijah. But from which company did Elijah emerge? Is he not one of the Prophets? etc.* From which in passing it is evident that GROTIUS wrote erroneously on Ephesians 5:14, and COMBEFIS on the passage of Hippolytus just cited, because EPIPHANIUS is to be numbered among those that think that the words of which we treat were taken by Paul from the Apocryphal writings of *Jeremiah*: whence this *παρόραμα*/oversight arose, FABRICIUS points out in his *Codice apocrypho Novi Testamenti, tome 2, page 524*, in the notes. GEORGE SYNCELLUS is able to have believed that these things are more truly said to have been taken from the apocryphal writings of

Jeremiah; these are SYNCELLUS' words, page 27, Πλὴν καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος σπανίως ἐχρήσατό τισιν ἐξ Ἀποκρύφων χρήσεσιν. ὡς ὅταν φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη ἐπιστολῇ, Ἄ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐδ' οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη. καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἐκ τῶν Ἡλία ἀποκρύφων. καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας, ἐκ τῆς Μωσέως Ἀποκαλύψεως, Οὔτε περιτομὴ τί ἐστίν, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, ἐκ τῶν Ἰερεμίου λεγομένων Ἀποκρύφων, Ἐγειραὶ ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοὶ ὁ Χριστός, *Save that the bless Paul sometimes, although rarely, consulted some passages out of Apocryphal Books: as when he says in the first epistle to the Corinthians, What things eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man. And those things you will find out of the apocryphal works of Elijah. And again in the epistle to the Galatians out of the Apocalypse of Moses, Neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. And in the epistle to the Ephesians, from the Apocryphal sayings of Jeremiah, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light. But both these, and a great many other, Apocryphal writings, that among the Ancients go by the name of one or another Prophet, are destitute of all solid foundation; and they enjoy no greater authority than what is excessively bestowed upon them by credulous men; forged by idle minds in not-so-pious fraud, so that either they might seek patronage for their errors from the name of some lauded man, or have a hiding-place for their ignorance, in which they were thinking some words to be cited in the New Testament, that were not so readily meeting them in the writings of the Old Testament; just as Syncellus was just now alleging those things to have been taken from the Apocryphal Books of Elijah, which the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 2:9 most certainly repeated out of Isaiah 64:4. Which JEROME himself in the passage of Isaiah cited acknowledges, and therefore in that same place he gravely inveighs against the patrons of those Apocryphal works: The paraphrase of this testimony, says he, the Apostle Paul, as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, takes from the authentic books in the Epistle that he writes to the Corinthians: not rendering it word for word, which he altogether disdains to do: but expressing the truth of the sense, of which use is made for that which he wishes to be confirmed. Whence let the delusions of the Apocryphal Books keep silent, which upon occasion of this testimony are carried into the Churches of Christ. Of which it is able truly to be said that the devil lies in wait with the rich in hidden/apocryphal places, so that*

he might slay the innocent, Psalm 10:8. And again in verse 9, He lies in ambush in an hidden/apocryphal place, as a lion in his den: he lies in ambush so that he might catch the poor. For the Ascension of Isaiah and the Apocalypse of Elijah have this testimony. And by this occasion, and many difficulties of this sort, the foolish women of Lusitania¹ have been deceived, heavy laden with sins, who are led by various lusts, always learning, and never arriving at a knowledge of the truth:² so that they might accept the portents of Basilides, Balsamus and Thesaurus, Barbelo and Leusibora,³ and the rest of the names, etc. And doubtlessly in the case of Ephesians 5:14 they would have held Jerome no more favorable to Apocryphal writings, unless we had heard him concede that he, diligently perusing all the editions of the ancient Scriptures, and the very scrolls of the Hebrews, had never and nowhere found this written. Concerning all the Apocryphal writings of this sort FABRICIUS, in his *Præfatione Codicis pseudepigraphi Veteris Testamenti*, rightly wrote, being about to render an account of his plan in publishing the same: "I am not led by fables of this sort, or rather I prove them frauds; but I think that nothing more fitting is able to be done to reject and explode them than that they might be exhibited thus side-by-side for inspection and be exposed to the contempt of all." So then it is not at all strange that those that formerly thought the words of our text to be borrowed from the Apocrypha generally have found no follower among the more recent Writers. But it is fitting that this be the less marveled at, as Interpreters have indicated with greater certainty the words cited by the Apostle in the Canonical Codex of the Old Testament.

¹ Lusitania was a region of the Iberian Peninsula.

² See 2 Timothy 3:6, 7.

³ With the exception of *Thesaurus*, which appears to be a title of a work by Mani, explaining Gnostic cosmology, these appear to be names for divine emanations in Basilidian and Priscillian Gnosticism.

§ 8: What Are the Sources? (Part 2)

Previously we taught that we send the $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, *wherefore he saith*, to Moses and the Prophets, to the Codex of the Old Testament. And we did not see that by a formula of this sort the Apostle was wont to appeal merely to the argument of the Prophetic doctrine in general, but to some certain pericope of the Ancient Scripture and its words. Hence it is all the more displeasing to me, what ZANCHIUS signifies as pleasing him most of all in his *Commentario on this passage*, namely, that the Apostle “has drawn together a summary of the preaching of repentance out of the Prophets, and has comprehended it in this brief sentence, Awake thou that sleepest, etc., that is, leave off sinning and repent, and Christ shall give thee light, that is, Christ shall save thee, and shall give thee eternal life: for in these two parts consists a summary of Prophetic and Apostolic doctrine, namely, by the preaching of repentance let us arise from sins, and by the announcement of the promises concerning the remission of sins and eternal salvation through Christ.” With which the commentary of ARETIUS¹ also agrees completely. But the two poles here appear to be too far distant, than that it might be a satisfactory explanations both for the formula of citing the Ancient Scripture, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, or $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, and for the form of words that in Paul follow in the text; words that sufficiently indicate that the Apostle, not only in the matter that he sets forth, but also in the words and phraseology, directs his attention to one or another place of the Old Testament, which he here desired to cite specifically. But to determine what that passage of the Old Testament might be, to which the Apostle thus appeals, this is the work, this the labor: since we are not able to deny that those things that are mentioned here by Paul nowhere in the Old Codex occur in so many words and syllables in some certain passage. At the same time, the labor will be made much lighter for us in the investigation of this matter, when we will have prefaced one or another observation concerning the citation of the Scripture of the Old Testament in the New. And here it comes to be noted especially, that in citations of this sort the Apostles and Evangelists are not always in the habit of rendering word for word; but,

¹ Benedictus Aretius (1505-1574) was a Swiss scholar and Reformed Theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Bern (1563-1574). He wrote a commentary on the New Testament.

since they, no less than the ancient Prophets, were enjoying the inspiration and infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, they carried those words of the Ancient Scripture, that they knew to be especially accommodated to their uses, into their own context; and in reciting those words they often adjusted them by the same agency, lest the reader wander from the mind of the Spirit, and so that at the same time he might rightly perceive the force of the argument intended by the Evangelist or Apostle. Then, in the same citation of the Ancient Scripture they did not always have only one passage before their eyes, but they had it in mind sometimes to appeal to two or more passages at the same time. Which if one duly observe, with little effort, I think, he shall be able to search out the Prophetic pericope, whereby the Apostle decided to confirm his preceding admonitions in our text. It was fitting that JEROME in his *Commentario on this passage* was mindful of the hermeneutical Canon that we heard him furnish on Isaiah 64:4; namely, sometimes *the Apostle takes up a paraphrase of the ancient testimony, not rendering it word for word, which he altogether disdains to do; but expressing the truth of the sense, of which use is made for that which he wishes to be confirmed.* That this same thing was also taught by CHRYSOSTOM, DANIEL HEINSIUS observes in his *Exercitatione Sacra on this passage*, relating these words of that most holy Father: Ὅτι λέγεται γεγράφθαι, καὶ ὅταν μὴ διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων κείμενα ἢ ἢ ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα μὲν κείμενον ἢ, μὴ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων, *that it is said to have been written, even when it is set down, not through words, but through the very substance: or when the very intention is set down, but not in the very words.* GLASSIUS shall lend much light on this matter, where one, turning through his *Rhetoricam Sacram, tractate II, chapter VII, page 586-594*, may attentively read through and see all things illustrated with examples, only the chief heads of which do we review here. *Testimonies, says he, and prophecies of the Old Testament are cited and set forth in the New, not always according to the letter and individual words, but even often with the words changed for various reasons; so that by those citing the oracles of the Old Testament these things are sometimes done to the words: 1. Subtraction, of those things that seemed to make nothing for the present purpose. 2. Addition, of those things that were able to illustrate the present place. 3. Transposition of words, in which there is no departure from the sense. 4. Change, even indeed, α. of the very words, 1. from a variant reading in the Hebrew text and Septuagint Version, 2. for sake of inference and ἐξηγήσεως/explanation: β. and of the circumstances of the same, which*

sort are, 1. Number, 2. Person, 3. Mood and tense. *But such is sometimes the case, that it is not able to be known with sufficient clarity from what passage of the Old Testament the sentence was taken:* for the confirmation of which matter he adduces our text, *where, says he, some direct us back to Isaiah 60:1, others to Isaiah 26:19, 21, with this epicrisis/comment subjoined: But the former passage squares more completely on account of the similar scope.* Then he adds this Canon: *The Writers of the New Testament are wont to weave two or more cited testimonies into one.* The Reverend MARTIN has applied these rules to our passage in his French *Notis*, advising: “The Apostle has done two things here, which were common to the writers of the New Testament, the one in not subjecting themselves to the very terms of the passages to which they had regard; because, speaking and writing under the direction of the same Spirit that inspired the Prophets, they had no need constantly to stop themselves with the words that the Prophets had used, but it was enough for them to show and develop the sense, as in Matthew 2:23; Hebrews 10:5. And the second in joining several passages together, whatever may be isolated in one Prophet, and in relating them at the same time, as making only one and the same oracle, when the Spirit had had in the one and in the other the same designs.” From this twofold observation the Most Illustrious SURENHUSIUS does not draw back in his Βίβλω Καταλλαγῆς on our text. “There are some of the Fathers,” says he, “that do not think...that this passage was cited from the Prophet Isaiah, since the words of Paul in many things do not agree with the words of the Prophet, except that the words of the former were conflated from diverse passages, not one certain passage. Moreover, we notwithstanding think that the words of the Apostle were taken from the Sacred Books, which we are compelled to affirm for two reasons: of which the first is that the ordinary Formula for the citation of the Sacred Scripture is set down before; the other is that the Method of citation does not differ from other passages, nor from the custom of the ancient Hebrew Theologians.... Now, that Paul’s passage is concise, and inserted with strange words, is of no importance, since the ancient Hebrew Doctors in citing and explaining the Sacred Scriptures were sometimes wont to draw the words into a compendium, and to cite only so many words as were necessary for the scope, and likewise to mix in different words for the greater clarity of the matter, just as it is evident from our theses V, VI, and IV, concerning the Methods of citing and interpreting the Sacred Scriptures.... Whether the Apostle used ἐγείραι/*awake* in the place of ἡγείρω/*arise*, because there

is almost no difference between *to arise* and *to awake*...; or he took this word from a parallel passage, does not matter at all, since both Methods of interpreting the Sacred Scriptures were current among the ancient Theologians of the Hebrews, just as it is evident from our thesis VII, concerning the contraction of several passages into one, and from thesis VIII concerning the substitution of other vocabulary words, and also from XIX and XX concerning the affinity of significations.... Finally, it is to be observed that the Apostle plucks the first word *קִיּוּם*/*arise*, or *awake*, from the Hebrew text, and afterwards interpolates, *ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, *thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead*, passing over the intervening words; in this sense the ancient Theologians of the Hebrews in the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures were saying, *גורין ומוסיפין ודורשין*, *they subtract, they add, and they expound*, just as it is evident from our thesis XI.” It will be worth the effort to consult diligently the individual Theses, to which the Most Illustrious SURENHUSIUS sends his reader, since he gave each of these illustrated and confirmed with multiple examples taken from the New Testament. Formerly the most brilliant luminary of this nascent Academy, FRANCIS JUNIUS, *Parallelis Sacris*, book II, *opera*, tome I, column 1141, 1142, uniquely comparing Isaiah 60:1, 2 with our text, already formerly urged this also, that the text of the Old Codex is often cited by the sacred Amanuenses in the New Testament, not according to the individual words, but according to the sense, and that the same also obtains here. “Many and various, indeed,” says he, “are the words of which Isaiah makes use in that glorious exhortation; but without violence to that the Apostle glanced over the passage, and contracted its argument into a certain summary.... But the words are not the same, one might say; but it does not matter, as long as the sense in both passages is held to be the same: especially since it was the intention of Paul only to glance over the passage and to show his readers that it is worthy of consultation; and to interpret more clearly what things of the prophecies appeared to have been more obscurely spoken at the time, according to the illumination of the Gospel of the glory of Christ. For which reason that saying of Isaiah, *Arise*, is explained a little more fully, saying, *Be awakened thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead*; so that he, displaying to us the drowsiness and death in which we dwell, might more greatly affect us with zeal and conscience of our duty. Now, in the place of those words, *Jehovah shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee*, he substituted that which is the most evident of all, *Christ shall give thee light*. Which

interpretation, to whom it is not evident, neither will Christ even be able to be evident to him.”

§ 9: What Are the Sources? (Part 3)

Fortifying the way in this manner, by degrees we are led to our intended destination. The DUTCH TRANSLATORS in their *Notis* on our text send us to three passages of the Prophet *Isaiah*, with which the Pauline text may be able to be compared. Among these is the pericope that occurs in *Isaiah* 26:19, קִימוּן מִתֵּיבָה נְבִלָתִי? קוֹמִיּוּן הַקִּיצוֹ וְרִנְנוּ שְׂכַנֵּי עֶפְרָר כִּי, טַל אֹרֶת טֶלֶה וְאַרְזֵי רִפְאִים תִּפְּלוּ: *Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise: awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.* From this passage and verse 21 following, *much more than from Isaiah* 60:1, Beza believes that saying of Paul in our text was *drawn; it is strange that this was not attended to by Interpreters.* FAUSTUS SOCINUS in his *Lectionibus Sacris, opera, tome I, page 305*, professes that the same is fixed as his opinion. There is good reason for us now to digress into the exegesis of this prophetic text. Just how greatly learned Men differ on it, their commentaries declare. Consult, in addition to POOLE'S *Synopsin Criticorum*, MICHAELIS' *notas on this passage.* But I agree with those that do not believe this passage is adduced for the sake of proof by the Apostle in our text, although a sort of agreement in expression presents itself in both. Since with the same Interpreters I think that *Isaiah* does not prophesy in the words cited concerning the spiritual Resurrection to be granted to the Church through the rising of Christ with the advent of the new economy; but concerning the bodily Resurrection on the last day, indeed, the universal Resurrection, but anticipated by the faith of the pious alone, when *καίροισι ἀναψύξεως*, *the times of refreshing*,¹ shall begin to dawn upon them, and to them peace and refreshment from all the labors and vexations of this life shall be recompensed; while the impious, by whom they had been continually afflicted and vexed in this world, after they died in their sins, shall never rise either unto the vexation the Church again, or for the enjoyment of eternal and blessed life, by comparison with *verse 14.* Moreover, in *verse 21*, when the Prophet subjoins, *For, behold, Jehovah shall come out of His place, to visit the iniquity of the inhabitant of the earth upon him, etc.;* he prophesies concerning the future Judicial Coming of Jehovah, destructive to the impious, rather than concerning

¹ Acts 3:19.

His Coming, saving to the pious, for their illumination. WALTHER, in his *Harmonia Biblica* on Ephesians 5:14, “Beza asserts that it was fetch from Isaiah 26:19, 21, and it is to be wondered at that this has not been attended to by Interpreters. But it has been set down in the clear light of day that there not a spiritual Resurrection, which happens in this world, but bodily and universal, which will happen at the end of the world.” Do not miss MARCKIUS’ exegetical Analysis on Isaiah 26, which is found in that Most Illustrious Man’s *Exercitationibus textualibus*, Part VI, *Exercitation XIX*, § 18, 19; add SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT’S *Commentarium on this passage*.

§ 10: What Are the Sources? (Part 4)

The other passage collated by the DUTCH TRANSLATORS is that in Isaiah 9:2, which verse immediately coheres with Isaiah 9:1, *for the gloom shall not be thick to him to whom it was a vexation: in the former time He made the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali vile: but in the latter time He honored it, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; upon the inhabitants of the land of the shadow of death light hath shined.* The fulfillment of this prophecy is indicated by *Matthew the Evangelist*, Matthew 4:12-16. Thence it appears that *in this passage* Isaiah prophesies concerning the time of the Advent of Messiah, and the beginning of the new economy; but that this promise has regard most nearly to the Jewish nation, and most especially indeed to that part of the people that was dwelling in Galilee; which, as it was formerly pressed most grievously, and was everywhere held to be vile, even more than Judea and its inhabitants; so it would not be altogether darkened, but the God of Israel would magnify it with a singular honor, even above the other regions of the land of Israel, since He would illuminate this people, sitting in darkness and in the valley of the shadow of death, with a new light and brilliantly flashing splendor. Of course, among the characteristics of the time of the Advent of Messiah this also is able to be enumerated, that manifest and deep *Darkness* occupied just about the entire world, in the idolatry of all Nations; but also in the sects of the Jews and corruptions of the Pharisees and Sadducees: which *Darkness* was at last to be dispelled by the rising of a *Star* out of Jacob,¹ and of *the Sun of Righteousness*² and *Dayspring from on high*:³ see SPANHEIM'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century I, chapter I, § 2, column 518. At that juncture of time Sarah, completely barren, would be a mother, in small number bearing genuine offspring to be placed together with free Isaac. In the external and visible assembly of the Church, the *Darkness* of ignorance would prevail through the removal of the key of knowledge,⁴ and also errors, impiety, misery, and many an image of spiritual death; which would be clearly seen

¹ Numbers 24:17.

² Malachi 4:2.

³ Luke 1:78.

⁴ See Luke 11:52.

especially in Galilee bordering upon the nations, the inhabitants of which thoroughly mixed with the Gentiles. These things would be dispelled by the pleasing *Light* of the fulfillment of the Gospel, and the appearance of Messiah, who Himself, as *the Dayspring from on high*, would publicly proclaim that Gospel in his walking through the land of Israel through several successive years, with the beginning of His preaching being in Galilee: with such success, that hence many were gladdened with the blessed Light of knowledge, holiness, and consolation, by comparison with Luke 1:78, 79: see the *Commentaries* of the Most Illustrious VITRINGA, SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT, and the Reverend HELLENBROEK,¹ *on this passage*. From the argument of this Isaian passage traced in rough outline it is easily demonstrated that, although it comes nearer to the text of which we speak than that other one out of Isaiah 26, of which we just now treated, it differs too much from the Pauline words, than that we might say that the Apostle here sets down his admonition with its subjoined promise as taken from this oracle of *Isaiah*. But, while the Apostle urges his admonition with a promise, *καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*, and *Christ shall give thee light*, we are unwilling to deny that, with the text verily cited by Paul these things that occur in Isaiah 9:1, 2, with respect had to that promise, are therefore able to be compared as parallel for greater confirmation, with the utmost plausibility also from the sentence of the Apostle; especially since the promise is here made *to Galilee of the Nations*, where Jews were not only bordering upon the Gentiles, but also mixed together with Gentiles. But similarly with the promise, whereby Paul commends his admonition set forth from the Ancient Scripture, whatever other prophecies of the Prophets deserve to be consulted as parallels, in which Messiah is promised not only as *the Light*, but especially as *the Light of the Gentiles*, which after the accomplishment of salvation would fall to Messiah for an hereditary possession as the reward of His work; especially Isaiah 42:6, 7, *I Jehovah have called thee in righteousness, that I might hold thine hand: and I, keeping thee, will give thee as a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoner from the prison, those sitting in darkness from the prison house*. Isaiah 49:6, *And He (Jehovah) said, It is too small a thing that thou shouldst be to me a servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; and so I have given thee as a Light to the Gentiles, so that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth*.

¹ Abraham Hellenbroek (1658-1731) was a Dutch Reformed Pastor of the *Nadere Reformatie*.

§ 11: What Are the Sources? (Part 5)

And so remains, as to which Prophetic text properly deserves to be said to be cited by the Apostle, that third one that the DUTCH INTERPRETERS in their *Notis* commend, namely, Isaiah 60:1, to which *verses* 2 and 3 deserve to be added: קוּמִי אֲוִרִי כִּי בָּא אֲנֹרָךְ וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה עָלֶיךָ: זָרַח: כִּי־הִנֵּה הַחֹשֶׁךְ יִכְסֶה־אֶרֶץ וְעֲרַפֵּל לְאֻמִּים וְעָלֶיךָ יִזְרַח יְהוָה וּכְבוֹדוֹ עָלֶיךָ: וְהִלְכוּ גוֹיִם לְאֲנֹרְךָ וּמְלָכִים לְנֹגַהּ זִרְחֹךָ: יִרְאֶה: *Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon thee. For behold! the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but Jehovah shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the nations shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.* The speech is directed to the Church considered under the emblem of the *City of Jehovah*, the antitype of old *Zion* and *Jerusalem*, by which names it is accordingly represented everywhere in the Prophets, and here in this context, Isaiah 59:20; 60:14; whence both the *Septuagint* and *Targum Jonathan* supplement the sense by the word *Jerusalem*: φωτίζου, φωτίζου, Ἰερουσαλήμ, *shine, shine, O Jerusalem*; קוּמִי אֲנֹרָךְ יְרוּשָׁלַם, *arise, shine, O Jerusalem*; to which a joyful day of grace is appointed in the place of the nocturnal darkness that had preceded, but now would vanish by degrees. A weighty exhortation begins the sermon, קוּמִי/arise; which word occurs both where the speech concerning natural sleep, from which one, waking up, arises from the bed, Job 7:4;¹ 24:14;² Psalm 119:62;³ Proverbs 6:9;⁴ 31:15;⁵ Ecclesiastes 12:4;⁶ Jonah 1:6;⁷ and where there is discussion

¹ Job 7:4: “When I lie down, I say, When shall I arise (אָקוּם), and the night be gone? and I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of the day.”

² Job 24:14: “The murderer rising (יָקוּם) with the light killeth the poor and needy, and in the night is as a thief.”

³ Psalm 119:62: “At midnight I will rise (אָקוּם) to give thanks unto thee because of thy righteous judgments.”

⁴ Proverbs 6:9: “How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard? when wilt thou arise (תִּקְוֶם) out of thy sleep?”

⁵ Proverbs 31:15: “She riseth also (וַתִּקְם) while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens.”

⁶ Ecclesiastes 12:4: “And the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low, and he shall rise up (וַיִּקְם) at the voice of the bird, and all the daughters of musick shall be brought low...”

⁷ Jonah 1:6: “So the shipmaster came to him, and said unto him, What

concerning natural death, the brother of sleep, from which one, having been resurrected, arises to take hold of life again, Job 14:12;¹ Psalm 88:10;² Isaiah 26:14,³ 19.⁴ In the place of the Hebrew *אָרַץ*/*arise*, in our text Paul has *ἐγείραι*/*arise*, which verb, *ἐγείρειν*, *ἐγείρεσθαι*, also properly leads us to sleep, from which those that are recalled to wakefulness are said *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *to be awakened*, Romans 13:11, *ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι*, *that now it is high time to awake out of sleep*: but also quite familiarly the same verb is transferred to death and the calling from the same to life, Matthew 11:5, *νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*, *the dead are raised up*, 1 Corinthians 15:35, *πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί*, *how are the dead raised up?*; etc. Mark expressly translates the Hebrew *אָרַץ*/*cumi*/*arise* by the Greek *ἐγείραι*/*arise*, remembering the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus from the dead, Mark 5:41, *λέγει αὐτῇ, Ταλιθά, κουμί· ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειραι*, *He said unto her, Talitha cumi, which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise*. Thus the dead are said *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *to be raised*, says the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS, *Historia Exaltationis Jesu Christi*, book I, chapter I, § 5, *that is, insofar as they, previously in death being without bodily sense and motion, even in comparison with those sleeping most deeply, recalled to life, receive bodily sense and motion, not only within but without, by all which they irrefutably demonstrate that they live*. But now the Apostle by citing the words of the Prophet also explains the same things, and indicates that the word *אָרַץ*/*arise* used metaphorically by Isaiah leads us to this, that the Church, to which the speech is turned, is contemplated by us under this twofold emblem, as that which was dwelling in a state of sleep and at the same time of spiritual death, from which it was obliged *to awake* and *to arise*. And so, in the place of *אָרַץ*/*arise*, he not only has the verb *ἐγείραι*/*arise*, which best answers to it;

meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise (אָרַץ), call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not.”

¹ Job 14:12: “So man lieth down, and riseth not (אָרַץ-לֹא-יָקִים): till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.”

² Psalm 88:10: “Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise (אָרַץ) and praise thee? Selah.”

³ Isaiah 26:14a: “They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise (אָרַץ-לֹא-יָקִים)...”

⁴ Isaiah 26:19: “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise (אָרַץ). Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.”

but in addition he adds for the sake of explication, ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead.*

After this Disputation was publicly defended, the Most Illustrious VRIEMOET communicated with me his own ingenious conjecture concerning the double verb of Isaiah, קִימִי אֲוִרִי, *arise, shine*, expressed by Paul in the words, ἐγείρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead*, but in inverse order: which, while these little pages are being printed, I do not wish to conceal from the reader, but in the very words of that Most Illustrious Man to submit it to the decision of the reader, so that he might judge whether the one, or indeed the other, which I myself set forth in the Disputation, opinion, as approaching most nearly to the truth, is to be adopted. Thus that Most Illustrious Man writes in a most courteous letter sent to me: “It is strange that in the collation of the words of the Apostle with those in Isaiah, that it did not occur to anyone that עוּרִי, *wake up*, is in the closest relationship with אֲוִרִי/*shine*, with a pronunciation conventional especially in the age of the Apostle; by a frequent exchange of the letters א and ע, especially in the Hebræo-Chaldean dialect, concerning which there is something recently in his *Ad Dicta Classica*, pages 324, 325. To which by at least some allusion the Apostle would have regard by his own ἐγείρε/*arise*. But not even I would dare to believe that perhaps this was thus taken so subtly by that holy and θεοπνεύστῳ/*inspired* Man. It is not necessary; when that word אֲוִרִי, *to illuminate, to become illuminated*, as in 1 Samuel 14:29, אֲרוֹ עֵינַי, *mine eyes have been enlightened*, and in *verse 27*, if there the reading is to be taken from the *Qere*, וְתִאֲרָךְ, *and were enlightened*, supporting that punctuation in the textual reading,¹ is able rightly to be explained *of light striking the eyes of one awakened from sleep*. Which also sufficiently agrees with the pericope in Isaiah, both by the conjunction of אֲוִרִי with קִימִי; and by what is next added, and in *verse 2* the mention of *the light first rising*; and finally by the connection with what precedes: for with the גּוֹאֲלִי/*Redeemer* bringing new light to His Zion, and with them returning from their obstinacy in Jacob, Isaiah 59:20, and

¹ 1 Samuel 14:27: “But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath: wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and dipped it in an honeycomb, and put his hand to his mouth; and his eyes were enlightened (Ketib, וְתִאֲרָךְ; Qere, וְתִאֲרָךְ).” The pointing of the Ketib is more consistent with the consonants of the Qere.

with the expectation thus established out of *verse 21* of a perpetual divine covenant; what is more suitable, in this new or continued, Isaiah 60, prophetic sermon, than for the spiritual Zion *to be roused* (even perhaps from some preceding *torpor*) to acknowledge these, their new fortunes? Now, by your leave, I thus refer ἔγειραι/ *arise* to Isaiah's אֲרִי, *be illuminated*, not to his קוּמִי/ *arise*; to which, it seems to me, the following ἀνάστα/*arise* better corresponds: so that the Apostle himself might also more perfectly and distinctly express those things distinguished by two words in Isaiah; with only a slight transposition of phrase made. In this manner, the whole saying of Isaiah 60 would be exactly expressed by the Apostle; neither is it needful to look elsewhere for any pretext.”

This awakening is urged in the Prophet with an eminent promise added: אֲרִי וְקוּמִי יְהוָה וְגִבּוֹר יְהוָה עָלֶיךָ יִנְרָח: *for thy light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon thee*, which with a small alteration, yet making for the illustration of the same, is repeated in *verse 2*, וְעָלֶיךָ יִנְרָח יְהוָה וְגִבּוֹרוֹ עָלֶיךָ יִנְרָאֵה: *but Jehovah shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee*, in which the new *Light* that was going to arise upon the Church is explained of *Jehovah* Himself and *His Glory*. A glorious and brilliant *Light*, which sort belongs to the rising sun, would appear and rise upon the Church through the Coming of *Jehovah*, the Son of God, the Messiah, in flesh; whereby He might satisfy the desire of those awaiting the kingdom of God, and those panting after the consolation of Israel might be filled with spiritual joy and consolation; who Himself would proclaim and offer Salvation and Redemption, which He would acquire by His own covenanted obedience and satisfaction; and, having been perfected in sufferings, would gloriously ascend the throne of the kingdom of His father David; and, with His royal Spirit plentifully poured out upon the people redeemed by Him and to be gathered out of every nation, would imbue the same with spiritual knowledge, true holiness, and unspeakable joy and consolation, in this manner would render the Church more glorious day-by-day, until finally this blessed state is fully consummated in celestial glory. In every which way the *Glory of Jehovah* would be manifested, and all His perfections, gloriously shining in the Son, the Messiah, would be made plainly visible; such that the Messiah Himself, who according to His own divine person is ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, *the brightness of the glory*,¹ of the Father, might deserve to be called the *Glory*

¹ Hebrews 1:3.

of *Jehovah* with the greatest emphasis, by comparison with Isaiah 40:5, וְנִגְלָה כְבוֹד יְהוָה וְרָאוּ כָל-בָּשָׂר יְהוָה כִּי פִי יְהוָה דָּבַר: *and the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it*, as the true antitype of the *Pillar of Cloud and Fire*, in which the Angel of the Covenant was formerly appearing as present with the Israelite people, illuminating and covering His people, showing the way through the desert to them, and terrifying their enemies; which symbolic sign of the presence of the Divine among the camps of the Israelites and over the tabernacle is not rarely marked with the name of יְהוָה, *the glory of the Lord*, also: see *Concionem meam* on Psalm 90:16, in the volume entitled *Gedachtenis, etc.*, pages 459-466, and *Commentarium meum* on 2 Peter, chapter I, pages 670 and following. Thus many ancient Jews explain the text of Isaiah 60 of the Messiah and His appearance, citations of which see in MICHAELIS' *Adnotationibus* on Isaiah 60:1: and, just as the glorious sign of the divine presence in the old Sanctuary among the Jews everywhere goes by the name of שְׁכִינָה / *Shekinah*, which not without reason is thought to lead us to the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, by comparison with John 1:14; Colossians 2:9; so also the paraphrase of JONATHAN of verse 2, in the place of וְעָלְיָךְ יִנְרָה יְהוָה, *but upon thee shall arise Jehovah*, has וּבֵיךְ יִשְׁרֵי שְׁכֵנְתָא דִּי, *but upon thee shall dwell the Shekinah/majesty of the Lord*. The Most Illustrious WESSELIUS relates, and signifies that these things do not displease him, with some evidence added, in *Dissertationibus Sacris Leidensibus, Dissertation III, § 15, pages 106, 107*, "The very most learned Men are of the opinion that this title of *the Glory of the Lord* elsewhere in the Scriptures is frequently bestowed upon the Lord and King of Glory, that is, *the Son of God, the Messiah*, evidently so called, *both* on account of *the Cloud of Glory*, a certain Symbol of His presence among the People; and because He was to be revealed through the Gospel, the Spirit, and judgments, with much demonstration of the Divine Truth, Holiness, Righteousness, Grace, and Power, just like that brightness, which was appearing out of the thick cloud, and sometimes was suddenly erupting from it, Leviticus 9:23, 24. Unto this sense passages are cited, Isaiah 40:5, *and shall be revealed* כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, *the Glory of the Lord*; Isaiah 58:8, כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, *the Glory of the Lord, shall be thy reward*; Isaiah 60:1, 2, *Arise, shine or be illuminated, for thy light is come*, וַיִּכְבְּדוּ יְהוָה, *and the Glory of the Lord, is risen upon thee: For, behold! the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the nations, and upon thee shall arise Jehovah*, וַיִּכְבְּדוּ, *and His Glory, shall be seen upon*

thee, by comparison with Ephesians 5:14, *Wherefore He saith*, that is, the Spirit through Isaiah in the passage cited, *Be awakened thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, and Christ shall give thee light.*” Inasmuch as these things are so, Paul strictly and clearly, and at the same time optimally, expressed the the sense of this Prophetic promise through καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, *and Christ shall give thee light.* Thus the Apostle contracted into a summary what things are found more copiously in the Prophet; with the utmost faithfulness he thence selected what things were serving his purpose, and at the same time briefly expressed the mind of the Prophet, sending the Ephesians back to Isaiah himself, so that from the entire context of the Prophet they might learn additional things that were able to conduce to their spiritual edification. Certainly from the words that occur in the former part of *verse 2, for, behold! darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the nations*, the Ephesians, having been converted from Gentilism, were able to recall their natural state, in which hitherto with all the world of the Heathen they had dwelt; but from which divine mercy had just recently freed them through the preaching of the Gospel, conjoined with the heart-changing grace of the Holy Spirit, by the power of the merits of Christ, who was made perfect in sufferings,¹ such that those that ἦσαν ποτε σκότος, *were sometimes darkness*, now have been made φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, *light in the Lord*, in comparison with Ephesians 5:8. Hence the Apostle, particularly applying the prophetic admonition of *Isaiah* to men of this sort, that had now also been made part of spiritual Zion and Jerusalem, was able to explain that *אֲרִיז*/*arise* with so much greater emphasis, as one making for the awakening from this sleep and death of those that, having been buried and interred, were lying not only in deep sleep but in spiritual death. But, when it next follows in *verse 3, and the nations shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising*; these that drew their ancestry from Heathenism were made so much more powerfully certain that they also were certainly going to have a part in the Light and splendor that was going to shine in the Church, and most joyfully illuminate all its members. That is, the promised rising of the Light would make for the dispelling of the darkness, in which, according to *verse 2*, all Nations, with the Jews alone excepted, had been enveloped until the Advent of Messiah. The collation of the *third verse* also makes it clear that, although *in the beginning of the Chapter* address was rather made

¹ Hebrews 2:10.

to the Church, which sort in the time of the Coming of the Messiah would be among the Jews before the beginning of the Calling of the Gentiles, the Apostle nevertheless was able to set forth this Prophetic oracle to admonish believers of the Gentiles concerning their duty: since the promise set forth in *verses* 1 and 2 is then in *verse* 3 extended to the Gentiles; who, so that they might become sharers in this promise, ought also to comport themselves in a manner worthy of the calling of God; and when these more than the Jews are described in *verse* 2 as covered with thick darkness and dwelling in the darkness night, it also especially belonged to these *to arise* from sleep and death, so that, when the night passed, they might be made sharers in the pleasing Light of the coming day of salvation, and might walk in it as children of the light and of the day. And, while elsewhere the *Bride* with shame shows herself as also *sleeping* sometimes, Song of Songs 5:2, and while the Lord asserts of the Church of Sardis, ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα ἔχει ὅτι ζῆ, καὶ νεκρὸς ἐστὶ, *that it has a name that it is living, and is dead*, Revelation 3:1, on which passages see the *Commentarium* of the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS; will one that duly attends to the spiritual state of the Jewish Church at the time of the coming of Messiah into the world, of which in § 10 a few things have already been said, be amazed that the same, however much the true members of the Church enjoy spiritual life that cannot be lost, is aroused so that *it might arise*, as what was overtaken by sleep and death? As *those sleeping*, whatever *heart might be awake*, in various respects true believers in the Gospel appear to us in the time of Christ's earthly life: the spiritual life of those was everywhere so tenuous and weak, that its vital motions and actions hardly appear, and it appears to be able to be extinguished easily. But much more was the most exact likeness of the deepest sleep and true death appearing in the far greatest part of them, who in the members of the assembly of the visible church at that time were professing the name, and from whom to the design of a gracious election many thousands thereafter through efficacious vocation were also gathered to the living members of the church. Who all accordingly, each agreeably to his spiritual condition, were held *to arise* and *to wake up* from their sleep and death.

§ 12: What Are the Sources? (Part 6)

And since, with the precautions applied that I advised in § 8 are to be observed time and again in the citation of the Old Testament made by the Writers of the New Testament, all things are plain and clear, if we establish that the words of Paul in Ephesians 5:14 were borrowed from *the beginning of chapter of* Isaiah 60; it is not at all strange that Interpreters, many and eminent, turned to this opinion, which affirms that the words of the Apostle in our text were fetched either completely or in the greatest part from the pericope of *Isaiah* just now mentioned. Thus we heard in § 8 FRANCIS JUNIUS pronouncing in his *Parallelis*, whom see at greater length in the place cited by us above; and in *the same place* we saw GLASSIUS agreeing with this. To these are added from the Papists THOMAS AQUINAS, CAJETAN, and ESTIUS.¹ From the Lutherans LUCAS OSIANDER, ABRAHAM CALOVIUS, and MICHAEL WALTHER in his *Harmonia Biblica* on Ephesians 5:14, where he comments in this manner: “Most with Francis Junius think that a finger is pointed to the passage in Isaiah 60:1.... To me also this comes very close to the truth; for, just as the Prophet there exhorts the Church to acknowledge the light of the Gospel, which has arisen upon it, with a thankful heart, and to walk in it; so also Paul exhorts the Ephesians, after they have been illuminated by Evangelical truth, to reject darkness and spiritual sleep, and to walk in that light. Now, although the words in the Prophet sound somewhat different than those cited by the Apostle, nevertheless the sense in both places is clearly the same. For, when the Prophet says, *arise*, Paul expresses that at greater length, and ἕνεκα, *for the sake of*, greater δεινότητος/*forcefulness* thus relates: *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead*, understanding the death of sin, in which men are born, and from which they are roused, when they begin to live piously. When the Prophet writes, *the Glory of Jehovah is risen upon thee*, Paul explains it of *Christ*, concerning whom the Scripture elsewhere

¹ William Estius (1542-1613) labored first as a lecturer on Divinity, then as the Chancellor at Doway. Theologically, he bears the imprint of the modified Augustinianism of Michael Baius. In his commentary writing, as exemplified in his *Commentarii in Sacram Scripturam* and *Commentarii in Epistolas Apostolicas*, he focuses on the literal meaning of the text; and he is widely regarded for his exegetical skill and judgment.

testifies in John 1:9 that *He is the true Light, illuminating every man that cometh* (I would rather read *coming*, referring back to *Light*) *into this world.*” Additionally, JOHANN CHRISTOPH WOLF *on this passage*, of which after the weighing of the various opinions of others this is the epicrisis: “And so I am unwilling to draw back from the force and notion of the phrase *διὸ λέγει*, *wherefore He saith*, even in *this place*, but rather to take part with those that think that the Apostle turned his gaze to Isaiah 60:1. I acknowledge that not so much the words are related here, as the sense is expressed. But this is sufficient, since it is evident that both Paul and the other Sacred Writers have thus done.” Likewise JOHANN GOTTLOB CARPZOV in *Criticis Sacris Veteris Testamenti*, where indeed in *part I, chapter III, § 6*, to objection X against the uncorrupted integrity of the Hebrew Codex of the Old Testament, an objection fetched from passages cited from the Old Testament, which are read differently in the New Testament, among other things he responds, *page 121*: “Finally, in passages that are not clearly found in the Old Testament, and yet are cited in the New, careful attention is to be paid to the formula of citation. For, such things are cited, not as written, but only as expressed by mouth, for example, Matthew 2:23, *ὅπως πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*, *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.* Thus in Ephesians 5:14, *διὸ λέγει*, *wherefore He saith* (that is, the Lord, yet not precisely in the writings of the Old Testament, but now through me, or Christ in the days of His flesh), *ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων*, etc., *awake thou that sleepest, etc.*” But in *part III, contra Pseudocriticam Whistoni, chapter II, § 4*, concerning the fount and seat of the citations from the Old Testament in the New, he observes after other things: “At the same time, a saying cited *κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν*, *according to the wording*, in the Old Testament is nowhere found, but from that it is cited *κατὰ τὸν διάνοιαν*, *according to the sense*, or by consequence also, whence a lacuna or a corruption of the modern codex is not to be argued, but the force of the argument and the divine Logic of the Holy Spirit is to be discerned and elicited; to this regard is paid in Matthew 2:23, *He shall be called a Nazarene*, which is nowhere found in the Prophets *ῥητῶς/verbatim*, etc.: likewise in 1 Timothy 5:18, *the laborer is worthy of his reward*, which words are deduced from the sense of the law in Leviticus 19:13 and Deuteronomy 24:14 and *following*: and in Ephesians 5:14, which words are elicited from the sense of the prophecy in Isaiah 60:1.” And in *part III, contra Pseudocriticam*

Whistoni, chapter II, § 10, where, as an example of a passaged alleged out of the Old Testament in the New, which nevertheless today is altogether missing in the Old Testament, Ephesians 5:14 is cited by *Whiston*, CARPZOV answers in a similar manner on page 869: “Indeed, the entire sense of Isaiah 60:1, 2 is evident, which Paul has ingeniously accommodated to his scope/purpose.” Of Our Men, the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS has: “Διὸ λέγει, *wherefore he saith*. Grotius: τὸ φῶς, *the light*, that is, the pious man. And he thinks that they are not the words of Scripture. But it is more suitable that they be a confirmation from the words of Scripture, but explicated and accommodated. Isaiah 60:1, *Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee*; if we should thus take it simply, the παραίνεσις/*exhortation* will be the twin of that which the Apostles sets forth here.” In a time now passed, DANIEL TOSSANUS, a celebrated Theologian of the Palatinate, had also judged that the words of Paul *in this place* were repeated out of Isaiah 60, in his *Prælectionibus in Epistlam ad Ephesios*: “But even if (says he) Jerome thinks that the saying in verse 14, *Arise thou that sleepest*, is nowhere found in Scripture; yet there is no doubt that he alluded to at least some passage of Scripture, and has interpreted it paraphrastically, as it were: and we happily refer this to that passage in Isaiah 60:1, in which, with the hope of the Savior and Protector of the Church depicted, he exhorts the Church to arise, that is, to raise itself, and to appear in order to acknowledge and enjoy the benefits of Christ when His light will have come, that is, the time of grace and renewal through Christ.” But JOHN PISCATOR of Herborn in his *Analysi* of Ephesians 5 also wrote: “In verse 14 he confirms the instituted exhortation by prophetic testimony; which appears to have been taken, although not verbatim, from Isaiah 60:1, 2.” Among English Interpreters WALTON advises that here a *citation* of the text of Isaiah 60:1, or an *allusion* to the same, obtains. HAMMOND thus παραφράζει/*paraphrases* our verse: “Verse 14: According to the saying of Isaiah the Prophet, Isaiah 60:1, *Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee*. As it is signified that Christianity is the brightest day, as it were, the light and promises of which everyone will long to enjoy; it is fitting that there be a rejection of all dark and hidden lusts, of which men are ashamed in the open light.” From whom LE CLERC does not dissent in his own *Note*: “Διὸ λέγει, *wherefore it/he saith*: γραφή/*Scripture* is to be understood, so that the passage in Isaiah might be indicated, cited paraphrastically in our text; the sense of which, rather than the words, is

cited.” Francis Junius is closely followed by WILLEM SURENHUSIUS in his Βίβλω Καταλλαγῆς, which see. The Reverend DAVID MARTIN thinks that the words were borrowed by the Apostle partly from Isaiah 26:19, and partly from Isaiah 60:1. But again, that this Pauline pericope was fetched only from Isaiah 60:1, in view of the fact it approaches most nearly to the truth, is held by Reverend DINANT in his *Commentario Belgico on Epistola ad Ephesios*.

§ 13: What Are the Sources? (Part 7)

Moreover, I did not will to set before the eyes of the Reader this consensus of the most excellent Interpreters of divers ages and professions, so that by the prejudice of authority I might compel him, as it were, to embrace the opinion that pleases me more than the other: but so that I might show that the reading in Paul occurring in the place that we are treating did not appear to so many most weighty Men so different from the manner received by the Writers of the New Testament of citing the text of the Old Testament *κατὰ τὸν διάνοιαν*, according to the sense, and not so precisely *κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν*, according to the wording, since they judged that the words of the Apostle are easily able to be harmonized with those of *Isaiah*, *Isaiah* 60:1, 2, as alleged by him. But, even if far more and weightier Doctors also should be inclined to this, their footsteps ought to be forsaken, if reasons supplied from the sacred text itself should validly obstruct, so as to prevent us from approving their opinion. So some do indeed think, whom I shall endeavor to answer in a few words, lest, if I shall not have been able to remove their scruples, they should too greatly vex others. 1. No one will hesitate any longer in this, that between the text of *Isaiah* 60:1, 2, and the words of Paul in *Ephesians* 5:14, there is such a great difference that the former is not able to be said to be alleged in the latter passage. For I am confident that this difficulty has already been anticipated and taken away through those things that were observed in § 8, 11, 12. 2. Likewise, through those things that we set forth in § 11, the other objection shall readily vanish, namely, that in *Isaiah* the speech is not directed to the same persons as in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, many of whom were Gentiles, or converted from Gentilism. 3. But it is believed that our opinion is most grievously pressed by the argument taken from the Time with which the prophecy of *Isaiah* 60 lines up; which is judged by many not to have regard to the beginnings of the New Testament, so that it might be able to be applied by the Apostle in due justice to believers then living; but that it is to be referred to the final generations of the New Economy alone, in which opinion COCCEIUS, VITRINGA, and others share. But, α. even if we should support the same interpretation of the *Isaianic* context, we could nevertheless say with the same COCCEIUS in the words cited above in § 12, that the

admonition of Paul in Ephesians 5:14 is taken from the words of Isaiah, but *explicated and accommodated*: while the words of Isaiah *taken simply* contain a *παραινεσις/exhortation, the twin of that which the Apostles sets forth here*. But, β. whence will the most learned Interpreters offer it up as a settled point, that the Spirit of God had regard only to the final period of the New Economy in the grand speech that He speaks through Isaiah in Isaiah 60? There are three things especially from which the patrons of that exegesis attempt to elicit this. a. They say that such magnificent and grand things are here predicted concerning the Church, that the fulfillment of the same according to the whole emphasis of the phrases has not hitherto appeared in the Church, and so is yet to be expected in the future. b. The Interpretation of this vision made by John in Revelation 21 and 22 is added, where he teaches that this new Jerusalem is not going to appear until the end of time, after the destruction of the Beast and Babylon. c. They manifestly think that the same is able to be gathered out of the connection of *chapter 60* with *chapter 59*, in *verse 20* of which Isaiah now prophesies concerning the Conversion of the Jewish Nation, hitherto rejected and delivered to the hardness of an unbelieving heart, a Conversion yet to be expected, according to the infallible exegesis of the Apostle Paul, Romans 11:26.

§ 14: What Are the Sources? (Part 8)

So that I might respond to the proposed difficulties in order:

a. With respect to the *first*, I observe that Isaiah in that sublimer, but especially well-known, prophetic style thus depicts that blessed state of the Church, to be gathered under the New Testament, in this *chapter* 60, so that from the very beginnings of that Economy the fulfillment of this Prophecy in great part was looked for; a fuller exhibition of which we expect day-by-day, but the perfect fulfillment of which, in all details, is rightly said to be reserved for heaven. Compare SCHMIDT and HELLENBROEK on *Isaiah*, and RIDDER'S *Schriftuurlyk Licht*. And so with the words of Isaiah Paul was able best, and according to the sense intended by the Holy Spirit, to stir up and to console the Gentiles to whom he was writing, called out through the Gospel to communion with God and Christ. The Most Illustrious VITRINGA himself, in his *Commentario* on Isaiah 60:1, *tome* 2, *page* 802, asserts: "*There are those, says Jerome, that await in the future all these things that we relate as both to be ACCOMPLISHED IN PART, and to be completely fulfilled, after the first advent of the Savior unto the consummation of the World; they await them in the future, when, with the fullness of the Gentiles coming in, all Israel is to be saved:*¹ *whose opinion is by no means to be despised, since we know that these things are to be fulfilled only spiritually, and not carnally.* He wrote this with complete accuracy, and this is the sense of the most ancient Doctors of the Church. Jerome himself certainly professes that in his own time these things *were* only *fulfilled* IN PART, which I would gladly concede: he was awaiting *perfect fulfillment* in the future." But if the Most Illustrious VITRINGA would gladly concede the argument that Isaiah 60 was fulfilled in part already in the time of Jerome; the prophecies occurring here ought also to have regard, according to the intention of the Spirit, in part to the time preceding the age of Jerome, and so to predict the gathering of the Church of Jews and Gentiles soon after the advent of Messiah.

b. We refer Revelation 21 and 22, not to some glorious state of the militant Church yet to be expected on earth, but in these chapters we believe a vivid delineation of the Church gloriously triumphing in heaven is represented; after the holding of the final, universal Judgment,

¹ Romans 11:25, 26.

and through that the delivery of the enemies of the Church to eternal destruction, which from the very vision exhibited in *chapter 20* John has most clearly described. But if in depicting these things the Apostle John borrowed some phrases from Isaiah, and he is here to be designated as an Interpreter of Isaiah; one may retort that John thus attended to the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah, not begun in this world sooner or later, but final, perfect, and consummate in heaven: as thus many prophecies of the Prophets are fulfilled by parts, in a prior and latter time, partly on earth and partly in heaven, which the Most Illustrious VITRINGA also teaches, when he dwells upon the reconciliation of the text of 2 Peter 3:13 with Isaiah 65:17; 66:22. Let us hear that Most Illustrious Man speaking in his *Commentario* on Isaiah 65:17: “Certainly (says he) I do not deny that Peter among other passages had this, our passage, also before his eyes: but I definitely think that Peter did not take the passage according to the primary Prophetic sense, upon which we are chiefly intent, but according to every sense and emphasis that it is able to be thought to lie hidden in the words of Isaiah (as the Writers of the New Testament also model repeatedly elsewhere): when truly, and I do not deny it, that which he teaches concerning the physical *obliteration of the heavens and the earth* is involved in the Isaianic sentence.” Unto the same purpose the same Illustrious VITRINGA wrote, in his *Observationum Sacrarum*, book IV, chapter XVI, § 23: “I do not deny that those passages of Isaiah, first of all, are to be understood of some Economy or condition of the Church in this world, to be changed into another, better Economy or condition.... But this is to be observed, that Peter, according to the custom received by the Writers of the New Testament, considers the Blessedness of the Church, promised in these passages, in its *τελειώσει/fulfillment*, without which *τελειώσει/fulfillment* that blessedness could not consist, and without respect to which that could not have been promised to the Church in that fullness and abundance of predictions that occur in Isaiah. Evidently all the benefits that God furnishes for the Church in this world to perfect and bring to completion its state will receive their *ἀποτέλεσμα/fulfillment* in that most perfect and consummate state of the Church, which is to be revealed in the last time. Therefore, whatever is promised to the Church in this world with great fullness and majesty of expression, truly it is promised to it with respect to that state of *τελειώσεως/fulfillment*: and in short it appears thus to us, that the Holy Spirit was not going to make use of such full and emphatic expressions in describing those benefits, as He has done in

these *Chapters*, as well as in Isaiah 32; 35; 49; 60; 61, and in many other passages of Prophecies both of the Old and of the New Testaments, unless the Spirit had had regard to this τελείωσις/*fulfillment*. While Peter certainly saw it much more clearly than we now understand that: it is not to be marveled at that he relates this prophecy to the ἀποτέλεσμα/*fulfillment* of that state, to the beginning of which this prophecy is properly to be referred according to the mind of Isaiah.” Thus the Most Illustrious VITRINGA supplies for us what things are able to be given in response to him, when elsewhere in reconciling Isaiah 60 with Revelation 21 and 22, expounded according to our opinion, he hesitates; and at the same time what things are conducive to commend our thoughts just now proposed concerning the sense of Isaiah 60, consult the Most Illustrious MARCKIUS’ *Commentarium in Apocalypsin*, and the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS’ *Præfationem ante Analysin Belgicam Apocalypseos ex Marckii Commentario concinnatam a Reverendo Cornelius van Santvoort*, **** 1-3.

§ 15: What Are the Sources? (Part 9)

c. Finally, with respect to the promise occurring in Isaiah 59:20, :וְהָיָה מִשָּׁעַ בְּיַעֲקֹב נִצָּח וְיָשָׁע בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָצִיחַ יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, *and the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith Jehovah*, to which the Apostle appeals in Romans 11:26, καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται: Ἦξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, *and so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob*; not even does this evince that the argument of the following *chapter*, Isaiah 60, is to be referred only to the last times of the New Testament. Indeed, by some a two-part prophecy is not unskillfully observed here; the former concerning the Advent of the Goel/Redeemer to Zion, for Zion's sake, for the good of Zion, which they expound of the Advent of Messiah in the flesh to procure Redemption: the other, subjoined to the former by the connective and progressive *and*, concerning the bodily Advent of Messiah to apply the procured Redemption especially to those to be converted by His grace among the posterity of Jacob at the end of days: to which latter promise of these words the citation made by Paul is especially to be referred; whence perhaps in the place of יִשְׂרָאֵל, *to Zion*, which the Septuagint rendered ἔνεκεν Σιών, *for Zion's sake*, in the Apostle it is ἐκ Σιών, *from Zion*, upon which see FRANCIS JUNIUS' *Parallela*: unless this come to be attributed to a joining together of more than one prophetic oracle in the Pauline text, as the Most Illustrious VITRINGA supposes in his *Commentario* on *this passage*. But it is also rightly said concerning the sense of this passage, just as we also advised concerning the argument of *chapter 60* in § 14, that the promise occurs here in the greatest fullness, which sends forth a most abundant sense, and which began to be fulfilled in the Advent of the Messiah to the Church through the Incarnation, the purchase of Redemption, and the beginning of the erection of the kingdom promised to the Θεανθρώπου/*God-man*, through which He lured to His saving communion from Israel λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, *a remnant according to the election of grace*, which, says the Apostle, γέγονε καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, *is also at this present time*, Romans 11:5, and which will be able to reckoned finally complete ἐν

τελειώσει, *in fulfillment*, and perfectly, when at the end of days πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, *all Israel shall be saved*, which Paul by his divine wisdom taught us to expect from this prophecy taken in the full extent of its sense. This exegesis is confirmed from a comparison of the *verse* immediately following in Paul, Romans 11:27, καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, *for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins*, in which perhaps the Apostle has regard to several other pericopes of the prophetic Word, but most probably also to Jeremiah 31:33, 34, which promise the Apostle in Hebrews 8:6-13 referred to the renovation of the economy of the Covenant of Grace with the first, personal Advent of Messiah: but he will indicate a further fulfillment of the same at a later time in the yet expected conversion of the Jews, Romans 11:27. Thus WITSIUS, in *Meletematis Leudensiis, Dissertation IX, § 8*, “One and the same prophecy finds its fulfillment in a remarkable variety of times. Thus, what was predicted in Isaiah 59:20, *The Redeemer shall come to Zion and to those converted from defection in Jacob*, began to be fulfilled when Christ, coming in the flesh, brought everlasting righteousness;¹ but it will also be fulfilled in the future, universal conversion of the Jews to Christ, Romans 11:26. So also in Isaiah 65:17, *Behold, I am going to create new heavens and a new earth*, was fulfilled in the renovation of the Church through the preaching of the Gospel and the effusion of the Holy Spirit; but it is also going to be fulfilled on the last day, 2 Peter 3:12, 13. And in Jeremiah 31:31, *Behold, the days are going to come, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah*, began to be fulfilled when with the Old Testament abrogated the New Testament was substituted, Hebrews 8:13; but it shall be fulfilled at a distance, when the house of Israel and the house of Judah conjointly will possess the good things of that covenant, never again to be defrauded of them. And the parable of the gathering of the dispersed bones, and vivification of the dry bones, Ezekiel 37, began to be fulfilled through the leading of the people out of Babylonian captivity; but the consummation of the fulfillment in both advents of Christ:” compare FRANCIS JUNIUS’ *Parallela*; SCHMIDT on *Isaiah*; CALOVIUS’ *Bibliam illustratam* on Romans 11:26, 27; RIDDER’S *Schriftuurlyk Licht*; HELLENBROEK on *Jesaiam, part IV, pages 941-944, 963*; DAVID MARTIN on Romans 11:26, 27; DINANT on Ephesians 5:14, *page m. 146, 147*. It is not

¹ See Daniel 9:24.

agreeable to add more things in response to the Question, Whence the words that occur in Ephesians 5:14 might be borrowed.

§ 16: Who are the “Sleepers”? Who the “Dead”?

I advised in § 1 that it is able to be asked *in the third place*, *Whether in our text by the words ὁ καθεύδων, thou that sleepest, and νεκρῶν, the dead, two different sorts of men are set forth to us?* NICHOLAS DE LYRA does not appear to think so, giving this paraphrase of the text: “*Awake thou that sleepest, in the languor brought on by sin. And arise from the dead, in separating thyself from unbelievers, who are called dead men, Matthew 8, Send ye the dead to bury their dead.*” But in this opinion others are better versed, who assert that the speech in this admonition is uniquely directed to regenerate men, believers, those already made partakers of spiritual life; but who were made drowsy and seized with spiritual lukewarmness and torpor, especially because of their too familiar relations with *the dead*, with ψυχικοῖς, Πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχουσι, *sensual men, not having the Spirit*,¹ to whom they were also rendered very similar: which sort are indeed living, but as *sleepers* shall be roused in the text so that they might *awake*, and, *by arising from the midst of the dead*, separate themselves from their communion. But I do not believe that in the Sacred Books this is the sense of this quite common expression, *arising, resurrection or resuscitation ἐκ or ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, from the dead*. It may indeed be allowed thus to interpret this expression concerning the *resuscitation and resurrection from the midst of the dead*, when it is used of individual men, who are restored to life by divine power through miracle; and especially concerning Christ the Lord Himself (of whom this phraseology is frequently used, see MARCKIUS’ *Historiam Exaltationis Jesu Christi, book I, chapter I, § 5, 6*), who both after the fulfillment of His suretyship was loosed from the chains of death by His Father acting as Judge, and, having tasted death, arose to life by His own ἐξουσία/*authority* and δυνάμει/*power*; while the rest, having died, remained asleep under the power of death. But the same manner of speech presents itself in the Sacred Books concerning the absolutely universal Resuscitation and Resurrection of the dead at the consummation of the ages, Mark 12:25, ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν

¹ Jude 19.

ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε γαμίσκονται, etc., *for when they shall arise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, etc.*; Luke 20:35, οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε ἐγαμίσκονται, *but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage*; Acts 4:2, καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, *that they preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead*. But, since in the last Resurrection on that day absolutely no dead will remain in graves and dust, but all at the same time, the impious and the just, will revive, the ἀνάστασις ἀπὸ or ἐκ νεκρῶν, *resurrection from the dead*, in this case is not able to be explained of the Resurrection *from the midst* of dead men that continue to be such: but it is to be said, either that in this expression a concrete has been posited in the place of an abstraction, νεκροῦς, *dead men*, in the place of θανάτῳ/*death*; or that the expression is elliptical, so that *from the dead* is the same as *from the state or condition of the dead*. Moreover, that this same expression repeated so many times in the New Testament concerning the bodily Resurrection, whether the speech be made of individual persons, or the universal Resurrection, is to be taken everywhere in the same manner, rather than in diverse manners, since it is able to be done agreeably, everyone will readily agree, I suppose: but it will be done, where ἀνάστασις ἀπὸ or ἐκ νεκρῶν, *resurrection from the dead*, is always explained, not of a Resurrection *from the midst of the dead*, but *from the dead*, or *from the state and condition of the dead*. Thus by that added ἀπὸ or ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *from the dead*, the sort of Resurrection, which is able to be various, and both *of the living* and *of the dead*, shall be better determined; to which we are emphatically led by the article repeated in this expression in the passages cited above, Luke 20:35; Acts 4:2, ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν, *the resurrection that is from the dead*. Thus everyone arising ἀπὸ or ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *from the dead*, all the way to the moment of this Resurrection shall be indicated, not only to have dwelt in the fellowship of the dead, but also to have been liable to death, and devoid of that life to which he is returned through the Resurrection; such that concerning all that will rise ἀπὸ or ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *from the dead*, it is able to be said that νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, *the dead are raised up*, Matthew 11:5; Luke 20:37. With marked emphasis Paul thus urges the sort of Christ's Resurrection, which was a Resurrection *from death*, so that he might place the

possibility of a *Resurrection of the dead* beyond all controversy, 1 Corinthians 15:12, εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πῶς λέγουσί τινες ἐν ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, *Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*; Similarly the sort of the Rousing of a son not from the σώματι καὶ μήτρα νενεκρωμένη, *dead body and womb*, of parents, in comparison with Romans 4:19, but from *death itself*, which Abraham did not at all believe exceeded the Divine Power, the Apostle points out in Hebrews 11:19, relating concerning the father of the faithful that λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ Θεός, *he reckoned that God was able to raise him even from the dead*. But it is fair to believe now that this phrase, while it is transferred from its proper signification to another on account of similitude, as it happens in our text, preserves and imitates the character of the expression taken more in the proper and corporal sense: hence ἀνάστασις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *resurrection from the dead*, in this place is also to be explained, not of Resurrection *from the midst of the dead*, but of Rising *from death*, or *from the state or condition of the dead*. And so by καθεύδοντα, *one sleeping*, not another sort of man, indeed one of a far better condition, shall be indicated to us than by νεκροῦς, *the dead*: but, when ὁ καθεύδων, *the one sleeping*, is commanded ἀναστῆναι ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *to arise from the dead*, he is to be contemplated as one that hitherto is dwelling in death or the condition of the dead. In this sense you will best interpret the similar metaphorical expression in Roman 6:13, παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, *yield yourselves unto God, as those alive from the dead*; in Romans 11:15, εἰ γὰρ ἢ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἢ πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν, *For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?*; in which passages the present *life* is opposed to the preceding condition of *death*, which in the same subjects now living had previously obtained; rather than that by νεκροῦς, *the dead*, the past fellowship of these living men might be nakedly indicated. The Most Illustrious MARCKIUS went before us in this observation, *Exercitationibus Miscellaneis, Disputation VII, text IX, page 300*, where you may read: "Nothing is more evident than that the concrete name of *the dead* is commonly put in the place of the abstraction *death*, where resurrection is treated, when it is everywhere read of *rising* or *resurrection from the dead*, ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἐκ

νεκρῶν, Matthew 14:2;¹ 17:9;² 27:64;³ 28:7;⁴ etc. So that you might not object to these and similar passages that, not the state of the dead, but other dead men are signified, from whom by rising one is removed or separated, behold another, when the universal resurrection of all, in which none shall be left in their tomb, is set forth by the same phrase, Mark 12:25, compared with Luke 20:35, and likewise Acts 4:2. Nothing is clearer than that the state of death is indicated in Romans 6:13; 11:15; Ephesians 5:14, *Arise from the dead*. Neither is that expression harsh, since men raised *from the dead* are made alive, and by change of state cease to be dead. Unless you would rather that the expression be elliptical, with the substantive of *state* or *condition* to be understood.”

¹ Matthew 14:2: “And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead (αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν); and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.”

² Matthew 17:9: “And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ).”

³ Matthew 27:64: “Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead (ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν): so the last error shall be worse than the first.”

⁴ Matthew 28:7: “And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead (ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν); and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you.”

§ 17: To Whom Is This Directed?

The fourth ζήτημα/question that I proposed in § 1 is, *Whether the speech here is directed to the regenerate and believing alone; or to the unregenerate, who, in a natural state after the fall, yet lie insensible in their errors and sins in the sleep of spiritual death?* An answer to this question is almost able to be returned from those things that have already been set forth in § 11 for the illustration of the oracle of *Isaiah*, *Isaiah* 60:1-3. That the twofold or repeated admonition of Paul is to be referred to the same class of men, by whom it was to be turned into practice, I think to be sufficiently evident, because the address is made under only one name, ὁ καθεύδων, *thou that sleepest*, to which καθεύδοντι/*sleeper* it is commanded, ἔγειρε καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *awake and arise from the dead*. Moreover, one may observe that a twofold metaphorical expression occurs here, whereby, if we wish to speak properly, the Apostle will exhort to conversion and repentance: it is well-known that the grand duty of the sinner eager for salvation is wont to be set forth in diverse metaphorical expression, borrowed from natural matters quite diverse. But, that Repentance and Conversion are either first, or second and daily: that hence this same duty in the same words is wont to be imposed both on natural men, hitherto destitute of all spiritual life, faith, and practice of good works, who require a change of their entire state and life; and on regenerate believers, but either fallen again into a great sin, or, because of the indwelling remnants of native corruption and the flesh, still often, indeed daily, stumbling and tottering, who hence always have a need to put off and cast away the relics of the old man: novices have learned from the first principles of theological training. Thus both *sleep* and *death* are especially common emblems in the Sacred Books, both of the natural state of misery after the fall, comparing *Romans* 13:11; *1 Thessalonians* 5:6; *Matthew* 8:22; *Ephesians* 2:1; and of spiritual torpor and carnal security in the regenerate, through which these are yet made like unto ψυχικοῖς/*sensual* men externally, comparing *Song of Solomon* 5:2; *Matthew* 25:5; *Revelation* 3:1: just as *sleep* elsewhere comes figuratively for the natural death of the body, comparing *John* 11:11, 13; *1 Corinthians* 11:30, and is able to be used metaphorically in various respects, either for the cessation of natural life

simply (see ÆLIAN'S¹ *Variam Historiam*, book II, chapter XXXV, 'Ὁ Γοργίας ἔφη· Ἦδη με ὁ ὕπνος ἄρχεται παρακατατίθεσθαι τῷ ἀδελφῷ, *Gorgias*² said, *Just now sleep is going to deliver me up to his brother*, and SCHEFFER³ everywhere), or for the welcome peace and refreshment that believers enjoy in death, or for the want of spiritual life and motion and the errors arising thereupon: and both *sleep* and *death* are able to be taken in a spiritual sense more or less intensively, either of a total lack of life and activity, or of the remainders of native corruption and of the very tenuous indications of spiritual life, but through which one, himself ἡμιθανής/*half-dead* and quite similar to the dead, escapes. Moreover, in the same manner the situation holds with the duties that will be prescribed to the sleeping and the dead of this sort, *Awake and rise from the dead*; in which words the Apostle summarily requires that sleepers, with torpor shaken off, show themselves living and eager in fulfilling every good work in a manner agreeable to the welcome day that had begun to dawn upon them; an admonition of which sort again is able to be directed both to natural men and to regenerate and believing men according to the style of Sacred Scripture, each of whom according to that is bound to comport himself in a manner in keeping with his spiritual state, comparing 2 Timothy 2:26; John 5:25 in comparison with John 11:43; Romans 13:11; 1 Corinthians 15:34; Romans 6:13; Revelation 3:2. But I think that now the Apostolic use of this prophetic admonition in our text, which appeared to have been established skillfully and in a manner agreeable to the argument of the Isaianic prophecy in § 11, implies of itself that men, hitherto altogether destitute of spiritual life and devoid of faith and every truly good work, understand the same thing to be said to them in the fullest sense and with the utmost emphasis; but that at the same time true believers, spiritual men, hence learn to walk worthily of their state and vocation, and gather just how disgraceful it is for them to return to their former state of spiritual sleep and death; and so they shake off all torpor and sloth, watch against the weakness and slowness of the flesh, and proceed in subjugating the remnants of native corruption, and in exercising whatever spiritual operations pleasing to God with the greatest alacrity. Neither on that account does any inane tautology, unworthy of the

¹ Claudius Ælianus (c. 175-c. 235) was a Roman rhetorician and teacher.

² Gorgias (c. 485-c. 380 BC) was a Greek Sophist of Leontini, Sicily.

³ Johannes Schefferus (1621-1679) was a Swedish humanist. Schefferus produced notes on some portions of Ælianus's *Variæ Historiæ*.

sacred Writer, obtain here, although the twofold admonition be referred to the same subjects, each in their own way, and exhort to one great duty in the totality of the matter. But the Apostle thus makes use of synonymy or exergasia, a figure well-known to Rhetoricians, and common and a favorite to all the best writers; so that this admonition might sound so much more gravely and eloquently, and under a twofold, diverse metaphor there might depict more elegantly and vividly their miserable native and former state, from which he wishes to turn each one, and their holy and fitting duty, which he is eager to inculcate concerning the same. That to this matter the force of the words $\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\iota$ /*arise* and $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ /*arise* furnished amply opportunity, which are used of the rousing and arising from sleep and death equally, has already been treated in § 11. And that by the emblem of *sleep* conjoined with the state of *death* there is no lessening of the magnitude of native corruption, of the impotence of man in the state of the fall to accomplish spiritual good, and of the divine power requisite for the conversion of man, TRIGLAND warns against the Remonstrants, *Antapologia, chapter XXXI, page 432a*; but, as these things are signified by the emblem of death and of resurrection and vivification from that by the Spirit, so he observes that the emblem of *sleep* especially makes for the detestable *idleness* of man to be converted. CHRYSOSTOM, in *Epistolam ad Ephesios, homily XVIII, page 128, tome II, the edition of Montfaucon*: $\Delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \acute{\omicron}$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$: $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}$: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ $\delta\upsilon\sigma\omega\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\prime\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ $\phi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. $\acute{\A}\lambda\lambda\prime\ \omicron\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu\ \phi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}$: $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\eta}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$: $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$. $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, *Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light: By the sleeper and the dead, he means the man that is in sin; for he both exhales foul odors like the dead, and is inactive like one that is asleep, and like him he sees nothing, but is dreaming and forming illusions. But he is not saying this of unbelievers only, for many believers, no less than unbelievers, are held fast by wickedness; indeed, some far more. Therefore, to these also it is necessary to exclaim, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give*

thee light.

§ 18: How Can the Dead Be Made Mindful to Arise?

Thus briefly we consider this forth difficulty to have been loosed. But from the response to the same just now given a *fifth* Question spontaneously arises, which I enumerated in § 1 as worthy of careful consideration, namely, *In what manner the spiritually dead are able to be made mindful to awake and arise?* I respond, 1. the divine commandments and admonitions are not the measure of our strength, but they show us our appropriate duty, even if we have lost the strength to fulfill it in Adam. 2. In the resurrection of the dead to natural life we find that the Lord everywhere also makes use of His resounding voice, Mark 5:41; Luke 7:14; John 11:43, while nevertheless these dead men, as long as they be such, were in no way able to hear or understand that voice. It is not so strange that the Spirit commands those that were asleep and dead in sins to awake and arise: since these, however they might be without spiritual life and sense, nevertheless enjoy the natural faculty of hearing and understanding. 3. We saw in § 17 by these words not only were the unregenerate made mindful of their duty, but those truly believing also; but the latter were provided with life and spiritual strength in Christ through the Spirit of life, and hence they as second causes are actually able to comply with this divine admonition. 4. Moreover, the unregenerate are either reprobate or chosen unto salvation. With respect to the former, who while this life lasts are ignorant of that, their most miserable state, perhaps with those that have sinned against the Holy Spirit excepted; admonitions of this sort make for their conviction and greater ἀναπολογησίαν/*inexcusability*:¹ while the fault of their impotence does not rest on God; and on the other hand, although they are wont inanely to presume much concerning their own strength, they refuse to yield to divine admonitions, in which manner they aggravate their guilt. Now, with respect to the yet unregenerate elect of God, admonitions of this sort to awake from sleep, to arise from spiritual death, are moral means subservient to the omnipotent grace of God, the Changer of hearts; such that, while God supernaturally and internally, in a completely divine manner of operating, in predetermined

¹ See Romans 1:20; 2:1.

moments grants life and spiritual strength, in comparison with 2 Corinthians 3:5; Ephesians 1:19, 20, He at the same time externally, in a moral manner accommodated to the nature of a rational creature, sets forth to man his duty, displays the comeliness of it, urges it with threats and promises: so that man might know what he must do, and, knowing his natural impotence, might in earnest prayers entreat from God repentance unto life¹ and strength for yielding to all His commandments, and then might make use of the granted strength to submit most willingly to the call of God, and to work out his own salvation, while God is at work in Him both to will and to work for His own good pleasure.² See the *Heidelberg Catechism* IX;³ MARCKIUS' *Compendium Theologiæ*, chapter XV, § 26, chapter XXIII, § 7-9, 11, 12; and the *Præfationem* which I set down before my *Dutch Commentary* on 2 Peter, chapter I. PAREUS on this passage: "Why does He then command, if it is not in our power? Response: So that by commanding He might excite us, and move us to do that which He wills to do in us: and because He wills to bless those obeying the command." CALOVIUS on this passage: "For the rest, the things that are commanded are not therefore able to be done by us and our own strength, simply because they are commanded by God: we certainly gather our obligation from the divine precept; but we are not able certainly to conclude our ability to fulfill it." The observation is quite appropriate, that the divine admonition in the text, turning into ardent prayers, which are in *Novo Testamento Gallico cum Observationibus moralibus*, which are owed to QUESNEL, is subjoined to our text in these words: *But, Lord, does it not belong to thy light to go and seek the idle, who turns away to avoid seeing; to awaken the one that sleeps through the forgetfulness of God and His salvation, and to open his eyes; to resurrect the dead and hardened heart that hates the light; to give him eyes to see it and a willingness to love it? It is unquestionably thine own light that goes before, and prepares the heart in which it intends to dwell. Let this divine light of thine shine in our hearts, that it might work there, and dispel our darkness!* Which prayer depends upon those things that have been asserted in the observations immediately preceding concerning the natural misery and

¹ See Acts 11:18; 2 Corinthians 7:10.

² See Philippians 2:12, 13.

³ Heidelberg Catechism 9: *Doth not God then do injustice to man, by requiring from him in His law, that which he cannot perform?* Not at all; for God made man capable of performing it; but man, by the instigation of the devil, and his own wilful disobedience, deprived himself and all his posterity of those divine gifts.

impotence of man, and which the *Bull* of Clement XI, wont to be called *Unigenitus*, condemned without good cause,¹ *thesis* XLVIII.

¹ Pope Clement XI, born Giovanni Francesco Albani (1649-1721), reigned as Pope from 1700 to 1721. He was a patron of learning and the arts. He issued the Bull *Unigenitus* in 1713 against the Jansenists.

§ 19: What Is the Meaning of the Promise? (Part 1)

We proceed to the *sixth* Question moved in § 1, *What is the meaning of the promise subjoined to the admonition, and Christ shall dawn upon thee? And whether supernatural grace is only going to follow upon the right use of natural gifts?* With respect to the first member of the Question, we do not entertain here one and another variant reading, less suitable, or even inept, which already of old CHRYSOSTOM rejected and JEROME exploded, and concerning which Interpreters everywhere treat. When the Apostle writes, *καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, and Christ shall give thee light*, the sense of this promise is able to be fixed with sufficient confidence from those things that were observed in § 11 on the text of Isaiah 60:1-3, with those things compared that had been prefaced in § 10 for the illustration of the prophecy of the same Prophet, Isaiah 9:1, 2. That is, as the grace and salvation to be brought by Christ alone as the Redeemer and Savior of the world is wont not only to be magnified most brilliantly in the Sacred Scripture in proper words, but also to be commended under various emblems borrowed from whatever matters eminent in excellence, pleasantness, and usefulness: so all saving benefits to be merited by Christ and to be conferred upon the redeemed elect occur here under the emblem of *Illumination*, proceeding from *Christ*, as *the Dayspring from on high, ἀνατολῆ ἐξ ὕψους*, Luke 1:78; *the Sun of Righteousness, under whose wings are spiritual healing and enlargement*, Malachi 4:2; *the true Light that, coming into the world, illuminates whatever man; the Word in whom was life, which life was the Light of men, shining in the darkness*, John 1:9, 4, 5. This *Sun of Righteousness* in His rising would bring a gladsome *day* of grace, whereby the former *darkness* of ignorance, impurity, shame, and terror would be dissipated; and the agreeable *light* of saving wisdom, spiritual healing, divine favor, true holiness, continued enlargement of the new life, the very safest guidance, solid glory, and heavenly joy, would succeed according to the effects and adjuncts proper to Light, especially Solar Light. In the collation of which benefits *Christ* the Mediator would show the efficacy of His Sacerdotal merits, would extend His Prophetic instruction, and at the same time His Royal guidance, government, and liberality; which

prerogatives the elect in Israel had already of old enjoyed, by the retroactive power of the satisfaction and obedience of the promised and coming Mediator: but who, coming into the world through incarnation in a time of the thickest gloom, would in actuality merit these benefits, the distribution of which, extended even to the Gentiles, to whom previously communion in the same had been denied, and would bring light out of darkness, a most welcome day dawning after a terrible night. And from none other than *Christ, the sole Mediator between God and men*, 1 Timothy 2:5; *the way, the truth, and the life, without whom no one comes to the Father*, John 14:6; was this *Illumination* able to be expected and to proceed, who is uniquely qualified as the *Sun of Righteousness* and at the same time is alone sufficient to bless fully the entire world of the elect; just as also the Sun alone is given in nature, illuminating the entire world, warming, vivifying, and benignly nourishing and cherishing all things with its rays.

§ 20: What Is the Meaning of the Promise? (Part 2)

But now, when the text applies this promise *to those awaking from sleep and rising from the dead*, from this it is not gathered that supernatural Grace is only going to follow upon the right use of natural gifts and strength; as if by virtue of these the natural man could be awakened from spiritual torpor and arise from the death of sin. The contrary is taught by the whole Scripture; our National Synod of Dort, closely following the Scripture in this matter, is to be revered in the determination of Articles III and IV controverted between us and the Remonstrants. But, as it is not advantageous to one sleeping, even if the night be past and the day come; and it is at the same time unbecoming, after the sun has a short time ago risen and begun to shine widely in all directions, by snoring to lose the time, and willingly to neglect the immense advantages, which from the shining rays of the sun are otherwise able to return to us: so the Apostle recalls into the memory of the Ephesians the day of grace, which had also begun to dawn upon the Gentiles through Christ, the Light of the world, incarnate in the fullness of time and perfected in sufferings, according to the promises of the Father formerly made to Him; he sets forth to them a *duty* most becoming, being incumbent upon those called through the Gospel; and he renders the same more certain of the *bond* of the fulfillment of this duty with a gracious reward, especially fitting and most excellent, of which reward, on the other hand, they would be destitute, unless they act diligently in fulfilling the preceding admonition. But by no means in this manner is it signified, that the promised Illumination following the ἔγερσιν/*waking* from sleep and resurrection from the dead would be the first gift of grace to be granted to man by the power of the merits of Christ; and in no way is prevenient grace thus excluded, through which those called might fulfill this admonition: while everywhere in Sacred Scripture the beginning of all good in natural man, who is declared to be altogether inept for the fulfillment of it, is traced back to divine grace; the omnipotent, efficacious, insuperable power of which is everywhere declared as preceding in order all cooperation of man in the elect man's regeneration, new creation, vivification, and resurrection from the sleep and death of sin: to which supernatural and divine operation the moral

method of operating, occurring in our text in a manner altogether suited to God's independence and man's dependence, as I already advised above, ought to be subjoined. Compare similar propositions found in the Sacred Codex, Proverbs 8:17; Ezekiel 33:11; Malachi 4:2; James 4:8; Revelation 3:20: and in what manner generally these come to be taken in accordance with sounder Theology, in such a way Pelagianism might gain nothing from them, you will learn from the passages already cited in § 18: see, if you please, MARCKIUS' *Compendium Theologiæ*, chapter XV, § 26, chapter XXIII, § 7, 9. PAREUS on this passage: "It appears that the Apostle makes illumination our work: as if we might at last be illuminated, after we have risen by our own strength from our sins. Such is the Syllogism: To whom now awakened from the sleep of sin Christ at last gives light, those go before grace: But the Apostle attributes that to us: Therefore, the beginning of conversion is of us. RESPONSE: The minor is denied: The Apostle does not give notice about the effect, so that we might reflect upon the cause: as it often happens, that the cause, prior in nature, only becomes known after the effect. Thus illumination by the Holy Spirit is the cause of our conversion, preceding our conversion in nature: but we only learn that we have been illuminated after we have been converted to Christ and have risen from sins. Therefore, the Apostle exhorts that we arise, so that we might see that we are illuminated by Christ. *Second*, even with the minor conceded, it does not follow: The Apostle orders us to arise: Therefore, we are able to arise by our own strength. *Third*, it is not a promise of the beginning of conversion, but of its increase, which does not take away the promise of its beginning, to which Scripture testifies that it is from God alone: *Lord, turn thou me, and I shall be turned.*¹ *Without me my can do nothing*, John 15:5. *No man cometh to me, except the Father draw him*, John 6:44. Therefore, the sense is: Rise, and Christ shall give thee light: that is, more and more, so that thou mightest make progress in true repentance, according to the promise, *Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, etc.*²"

¹ Jeremiah 31:18.

² Matthew 13:12; Mark 4:25; Luke 8:18; 19:26.

§ 21: How Does the Prophecy Serve the Apostle's End?

Finally, it remains to respond in a few words to the *seventh* Question mentioned in § 1, *How does the Apostle, in citing this prophecy, reach the goal that he intends?* tying verse 14 with what precedes by the logical conjunction διό/*wherefore*. In context, Paul addresses believing Ephesians, who *were sometimes darkness, but now were made Light in the Lord*, verse 8. He had instruct these, in verse 11, καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάργοις τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγγετε, *and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them*: and this admonition he had confirmed in verses 12, 13, with arguments sought from the nature of the matter. But now in verse 14 the Apostle cites to them a formula taken from the Prophetic word, whereby they might be able to refute those that were going on to indulge and to serve the unfruitful works of darkness, and to rouse them to better fruit. Likewise, in verse 8 he had admonished the believing Ephesians, who were made Light in the Lord, that by abstaining from fellowship with works of darkness *they should contrariwise walk as children of light, ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε*: and in verses 9 and 10 he had taught them the way in which they might fulfill this. But he also urges this admonition in verse 14 in the words of *Isaiah*, which for those conducting themselves worthily of their state and calling were at the same time creating the hope of an ample and most joyous recompense, of greater *Illumination* to be expected daily *from Christ*; which ought to make each one especially active in painstakingly fulfilling the duty that the text prescribes, in comparison with Psalm 89:15-18; *Isaiah* 58:8; *Ephesians* 1:15-18. But that in this matter the Apostle appeals very suitably to the prophecy of *Isaiah*, *Isaiah* 60:1-3, appears from those things that were discussed in § 11-15: where it was seen that this prophetic pericope also has complete regard to the beginnings of the New Testament; and that in that very place to the Gentiles, hitherto removed from the communion of God and salvation, a portion is particularly and expressly assigned, which at this juncture of time would arise to the Church, to which therefore these Nations were also held to join themselves conformably. Such that another prophecy more suited to his scope, whereby he might

urge the preceding admonitions, the Apostle was hardly able to cite. *Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτα*, and *this indeed is thus*.

On February 11, March 11, and April 5, 1758, in the public defense of this disputation they exercised themselves:

ABRAHAMUS RUYSCHE, *Son of Joh. Wilh., of Batavian Vlaardingen*,¹ now Pastor of the Church of Auxelles.

ADRIANUS VAN ASSENDELFT, *of Batavian Haarlem*,² now Pastor of the Church that is gathered to Christ in country district of *Nieuwenhoorn*.³

ARNOLDUS DUIRCANT, *Dordracenus*, now by the Will of the Great God in the country district of *Ysselmuyden*.

¹ A city in South Holland.

² A city of North Holland.

³ A village in South Holland.

Index

- Abarbanel, Isaac, 271
Abicht, Johann Georg, 351-352
Abram, Nicholas, 71
Adami, Cornelius, 259
Ælianus, Claudius, 709
Alabri (Johannes Arboreus), 493
Alberti, Johannes, 124
Alexandre, Noel, 189
Alting, Heinrich, 116
Alting, Jacob, 174-175
Altmann, Johann Georg, 124
Amama, Sixtinus, 184
Ammonius Saccas, 322
Amphilochius, 29
Andrade, Diogo de Paiva de, 114
Antiochus Epiphanes, 103
Apollonius of Ephesus, 243
Apostolic Canons, 376
Apostolic Constitutions, 376
Appelles, 288
Aquiba, 56
Aquila of Sinope, 186
Aratus, 384
Aretius, Benedictus, 676
Aristobulus of Paneas, 219
Arius, 290, 574
Arnauld, Antoine, 523
Arnobius, 30
Arnoldi, Nicolaus, 81
Arnold, Valentine, 433
Arlotto of Prato, 325
Astruc, Jean, 52
Athanasius, 28
Athenæus of Naucratis, 545
Augsburg Confession, 25
Austro-Sylvius, Petrus Jakobus, 359
Azor, Juan, 493
Bachiene, Willem Albert, 317
Baile, Guillaume, 114
Baille, Robert, 621
Bale, John, 325
Bangius, Thomas, 148
Bannes (Domingo Banez), 162
Baronio, Cesare, 153
Bartolucci, Giulio, 182
Basilides, 471
Basil the Great, 28
Baudart, Willem, 509
Bayle, Pierre, 56
Bechai (Bahya ben Asher), 139
Basnage (Henri Basnage de Beauval), 147
Basnage, Jacques, 286
Becanus, Martinus, 400
Becmann, Christian, 660
Beels, Leonard, 211
Bekker, Balthasar, 405
Bellarmine, Robert, 50
Ben Asher, 182
Bengel, Johann Albrecht, 124
Benjamin of Tudela, 285
Ben Naphtali, 182
Bentley, Richard, 108
Berosus, 545
Bingham, Joseph, 394
Blondel, David, 377
Bochart, Samuel, 415-416
Boerner, Christian Frederick, 506
Bogerman, Johannes, 509
Bolingbroke, Henry St. John of, 110
Bonfrerius, Jacobus, 162
Boniface III, 602
Bonnet, Gijsbert, 97
Bos, Lambert, 127
Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne, 469
Brahe, Jan Jacob, 92
Braun, Johannes, 566
Brenz, Johannes, 114
Brocardo, Jacopo, 540
Broughton, Hugh, 173
Brugensis, Francis Lucas, 585
Bucerus, Gerson, 509

- Bucholtzer, Abraham, 71
 Buddeus, Johann Franz, 25
 Burman, Frans, 625
 Burmann, Pieter, 132
 Burnet, Thomas, 405-406
 Buxtorf, Johann (Sr.), 133
 Buxtorf, Johann (Jr.), 133
 Bynæus, Antonius, 620
 Cabeljauw, Pieter, 521
 Cæcus, Joseph, 502
 Cajetan, Thomas, 194
 Calovius, Abraham, 149
 Cameron, John, 122
 Camisards, 480
 Cano, Melchior, 71
 Canz, Israel Gottlieb, 581
 Cappel, James, 668
 Cappel, Louis, 133-134
 Carafa, Antonio, 209
 Carpocrates of Alexandria, 457
 Carpzov, Johann Benedict II, 213
 Carpzov, Johann Gottlob, 59
 Carranza, Bartolome, 398
 Castalio, Sebastian, 370
 Castell, Edmund, 204
 Castro, Alfonso de, 519
 Cave, William, 53
 Cerdo, 289
 Cerinthus, 244
 Chamier, Daniel, 63
 Chapman, John, 109
 Charron, Pierre, 63
 Chemnitz, Martin, 163
 Chillingworth, William, 121
 Chrysostom, John, 28
 Chubb, Thomas, 109
 Clario, Isidore, 194
 Clement of Alexandria, 27
 Clement of Rome, 153
 Cloppenburg, Johann, 123
 Cocceius, Johannes, 54
 Cocquius, Gisbertus, 77
 Code of Justinian, 139-140
 Collins, Anthony, 105
 Comenius, John Amos, 277
Complutensian Polyglot, 191
 Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 109
 Cosri (Book of), 56
 Coster, Franciscus, 489
 Coton, Pierre, 162
 Crabbe, Pierre, 398
 Crellius, Johannes, 229
 Cremer, Bernard Sebastian, 485
 Crenius, Thomas, 55
 Crocius, Johannes, 484
 Croese, Gerard, 475
 Crusius, Arnold Cornelisz, 509
 Ctesias of Cnidus, 545
 Curtius, 77
 Cyprian, 30
 Cyril of Alexandria, 29
 Cyril of Lucar, 209
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 28
 Daille, Jean, 377
 Damasus I, 157
 Damman, Sebastiaan, 510
 Danæus, Lambert, 217
 Danz, Johann Andreas, 184
 De Beausobre, Isaac, 664
 De Brais, Stephen, 435
Decretum Gelasianum, 400
Decretum Gratiani, 129
 Dematius, Carolus, 510
 Deyling, Salomon, 119
 Didymus the Blind, 325
 Dieu, Louis de, 61
 Dinant, Petrus, 64
 Dio Cassius, 119
 Dio Chrysostom, 545
 Diocletian, 103
 Diodati, Giovanni, 346
 Diodorus Siculus, 96
 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, 119
 Dionysius (Pseudo-), 28
 Dioscorus of Alexandria, 574-575
 Doddridge, Philip, 98
 Dodwell, Henry, 53, 115
 Dooregeest, Engel Arendszoon
 van, 361
 Dorhout, Ambrosius, 301
 Drabicius, Nicholas, 479
 Driedo, Johannes, 162
 Driessen, Antonius, 485
 Drusius, Joannes, 271

- Dupuy, Claude, 323-324
 Duran, Profiat, 273
 Ebionites, 151
 Eck, Johann Maier von, 114
 Eckhard, Heinrich, 282
 Edzardi, Georg Elieser, 629
 Elcesaites, 472
 Elias Levita, 133
 Elsner, Jakob, 101
 Emmius, Ubbo, 510
 Enjedinus, Georgius, 549
 Ens, Johannes, 245
 Epimenides, 384
 Epiphanius, 28
 Episcopus, Simon, 78
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 31
 Espencæus, Claudius, 467
 Essenius, Andreas, 23
 Euchites, 470
 Eugubinus, 192
 Estius, William, 692
 Eusebius, 28
 Euthalius, 323
 Evagrius Scholasticus, 232
 Fabritius, Johann Ludwig, 122
 Faulkelius, Herman, 509
 Faustus of Mileve, 289
 Favorinus of Arelate, 450
 Findlay, Robert, 266
 Forerius, Franciscus, 194
 Forster, Johannes, 173
 Franck, Sebastian, 487
 Frick, Johann, 624
 Fruytier, Jacobus, 90
 Fullenius, Bernard, 510
 Galatinus, Petrus, 167
 Gataker, Thomas, 119
 Gausсен, Etienne, 92
 Geldorpius, Gosuinus, 510
 Gemara, 139
 Genebrard, Gilbert, 173
 Gerdes, Daniel, 98
 Gerhard, John, 187
 Gisbert ab Isendoorn, 86
 Glassius, Solomon, 527
 Godefroy, Jacques, 119
 Gomarus, Franciscus, 11
 Gorgias, 709
 Gousset, Jacques, 219
 Grabe, John Ernest, 52
 Gratian, Johannes, 83
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 28
 Gregory of Nyssa, 28
 Gregory the Great, 31
 Gretser, Jakob, 190
 Grotius, Hugo, 53
 Guzman, Dominic, 128
 Habbema, Johannes, 646
 Habermann, Johann, 184
 Hackspan, Theodoricus, 184
 Harenberg, Johann Christoph, 280
 Hartnack, Daniel, 474
 Hase, Jakob, 187
 Hase, Theodor, 231
 Heclesaites, 289
 Hegesippus, 378
 Heidanus, Abraham, 85
 Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, 56
 Heinsius, Daniel, 225
 Hellenbroek, Abraham, 684
 Helmichius, Werner, 509
 Hesiod, 102
 Heumann, Christoph August, 254
 Hilary, 30, 31
 Hinlopen, Nicolass, 223
 Hippolytus, 27
 Hobbes, Thomas, 70
 Hody, Humphrey, 213
 Hofstede, Petrus, 478
 Hoingius, Jodocus, 509
 Hollenhagen, Jacob Friedrich, 317
 Holtius, Nicolaus, 465
 Hombergk, Johann Friedrich, 465
 Hommius, Festus, 509
 Honert, Jan van den, 85
 Honert, Taco Hajo van den, 217
 Hoornbeeck, Johannes, 11
 Hosius, Stanislaus, 66
 Hospinian, Rudolf, 388
 Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 480
 Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 47-48
 Hottinger, Johann Heinrich III,
 478
 Huber, Marie, 107

- Huber, Ulrich, 92
 Huet, Pierre-Daniel, 58
 Hugo, Hermann, 51
 Hugo of St. Cher, 324
 Hulsius, Antonius, 615
 Hyrcanus, John, 371
 Hyperius, Andreas, 153
 Ibn Ezra, Abraham, 262
 Ignatius, 27
 Iken, Conrad, 231
 Illyricus, Matthæus Flaccius, 282
Index Expurgatorius, 191
 Irenæus, 27
 Isaac, Johannes, 174
 Isaac Nathan ben Kalonymus, 326
 Isidore, 160
 Ittig, Thomas, 620
 Jacob ben Hayyim, 174
 James, Thomas, 196
 Jewel, John, 459
 John of Damascus, 29
 Jonathan ben Uzziel, 350
 Joris, David, 474
 Josephus, 54
 Julian the Apostate, 411
 Julius Africanus, 416
 Junillus Africanus, 277
 Junius, Franciscus, 11
 Justin Martyr, 27
 Justinus, Junianus, 96
 Karaites, 138
 Kettner, Friedrich Ernst, 621
 Kimchi, David, 175
 Kircher, Athanasius, 53
 Knatchbull, Norton, 465
 Kromer, Martin, 488
 Kulenkamp, Gerardus, 362
 Laan, Petrus, 651
 Lactantius, 30
 Lampe, Frederic Adolphus, 70
 Languis, Johannes, 510
 Langton, Stephen, 325
 Larenus, Jodocus, 510
 Lasco, Johannes à, 508
 Laurentius, Jacob, 282
 Le Clerc, Jean, 77
 Leland, John, 104
 Le Long, Isaac, 508
 Lelong, Jacques, 195
 L'Empereur, Constantin, 642
 L'Enfant, Jacques, 664
 Leo I, 314
 Leusden, Johannes, 149
 Leydekker, Melchior, 125
 Lightfoot, John, 87
 Lilienthal, Theodor Christoph, 109
 Limborch, Philip van, 254
 Lindanus, William Damasus, 162
 Livy, 77
 Lomeier, Johannes, 620
 Lubbertus, Sibrandus, 510
 Lucian of Antioch, 185-186
 Lucian of Samosata, 411
 Lulofs, Johannes, 110
 Lundius, Johannes, 236
 Lydius, Jacobus, 259
 Lyra, Nicholas de, 194
 Macedonius I of Constantinople,
 574
 Macrobius, 119
 Maimonides, 269-270
 Major, George, 163
 Manetho, 55
 Manichæism, 124
 Manutius, Aldus Pius, 209
 Marcion, 243
 Marckius, Johannes, 11, 12
 Maresius, Samuel, 73
 Mariana, John, 191
 Marnixius (Philips of Marnix),
 480
 Maronites, 503
 Martin, David, 653
 Marti, Ramón, 262
 Masius, Andrew, 192, 627
 Masorettes, 132
 Maastricht, Gerhard van, 279
 Maastricht, Petrus van, 23
 Maundrell, Henry, 286
 Mayer, Johann Friedrich, 166-167
 Meiboom, Marcus, 164
 Meier, Johannes, 211
 Melito of Sardis, 277
 Melville, Andrew, 122

- Menander, 384
 Menasseh Ben Israel, 543
 Mercerus, John, 150-151
 Messalianians, 470
 Meyer Lodewijk, 565
 Michaelis, Christian Benedict, 147
 Michaelis, Johann David, 72
 Michaelis, Johann Heinrich, 300
 Micron, Martinus, 508
 Mill, David, 234
 Mill, John, 343
 Minucius Felix, 30
 Miranda, Giovanni Pico, 192
 Mishnah, 139
 Molqueren, Douwe Feddriks van,
 362
 Monheim, Johann, 489
 Montanus, Benedict Arias, 162
 Montanus, Petrus, 86
 Morin, Etienne, 620
 Morin, Jean, 162, 202
 Mosheim, Johann Lorenz von, 187
 Moulin, Pierre du, 521
 Muis, Simon de, 162-163
 Muller, Lorenz Joachim, 254
 Munster, Sebastian, 150
 Muntzer, Thomas, 474
 Musculus, Wolfgang, 336
 Musso, Cornelio, 607
 Nazarenes, 267
 Nestorius, 574
 Nicolaitans, 458
 Nieuwentyt, Bernard, 103
 Nieuwland, Pieter, 384
 Nolde, Christian, 641
 Nonnen, Nicolaus, 276
 Nonnus of Panopolis, 624
 Novatian, 247
 Numa, 95
 Œcumenius, 29-30
 Oeder, Georg Ludwig, 276
 Offerhaus, Leonard, 421, 531
 Oleaster (Jerome Olivier), 194
 Optatus, 31
 Origen, 27
 Osiander, Lucas, 282
 Ostorodt, Krzysztof, 369
 Ouseel, Philippus, 132
 Owen, John, 217
 Pagnine, 194
 Pamelius, Jacobus, 489
 Pamphilus of Cæsarea, 208
 Papias, 149-150
 Paracelsus, 474
 Pareus, David, 346
 Pasor, Georgius, 643
 Paul of Burgos, 194
 Paul of Samosata, 574
 Pererius, 164
 Perronius, 162
 Petavius (Denis Petau), 302
 Peter I, 624
 Petit-Didier, Matthieu, 402
 Pfaff, Christoph Matthæus, 85
 Pfeiffer, August, 133
 Philastrius, 31
 Philo of Alexandria, 168
 Photinus, 574
 Photius, 29
 Pictet, Benedict, 112
 Pighius, Albert, 489
 Piscator, John, 303
 Plancius, Petrus, 510
 Pliny the Younger, 96
 Poiret, Pierre, 485
 Polanus, Amandus, 392
 Polanus, Petrus Suavis, 188-189
 Polyander, Johannes, 412
 Polycarp, 308
 Poole, Matthew, 650
 Porphyry, 411
 Potter, John, 331
 Plutarch, 173
 Prideaux, Humphrey, 148
 Pritius, Johann Georg, 232
 Procopius, 52
 Prudentius, 31
 Pyrrhonism, 542
 Pythagoras, 56
 Quadratus, 311
 Quesnel, Pasquier, 522
 Quintilian, 67
 Quintin, Jean, 489
 Rainolds, John, 190

- Rambach, Johann Jakob, 302
 Rau, Sebald, 149
 Reland, Adriaan, 132
 Renesse, Lodewijk Gerardus van, 505
 Revius, Jacobus, 510
 Reyher, Samuel, 634
 Ribera, Francis, 153
 Ridder, Franciscus, 412
 Rivet, Andrew, 77
 Roëll, Hermann Alexaner, 90
 Rolandus, Jacobus, 509
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 111
 Ruffinus, 259-260
 Ruizius (Diego Ruiz de Montoya), 335-336
 Rumpæus, Justus Wesselius, 232
 Saldenus, Guilielmus, 51
 Salmasius, Claudius, 156
 Salmeron, Alfonso, 161
 Salomon Jarchi, 262
 Sanchez, Gasper, 355-356
 Scaliger, Josephus, 53
 Schaaf, Karl, 505
 Scharpius, Johannes, 412
 Schefferus, Johannes, 709
 Schickard, Wilhelm, 184
 Schiyn, Herman, 361
 Schlichting, Jonas, 229
 Schmidt, Erasmus, 122
 Schmidt, Johann Lorenz, 565
 Schmidt, Sebastian, 61
 Schultens, Albert, 62
 Schwenckfeld, Caspar, 473
 Scultetus, Abraham, 376
Seder Olam Zuta, 210-211
 Selden, John, 158
 Semler, Johann Salomo, 276
 Serarius, Nicholas, 189
 Severians, 471
 Severus of Antioch, 623
 Sibelius, Caspar, 510
 Simonians, 288
 Simon, Richard, 77
 Sixtus Senensis, 162
 Smalcus, Valentinus, 229
 Socinus, Faustus, 81
 Sozzini, Lelio, 72-73
 Spanheim, Ezekiel, 148
 Spanheim, Frederic (the Younger), 24
 Spinoza, Baruch, 77
 Stapfer, John Frederick, 64-65
 Stephanus, Henricus, 127
 Stapleton, Thomas, 125
 Stock, Christian, 640
 Stosch, Ferdinand, 346
 Strauch, Ægidius, 55
 Suarez, Francisco, 190
 Suetonius, 96
 Suicer, John Casper, 121
 Suidas, 185
 Surenhuys, Willem, 654
 Sutor, Petrus, 192
 Symmachus, 186
 Syncellus, George, 53
 Tacitus, 96
 Targum Jerusalem, 350
 Tatian, 288
 Teekmannus, Arnoldus, 510
 Tertullian, 30
 Thaumaturgus, Gregory, 477
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 322
 Theodoret, 29
 Theodotion, 186
 Theophilus of Antioch, 243
 Tiberius, 157
 Tilenus, Daniel, 86
 Tindal, Matthew, 105
 Tirinus, James, 73
 Toland, John, 109
 Torniellus, Augustine, 331
 Tossanus, Daniel, 153
 Tremellius, John Immanuel, 275
 Trigland, Jacobus (the Elder), 52
 Trigland, Jacobus (the Younger), 187
 Trotz, Christianus Henricus, 51
 Turretin, Francis, 66
 Twells, Leonard, 245
 Ussher, James, 417
 Uytenhove, Jan, 508
 Valentia, Gregorius de, 189
 Valentinus, 289

- Valerinaus Magnus, 557
Valle, Pietro della, 286
Van Aalst, Gerardus, 434
Van Alphen, Hieronymus Simons,
317
Van der Waeyen, Johannes, 434
Van Irhoven, Willem, 597
Venema, Herman, 299
Verbrugge, Otho, 131
Victorinus, Gaius Marius, 248
Victor of Tunnuna, 108
Vincent of Lerins, 605
Vitranga, Campegius (Sr.), 51
Vlaming, Philippe, 523
Voetius, Gisbertus, 73
Voget, Albertus, 474
Voisin, Joseph de, 262-263
Volkel, Johans, 163-164
Vossius, Gerhard Johann, 51
Vossius, Isaac, 164
Vriemoet, Emo Lucius, 47
Vries, Gerardus de, 25
Walæus, Antonius, 11
Walch, Johann Georg, 165
Walther, Michael, 412
Walton, Brian, 203
Weems, John, 219
Weigel, Valentin, 473
Weismann, Christian Eberhard,
473
Wendelin, Marcus Friedrich, 564
Werenfels, Samuel, 87-88
Wesseling, Petrus, 108
Wesselius, Johannes, 11
Wettstein, Johann Jakob, 623
Wettstein, Johann Rudolf, 258
Whiston, William, 167-168
Whitaker, William, 126
Whitby, Daniel, 343
Widmannstetter, Johann Albrecht,
504
Widmarius, Abdias, 510
Wilhelmus, Wilhelmus, 348
Witsius, Hermann, 11
Wittich, Christoph, 405
Wolf, Johann Christoph, 56
Worger, Franz, 620
Wowern, Johann von, 186
Ximenez, Francisco, 191
Zanchi, Girolamo, 153
Zeibich, Christoph Heinrich, 620
Zeltner, Gustav Georg, 621
Zorn, Peter, 608