

https://www.google.com/books/edition/Theses_de_Sacra_Scriptura_contra_Robertu/6CpKAAA_AcAAJ?hl=en

Thesis on Sacred Scripture, Against Robert Bellarmine

TO THE PREFECTS, OWED BY ME WITH PROPER SUBJECTION AND OBEDIENCE TO MY FELLOW CITIZENS TO BE REVERED. GREETINGS.

IT HAS NOT LONG SINCE ENTERED MY MIND, Fathers of the fatherland, my honored Lords, that it is shameful and unworthy for a man blessed with very many and great benefactions, being mindful of merits, not to give thanks with a grateful spirit. Whence for many reasons by no means trivial I have been led, unless I should have a most hardened mouth and a spirit far most ungrateful, to consecrate to Your Amplitudes the dissertation on the principles of Christian doctrines, undertaken by the authority and advice of the Magnificent Rector, the Reverend and Most Illustrious Man, Mr. STEPHEN GERLACH, a most celebrated Doctor of Sacred Theology, and also of the Reverend and Most Illustrious Man, Mr. JOHN GEORGE SIGWART, an excellent Doctor of Sacred Theology, the Inspectors and my Preceptors to be honored in the highest degree, and subjected to the criticism of the Theological Faculty, and by no means could I bring it before others, however eminent in every kind of Nobility, apart from you.

I have briefly comprehended it, as far as could be done, imitating Timanthes, who used to conceal with a veil what he was unable to express with his brush. Wherefore I humbly request that you may deign both to kindly retain and preserve toward me your favorable acknowledgment of the salutation of the letter, and the signification of a grateful mind, and a fatherly warmth of affection (with which you have hitherto abundantly nourished the minds and talents of many). May Almighty God in his goodness guard to the end of life the excellent and divine mind which he has bestowed upon Your Amplitudes. Farewell.

Tübingen, the 18th of November, 1597.

On Sacred Scripture.

THESIS I

NEARLY ALL AFFIRM WITH ONE VOICE THAT OUR SAVIOR HAS THREE OFFICES: THE PROPHETIC, THE PRIESTLY, AND THE KINGLY. For as King he protects and governs his own, powerfully ruling even in the midst of enemies; as Priest he prays and offers himself as a most acceptable holocaust to God; as Prophet he foretells and teaches the way to salvation.

2. But there is not one judgment of all as to how he teaches men and leads them to the knowledge of eternal life.

3. We attribute this honor to the canonical books of Sacred Scripture alone, just as Augustine says in his letter to Jerome.

4. The canonical books are those which, without any contradiction, have been recognized and approved as divine by the testimony of the true churches, and which the tradition of the people of God in the Church has handed down to our times. (Canonical Books)

5. Moreover, they are called canonical because they are the most exact rule according to which all other sayings and writings are freely to be judged and examined, embracing those agreeing with it, but rejecting those disagreeing.

6. The canonical books of the Old Testament are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, the book of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, two of Samuel, two of Kings, two of Chronicles, two of Ezra, Esther, Job, the Psalter, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

7. The canonical books of the New Testament are: the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul - one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon, the first Epistle of Peter, one of John.

8. Then there are also the Apocryphal books, about some of whose authors or authority there was doubt in the ancient Church; Cyprian called them Ecclesiastical, which were read in the churches, but were not put forth to confirm the authority of the faith from them. (Cyprian in expof, symb)

9. Afterwards it happened that those now called Ecclesiastical were at one time also called Canonical.

10. However, we will notice the homonymy, if we distinguish the canonical. For it can be called canonical what is read in the Church as a canon of morals. Again, that also is canonical which is the canon and rule of the Christian faith.

11. Cardinal Cajetan and the Prefator to the Ordinary Gloss have noted this distinction.

"There are many," says the Prefator of the Ordinary Gloss, "who, because they do not devote much effort to Sacred Scripture, think that all the books contained in the Bible are to be revered and adored with equal veneration; not knowing how to distinguish between the canonical and non-canonical books, which the Hebrews reckon among the Apocrypha. Whence they often appear ridiculous before the learned [note that those who counted these books among the Canonical were considered ridiculous and unlearned] and they are disturbed and scandalized when they hear that someone does not follow with equal veneration something that is read in the Bible. Therefore here we have distinguished and separately enumerated first the canonical books, and afterwards the non-canonical; among which there is as much difference as between the certain and the doubtful. For the canonical were composed with the Holy Spirit dictating; but

about the non-canonical or Apocryphal, it is not known, he says, at what time or by what authors they were published: because, however, they are very good and useful, etc., the Church therefore reads them and permits the faithful to read them for devotion and moral instruction: yet their authority is not considered adequate for proving those things which come into doubt or into contention, and for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas, as Jerome says in his Prologue on Judith." Thus far the Prefator.

13. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament are: The Prayer of Manasseh, 3 and 4 Ezra, Tobit, Judith, the Additions to Esther, Psalm 151 (which Athanasius mentions in his Synopsis), the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the Additions to Daniel, the Books of Maccabees.

14. Of the New Testament: the Epistle to the Hebrews, of James, of Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Apocalypse.

15. Finally, there are also the Spurious books, which are called adulterated, such as the Gospels of Peter, Nicodemus, Bartholomew, Thomas, James, Enoch, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle to the Laodiceans - which Epiphanius testifies is spurious, as does the Second Nicene Council, Act 6.

16. Bellarmine, in order to prove that the Apocryphal books are canonical, adduces the Third Council of Carthage, the Council of Trent, likewise Pope Innocent, Gelasius, Augustine, Isidore, Cassiodorus, Rabanus, etc. together. He contends that the Church does not have the power of making a non-canonical book canonical, but only has the power to discern the canonical books from those which are not canonical. (Bellarmine on the word of God 1.1.c. 4. go to I.1.c.10.)

17. But the Jesuit's speech is suspect. For if he means that the Church has the power to distinguish the non-canonical books from the canonical, and that on account of this distinction the books are or are not canonical, then he is playing with entanglements of words, is mistaken and misleads. But if he means ingenuously that the Church can distinguish the canonical books from the non-canonical, and that they are not canonical books on account of the Church's distinction, but because they are the Word of God, or because they are divinely inspired, then he thinks rightly and is of one mind with us.

18. For the Church's judgment does not make an Apocryphal book canonical, but by its testimony it only commends, preserves, and propagates to posterity the canonical books.

19. Those unable to slip away declaim that the sources have been corrupted by the Jews. But it is manifest that in this matter they are being deceived from the letter of Augustine 3 and 59, who praises the admirable diligence of the Jews in preserving the sacred books.

20. Indeed, neither Christ nor the Apostles ever rebuked the Jews for any rejected, corrupted, or mutilated book. We certainly read that Christ accused the Jews of not knowing the Scriptures; but we do not read that they were accused by Christ of having rejected or mutilated any part or book of Scripture. Yet it is not credible that Christ or the Apostles (who so faithfully administered

their office) would have connived at such a nefarious crime and monstrous wickedness, and chosen to dissimulate it.

21. To this is added: if the Jews had corrupted the Scripture before the time of Christ, Christ and the Apostles would not have drawn their doctrine from it. But Christ and the Apostles everywhere confirm their doctrine from it, Luke 24:27, Acts 28:23, persuading them concerning Jesus Christ from the law of Moses and the prophets, from morning until evening.

22. Moreover, Christ and the Apostles admonished their hearers to read the Scripture, John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures," etc. And Luke 16:29, "They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them." Unless the Jewish canon had been whole and uncorrupted, they would not have referred us to it.

23. Finally, if the Jews had adulterated the sacred writings before the time of Christ, Paul would not have said that he believed all things which are written in Moses and the Prophets, Acts 26:22.

24. The second question is: whether the authentic truth of the canonical Scripture is to be established rather from the Hebrew and Greek sources than from the common Latin version? (*Of the authentic edition of the scriptures*)

25. We answer with Augustine in On Christian Doctrine, book 2, chapter 12, writing in these words: "Indeed the Latin language, the men whom we have undertaken to instruct need to know two other languages besides for the knowledge of the divine Scriptures, namely the Hebrew and the Greek, so that recourse may be had to the preceding originals, if any doubt arises from the endless variety of Latin translators." And a little later: "Those who have translated the Scriptures from the Hebrew language into Greek can be enumerated; but the Latin translators by no means." Canon Law, dist. 9, Can. 6.

26. Therefore, it is the authentic text to which all Latin copies ought to be corrected. But the Hebrew and Greek texts, as sources, are what all Latin copies ought to be corrected by. Therefore the Hebrew and Greek texts are authentic.

27. Jerome in his letter to Vitalis says that in the Old Testament he takes refuge with the Hebrew truth as with a fortress.

28. Nor indeed is the common edition authentic because the Church has used it for a thousand years; for it is not the antiquity of a thousand years, but divine inspiration that makes it authentic.

29. If antiquity confers authority, no edition is more ancient than the Hebrew.

30. As for vernacular editions and versions, we determine that it is permissible for all Christians to read the Sacred Scripture in the vernacular tongues. Hence Jerome translated it into the

Dalmatian language, as Alphonsus a Castro testifies in book 1, chapter 13. Chrysostom into Armenian, as Sixtus of Siena testifies. Ulfilas into Gothic, Socrates in the Tripartite History book 8, chapter 13, or in the Ecclesiastical History book 4, chapter 33. Methodius into Slavic, as Aventinus testifies in his Annals, book 4. Moreover, Augustine makes mention of the Syriac version.

31. "For it is not enough," says Augustine, "that you hear the divine readings in church; but you must also either read them yourselves at home or seek others reading them." (*in the head of the fast*)

32. The position concerning the perspicuity of Sacred Scripture must be well established, which Bellarmine perverts. For we do not say that the entire Scripture is so perspicuous that it needs no interpretation or explanation at all, nor do we assert that it is so easy throughout that any common person perfectly comprehends all its passages. (*On the perfection and obscurity of Holy Scripture*)

33. But this is the state of the question: whether all things in the Sacred Scriptures are so obscure that either nothing in them can be understood without commentaries, or whether the unlearned may profit something from reading them?

34. We assert that the Word of God is so clear that it shows the true meaning perspicuously in controversial matters; for it makes the man wise, enlightens the eyes, and directs our steps. It is a light on our path, bringing light.

35. Meanwhile, however, some passages of Scripture are obscure to some because of mental blindness, carnal wisdom, contempt for truth, self-conceit, combined with ignorance of the phrase, scope, and purpose, as well as because of the subject matter and hidden mysteries contained in them.

36. St. Paul says in 2 Corinthians 4: "And if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing, in whose case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the illumination of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not shine on them."

37. On this matter Augustine also says excellently in *On Christian Doctrine*, book 2, chapter 6: "There are certain things in Scripture obscure and difficult; yet they contain nothing else than what is put forth in other places in the plainest language. The Holy Spirit has therefore admirably and profitably modulated the Scriptures, so that by the open passages he might give nourishment, and by the obscure, he might rid us of disgust. For scarcely anything is extracted from those obscurities which is not found most plainly stated elsewhere. But where things are set forth more openly, there we must learn in what sense the obscure passages are to be taken."

38. From these statements, Bellarmine seems to conclude in this way: There are some obscure sentences in the Scriptures. Therefore, the entire Scripture is obscure. It is a captious mode of arguing; it is called the fallacy of concluding simply from what has been stated only in a certain respect.

39. Yet, lest he seem to have said nothing at all, Bellarmine responds: The doctrine of the Prophets is called a shining lamp, not because it is easily understood, but because when understood it illumines and illustrates the mind. (*On the word of God 1.3.C.2*)

40. Therefore, unless it is understood, it is not a shining lamp? This is the fallacy of non causa pro causa (assigning a non-cause as the cause). For it is not only because it is understood that it is a shining lamp; but also because it has light and clarity in itself, and brings them to others who do not yet understand, illuminating them and causing them to see and understand.

41. And just as the Sun is not bright because men look upon it (for it is luminous and bright in itself, even if no one saw it), but because it is luminous and bright by its nature, therefore men see it.

42. In the same way, the Word of God is not perspicuous and lucid because man understands it (for it would be lucid even if no human being understood it), but because it is lucid, therefore it illuminates men so that they apprehend it. And sacred doctrine can be lucid, even if it is not lucid to the Jesuits.

43. Besides, Sacred Scripture (which is rightly called a hammer, Jeremiah 23:29, shattering the rocks of heretical inventions; a fire, burning up and consuming the wickedness of customs; a two-edged sword, dividing piety from superstition; a lamp, Psalm 119:105, directing the steps of the faithful in a dark place; a rudder, steering the ship of faith through the stormy waves of this world to the haven of salvation) derives its authority first from its efficient cause, which is God, Job 7:16, 1 Thessalonians 2:13, 2 Peter 1:21. Secondly, from the excellence of its material or the doctrine which it treats. Thirdly, from the mode of its transmission, from miracles, and finally from its effects.

44. For this reason, Sacred Scripture is read as being built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, not the Church upon Scripture, Ephesians 2:20.

45. Indeed, the Church is so bound to Scripture that it is not permissible for it to deviate from it even a nail's breadth, Deuteronomy 4:2.

46. St. Paul also pronounces anathema even upon an angel from heaven, if he preaches a gospel other than that announced by the Apostles, Galatians 1:8.

47. Hence we conclude that Scripture is superior to Councils and the interpretations of the Fathers; nor are we simply bound by the authority of Councils, but by the authorities of the

Scriptures, not anyone's private authorities, but those which are common, where thing is compared with thing, cause with cause, reason with reason.

48. For the Church, as Augustine testifies against Cresconius the Grammarian, book 2, chapter 21, ought not to set itself before Christ, since He always judges truly; but ecclesiastical judges, being human, are deceived. But we ought to give entire credence to the Scriptures; nor is it permissible for us to contradict them more than God, their author, says Alphonsus à Castro, part 1, page 4.

49. Therefore we appeal from the Church to Christ as Judge, and to Scripture as his voice.

50. The genuine sense of Scripture, fully consistent with itself, is that by which alone truth consists, by which alone it battles and conquers.

On the Interpretation of Scripture

51. But this sense does not proceed from the human mind, but from the Holy Spirit, 2 Peter 1:20. For Scripture is explained by the same Spirit by which it was given.

52. And in this way the interpretation of Sacred Scripture in setting forth the chief points of Religion and the articles of faith must be sought and taken from Scripture itself, for it is the best interpreter of itself.

53. Moreover, the supreme Judge for settling controversies is our Lord Jesus Christ, who through the Holy Spirit in Sacred Scripture has resolved, judged, and determined all controversies.

54. Neither Councils nor Fathers can be judges by themselves without Scripture. For it is true, as Alphonsus de Castro says in book 1, page 29: Concerning the person of the Judge, it must be established that he cannot err.

55. This cannot be affirmed concerning the FATHERS; for they fell into very serious errors.

56. Irenaeus was a Chiliast, as Jerome testifies in chapter 36 on Ezekiel.

57. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Philippians says: "If anyone fasts on the Lord's day or on the Sabbath, except the one Sabbath, he is a Christ-killer."

58. The same, in that same epistle, also has this: "And if anyone celebrates the Passover with the Jews, etc. he is a companion of those who killed the Lord and His Apostles." But it is certain that Polycarp and Polycrates celebrated the Passover with the Jews.

59. Clement of Alexandria in sermon 6 said that Christ neither truly hungered nor truly thirsted, but only in appearance; his words are these: "For he ate, not because of the body, which was

sustained by divine power, but for the sake of those with whom he lived, lest they should judge otherwise concerning Christ's body. Just as some afterwards thought that he appeared only in appearance; but he was altogether without suffering, upon whom neither passive emotion nor pleasure nor pain could fall."

60. Origen asserted that the only-begotten Son cannot see the Father, nor can the Holy Spirit see the Son, as Epiphanius relates in book 2, heresy 64. He said the human soul pre-exists; and that these are angels and higher powers, placed in sins, and shut into this body for that reason as a punishment: and that they were sent by God into punishment, so that here first they might undergo judgment. And he makes the resurrection of the dead defective; affirming it in some places with words, but most perfectly denying it elsewhere, and sometimes asserting that a part of it rises. Finally, he imputes to Augustine in his book On Heresies, chapter 43, that the devils will be saved from the punishment of hell.

61. Tertullian went over to the Cataphrygians, condemning second marriages; in his Exhortation to Chastity he says: "Therefore, if we restore marriages which have been taken away, undoubtedly we act against the will of God, desiring to have again what He did not wish us to have. For if He had wished it, He would not have taken it away." The same was a Chiliast. For thus he writes in book 3 against Marcion: "For we also confess that a kingdom was promised to us on earth, but before heaven, but in another state, that is, after the resurrection for a thousand years, etc."

62. Lactantius was a Chiliast, On the Divine Reward, book 7, chapter 14.

63. Hilary in On the Trinity, book 10, states that Christ's body could suffer nothing, nor when it was struck did it feel pain any more than water or fire or air divided by a weapon. He wished Christ's human nature to be subject to no sufferings on account of the union.

64. These are his words: "Therefore Jesus Christ, the only-begotten God, through the flesh and the Word, just as he is the Son of man, so also the Son of God, took a true man according to the likeness of our man, not departing from Himself as God; upon whom, although a blow might fall, or a wound descend, or knots run together, or suspension raise up, yet these would surely bring the force of suffering, BUT WOULD NOT INFLICT THE PAIN OF SUFFERING: just as a weapon perforating water or pricking fire or wounding air."

65. Jerome not only disapproved of second marriages, comparing them to fornication, but was simply unjust towards marriage itself, which is God's ordinance, writing against Jovinian, book 1: "As long as I fulfill the duty of a husband, I do not fulfill that of a Christian." And a little further on: "If one ought always to pray, then one ought never to serve marriage." The same: "If the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God, and those who are in the flesh cannot please God, I consider that those who serve the conjugal duty love the wisdom of the flesh and are in the flesh." He indeed grants marriages, he grants digamy, and if necessary, he even prefers trigamy to fornication and adultery, etc. Therefore what he grants is neither good, nor well-pleasing, nor perfect.

66. Augustine determined that the Eucharist is necessary for little children for eternal life, Epistle 106 to Boniface. The same contends that little children not baptized cannot have eternal life, On Faith to Peter; his words are these: "Hold most firmly and do not at all doubt that not only those using reason, but also little children who have begun to live either in their mothers' wombs and die there, or who, when born from their mothers, depart from this world without the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, given in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are to be punished with eternal torment in the everlasting fire, etc."

67. But we also cannot simply defer judgment to COUNCILS, since very many have erred.

68. Nor can the Roman Pope be the judge, since, even as Alphonsus testifies (who was present at the Council of Trent), every man can err in the faith, even if he is the Pope; nay, it is ascertained (says the same Alphonsus) that some Popes have erred in the faith.

69. Zephyrinus was a Montanist, as Tertullian testifies against Praxeas, chapter 1, whose words are these: "The same [Praxeas] then compelled the Roman bishop, acknowledging the prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and bringing peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia from that acknowledgment, to revoke the letters of peace already issued."

70. Marcellinus sacrificed to idols. Platina, in the life of Marcellinus, says: "Marcellinus the Pontiff, being led to the sacrifices of the heathen, when the executioners pressed too hard that he should offer incense to the gods, being terrified by fear, ADORED FOREIGN GODS." The same Marcellinus was convicted of having offered incense in the temple of Isis and Vesta by Gaius and Innocentius, Deacons, Urbanus, Castorius and Juvenalis, Presbyters, and by 28 other witnesses, as is found in Caranza's Summary of the Councils.

The Bundle of Times for the year of Christ 284 affirms: "This Marcellinus, having been seized because of the cruelty of the persecution, imposed three grains of incense as a sacrifice to idols. This Marcellinus, prostrate on the ground, was condemned by the Council of Sinuessa for this deed."

71. Liberius was an Arian. The witness is Athanasius in his letter to the solitaries, saying: "Liberius then, after two years in exile, was bent, and by threats of death was induced to subscription." Jerome in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers says thus: "Fortunatianus first solicited and broke Liberius, the Bishop of the city of Rome, going into exile for the faith, and compelled him to subscribe to heresy." The same Jerome in his Chronicle for the year of Christ 352: "Liberius, overcome by weariness of exile, and subscribing to the heretical depravity, entered Rome as if a victor." The Bundle of Times for the year of Christ 354 has this: "The Arians themselves asked Constantius that Liberius be restored, as being MORE FAVORABLE TO THEM; and thus Liberius was recalled, and Felix was deposed. But because Liberius favored the Arians, the same Felix with the Catholics, having admonished him and finding him contumacious, expelled him from the Church as A HERETIC." The Chronological Compilation: "This Pope (speaking of Liberius) was a Heretic. And, Liberius, overcome by weariness of exile,

subscribed to the Arian heresy, nor is he read to have been converted to the faith and to penitence."

72. And Felix II was an Arian. Jerome in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers says thus: "Acatius was so distinguished under the Emperor Constantius, that he appointed the Arian Felix as Bishop in place of Liberius at Rome." Socrates, book 2, chapter 29: "Felix, a Deacon of the Roman Church and addicted to the Arian sect, was by force and violence chosen to the same rank by the same Ursacius."

73. Vigilius was a Eutychian; concerning whom Liberatus in his Breviary, chapter 22, says: "We do not confess two natures in Christ (says Vigilius), but one Son composed of two natures." Then he plainly condemns Leo: "He who says that in Christ there are two forms, each acting with its own communion, and does not confess one Person, one Essence, let him be anathema."

74. Honorius was a Monothelite, and on that account was condemned in the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, Act 13; the words are these: "Together with these we have also decided that Honorius, who was the former Pope of Old Rome, should be cast out from the Holy Catholic Church of God and anathematized, because in all things he followed the mind of Sergius, and confirmed his impious dogmas." And in Act 16: "And for the same reason as them, we anathematize Honorius, who was the leader of the Romans, because in all things he followed them." The Eighth General Council of Constantinople, Act 7: "Honorius was a heretic, and was condemned by the consent of the first See." The Seventh General Council of Nicaea II also pronounced anathema on him.

75. Thus three Ecumenical Councils condemned Honorius, just as also three Pontiffs did.

76. The first is Agatho, who in his Letter to the Emperor denounced anathema on Honorius. Concerning which these words are read in Caranza's Summary of the Councils: "In the same place he anathematizes the heretics who held opinions contrary to the aforesaid, Theodore, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, who were prelates of New Rome (Constantinople), and Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome."

77. The second is Leo II (who succeeded Agatho in the Roman See), in the Pontifical, in the life of Leo II, and in his Letter to Constantine, writing thus: "We anathematize also Honorius, who did not illuminate this Apostolic See with the doctrine of Apostolic Tradition, but by profane treachery endeavored to subvert its immaculate faith."

78. The third Pope who attributes the Monothelite heresy to Honorius is Adrian II, whose words are read in the Eighth Ecumenical Council, Act 7, in Caranza p. 401, and in Francis Turrianus against Albert Pighius on the true Acts of the Sixth Synod. "Although (says Adrian to the Council) anathema was pronounced on Honorius by the Orientals after his death, it must be known that he was accused of heresy, for which alone it is permissible for inferiors to resist the motions of their superiors, and freely to reject their depraved opinions, etc."

79. Finally, Umbertus, Bishop and Cardinal, the Legate of Leo IX to the Constantinopolitans, in the book which he wrote against Nicetas, also numbers Honorius among the condemned Monothelites.

80. John XXII taught that the souls of the blessed, separated from the body, would not see the Lord before the resurrection. Concerning him, Occam in his work of 93 days, Adrian on Confirmation towards the end, Gerson in his sermon on Easter, Erasmus in the Preface to book 5 of Irenaeus.

81. At the Council of Constance, session 11, it was objected to and even demonstrated that John XXIII denied the future life and the resurrection of the flesh.

82. As for Christ's Vicar, Eusebius the Roman Pontiff says in Letter 3: "Christ is the Head of the Church; but the priests are the Vicars of Christ, who fulfill the role of Christ in the Church."

On the Perfection of Sacred Scripture

83. We acknowledge that Sacred Scripture is perfect: 1. Because nothing is to be added to it, nor anything taken away. 2. Since in it we have eternal life, John 5:39, and it is able to instruct man unto salvation, and to furnish him perfectly unto every good work; finally, because Christ condemns every doctrine of men, and wills that Moses and the Prophets be heard, Luke 16:29.

84. We pray the Most High God to dispel the thick darkness in which the Pontiff is enveloped, to shake off the heavy slumber by which he is oppressed, to purge away the foul filth by which he is contaminated, for the glory of His Name and the blessedness of men. Amen.